

ATTACHMENT 2 - Combined SEPA Checklist

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. You may use "not applicable" or "does not apply" only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown. You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Instructions for Lead Agencies:

Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B plus the [SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS \(part D\)](#). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in Part B - Environmental Elements –that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

A. Background [\[HELP\]](#)

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Lakeside SR 169 Asphalt Plant and Lakeside/WSDOT SR169 Transportation Facility, with relocation of existing driveway and new deceleration/acceleration lane.

{03992157.DOCX;2 }

2. Name of applicant:

Lakeside industries, Inc.

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

Karen Deal, 6505 226th Place SE, Ste. 200, Issaquah, WA 98027
Tel: (425) 313-2660

4. Date checklist prepared:

July 31, 2020

5. Agency requesting checklist:

King County Department of Local Services/Permitting Division

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

Promptly after permit approval. Grading activities including excavation of petroleum contaminated soils, and backfill with clean soils, will be the first actions. The plant construction and the work on the WSDOT/ Lakeside Transportation Facility will start immediately following completion of the grading activities. Grading for the Transportation Facility could occur at the same time as grading for the plant.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

No.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

- Release Notification and Notice of Independent Remedial Action, Farallon Consulting, September 1, 2016
- Critical Area Assessment, Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. (AESI), May 23, 2017
- Revised Critical Area Assessment, Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. (AESI), September 20, 2018
- Subsurface Exploration, Infiltration Testing, Design Infiltration Rate, and Groundwater Mounding Analysis, Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. (AESI), October 2, 2018
- Response to King County Comments dated November 18, 2019, Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. (AESI), June 8, 2020
- Supplemental Response to King County Comments dated November 18, 2019, Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. (AESI), July 16, 2020

- Stream & Wetland Delineation Report, The Watershed Company (TWC), February 24, 2017
 - Critical Areas Report, The Watershed Company (TWC), September 2018
 - Critical Areas Report, Maple Valley Asphalt Facility, The Watershed Company (TWC), Revised June 2020
 - Responses to Muckleshoot Tribe Comments, The Watershed Company (TWC), June 4, 2020
 - Responses to the Suquamish Tribe Comments, The Watershed Company (TWC), June 4, 2020
 - Mitigation Plan, Maple Valley Asphalt Facility, The Watershed Company (TWC), June 15, 2020
-
- Level 1 Traffic Impact Analysis, Transportation Engineering NorthWest (TENW), June 19, 2017
 - Updated Traffic Impact Analysis; Transportation Engineering NorthWest (TENW), November 2, 2018
-
- Floodplain Analysis and Delineation, David Evans and Associates, Inc. (DEA), September 7, 2018
 - Technical Information Report, David Evans and Associates, Inc. (DEA), October 2, 2018
 - Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention (CSWPP) Plan, David Evans and Associates, Inc. (DEA), October 2, 2018
 - StormTech SC-740 Chamber Adjustment Request, David Evans Associates, Inc. (DEA), May 20, 2020
 - Technical Information Report, David Evans Associates, Inc (DEA), Revised June 8, 2020
-
- Lakeside-Maple Valley Asphalt Plant Noise Assessment, Ramboll US Corporation, November 1, 2018
 - Updated Noise Assessment Report, Ramboll US Corporation, June 4, 2020
-
- Critical Areas Review Application (Required for King County Public Health Department Permit Application for Septic Holding Tank), submitted 09-18-2019 through MybuildingPermit.com application portal, Reference Permit # CADS19-0258
 - Lakeside Responses to Public Comments, July 24, 2020 together with Index and Summary of Public Comments
 - Lakeside Responses to November 18, 2019 King County Letter, August 24, 2020

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

{03992157.DOCX;2 }

No other applications are pending affecting the property.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

The following approvals/permits will likely be needed for this proposal:

SEPA Threshold Determination.....	King County
Demolition Permit.....	King County
NPDES Permit.....	State Dept. of Ecology
Stormwater Pollution Prevention Control Plan (SWPPP).....	King County
Clearing and Grading Permits.....	King County
Utility Permits.....	King County
Building Permit.....	King County
Access Connection Permit.....	WSDOT
Developer Agreement.....	WSDOT
Shoreline Substantial Development Permit.....	King County
Air Permit.....	Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
Septic Holding Tank.....	King County Public Health

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

This SEPA Checklist is prepared to supplement the prior SEPA Checklist for the earlier filed grading permit application and to provide additional information for the site work and the Site Engineering Plans and related permits for the asphalt plant and the Transportation Facility. All information relating to all three components--site remediation and grading, the asphalt plant and the Transportation Facility are included in this combined SEPA Checklist.

The property previously held large stockpiles of material used by the previous owner, Sunset Materials, which operated a landscape supply company. Prior to purchase of the property, Lakeside Industries performed due diligence, including Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs). The ESAs identified petroleum contaminated soils resulting from historical petroleum handling operations by multiple prior owners, including historical leaking underground storage tanks.

The applicant proposes to remediate the site which includes removing the contaminated soil from the property. A grading permit will be obtained to remove the contaminated soil and grade the site for construction of the asphalt plant and the on-site portion of the Transportation Facility. All the Critical Areas buffers on the site which have been seriously degraded by past operations will be restored and enlarged by this project.

Several structures previously existing on the property have since been removed by the former owner and operator under demolition permits obtained by Sunset Materials.

The Applicant has submitted the commercial building permit application for the asphalt plant and accessory structures. Please refer to the David Evans Associates Site Engineering Plans dated 6/8/2020, as well as multiple Smith Monroe Gray plans for details on the use and size of the project site.

The Transportation Facility proposal is to add a deceleration and acceleration lane in State Highway 169 adjacent to the Lakeside property at 18825 SE Renton Maple Valley Road, King County, Washington, together with relocating the existing driveway into the Lakeside property per WSDOT standards, together with a guardrail, relocation of a utility pole, drainage and landscaping. The approximate area of disturbance within the arc of the Shoreline Jurisdiction is 56,918 sf. The area of disturbance in the State Highway ROW will be approximately 19,890 sf; the area of disturbance on the Lakeside property will be approximately 37,028 sf. The Washington State Department of Transportation has approved these improvements and has issued a WSDOT Site Access Permit and a Developer Agreement.

The Facility will typically operate from 7AM to 5:00PM Monday through Friday and intermittently between 9AM to 5:00PM on weekends. Some night time work may occur periodically to meet state and local contract requirements. Night time work hours would be between 10PM and 7AM during weekdays and between 10PM and 9AM on weekends.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

The property is located at 18825 SE Renton Maple Valley Road, King County, Washington, east of Renton and west of Maple Valley. The property is on the south side of SR 169 and is approximately 25.39 acres in size. The portion of the property subject to the Shoreline Substantial Development Permit Application is a small arc of the Rural Shoreline Jurisdiction of the Cedar River. This small area is separated from the Cedar River by the 5 lane State Highway 169 and the former railroad right of way and berm that is now a pedestrian and bicycle trail. The arc of the Shoreline jurisdiction intersects with the Lakeside property from 0.0 feet to a maximum of 60.8 feet.

B. Environmental Elements [\[HELP\]](#)

1. Earth [\[help\]](#)

a. General description of the site:

(circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other _____

The property is primarily flat. The area of SR 169 is flat. The southern portion of the property does have steep slopes but no development activity is proposed on,

or immediately adjacent to, the slopes. Restoration of critical areas will occur at the base of the slopes.

- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

75%

- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

The sloped areas of the site are considered consolidated till. The lower, flatter portion of the site consists of silt, sand and gravel. More information can be found in the Critical Area Assessment (AESI, Inc., May 23, 2017).

- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

Yes. A deep-seated historical landslide is mapped by King County on the slope above the eastern panhandle. Development is not proposed in this area or within a 100-foot buffer of the mapped landslide toe.

- e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

The purpose of the grading permit is to remove contaminated soil and complete grading activities necessary for the construction of the asphalt plant facility. The amount of soil to be removed is unknown and depends upon the level of contamination. There are four areas that require remediation. The largest area could be as big as 12,000 square feet. In total, about 30,000 square feet of area will be disturbed for remediation purposes. Excavation areas will be backfilled with clean soils prior to construction of the proposed asphalt plant. On-site material, if suitable, would be used to fill the disturbed areas. If additional or suitable material is needed to complete fill and compaction, a source for that material will be identified in the future.

The future asphalt plant facility includes engineered stormwater facilities on-site. Please refer to the David Evans Associates Technical Information Report dated July 6, 2020 and the Site Engineering Plans dated 6/8/2020 for stormwater facility construction details including subsurface detention and infiltration.

For construction of the Transportation Facility, some material will be removed from the current shoulder of the State Highway in order to create the new lane along the shoulder (the deceleration lane will be along the west section of the shoulder and the acceleration lane will be along the east section of the shoulder). The current Highway drainage ditch will be relocated per the Site Plan and there will be grading and paving to connect the new lane with the access point. Approximate amounts of excavation and fill are 1,474 cy and 1,351 cy for a net excavation of 123 cy.

- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

{03992157.DOCX;2 }

Erosion could occur if soil is disturbed and left exposed for a long period of time.

- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

Outside of critical areas, the site is generally 100% impervious in current conditions. During construction of the asphalt plant, the site will be paved with asphalt cement. Landscape areas will be pervious. All of the stormwater on the site will be collected, treated and infiltrated. Please see the Technical Information Report and the Site Engineering Plans. Currently the total area disturbed within the plant project site is approximately 12.30 acres. The total existing impervious area is 10.46 acres. After project construction, the impervious area will be reduced to 6.02 acres. The total existing impervious area will be reduced by 42%.

In the Transportation Facility, within the arc of the Shoreline Jurisdiction, the new lanes and access point will be paved and thus impervious. The drainage ditches and the landscaping areas will be pervious. The area of the State Highway 169 that will include the new lane is currently impervious.

The arc of the Shoreline Jurisdiction is approximately 56,880 sf of which 28,207 sf is currently impervious. After completion of the project, approximately 17,637 sf of State Highway ROW will be impervious. The area of the Lakeside property within the Transportation Facility that will be impervious after completion is approximately 3,818 sf. Within the arc of the Shoreline Jurisdiction, after project completion, the amount of impervious surface will be reduced to approximately 21,455 sf.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

Please refer to the Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention (CSWPP) Plan for measures to reduce or control erosion during construction. Following construction, all stormwater from the areas outside the critical areas, critical areas buffers and landscape areas will be collected, treated and infiltrated in the engineered stormwater system on site. Critical area buffers and landscape area will be designed and vegetated to reduce erosion.

2. Air [\[help\]](#)

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

During construction, exhaust from workers' vehicles and construction equipment will be generated. Fugitive dust may be created while soil is being disturbed.

The asphalt plant will require an air permit to operate. The air permit application is processed and issued by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA).

{03992157.DOCX;2 }

PSCAA regulations along with State and Federal regulations require evaluation of Criteria Pollutants, Greenhouse Gas, and Toxic Air Pollutant emissions. Based on these evaluations, the asphalt plant is required to implement Best Available Control Technologies to ensure the best available control of the following Criteria Pollutants: Nitrogen Oxides (NOx), Carbon Monoxide (CO), and Particulate Matter (PM). Other emissions are considered de minimis or small quantity.

The asphalt plant to be relocated and operated on the site was issued an Order of Approval for Notice of Construction No. 11175 by PSCAA on November 7, 2016. The plant is registered with PSCAA as a portable plant (Registration No. 14103) with current installation address listed as 18808 SE 256th St., Covington, WA. In accordance with PSCAA Regulation I, Section 6.03 (b)(3), a Notice of Construction application and Order of Approval are not required for relocation of portable batch plants for which an Order of Approval has been previously issued by the Agency provided a complete notification is filed with the Agency. Lakeside will submit the proper notifications to PSCAA prior to relocating to 18825 SE Renton-Maple Valley Road, Renton. A copy of the permit is enclosed and details the emissions and operation limitations of the plant. In addition, Lakeside will submit notifications to PSCAA of plans to install additional silo loadout fugitive emission collection and controls to mitigate odor concerns. Lakeside will require that all trucks leaving the site with asphalt have covered loads. These controls are for odor mitigation and not required for compliance with emission limitations.

The proposed development of the site will increase traffic along SR 169, but the increase will be a small fraction of the existing traffic and, therefore, a small increase in emissions from vehicles operating on SR 169.

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

No.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

During construction, idling vehicles and construction equipment will be kept to a minimum. Watering of the site will help minimize fugitive dust emissions into the air.

Air emissions from the asphalt plant will be controlled through the use of Best Available Control Technologies including operation of a baghouse, ultra-low-NOx burner controls, and fugitive emissions collection system and through implementation of Best Management Practices. Fugitive dust emissions from aggregate material transfer and paved roadways will be controlled by sweeping and using wet suppression methods. Odor will be controlled by enclosing the truck loadout area and using negative air pressure to direct emissions into a dedicated baghouse. Temperature controls and additives will also be used to mitigate odor. All trucks leaving the site with hot asphalt will be required to have covers.

3. **Water** [\[help\]](#)

{03992157.DOCX;2 }

a. Surface Water: [\[help\]](#)

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

Please refer to the Critical Areas Report (The Watershed Company, September 2018, revised June, 2020) for descriptions of surface waters on and in the immediate vicinity of the site.

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

The project will require work within 200 feet of the surface waters described in the Critical Areas Report (The Watershed Company, September 2018, revised June, 2020). Please refer to the Site Engineering Plans (David Evans Associates, 6/8/2020) for project work proposed and proximity to surface waters.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

Filling or dredging of will not occur within surface waters or wetlands. But see the Critical Areas Report and Mitigation Plan (The Watershed Company, June 4, 2020) for removal of fill adjacent to Stream A and restoration of bank of Stream A.

- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

No.

- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.

No. Please refer to the Floodplain Analysis and Delineation (David Evans and Associates, Inc., September 7, 2018) for additional information.

- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

No.

b. Ground Water: [\[help\]](#)

- 1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

The site is currently served by an existing Group B Water System Well (Water System No. AB892) identified with Ecology well tag No. AFJ613. Please see Associated Earth Sciences *Critical Area Assessment* report for additional well detail and the Site Engineering Plans for proposed location of water distribution lines.

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

No industrial waste will be discharged into the ground. No onsite disposal system is proposed at this time. Office wastewater will be plumbed to a buried 10,000 gallon holding tank. This tank will be serviced regularly in accordance with a King County Health Department permit.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

Currently runoff from the site enters Wetlands A, B, and C, and Streams A and B unimpeded. During grading to remediate contaminated areas, construction fencing and silt fencing will be installed to prevent sediment from entering streams and wetlands.

When the future asphalt plant is constructed, all runoff from impervious areas will be directed to catch basins and conveyed to engineered multi-system stormwater treatment and infiltration facilities on-site. Please refer to the Technical Information Report (David Evans Associates July 6, 2020) and the Site Engineering Plans (David Evans Associates, 6/8/2020)) for stormwater facilities design and engineering.

Currently, all the Highway runoff flows to the existing Highway drainage ditch and then untreated through culverts into the Cedar River. Under the proposal, surface water runoff from the western section of the Transportation Facility and an adjacent portion of SR 169 will drain to the relocated Highway drainage ditch and will be conveyed to the adjacent site engineered multi-system stormwater treatment facility and will then be infiltrated on-site. See Technical Information Report (David Evans Associates, July 6, 2020).

- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

Under current conditions, waste materials from accidental spills or leaks of equipment could enter ground or surface water. The proposed project includes grading and excavation of existing petroleum contaminated soils. Subsequently, the site will be paved with asphalt cement, source control structures will be constructed, and stormwater control facilities will be installed to mitigate and prevent waste materials from entering ground or surface water.

- 3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

Drainage from the site, which is largely impervious, is currently uncontrolled and untreated. In the future, after construction of the proposed asphalt plant, surface water will be collected from impervious surfaces and conveyed to engineered multi-system stormwater treatment and infiltration facilities on-site. Please refer to the Technical Information Report (David Evans Associates, July 6, 2020) and the Site Engineering Plans (David Evans Associates, 6/8/2020) for drainage details.

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any:

Surface water runoff will be collected from impervious surfaces and conveyed to engineered multi-system stormwater treatment and infiltration facilities on-site. As described above, a portion of the runoff from the State Highway that currently flows untreated to the Cedar River will be treated and infiltrated. Please refer to the Technical Information Report (David Evans Associates, July 6, 2020) and the Site Engineering Plans (David Evans Associates, 6/8/2020) for drainage details.

4. **Plants** [\[help\]](#)

- a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:

☒ deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
☒ evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
☐ shrubs
☒ grass
☐ pasture
☐ crop or grain
☐ Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
☒ wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
☐ water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
☐ other types of vegetation

- b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

The site is already cleared of vegetation.

- c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

None

- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

The applicant proposes to restore wetland and stream buffers that have been impacted and degraded by past owners and operators. Please refer to the Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, Appendix A of Critical Areas Report (The

{03992157.DOCX;2 }

Watershed Company, September 2018, revise June, 2020) for detailed restoration plans. The applicant is proposing to add landscaping as shown in the Site Plan and the new vegetation in the area and in the Highway drainage ditches will improve water quality and other conditions.

- e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

Please refer to the Critical Areas Report (The Watershed Company, September 2018). Noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site include Reed Canarygrass and Himalayan/Evergreen Blackberry. Restoration areas will be cleared of invasive weeds prior to restoration planting. Control shall include but not be limited to: Japanese Knotweed, Reed Canarygrass, Himalayan/Evergreen Blackberry, English Ivy, and English Holly.

5. **Animals** [\[help\]](#)

- a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site.

Examples include:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:
fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other _____

The areas of the site planned for grading and plant construction were heavily impacted by prior owners and were completely cleared and utilized. Birds may fly over the site, but no birds, mammals, or fish exist on the site.

- b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

None. Please refer to the Critical Areas Report (The Watershed Company, September 2018, revised June, 2020). No priority habitats or species are mapped on the site, and no active breeding sites for priority species are documented on the site, nor were nests observed during site visits. None of the wildlife habitat conservation area species listed in KCC 21A.24.382 are documented on the subject property.

- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

No

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

The sloped and forested areas west, south, and east of the proposed asphalt plant facility area will be maintained in their current condition. Wetland and stream buffers will be restored.

- e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

None

{03992157.DOCX;2 }

6. **Energy and Natural Resources** [\[help\]](#)

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

Electricity and propane or natural gas will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs for heating, lighting, operating of mechanical and electronic equipment and manufacturing. The asphalt plant facility operation will primarily use electricity and propane or natural gas. The asphalt plant dryer burner is fired on propane or natural gas. Propane or natural gas will be used to heat the office building.

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

No

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

The office building will be compliant with state energy codes. The asphalt plant will be equipped with a highly efficient ultra-low NOx burner.

7. **Environmental Health** [\[help\]](#)

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

Although it is unlikely that environmental health hazards would be encountered under normal working conditions, construction equipment could potentially pose a threat to environmental health via leaky equipment, spills during refueling, and leaky containers stored on-site for construction equipment maintenance. All project related construction will meet all current local, county, state and federal regulations.

- 1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.

Past activities on the site including former leaking underground storage tanks have resulted in limited areas of petroleum contaminated soils.

- 2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.

The existing contamination is proposed to be removed prior to development of the proposed asphalt plant facility.

- 3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.

{03992157.DOCX;2 }

Construction related materials, diesel fuel, propane, and other hazardous chemicals could be stored and used during construction. Removal of the contaminated soils will be done per industry standards and disposed in accordance with state and federal regulations.

Operation of the asphalt plant includes storage, handling, and processing of petroleum products including diesel fuel, heated asphalt cement, emulsified asphalt, and propane or natural gas. The materials will be stored in above ground storage tanks with secondary containment provided to prevent potential contamination.

- 4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

None

- 5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

State regulations regarding safety and the handling of hazardous materials would apply during the construction process. Equipment refueling areas would be located in areas where a spill could be quickly contained, and where the risk of the hazardous material entering surface water is minimized.

A concrete pad will contain the above ground storage tanks necessary to operate the proposed asphalt plant. A concrete wall will enclose the tanks to provide secondary containment.

Grass lined swales, catch basins, coalescing plant oil/water separators, an underground pre-settling vault, and a sand filter system will treat surface water runoff.

b. Noise

- 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

Noise in the existing area will not impact the grading activities or the completed asphalt plant. Noise from existing traffic along SR 169 is the most prominent source of noise in the area. For many decades, trucks and cars have been entering and exiting the site.

- 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

All construction would be during the King County approved hours of operation.

Please refer to the Lakeside-Maple Valley Asphalt Plant Noise Updated Assessment (Ramboll US Corporation June 4, 2020) for current noise levels and modeled levels of noise to be created by the project.

Potential project-related increases over existing sound levels during the quietest existing daytime and nighttime hours range from 0 to 2 decibels.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

Please refer to the Lakeside-Maple Valley Asphalt Plant Noise Updated Assessment (Ramboll US Corporation, June 4, 2020) for proposed measures to reduce and control modeled noise impacts.

8. Land and Shoreline Use [\[help\]](#)

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.

The property is currently vacant. Up until July 2018, the property was used for residential and commercial landscape material bulk import, processing, storage, stockpiling and sales, and prior to that time the site was used by King County Roads for storage, maintenance and repair of trucks and other heavy equipment. Further in the past, the property was used for mining and processing of coal.

The asphalt plant facility will replace the recent use and is an allowed use in the underlying zone and is not expected to affect nearby or adjacent properties.

b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?

No.

1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:

No.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

Retaining walls associated with former structures remain within critical area buffers and must be removed to complete buffer restoration work. A wellhouse housing the Group B Water System Well will remain on the site. Please refer to Sheet 2 of the Site Engineering Plans.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

Retaining walls associated with former structures within critical area buffers must be removed to complete buffer restoration work. Please refer to the Site Engineering Plans (David Evans Associates 6/8/2020).

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

The property is zoned "I" for industrial uses. Properties adjacent to the west, north, and east are zone RA-5, which allows primarily residential uses. Property to the south is zoned RA-2.5, which also is primarily residential.

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

The property is designated "I" (Industrial) in the 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

A very small portion of the property along the northwestern boundary has been classified as Rural Shoreline. That portion of the property is separated from the Cedar River by the State Highway and the former railroad berm now being used as a multi-modal trail.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.

Please refer to the Critical Areas Report (The Watershed Company, September 2018, revised June, 2020) and the Revised Critical Area Assessment (AESI, June 4, 2020) for descriptions of critical areas identified and evaluated.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

The proposed asphalt plant is planned to employ 30 people.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

None

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

NA

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

The proposal is consistent with the King County Comprehensive Plan and King County Zoning. Except for being adjacent to the 5 lane SR 169, the site is isolated from surrounding land uses. The RA 2.5 land uses to the south of the site are above, and set back from, a high bluff on the south side of the site.

m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

There are no impacts to agricultural or forest lands.

{03992157.DOCX;2 }

9. **Housing** [\[help\]](#)

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

The site is an industrial site and will not include any housing.

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

There are no housing units on the site and it has long been used for industrial purposes.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

NA

10. **Aesthetics** [\[help\]](#)

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

The height of the tallest building structure roof is 40 feet. The asphalt cement storage silo plant equipment is approximately 80 feet above ground surface.

- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

No one's view would be obstructed. The plant will be viewed in front of the hillside as one drives along SR 169.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

Restoration planting of critical area buffers is proposed and will improve the aesthetics of the property. Landscaping will be added.

11. **Light and Glare** [\[help\]](#)

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

Lighting will be utilized for safety and security. Lighting will be directed downward, inward, and shielded or recessed to prevent light and glare impacts to adjacent properties.

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

No

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

Vehicles lights on SR 169 at nighttime will not affect the plant.

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

Lighting will be directed downward, inward and be shielded or recesses to prevent light and glare impacts.

12. Recreation [\[help\]](#)

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

The Cedar River is north of SR-169 and is separated from the site by the 5 lane State Highway and the old railroad right of way berm that is a pedestrian and bicycle trail.

- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

No

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

NA

13. Historic and cultural preservation [\[help\]](#)

- a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers? If so, specifically describe.

There are no sites, buildings, or structures on the site or in the immediate vicinity that meet criteria for listing on preservation registers.

- b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.

None. The Washington Information System for Architectural & Archaeological Records Data was utilized to confirm this response.

- c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.

The Washington Information System for Architectural & Archaeological Records Data was consulted.

- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.

NA

14. Transportation [\[help\]](#)

{03992157.DOCX;2 }

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

Primary access for the site is SR 169. Please refer to the Site Engineering Plans and the Updated Traffic Impact Analysis (TENW, November 2, 2018) for transportation system and site access details.

- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

There are no public transit stops in the immediate vicinity of the property. The nearest stop is approximately 2.3 miles southeast of the site. The stop is served by Metro Route 143 in the peak hours only, as well as DART Route 907.

- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?

The future asphalt plant facility will provide 52 parking spaces. The site is currently vacant and has no defined parking spaces.

- d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

While not required, the proposal includes improvements to transportation facilities including voluntary frontage improvements within the right-of-way of SR 169 and required new access. The applicant will voluntarily construct speed change lanes (acceleration lane and deceleration lane) and will relocate a guardrail and rebuild and revegetate the highway drainage. The applicant has obtained approval and a Connection Access Permit and Developer Agreement from the Washington State Department of Transportation for all of this work.

- e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

No

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and non-passenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?

Please refer to the Updated Traffic Impact Analysis (TENW, November 2, 2018) for projected vehicle trips to be generated by the completed project.

- g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.

No

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

{03992157.DOCX;2 }

Please refer to the Updated Traffic Impact Analysis (TENW, November 2, 2018).

15. Public Services [\[help\]](#)

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

No

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

The project will pay applicable impact fees which are used to off-set potential impacts. No other mitigation is required.


16. Utilities [\[help\]](#)

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:
electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other _____
- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

The site is served by an existing well. This will remain in use along with power and telecommunications.

C. Signature [\[HELP\]](#)

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: 
Name of signee Karen Deal
Position and Agency/Organization Director, Environmental & Land Use / Lakeside Industries, Inc.
Date Submitted: August 24, 2020

D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions [\[HELP\]](#)

(IT IS NOT NECESSARY to use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.