

June 21, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL AND US MAIL

Amanda L. Reeck  
Engineer, Resource Product Line  
King County Department of Permitting and Environmental Review  
35030 SE Douglas St., Ste. 210  
Snoqualmie, WA 98065

Re: Response to Request for Information; KC File GRDE 15-0004  
Raging River Quarry Permit Revision Application

Dear Amanda:

I am writing on behalf of Raging River Quarry (“RRQ”) to respond to your letter of June 8, 2018, which provides comments and requests additional information related to the submittals made by RRQ in November and December 2017, as required by the September 2017 Periodic Review Report and Decision.

As an initial matter, it is not feasible for RRQ to provide all the requested information by the stated deadline of July 25, 2018, which is approximately six (6) weeks from the date of your letter. RRQ is a small, family-owned business, and their ability to respond depends largely on the availability of their consultants. A 6-week response timeline is especially unreasonable during the summer months when many people have planned vacations—and when the County took six (6) months to reply to the original submittal.

More specifically, RRQ requests additional information and/or an extension of the “Summary of Requested Materials” on pg. 9 of your letter as follows:

- **Ecological Review.** RRQ has reviewed the May 8, 2018 memo from Laura Casey with its wetland consultant, and it has a number of questions, as well as some substantive disagreements with its findings and conclusions. As an initial matter, we would like to request the wetland rating forms, so that we can understand the basis for these findings. We would then like to schedule a meeting with you and Laura Casey to discuss the issues on pg. 2 of your letter so that we are clear on the County’s requests and next steps, particularly related to the buffer averaging proposal. We look forward to working with you to resolve these issues and identify a reasonable response deadline.
- **Air Quality.** The comments made by PSCAA are clear, and RRQ will incorporate responses into its next submittal.

June 21, 2018

Page 2 of 2

- **Traffic and Road Standards.** These comments are generally clear and acceptable, with the exception of Comment #3, which suggests that parking, stockpiles, equipment storage, and the caretaker's residence cannot be located within the 300' contour line of the Raging River. RRQ is not aware of any previous decisions issued by the County characterizing these uses as "mining-related;" in fact, these uses have existed in the current location for nearly fifty years and do not adversely impact the River.
- **Supplemental Plans.** RRQ believes it can provide the requested updates to the Road Surface Management Plan, Dust Mitigation Plan, Noise Management Plan, and Traffic Management Plan by **August 10**. However, in some respects, the level of detail the County is requesting appears to be extreme. It would be helpful if you could provide an example of similar, acceptable plans developed for other aggregate operations in the County, so that RRQ could use those plans to guide its response.

Please note that the issues listed above are not exhaustive. RRQ is still evaluating the requests with its consultant team, and additional issues may arise.

Thank you for your attention to this letter. We look forward to your response and to the opportunity to discuss these issues in more detail.

Sincerely,



Courtney E. Flora

cc: Devon Shannon, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Civil Division  
Randy Sandin, Deputy Director