



P.O. Box 7016 / Issaquah, WA 98027
ph: 425.313.2600 / lakesideindustries.com

August 24, 2020

Fereshteh Dehkordi, Senior Project Manager
King County
Permitting Division
Department of Local Services
35030 SE Douglas Street, Suite 210
Snoqualmie, WA 98065-9266

RE: KC File COMM18-0014 & SHOR18-0032
Proposed Lakeside Asphalt Plant
Response to Comment Letter Received November 18, 2019

Dear Ms. Dehkordi:

Lakeside Industries (Lakeside) received the King County Department of Local Services-Permitting Division staff comments, regarding the Lakeside applications referenced above, on November 18, 2019. This letter is in response to the comments received.

In addition, Lakeside obtained copies of public comments submitted to the County in response to the referenced applications. Attached to this letter is a detailed collective response to the public comments, organized by topic and identified by the name(s) of those submitting the comment to ensure all public comments received are addressed in detail.

The staff comments, presented in the County letter dated November 18, 2019, are duplicated below followed by a response.

- A. SEPA State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA): Two separate checklists have been prepared and submitted; one for construction of the asphalt plant (COMM18-0014) and one for the shoreline permit (SHOR18-0032) related to the proposed new driveway location to the site. Under the direction of SEPA standards, the department is reviewing the project in its entirety to evaluate its potential adverse impacts and will render one SEPA decision.
 1. A revised and combined environmental checklist is requested to include all aspects of the project (soil remedial (GRDE18-0069), construction of the facility (COMM18-0014) and its new driveway (SHOR18-0032). Please correct and refer to the project in the revised checklist as the "proposed asphalt plant with a proposed new driveway" not the future asphalt plant.

RESPONSE: See attached revised Combined SEPA Checklist.

2. On page 5 of the ECL and under the list of potential permits required, please include the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) permit. Please summarize and include the response you provided in the response letter dated April 20, 2018 including any mitigation measures to address potential excessive odor or chemical hazards. Many comments we have received from the members of the public are concerned about potential toxic fumes and chemicals. Please list the most common toxins and particulates emitted from the proposed plant under your current operation. Please list if any new ingredients that will be used in the new plant which would generate additional or different toxins. Please list mitigations imposed by PSCAA and incorporate them in your operation that would address any potential health hazard.

RESPONSE: See attached revised Combined SEPA Checklist. Lakeside will relocate its Covington Plant to the SR 169 Site. The Covington Plant has been permitted by PSCAA. A copy of the PSCAA Permit is attached to the revised Combined SEPA Checklist and it details the regulated emissions and operation limits of the Plant. No new ingredients will be used in the new plant that would generate additional or different emissions than those approved by PSCAA.

3. Under the description of the proposal (page 5, item 11), please indicate days and hours of operation.

RESPONSE: See attached revised Combined SEPA Checklist.

B. Site Plan

1. All structures, shown on the site plan received and dated November 6, 2018, except the control room, proposed office, the 10-foot tall sound wall adjacent to RAP Feed; the 39-foot tall retractable sound wall sand filter and flow spreader; pre-settling vault; truck enclosure; concrete mix designs and other improvements listed under "deferred submittal" have been reviewed and approved by Reid Middleton for structural design compliance under the COMM 18-0014 permit. Please remove the reference "under separate permit" for structures that are included under the present permit. See also item F-7 below. We have received a plan set for the silo loader which will be reviewed by Reid Middleton. If you plan to permit the structures listed under "differed submittal" under this permit, please submit the structural information for review and approval or label them as a separate permit.

RESPONSE: Noted and Agreed.

2. Please show the required 25-foot wide front yard setback and 20-foot wide interior setbacks on the site plan. No structures including walls over 48 inches tall shall be within the required property line setback. Maximum height in the Industrial zone is 45 feet. Any structure exceeding 45 feet in height must comply with the increased front or side setback requirement of one foot for every one increased foot in height (KCC21A.12.040(10)).

RESPONSE: Setbacks are shown. Structures have been removed from the setback. With the exception of the product storage silos, all equipment and buildings on-site do not exceed 45 feet in height. The two storage silos are 69.6 feet in height and are set back more than 160 feet from the 25-foot wide front yard setback.

3. KCC21A. 16.16.030(4) requires landscaping for “processing” uses under table 21A.08.090. A 20-foot wide type II landscaping must be provided to screen nearby residential and recreational uses from the proposed industrial use. Please provide a landscaping plan showing detail; shrubs and trees to meet the “filter” quality of a type II landscaping buffer (KCC21A. 16.040(B)). This should be separate from the wetland and stream mitigation planting areas.

RESPONSE: Per phone calls on February 19 and 20, 2020 and follow up email with Fereshteh Dehkordi it was confirmed that the perimeter buffer around the site is a Type I buffer, 20’ wide and along the SR 169 frontage is, a Type II buffer, 10’ wide.

Both required perimeter buffers are delineated on sheet L1.

For the Type I, 20’ perimeter buffer, the only area where new planting is proposed is in an approximately 200’ x 20’ strip south of the office building plus an area west of that strip and adjacent to the RAP Crusher Building. In all other areas around the site perimeter, there is either proposed mitigation planting and/or existing wooded area to remain that satisfies the Type I buffer planting requirements.

For the Type II, 10’ frontage, planting is proposed in areas adjacent to the developed portion of the site, specifically the 10’ x approximately 100’ strip in the north west portion of the site. East of that area, the proposed planting is south of the 10’ perimeter strip. This planting area exceeds the required 10’ width. East of the developed portion of the site (east of the office building), there is no new planting proposed in the landscape plans because the proposed mitigation planting and existing woodland vegetation exceed the requirements of the Type II buffer.

See sheets L2 and L3 for proposed planting in the above-mentioned areas.

4. Please show parking dimensions, driveway and aisle widths in accordance with the KCC21A. 18 on the parking plan. This may be provided on a separate parking plan sheet as part of the plan set.

RESPONSE: Parking and drive dimensions are provided on sheets 6 and 7 of the Site Engineering Plans (SEP).

5. Please provide additional detail on the 39-foot tall retractable sound wall such as when and under what circumstances it would be in use.

RESPONSE: Retractable sound wall curtain structural details is a deferred submittal. The retractable sound wall is only required for nighttime noise mitigation and will be deployed if nighttime operations occur between 10PM and 7AM during weekdays and 10PM and 9AM on weekends.

6. Please correct the wall height on the west side of the site in accordance with the height shown in the Noise Study (Figure 2). The study refers to a 24-foot tall wall whereas the site plan shows an 18-foot tall noise barrier wall on the west of the proposed facility.

RESPONSE: Wall heights have been corrected to be consistent with the current noise study.

7. Please show the dimensions of the foot print of the office structure.

RESPONSE: Dimensions have been added to the structure, (See plan sheet 7.)

C. Office Structure

The site plan shows a sewage holding tank next to the office building. A health approval is required for this method of sewage disposal and its location on the site.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. See response to D.

D. Health Permit Approval

Please provide a health department approval for the proposed septic system.

RESPONSE: An application for the on-site sewage holding tank has been prepared and will be submitted to King County Public Health upon receipt of the applied for Critical Area Designation, CADS19-0258. See King County Comment E below.

E. Critical Area Designation (CAD)

CADS19-0258 has been received for review and will be completed soon so that it can be provided to King County Public Health along with application for an on-site septic system.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

F. Site Engineering Comments- King County Surface Water Design Manual Standards (KCSWDM):

1. KCDLS-Permitting Division standard procedure requires the civil engineer to prepare the standard flood certification form for review and analysis of the floodplain for the stream on-site. Please fill out the standard flood certification form (enclosed) and insert it in the TIR with the floodplain analysis.

RESPONSE: This form has been prepared and was/is included in the Flood Study. A copy of the form is also included in the Technical Information Report (TIR).

2. We have received the development agreements signed by the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) for construction of the new driveway and the acceleration lane along SR-167. However, for our record, we require a stamped approved copy of the plans by WSDOT for our record. We will coordinate the approved road construction plans with the improvements within the site and shown on the final site plan.

RESPONSE: A copy of the Road Improvement Plans, approved by WSDOT, will be included with the resubmittal. [A minor drainage revision to these approved plans was accepted by WSDOT for review on May 27, 2020 and are included as reference in the SEP Plan resubmittal set].

3. Proposing a Contech Storm Chamber for the infiltration system. Contech Chamber is not an option in the 2016 KCSWDM. This will have to be reviewed and approved through a SWDM Variance Adjustment application.

RESPONSE: An adjustment application was submitted for approval on May 27, 2020.

4. The site contains landslide hazard areas. These sensitive areas must be reviewed by our Geotech Review section for potential consideration in the design of the storm drainage system.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

5. The project site is located within groundwater protection areas. These include but are not limited to critical aquifer recharge areas (CARAs), wellhead protection areas or zones (including 1, 5 and 10 year time of travel zones for municipal well protection areas, if available), and sole source aquifers. Provide explanation on how you meet the groundwater protection criteria as described in page 5-51 to 5-53 of the 2016 KCSWDM.

RESPONSE: Please see AESI July 16, 2020 Letter to Lakeside Industries, Subject: Supplemental Response to King County Comments. AESI has responded as follows:

AESI Response:

The underlying purpose of the Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARAs) description contained in AESI's October 2, 2018 "Critical Area Assessment" (CAA) letter-report prepared for Lakeside Industries, Inc. was to disclose the project site's high susceptibility rating to contamination of area groundwater resources. The letter-report specifically discloses the relevant King County CARA code (*King County Code* [KCC] 21A.06.253C), which identifies both areas with a high susceptibility and medium susceptibility to contamination. The referenced KCC specifically identifies the relationship between high or medium susceptibility and "wellhead protection areas for a municipal or district drinking water system" well. King County adopted a CARA map under KCC 21A.24.311.

Figure 5 of the letter-report includes the mapped areas identified by King County as having either a high susceptibility or medium susceptibility. The map indicates the entire Cedar River valley classifies as either high or medium susceptibility, with most of the Cedar River valley and the northern portion of the project site classified as high susceptibility.

The CAA disclosed the high susceptibility to contamination rating of the project site and indicated the KCWD #90 wells are located within the 5-year time of travel (TOT) from the project site. The King County Water District #90 2014 Wellhead Protection Plan (WHPP) prepared by Pacific Groundwater Group (PGG) indicates the project site is located in the 10-year TOT. The CAA used the conservative assumption of a 5-year TOT. The WHPP specifically states “The supply aquifer is confined by 22 to 33 feet of overlying silt and clay, which pressurizes groundwater levels at the wellfield to approximately 12-13 feet above ground surface”. The CAA conservatively assumes the wells are not protected by any intervening low-permeability units. The CAA considered the project site to have a high susceptibility rating for groundwater contamination, assumed the most conservative estimate for TOT for KCWD #90 wells, and did not attempt to suggest the KCWD #90 wells or any other wells in the Cedar River valley would be protected by confining layers.

The project water quality treatment train does not depend on the underlying soil to provide any water quality treatment. All water quality treatment is achieved prior to “release” into the soil horizon beneath the infiltration facility and prior to contact with the underlying shallow groundwater system. Since stormwater runoff will be infiltrated the project must comply with KCSWDM Core Requirement #8 and Special Requirement #5 to avoid contaminating groundwater. Core Requirement #8 requires water quality treatment. The project is considered “high use”, therefore Enhanced Basic water quality treatment is the applicable standard. This standard is met by provision of the large sand filter alone. The project proposes to exceed this standard through a treatment train of a grass-filter swale, pre-settling vault, and sand-filter prior to infiltration to groundwater. Special Requirement #5 requires Oil Control. The project proposes to satisfy this requirement by incorporating two coalescing plate oil/water separators upstream of the pre-settling vault.

Areas mapped as highly susceptible to contamination are considered Category I, and medium susceptibility areas are considered Category II under KCC 21A.24.313. Development standards in CARAs are identified under KCC 21A.24.316. The CARA discussion discloses the proposed use of two 30,000-gallon heated asphalt cement storage tanks, one 10,000-gallon diesel tank, and one 10,000-gallon emulsified asphalt tank. As required under KCC 21A.24.316.A.8, the proposed aboveground storage tanks for hazardous substances will be protected with primary and secondary containment areas. This mitigation requirement was described in the CAA. The CAA also identified that a spill prevention and response plan would be developed in accordance with the General Permit.

The project proposes to provide a stormwater quality treatment train designed to exceed the requirements of the 2016 KCSWDM criteria and is therefore protective of groundwater resources. In addition, the project will develop a spill prevention and response plan in accordance with the General Permit. Therefore, it is our opinion the project design meets the underlying goal of avoiding adverse impacts to groundwater resources, and will maintain beneficial uses of groundwater resources.

6. The engineering site plan submitted refers to walls over 4 feet in height and it refers to a separate permit application. Structural walls shown on the site engineering plan must be reviewed for appropriate setback requirement. Therefore, structural walls are required to be reviewed and approved under this permit application and not as a separate permit application. Provide the appropriate structural information for review. The retaining wall requires setback from the proposed grassed swale and conveyance pipe system. See page 4-5, Table 4.1 for the setback requirement in the 2016 KCSWDM.

RESPONSE: The site plan has been revised to provide additional wall setbacks from interior property lines and wall/storage bin setbacks from piped conveyance lines and swales. Setbacks reflect requirements for drainage easements over the piped conveyance lines and swales, although easements are not required for the privately maintained facilities.

7. Per page 1-101 in the 2016 KCSWDM, it states that the 100-year floodplain shall be determined and the boundaries shall be delineated on the site improvement plans and profiles. Therefore, delineate the floodplain of the stream on the site drainage plan. It is only delineated in the cross-sectional detail. Also, it needs to be shown on the TESC plan too. It needs to be shown on the TESC plan to verify that the proposed grading work will not encroach into the stream floodplain area.

RESPONSE: In addition to the Site Paving and Drainage sheets of the site plan, the 100-year flood plain has been delineated on the site cross-sections and TESC plan. The Watershed Company has incorporated Stream B's floodplain into the Mitigation Plan set and adjusted the plant selection accordingly.

8. Engineering plan sheet 6 shows a proposed ditch that is located within WSDOT right-of-way and on-site (King County). The ditch must be located entirely within the property.

RESPONSE: This ditch has been eliminated.

9. Sheet 7 (detail B) shows an equipment "lean to" building next to a proposed grass lined ditch. Provide appropriate building setback consistent with page 4-5, Table 4.1 in the 2016 KCSWDM. Per page 4-4 in the 2016 KCSWDM, Table 4.1 (p. 4-5) lists the required widths and building setback lines for drainage easements. For all pipes or any channels or constructed swales greater than 30 feet wide, facilities must be placed in the center of the easement. For channels or constructed swales less than or equal to 30 feet wide, the easement extends to only one side of the facility. Show the drainage setback requirement on the drainage plan consistent with the 2016 KCSWDM. Specify all the

setbacks for the drainage conveyance system from adjacent structure and property line on the site plan.

RESPONSE: The site plan has been revised to provide additional wall setbacks from interior property lines and wall/storage bin setbacks from piped conveyance lines and swales. Setbacks reflect requirements for drainage easements over the piped conveyance lines and swales, although easements are not required for these privately maintained facilities.

10. The land disturbance within the wetland buffer was not considered in the detention analysis. Landscaping proposal can be considered a targeted surface unless you can describe and show/justify that it meets the detention exemption stipulated in the guidelines of the 2016 KCSWDM for native vegetation replanting consistent with the drainage manual guidelines.

RESPONSE: The wetland buffer is being restored/revegetated with native plantings and amended soils as part of an approved Buffer Mitigation Plan. As such, it will not be considered a targeted area and runoff mitigation will not be required.

11. All land disturbance associated with the project site is required to be treated through an erosion sediment control system. The TESC plan show only straw wattle erosion treatment for the grading proposed within the wetland buffer area. The land disturbance within the wetland buffer must be routed and treated by the erosion control system design for the project site. The sizing calculation for the erosion treatment will need to include this area of the wetland buffer. I am assuming it was not, since the design submitted is not routing it to the erosion control system for the project site.

RESPONSE: The TESC plans have been revised to incorporate temporary swales along the buffer's downslope edge to intercept runoff during construction and route it by pumping to a sediment control facility prior to discharge.

In the Buffer Mitigation Plan, The Watershed Company includes the use of jute blankets and wood chip mulch as soil treatment measures.

12. The erosion plan submitted is proposing wattle as a perimeter protection. The standard is that a silt fence must be used as a perimeter protection. Therefore, provide silt fence along the perimeter of the land disturbance within the wetland.

RESPONSE: Agreed. We placed a note on the plans indicating that wattles may be substituted if approved by the County's erosion control inspector at the time of installation.

13. Sheet 7 shows a detail of a grassed lined swale with no dimensions. Provide dimensions on the detail consistent with the conveyance analysis.

RESPONSE: The detail has been revised to show dimensions.

14. Show the roof connection for all the proposed building to the south. It must be consistent with the conveyance analysis.

RESPONSE: Connections are indicated on the plans, but contributions to conveyance inputs will be further clarified in the conveyance analysis provided in the TIR.

15. The flow splitter detail in sheet 9 of the engineering plans needs to show the following information:

- Provide an independent detail of the 24" overflow riser with specific information. The detail provided is very crowded and lightly shaded.
 - ◆ I am assuming it needs to be a solid bottom. Specify solid bottom.
 - ◆ Specify overflow elevation consistent with the computation analysis. A baffle should be provided at the overflow riser to trap the oil.

RESPONSE: The requested detail has been provided. A baffle is not required because the outlet is submerged.

16. The floodplain analysis, Subsurface Geotech Report, SWPP Plan, and Mounding Analysis was provided in a separate report book. It needs to be inserted into the TIR and not as a separate binder. It is part/associated attachment to the Technical Information Report (TIR).

RESPONSE: A copy of these items is incorporated in the TIR.

17. The proposed building structure referred as "lean to" is referred to a separate permit application. It must be reviewed and approved under this permit application for appropriate setback and design requirements. Otherwise, don't show it on the plan. This applies to all building in the future.

RESPONSE: The "lean to" has been reviewed and approved by Reid Middleton for structural design compliance under the COMM 18-0014 permit.

18. I discussed your proposed driveway entrance to the site of 50 feet width with the King County Development Engineer. The maximum allowed by the 2016 road standard is less than 50 feet. The proposal must be consistent with the maximum allowed by the road standard, unless you can provide justification that it is necessary.

RESPONSE: TENW has demonstrated that the road width is necessary to accommodate truck turns into/out of the site. This driveway width/location has been reviewed/approved by WSDOT. (See approved Road Improvement Plans, enclosed.).

19. The retaining wall proposed within the large sand filter will need structural review. Provide appropriate structural information (drawing details, soils report, and calculation) for review and approval.

RESPONSE: Structural drawings for the sand filter have been prepared by SMG and are included with the SEP resubmittal.

20. The pre-settling vault will require structural review. Provide structural detail, calculation, Geotech report specific to the structural design of the vault for review and approval. Please note that the approved structural plans must be consistent with the final approved civil plans.

RESPONSE: The precast concrete panel vault specified for the Pre-Settling vault will be a deferred submittal. Following review/approval of the schematic design prepared for the SEP, shop drawings and supporting calculations will be provided by Oldcastle upon order placement by the contractor, and then submitted for review by the Engineer and King County.

21. All drainage pipe connection must be conducted at a catch basin. The drainage line associated with the oil/water separator system show fusing pipes together.

RESPONSE: Design has been revised.

22. The TIR does not include calculations for the oil/water separator. Provide design calculation of the oil/water separator consistent with the 2016 KCSWDM guidelines. See page 6-62 in the 2016 KCSWDM for design calculation and design criteria. Show that you meet all design criteria.

RESPONSE: Oil/water separator calculations are included in the TIR, see section 4-12 & 4-13.

23. The existing condition of the site discharges in 4 culverts within the frontage road of SR169. The proposal is to discharge into one of the culverts to the Cedar River. A SWM Variance must be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Adjustment Committee. Provide sizing calculation for the downstream system to verify it has the capacity to accommodate the additional tributary area. If the culvert conveys a regulated stream, then analysis must be provided to show that the additional stormwater will not adversely impact the stream.

RESPONSE: Up to and including the 100-year storm, runoff is being managed onsite using a large infiltration gallery. Overflow or runoff from a more extreme event will discharge to an existing 30" culvert crossing under SR 169. This mimics the natural discharge location. Calculations demonstrating how the existing culvert will perform, if receiving the 100-year flows from the project site, are included in the TIR.

24. Provide the manufacturer's specs for the specific pump system proposed for this project, showing that it meets the hydraulic head required based on the calculation provided.

RESPONSE: In addition to the information provided on sheet 14, manufacturer's specifications and cut sheet documentation is included in the TIR.

25. Per page 4-36 in the 2016 KCSWDM for pump design criteria, it states that "The gravity-flow components of the drainage system to and from the pump system must be designed so that pump failure does not result in flooding of a building or emergency access, or overflow to a location other than the natural discharge point for the site". Show/describe what will happen to the stormwater if the pump system does fail and it overflows.

RESPONSE: Emergency overflow route has been indicated on the plans and described in an added section in the TIR.

26. Per page 5-49 in the 2016 KCSWDM, All infiltration facilities must have a spill control device upstream of the facility to capture oil or other floatable contaminants before they enter the infiltration facility. Provide/specify a spill control system on the site plan and include a detail consistent with the 2016 guidelines. It would seem appropriate to have the spill control device just before the pump system.

RESPONSE: A spill control device has been added upstream of the pump intake.

27. Provide a profile of the driveway entrance with connection to the road improvements within the State right-of-way. Verify that the change in grade is not too significant and within the guidelines of the 2016 road standard manual.

RESPONSE: A driveway profile has been added to sheet 8 of the SEP plans.

28. Fill out the standard bond quantity worksheet for review.

RESPONSE: The standard bond quantity worksheet is included in the TIR. The Watershed Company also provides quantity estimates and associated costs for mitigation work proposed in the wetland and buffers using the King County bond quantity worksheet.

29. Fill out the standard declaration of covenant and submit it for review. Include the standard exhibit as described in the document. Once we finalize the review of the document, it will need to be signed, notarized, and recorded. Provide our department a copy of the entire recorded document for our file.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. A draft is included in the TIR for review prior to recording.

30. The proposed French drain next to the office building structure must be setback appropriately. Specify the setback provided. It must be consistent with the drainage manual guidelines.

RESPONSE: The site plan has been revised to reflect the appropriate setbacks.

31. Provide appropriate setback for the French drain from the property line consistent with the 2016 KCSWDM guidelines. See page 4-5, Table 4.1 for the setback requirement in the 2016 KCSWDM.

RESPONSE: The site plan has been revised to reflect the appropriate setbacks.

32. Specify setback for conveyance pipe from all structure and property line. It must meet the requirement of the 2016 KCSWDM. See page 4-5, Table 4.1 for the setback requirement in the 2016 KCSWDM.

RESPONSE: The site plan has been revised to reflect the appropriate setbacks.

33. The Proposed grassed swale ditch conveyance system for the project site must be setback appropriately from property line and structures consistent with the guidelines of the 2016 KCSWDM, per section 4.1.2 (Easement and Setback requirement).

RESPONSE: The site plan has been revised to reflect the appropriate setbacks.

34. The specified volume of the pre-settling vault in page 4-15 in the TIR requires a depth of 5.13 feet of dead storage. Normally, this is calculated based on the outlet pipe elevation from the top of the sediment storage in the vault. The details of the pre-settling vault shows a depth of only 2 feet. I assume the storage is based on the pump system downstream. Provide description and explanation on how the depth will be sustained based on a pump system drawn process for review. The required/designed volume must be maintained.

RESPONSE: The elevation of the connection from the pre-settling vault to the pump station does not dictate the dead storage elevation within the pre-settling vault. The pump floats will determine the dead storage elevation by shutting off the pumps once the water level decreases to the top of the dead storage.

35. Per page 6-29, Table 9.2.4.A in the 2016 KCSWDM, sand filter requires treatment liner and not low permeability liner. The plan specifies low permeability liner. Modify the liner on the civil plan to be consistent with the treatment liner design requirements. Provide the specs for the treatment liner on the civil plans.

RESPONSE: The sand filter liner has been revised to a "treatment" liner.

36. The plans and design approved by the engineering section must be consistent with the plans reviewed and approved our Geotech Review section and wetland review section.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

37. Specify on the engineering plan the setback provided for the proposed infiltration system from the office building and any structure near the vicinity. The setback must be consistent with the drainage manual guidelines, which requires 20 feet.

RESPONSE: The site plan has been revised to reflect the appropriate setbacks.

38. The plan shows a well house on-site. Normally, there is a radius diameter of 100 feet setback required by the King County Health Department. Why is it not shown on the plans? All the proposal must be setback appropriately consistent with the approval by the King County Health department.

RESPONSE: The setback is shown on Sheet 2. The proposed site improvements will not impact the well or its setback.

39. Provide and specify rock check dam on the proposed conveyance ditches on the project consistent with the guidelines of the 2016 KCSWDM.

RESPONSE: Provided.

40. Provide and specify interim CB protection on the TESC plan. Provide a standard detail.

RESPONSE: Provided.

41. The floodplain of the Cedar River abuts the road on the other side of this project. The project site contains culvert that crosses the road and discharge into the Cedar River within a short distance. There is the potential of the floodplain of the Cedar River migrating through the culvert and encroaching within the project site. Verify that the floodplain of the Cedar River will not encroach into the project site.

RESPONSE: An exhibit is included in the TIR which indicates Cedar River floodplain elevation at each of the cross culverts. The floodplain extends only to the bottom of the roadside ditch on the south side of the highway. Flood elevations are shown to be below any invert elevations of conveyance elements connecting to the on-site stormwater management system.

42. The backwater analysis for the grass swale must be incorporated into the backwater analysis for the entire conveyance system for the project. I could not determine that a backwater analysis was conducted on the grassed swale. It is considered as part of the conveyance and needs to be analyzed accordingly base on the drainage manual guidelines.

RESPONSE: The grass lined swale is now included in the backwater analysis.

43. Please submit a copy of the approved engineering and construction plans by the WSDOT for the new proposed driveway and road improvements. Permitting Division will coordinate the portion of the driveway within the site with the driveway location reviewed and approved by WSDOT.

RESPONSE: A copy of the Road Improvement Plans, approved by WSDOT, will be included with the resubmittal. [A minor drainage revision to these approved plans was accepted by WSDOT for review on May 27, 2020 and are included as reference in the SEP Plan resubmittal set].

44. Analyze the inlet and outlet of the proposed culvert within the project site. It must be consistent with the 2016 KCSWDM guidelines for analyzing the inlet and outlet of a culvert.

RESPONSE: Analysis results are incorporated into the TIR.

45. Per page 6-109 in the 2016 KCSWDM, the underdrain system is sized to convey the peak filtered flows to the outlet. For the basic sand filter, the central collector pipe(s) shall be sized to convey, at a minimum, the 2-year return frequency flow into the facility using the KCBW program's backwater analysis techniques described in Chapter 4.

RESPONSE: The KCBW program's backwater analysis techniques have been used to demonstrate underdrain is appropriately sized.

46. In engineering plan sheet 2, it states domestic well to be decommissioned. Provide information that it has been finalized prior to engineering plan approval. Talk to Scott if this needs to be done.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. The location of the well is known; however, the wellhead was covered over with soil by the previous owner/operator. It is anticipated that the wellhead will be exposed during grading activities associated with the site development and will be decommissioned accordingly.

47. The proposed mitigation trade submitted in the TIR is within the State ROW. Generally, it has to be on-site, which King County has jurisdiction and control.

RESPONSE: A request for acceptance of this area trade has been submitted to Ron Hoelscher to determine if an adjustment is required. A copy of the request will be provided with this response letter.

48. Civil plan set and TIR has been marked up with comments. These markup package needs to be picked up from our office and addressed accordingly.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. Plan comments have been addressed – see green line responses on plans.

G. Critical Areas Code comments and applicable Standards

Laura Casey, KCDLS-Permitting Environmental Scientist visited the site and reviewed the revised Critical Areas Report by The Watershed Company, dated September 2018 and has the following comments and request for additional information:

- Wetlands A, B, C, D, DD and the right-of-way wetland are correctly identified and rated. As a high impact land use outside the Urban Growth Boundary, the revised Report correctly specifies larger buffers than standard around these wetlands to provide better protection from the impacts of this development. The revised Report states that the areas identified as marginal wetlands in the previous report no longer exist on the site.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. No action needed.

- Stream B is a Type F aquatic area that can support salmonid fish. Stream A is too steep at a 28% gradient for salmonid habitat, and is a Type N. Stream C is a narrow channel about one foot wide and appears to be a Type N aquatic area.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. No action needed. We agree Stream C is Type N.

- Stream A flows down the slope, across an alluvial fan and then along the west side of the parcel. The stream has overtopped its banks in the recent past and has been dredged in response to the flooding. Additional material has been placed to effectively create a berm on the downhill side of the stream. It appears that stream manipulation has occurred in the past. These actions are not permitted in the Critical Areas Code.
- ◆ Please evaluate the impact of dredging Stream A and constructing a berm in the buffer, and prepare a restoration plan. The restoration plan shall also assess the long-term impacts of alluvial sediment deposition on the current stream location and consider making recommendations for a stream enhancement and monitoring plan.

RESPONSE: The Mitigation Plan proposes to excavate the placed fill along Stream A and rebuild the streambank with bioengineering techniques, including the placement of logs, planting stakes, and container vegetation along the stream.

Sediment deposition will continue to aggrade the channel at the confluence of Streams A and B. Presently, flows from Stream A backup into Stream B and Wetland A (via a culvert), sheet flow to the northwest, enter a storm water drain, and emerge back into Stream B at the location of the ecology blocks. The stormwater catchment will be decommissioned and the Stream B bank restored. The proposed grading, soil decompaction, and planting in the buffer will allow water from Stream A to continue to flow into Stream B and Wetland A, infiltrate into the ground, and during peak flow events, flow via groundwater and sheetflow to the west through the buffer area and floodplain and back into the low gradient of Stream B. See the Mitigation Plan for details.

The plan should be prepared in conjunction with assessment by the geotechnical consultant to address sediment deposition processes. Recommendations should be provided to minimize the need for stream disturbance over time.

RESPONSE: Stream A is an intermittent steep gradient gravel-bedded stream, and flows to the north down the steep slopes located along the southern margin of the site. The stream corridor bends to the west as it approaches the toe of the slope as shown on Sheet M1.0 of 14, provided by TWC, attached. The stream gradient flattens abruptly at the confluence with Stream B at the toe of the slope. Sediment accumulates in an alluvial fan at the abrupt change in slope at the confluence of Streams A and B where sediment transport energy is significantly reduced due to the change in slope gradient.

Alluvial fan deposition/aggradation. In the existing condition, sediment is transported from the upslope channel due to long-term incision due to off-site upslope stormwater runoff. The project has no control over the upslope, off-site runoff. The only available practical approach to mitigate on-site channel erosion in Stream A due to the off-site runoff includes maximizing the flow length of Stream A. The current geometry of Stream A already maximizes the flow length by flowing near the toe of slope prior to the confluence with Stream B at the change in gradient at the base of the slope. The longer flow path reduces the rate of headward erosion, as a result of decreasing the stream gradient. The flattening of the stream gradient decreases flow velocity and minimizes erosion and sediment carrying capacity resulting in reduced sediment transport to the confluence of Streams A and B. The existing geometry of the long flow path must be maintained to minimize future headward erosion in Stream A and associated fan sedimentation at the toe of the slope.

According to information provided by TWC in an email dated May 21, 2020, no grading is proposed in the floodplain at the confluence of Streams A and B. Sediment is expected to continue to accumulate, and the water can back up into Stream B and its floodplain. The water would then travel northwest, downgradient, across the site and back into the existing Stream B channel.

Streambank restoration area regrading/re-enforcement. Stream A has previously breached the streambank resulting in sediment transport and flooding of a portion of the site including the area around the existing wellhouse. TWC's proposed streambank restoration plan incorporates bioengineering techniques designed to minimize future streambank breaching during high flow events. The proposed bioengineered reinforcement plan is intended to mitigate the potential for avulsion (cut-off) in Stream A and associated erosion and sedimentation due to breaching of the streambank.

- The County received comments from the Muckleshoot and Suquamish Tribes on this project. The Muckleshoot Tribe expressed concern about the project's potential impact on salmon habitat in the Cedar River and recommended an environmental impact statement. They asked for a site alternatives analysis for least environmental impact. Some additional recommendations include making the culvert beneath SR 169 that conveys flows from Stream C fish-passable, classifying Stream C as Type F, and modifying site lighting to reduce impact on fish resources. The Suquamish Tribe concurred with the Muckleshoot Tribe comments and requested additional information on stream classification.

- ◆ Please provide a written response to the Tribes' recommendations.

RESPONSE: The Watershed Company provided written responses to the Muckleshoot and Suquamish Tribes addressing their concerns. See letters dated June 4, 2020.

The County's Wildlife Network crosses this property in the northwestern corner. The wildlife network must be protected with a 300-foot wide corridor. Part of that corridor is on this property and part extends offsite. Several public comments were received in Spring 2019. Several expressed concern that wildlife observed in the area might be impacted by this project. The County's critical areas code requires protection of specific breeding sites of certain species, listed in KCC 21A.24.382, and the active breeding sites of federal or state listed endangered, threatened, sensitive and candidate species of King County species of local importance. Rare or migratory species passing through the Puget Sound area are not protected in the County's Critical Areas Code unless they meet the above Code criteria and have active nest sites. None of the identified protected species have been observed in the vicinity of this project site. No additional information or revision is required.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. No action needed.

- Please note that the Washington State Department of Ecology (WSDOE) provided comments regarding the Shoreline Permit associated with this project. Specifically the WSDOE recommended that the County consider whether the highway expansion and access improvements in shoreline jurisdiction are part of a single integrated project which includes the asphalt plant outside of shoreline jurisdiction. The County has determined that the shoreline development permit is for relocation of the existing access driveway to serve the site. The SR-169 frontage improvement as approved by the State Department of Transportation is to improve safety and traffic movements in and out of the Industrial zoned property with industrial type land use activities.
- ◆ Please identify any potential impacts in the shoreline environment from the proposed industrial access associated with this project. The Division will review any potential impacts associated with the proposed access within the combined environmental review of the project under SEPA.

RESPONSE: No potential adverse impacts in the shoreline environment from the proposed industrial access associated with the project are anticipated. For this project, shoreline jurisdiction includes uplands located within 200 feet of the ordinary high water mark of the Cedar River. This shoreline jurisdiction extends onto the subject property in some locations up to approximately 60 feet. No wetlands are located within shoreline jurisdiction on the south side of SR 169.

The Cedar River is functionally isolated from the subject property by SR 169, a busy five-lane highway carrying heavy traffic at high speeds during most times of the day. King County Code (at 21A.24.358.E.1.d) states that if "a legally established roadway transects an aquatic area buffer, the roadway edge closest to aquatic area shall be the extent of the buffer, if the part of the buffer on the other side of the roadway provides

insignificant biological or hydrological function in relation to the portion of the buffer adjacent to the aquatic area.” As detailed in the project Critical Area Report (see pages 21-22), because both biological and hydrologic buffering functions to the Cedar River are lacking or insignificant on the south side of SR 169, the stream buffer should end at the roadway edge north of SR 169. Therefore, all proposed development associated with the project would occur outside of the shoreline buffer.

Moreover, the proposed stormwater improvements are anticipated to improve the shoreline environment. Currently, runoff from SR 169 flows to an existing drainage ditch and then flows untreated through culverts into the Cedar River. In contrast, this project’s proposed development will be constructed in compliance with the 2016 King County Surface Water Design Manual, including water quality and flow control requirements.

- Please revise the site plans to address the following:

Sheet 2 of 32 depicts an existing headwall along a portion of Stream B. A pipe and catchbasin in the vicinity are proposed to be removed. Please also remove the headwall, either as part of project demolition or as part of the buffer enhancement plan.

RESPONSE: The ecology blocks are proposed to be removed with gentle regrading outside of ordinary high water mark, and the surrounding area planted with native vegetation (see Mitigation Plan for reference).

- ◆ Landscape Plans- Three species of plants within critical areas buffers and/or shoreline jurisdiction are non-native. Please replace *Acer rubrum*, *Betula nigra* and *Lonicera pileata* with native tree and shrub species.

RESPONSE: The Landscape Plans have been revised to remove non-native plants within the 200’ shoreline setback. *Acer rubrum*, *Betula nigra*, and *Lonicera pileata* are no longer proposed within the shoreline setback. They have been replaced with native plants that are shown with an asterisk (*) on the plant schedule on sheet L1.

Additionally, the seed mix to be used in the entire project will consist of native grass seed.

- ◆ Sheet M2.0 and 2.1 of 10- Buffer averaging, project impacts, and proposed mitigation are acceptable.

Acknowledged. No action needed.

H. Fire Access and Compliance with Fire Code

Please contact Mark Ossewaarde at (206) 477-0366 or mark.ossewaarde@kingcounty.gov

He has noted that he has been in touch with you regarding fire requirements. The applicable fire standards (if any) must be reflected in the resubmittal.

RESPONSE: The King County Fire Marshal and the King County Building Official approved the fire flow requirements for the site and the fire suppression plan drafted by Water Environment Resources. Documentation of review and approval is included. Construction drawings are being prepared and will be submitted as a deferred submittal.

If you have any questions regarding this response to comments, please contact me at (425) 313-2660 or karen.deal@lakesideindustries.com.

Sincerely,



Karen Deal
Director, Environmental & Land Use

Enclosure(s)

- Attachment 1 – Lakeside’s Responses to Public Comments Matrix
- Attachment 2 – Combined SEPA Checklist
- Attachment 3 – Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Permit
- Attachment 4 – Technical Information Report, David Evans and Associates, Inc. (DEA)
- Attachment 5 – Floodplain Analysis and Delineation and King County Flood Hazard Certificate, David Evans and Associates, Inc. (DEA)
- Attachment 6 – Critical Areas Report Revised, The Watershed Company (TWC)
- Attachment 7 – Revised Critical Area Assessment, Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. (AESI)
- Attachment 8 – Subsurface Exploration, Infiltration Testing, Design Infiltration Rate, and Groundwater Mounding Analysis, Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. (AESI)
- Attachment 9 – Updated Transportation Impact Analysis, Transportation Engineering NorthWest (TENW)
- Attachment 10 – StormTech SC-740 Chamber Adjustment Request, David Evans and Associates, Inc.(DEA)
- Attachment 11 – Roadside Ditch Conveyance Calculations, David Evans and Associates, Inc.(DEA)
- Attachment 12 – Road Improvement Plans
- Attachment 13 – Response to King County Comments dated November 18, 2019, Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. (AESI)
- Attachment 14 – Supplemental Response to King County Comments dated November 18, 2019, Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. (AESI)
- Attachment 15 – Critical Areas Mitigation Bond Quantity Worksheet
- Attachment 16 – Response to Muckleshoot Tribe Comments, The Watershed Company (TWC)
- Attachment 17 – Response to Suquamish Tribe Comments, The Watershed Company (TWC)
- Attachment 18 – Response to King County Comments, The Watershed Company (TWC)
- Attachment 19 – Maple Valley Fire Protection Plan, Water Environment Resources, Inc.

Attachment 20 – Updated Noise Assessment Report, Ramboll US Corporation
Attachment 21 – Email Communication – Ron Hoelscher, King County and Rick Tomkins, DEA,
RE: King County Comment #F.47, July 6, 2020

Site Engineering Plan Set Revisions
Building Plan Set Revisions
Mitigation Plan Set Revisions