

ATTACHMENT 1 - Lakeside's Responses to Public Comments Matrix

Lakeside Industries - Maple Valley Asphalt Plant/WSDOT-Lakeside Transportation Facility
King County Application Numbers: COMM18-0014 & SHOR18-0032

Lakeside's Responses to Public Comments
July 24, 2020

Lakeside Industries submits the following Responses to the public comments submitted to King County in response to the Lakeside Applications listed above. A summary list of public comments and the names of those submitting comments are detailed in Exhibit A to this document. Many of the comments were duplicative and overlapping. Thus, all comments are collected by Topic, identified by the name(s) of those submitting the comment, and given a detailed, collective response. Topics are arranged alphabetically.

Topic	Comment	Response
Comprehensive Plan Inconsistency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plant is inconsistent with Comp. Plan re rural area and constitutes a spot zone. 	48. Rhys Sterling / Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council	Comprehensive Plan and Zoning issues were addressed and resolved in the 2018 King County DPER Cedar River Sites Industrial Moratorium Study. The referenced public comments on these issues are based on a misreading of the Comprehensive Plan. The Lakeside Application is consistent with the provisions of the Comprehensive Plan and is permitted by the Industrial Zone.
Critical Areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plant will result in adverse impacts to Cedar River environment, specifically contamination from chemicals entering the water system from air particulates (fumes and vehicles) and chemical leaching. • Spill or leak will likely contaminate the water system because the groundwater in 	1. Muckleshoot Tribe 3. Jillene Seiver 8. Crystal McDonald 9. Stephanie Mcaloon 10. John Desimone Hittman 11. Stephen Deutschman 12. Robin Cahill-Myers 16. Brian & Tammera Widell	The proposed development will improve water quality by treating all stormwater discharged from pollutant generating surfaces, consistent with all current stormwater requirements. The site will be paved in order to capture all stormwater discharge, prevent pollutant discharge to surface water and prevent untreated

<p>the area is very shallow, wetlands and culvert are present, and the Plant is located within the Cedar River Floodplain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEPA failed to identify wildlife that will be adversely impacted, e.g., salmon, bald eagles, orcas, bears, bees, etc. • Cedar River Trail will be adversely impacted, including from potential pollution as well as access and parking availability. • Steep slopes pose a significant risk of mudslides and landslides. • Classification as a steep slope, erosion hazard, and seismic hazard area merit an EIS. • Plant is contrary to protective and costly efforts to preserve and enhance the Cedar River. • Adverse impacts to economic profits from recreation. • AESI’s opinion is valid, but DPER needs to review stormwater plan for BMP compliance. Need to develop SWPP and Spill Plan. • The culvert under SR 169 at Stream C should be made fish passable. More information is required to assess the culvert conveying Stream B under SR 169. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 21. Meaghan Lodahl 25. Ike Kielgass & Brenda Chrystie 26. Mark Ditzler 27. Hendrick Haynes 28. Janet Dobrowski 29. Defenders of Wildlife 33. Joan Hains 35. Stephanie Schaeve 36. Barbara Rutledge (Citizens to Stop the SR169 Asphalt Plant) 37. Beth Stoddard 38. Danielle Patton 39. Liz Clayworth-Scott 41. George Sellhorn 42. Liz Nedeff 46. Wendy Sarino 50. Stuart Rutledge 54. Ike Kielgass 55. Jean Coy 59. Lawrence Fisher (biologist) 61. Thomas and Judith Rohm 63. Mark Ditzler 64. Fred Akerlund 65. Meaghan Lodahl 66. Tom Allyn 67. Alain Balland 71. Matt Wexler 72. Christian Lodahl 73. GMVUAC 74. Hank Haynes 76. Amanda Heins 77. R. Brian Bell 32. Hank Haynes 83. Paula and Dai Murakami 84. Tammie Lindholm 87. Karen White 	<p>infiltration to groundwater. As a result of the project, the amount of impervious surfaces at the site will be reduced by more than 6 acres. The total existing impervious area will be reduced by 42%. The water treatment infrastructure will include lined biofilter swales, oil/water separators, detention vault, a large sand filter, and an infiltration gallery. This treatment system will provide “enhanced basic” treatment for all stormwater discharged from pollutant generating surfaces before being released into the environment.</p> <p>The entire development area and most of the existing critical area buffers, are currently unvegetated and, therefore, unable to support most wildlife species, including those mentioned in the public comments. The proposed development will incorporate buffers consistent with King County Code (KCC). Please refer to the Critical Areas Report (CAR) by The Watershed Company dated September, 2018 and revised June, 2020. Buffer areas will be restored by regrading to amend the compacted and degraded soils and planting to establish a dense native vegetation community, including trees, shrubs, and groundcover. These plantings will be monitored over a three-year period to ensure successful establishment of all buffer areas. These buffers will significantly improve ecological functions, including wildlife habitat availability on-site for all critical areas and better connect</p>
--	--	---

	<p>90. Joe and Susan Zahniser 92. Hank Haynes (contributors – LarKen Buchanan, Stephen Deutchman, Celia Parker) 94. Scott Giordano 95. Green River Coalition (Greg Wingard) 100. DNR 101. KCWD 90 102. Cedar River Council/incl. list of public comments 106. Suquamish Tribe 107. Muckleshoot Tribe 109. Carol Husmann 110. Megan Llewellyn 111. Valerie O’Halloran 112. Siobhan Costello 113. Patricia F. Nedeff 115. Tammera Widell 116. Save the Cedar River/Carla Broom 117. Trout Unlimited</p>	<p>the on-site critical areas with the surrounding forested region. This is consistent with the County’s efforts to improve fish and wildlife habitat and ecological functions.</p> <p>The proposed development is not anticipated to alter trail access, trail use or current parking availability.</p> <p>Geologic hazard areas were evaluated in AESI’s Critical Areas Assessment dated October 2, 2018 and its letter responding to King County Comments dated June 8, 2020. AESI’s Assessment and Letter provide an assessment of landslide, steep slope, coal mine and erosion hazards. AESI described geologic hazards and proposed mitigation in its Assessment and Letter. A surface geologic map disclosing the extent of mass wasting deposits is included as Figure 3 in the 2018 Report. A map showing the approximate limits of a historic landslide area east of the proposed plant is included as Figure 4 of the 2018 Report. Steep slope hazards and recommended mitigations are described on pages 9 and 10 of the 2018 Report. Coal mine hazards are described on page 10 of the 2018 Report, and as documented in the Report the reviewed mine shaft maps “only showed workings beneath the slope of the property”. No coal mine hazard mitigations were required for the proposed plant since there is no evidence mining activity occurred under the proposed</p>
--	---	--

		<p>development footprint. Seismic hazards are described on pages 10 and 11 of the 2018 Report. The analysis included an assessment of liquefaction potential and specifically recommended further study to evaluate “seismically induced settlement during a design-level earthquake”. The analysis would be performed during the design phase of the project, and appropriate mitigations would be recommended as needed. The seismic hazards analysis included an evaluation of the potential for surface ground rupture due to currently active faults. There are no known active faults in the project area. Faults identified in documents contained in letter 82 are related to faulting of the Tertiary Renton Formation and have not be active for millions of years. The potential for surface ground rupture from active faulting impacting the project site was described on page 11 of the 2018 Report and was identified as low.</p> <p>Regarding the culvert under SR 169 at Stream C, please see The Watershed Company Letter to Karen Deal dated June 4, 2020 and Critical Areas Report and Update, dated June 2020. Stream C is a Type N Stream. In addition, the referenced culvert is not connected directly to the Cedar River. A concrete box bridge will be placed at the south end of the culvert to accommodate the acceleration lane. The Stream B culvert is not located adjacent to, or in the immediate vicinity of, the project</p>
--	--	--

		and no roadway modifications are proposed that would affect the culvert.
Driveway Encroachment (resolved)	6. Chuck Vowell	No Response Necessary
EIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An EIS should be required to analyze significant adverse impacts and to provide alternatives. 	73. GMVUAC 87. Karen White 89. Manny Mankowski 106. Suquamish Tribe 107. Muckleshoot Tribe 110. Megan Llewellyn 116. Save the Cedar River/Carla Broom 117. Trout Unlimited	Please see The Watershed Company Letters to Karen Deal dated June 4, 2020. “[T]he project will not result in significant adverse impacts to salmon habitat in the Cedar River basin and will result in positive, though relatively small, habitat improvements.” An EIS is only required if there are probable significant adverse impacts. Per application regulations, mitigation has been incorporated into the project proposal such that net degradation of habitat will not occur, either on-site or downstream. Because an EIS is not required, there is no requirement to study alternatives.
Emissions/Health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some asphalt fumes are carcinogenic and injurious to health (cite to studies). Air quality will be compromised and adversely impact residents. Fumes will compound existing adverse impacts from Cedar Hills Composting Site. Unique topography of the site creates an enclosed environment that traps fumes and pollutants resulting in a thermo cline and acid rain. Notes complaints from other Lakeside facility re emissions. 	2. Christian Sandstrom 3. Jillene Seiver 4. Jean Coy 5. Kate Lawson 6. Chuck Vowell 7. Tasha Quinn 8. Crystal McDonald 9. Stephanie Mcaloon 11. Stephen Deutschman 12. Robin Cahill-Myers 13. Dorothy 14. Amanda Krig 15. Tim Hayes 16. Brian & Tammera Widell 17. King County	Lakeside’s portable hot mix asphalt (HMA) plant is permitted by Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) for operation at Covington location. Emissions evaluations and testing demonstrate no issues with air pollutants. PSCAA rules for moving a portable HMA plant do not require re-permitting or modeling. However, a new modeling analysis was done for the proposed Maple Valley location, identical to what would be submitted to PSCAA for a new permit. The new analysis also indicates no issues with air pollutants. If the portable HMA plant were applying for an air permit from

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in traffic will generate additional emissions that will adversely impact health. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 18. Brian Renniger/Puget Sound Clean Air Agency 19. Brian Renniger/Puget Sound Clean Air Agency 20. Vivian Huynh 21. Meaghan Lodahl 23. Ron Bick 24. Christian Sandstrom 25. Ike Kielgass & Brenda Chrystie 26. Mark Ditzler 27. Hendrick Haynes 33. Joan Hains 34. Hendrick Haynes 35. Stephanie Schaeuwe 37. Beth Stoddard 38. Danielle Patton 39. Liz Clayworth-Scott 41. George Sellhorn 43. Kevin Groesbeck 44. Lisa Hollibaugh 45. Love Natural Beauty 49. Ada Liu & Chris Turner 53 Linda Stark 54. Ike Kielgass 55. Jean Coy 60. Scott Boone 61. Thomas and Judith Rohm 62. Darla Bennett 63. Mark Ditzler 64. Fred Akerlund 65. Meaghan Lodahl 67. Alain Balland 69. Joe Schmutzler 70. Nancy Pullen-Seufert 71. Matt Wexler 72. Christian Lodahl 	<p>PSCAA, it is highly likely that it would receive a permit, similar to the permit for Lakeside’s Covington location.</p> <p>There are different types of asphalt. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) determined that “occupational exposures to straight-run bitumens and their emissions during road paving are possibly carcinogenic to humans” (IARC, 2013). Exposures in areas surrounding an HMA plant will be considerably less than an occupational exposure. Thus, PSCAA issues permits for HMA plants, including Lakeside Industries’ portable HMA plant proposed for relocation from Covington to Maple Valley, since there is no issue with air pollutants.</p> <p>The proposed portable HMA plant is not expected to cause any adverse impacts, including odor or health impacts, to the areas surrounding the facility. At the SR 169 site, loading trucks will be in an enclosed area below the silos where emissions will be captured and processed. Trucks leaving the site will be required to cover loads.</p> <p>Every HMA facility incorporates varying air emission control technologies; however, the production process is generally the same. The portable HMA plant proposed for relocation from Covington to Maple Valley is a state-of-</p>
---	---	--

	<p>73. GMVUAC 74. Hank Haynes 75. Nancy Pullen-Seufert 76. Amanda Heins 92. Hank Haynes (contributors – LarKen Buchanan, Stephen Deutchman, Celia Parker) 94. Scott Giordano 110. Megan Llewellyn 116. Save the Cedar River/Carla Broom</p>	<p>the-art facility and was permitted by PSCAA after being subjected to one of the most stringent minor-source air emissions permitting programs in the country.</p> <p>The change in use of the site will increase traffic along SR 169, but the increase will be a small fraction of the existing traffic and, therefore, additional emissions from vehicles operating on SR 169 will be insignificant.</p>
<p>Federal SIC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plant should be assigned a Federal Standard Industrial Classification and suggests 295103 “Paving Materials – manufacturer.” 	<p>74. Hank Haynes</p>	<p>The plant has already been assigned the appropriate NAICS and SIC Codes. The Federal NAICS code for the plant is 324121 and the comparable Federal SIC Code is 2951 “Asphalt Paving Mixture and Block Manufacturing”.</p>
<p>Fire/Public Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern whether there are adequate fire safety public services provided. Notes there is one fire hydrant about a mile away. 	<p>30. Larry Krall 39. Liz Clayworth-Scott 41. George Sellhorn 54. Ike Kielgass</p>	<p>The King County Fire Marshal has prescribed the requirements for fire suppression systems at the facility and those requirements have been approved by the King County Building Official.</p>
<p>Fossil Fuel Moratorium should apply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Unincorporated King County Moratorium on new Fossil Fuel Infrastructure (1/28/19) should apply, which prohibits installation of tanks of LNG, Diesel, and Propane. 	<p>65. Meaghan Lodahl</p>	<p>The facility does not meet the definition of “Major fossil fuel facility” per Section 3, B.1. of the referenced ordinance (Ordinance 18866) and therefore the referenced Moratorium does not apply.</p>
<p>Geological Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coal mining activity undermined the soil and lands thereby creating instability, 	<p>30. Larry Krall 74. Hank Haynes 82. H. W. Hank Haynes</p>	<p>Geologic hazard areas were evaluated in AESI’s Critical Area Assessment dated October 2, 2018 and AESI’s letter responding to King County Comments</p>

<p>which is worsened by the presence of fault lines and likelihood of earthquakes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry whether site is within an earthquake liquefaction zone and there is adequate mitigation. 	<p>92. Hank Haynes (contributors – LarKen Buchanan, Stephen Deutchman, Celia Parker)</p>	<p>dated June 8, 2020. Coal Mine hazards are described on page 10 of the 2018 Assessment, and as documented in the Assessment the reviewed mine shaft maps “only showed workings beneath the slope of the property”. No coal mine hazard mitigations were required for the proposed plant since there is no evidence mining activity occurred under the proposed development footprint. Seismic hazards are described on pages 10 and 11 of the 2018 Assessment. The analysis included an assessment of liquefaction potential and specifically recommended further study to evaluate “seismically induced settlement during a design-level earthquake.” The analysis would be performed during the design phase of the project, and appropriate mitigations would be recommended as needed. The seismic hazards analysis included an evaluation of the potential for surface ground rupture due to currently active faults. There are no known active faults in the project area. Faults identified in documents contained in comment letter #82 are related to faulting of the Tertiary Renton Formation and have not be active for millions of years. The potential for surface ground rupture from active faulting impacting the project site was described on page 11 of the 2018 Assessment and was identified as low.</p>
<p>Hot Mix Asphalt Composition</p>	<p>116. Save the Cedar River/Carla Broom</p>	<p>HMA is a mixture of approximately 95% aggregate (rock and sand) and 5% asphalt cement. The asphalt cement is purchased</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chemical compound of HMA is unclear or unknown, which presents risks to health of environment and public. 		<p>from various producers and must meet defined specifications. Asphalt cement is specified by state and local agencies to meet agency standards. All asphalt cement purchased and used has a Safety Data Sheet (SDS). The SDS includes information such as the chemical properties of the asphalt cement and the physical, health, and environmental health hazards. Plant operations are state-of-the-art and feature specialized equipment, which allows us to meet and exceed emission standards.</p> <p>The content and composition of our HMA mix is tested and known. See responses above regarding Critical Areas and Emissions/Health.</p>
<p>Historic Landmark/Landmark Designation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is located on land that previously contained a historic landmark. 	<p>36. Barbara Rutledge (Citizens to Stop the SR169 Asphalt Plant) 48. Rhys Sterling / Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council</p>	<p>There are no historic landmarks remaining on the site. Before Lakeside Industries purchased the property, the historic Pacific Coast Coal Administrative Building landmark was approved for demolition by entities with jurisdictional authority including King County Landmarks Commission.</p>
<p>Improvements within Shoreline Jurisdiction require a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SSDP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements within the shoreline jurisdiction require an SSDP and evaluation in an EIS 	<p>73. GMVUAC</p>	<p>Lakeside has applied for an SSDP.</p>
<p>Jefferson County Code application</p>	<p>85. Rhys Sterling</p>	<p>The Lakeside Application is subject to the King County Code. The Jefferson County</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply Jefferson County Code to require plant be fully enclosed within a structure. 		Code does not apply. Nevertheless, the public comment is inaccurate. The Plant is capable of meeting requirements specified in JCC 18.20.220 and 18.20.240 and would not require enclosure.
<p>Lack of transparency and collaboration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allegations re insufficient noticing, failure to provide documents, etc. 	<p>2. Christian Sandstrom 21. Meaghan Lodahl 24. Christian Sandstrom</p>	No response required. Noticing met and exceeded requirements.
<p>Levee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyze the condition of the Cedar River Levee 	107. Muckleshoot Tribe	The site is separated from the Cedar River by Highway 169 and by the historic railroad right-of-way (ROW), which is now a King County multi-purpose trail. The mapped 100 Year Flood Plain reaches the drainage ditch on the south side of the Highway and does not impact the Plant site. The site does not rely on the embankment on the south side of the Cedar River for flood protection.
<p>Light</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Light will adversely impact residents and salmon. 	<p>36. Barbara Rutledge (Citizens to Stop the SR169 Asphalt Plant) 94. Scott Giordano 107. Muckleshoot Tribe</p>	Salmon are presumed to be absent on the project site, due to a culvert at the confluence of Stream B and the Cedar River that currently acts as a fish passage barrier and a lack of suitable year-round habitat to support juvenile rearing on-site. In the event access were to be reestablished, this stream is at the lower end of the state's definition of streams that support fish use. Regardless, the buffers used in the site layout and mitigation plan are consistent with fish-use stream requirements. Please refer to the Critical Areas Report (CAR) by The Watershed Company, September, 2018, updated June, 2020. The site's critical areas buffers, including part of the stream buffer, will be

		restored to a fully vegetated state following the KCC, ultimately creating sufficient vegetation to reduce light impacts to the stream and salmonid species – if the fish passage barrier is to be replaced in the future and some salmonid use is realized. The improved buffers, forested area, and the greater than 300-foot gradient from the proposed development to the nearest residential development should diminish any light impacts to residents. Lastly, light impacts to the Cedar River should be negligible as the plant sits at least 200 feet from the river and a border of mature riparian vegetation, including a dense tree canopy north of SR 169 can block/filter out any remaining light that may otherwise reach the river.
<p>Maps needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for numerous and extensive maps. 	74. Hank Haynes	Numerous regional, local and site-specific maps, photos and figures are included in consultant reports filed with King County.
<p>Native land/archeological value</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely native peoples utilized the land such that it has high archaeological value. 	74. Hank Haynes	There are no archaeological artifacts on the site. The site has been completely disrupted over decades by heavy industrial uses including the facilities of coal mining and processing companies, heavy equipment storage and maintenance, and landscaping materials processing and storage.
<p>No Burn Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facility is located in a “no burn area” and burning is specifically prohibited, therefore industrial uses requiring burning should be prohibited. 	42. Liz Nedeff	No open fire burning is proposed.

<p>Noise Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise from the plant will adversely impact residents and wildlife. • Topography of the site will enhance these adverse impacts. 	<p>2. Christian Sandstrom 7. Tasha Quinn 8. Crystal McDonald 9. Stephanie Mcaloon 16. Brian & Tammera Widell 20. Vivian Huynh 24. Christian Sandstrom 25. Ike Kielgass & Brenda Chrystie 26. Mark Ditzler 27. Hendrick Haynes 32. Paul Berger 34. Hendrick Haynes 35. Stephanie Schaeuwe 55. Jean Coy 73. GMVUAC 92. Hank Haynes (contributors – LarKen Buchanan, Stephen Deutchman, Celia Parker) 94. Scott Giordano 109. Carol Husmann</p>	<p>Noise modeling of the proposed Lakeside facility was conducted to evaluate the facility’s compliance with the County noise limits of 57 dBA during daytime hours (7 AM to 10 PM) and 47 dBA at night (10 PM to 7 AM). Lakeside incorporated numerous noise-reducing measures into their plans for the site, taking into consideration the unique topographic features surrounding the site. The noise mitigation measures included perimeter structures/sheds, noise suppression for some equipment, enclosure of the loadout area, and noise attenuation walls. With these noise-reducing measures, noise modeling indicates the facility would comply with the applicable daytime or nighttime noise limits at the property boundaries. The noise levels would be even lower at the nearest residences, and noise from the facility would result in minimal increases in noise at these residences. Please see: Updated Noise Assessment Report, dated June 4, 2020, by Ramboll US.</p>
<p>NPDES violations at Lakeside’s Covington Plant.</p>	<p>107. Muckleshoot Tribe 116. Save the Cedar River/Carla Broom</p>	<p>Historic numeric effluent violations for discharge to surface water at the Covington site were related to gravel mining operation discharges. No gravel mining will occur at the project site.</p>
<p>Odor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Odor from Cedar Hills Composting Site is already present and injurious, and will be enhanced by Plant. • Listed complaints re odors generated by a “similar Lakeside facility.” 	<p>20. Vivian Huynh 32. Paul Berger 44. Lisa Hollibaugh 45. Love Natural Beauty 62. Darla Bennett 113. Patricia F. Nedeff</p>	<p>See response to Emissions/Health. Moreover, the Lakeside proposal includes enclosing the truck loading area at the plant and requiring all trucks leaving the site with asphalt to have covers on truck beds.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topography of the site will enhance adverse impacts. 		
<p>Procedural Question</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various questions re locations of documents, timing of comments, etc. • Scope of evaluation re project impacts with respect to Shoreline Substantial Development Permit. 	<p>56. Peter Rimbo 57. Phil Kitzes 68. Angela Flick 79. Manny Mankowski 81. Rita Haselman 86. Manny Mankowski 105. Department of Ecology 109. Rita Haselman 114. Tammera Widell</p>	<p>Document requests have been addressed by King County DPER. Review and processing of the application for the Shoreline Substantial Development Permit will follow applicable law.</p>
<p>Property devaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General concern that the Plant will devalue surrounding properties. 	<p>2. Christian Sandstrom 23. Ron Bick 24. Christian Sandstrom 25. Ike Kielgass & Brenda Chrystie 26. Mark Ditzler 33. Joan Hains 53 Linda Stark 60. Scott Boone 63. Mark Ditzler 70. Nancy Pullen-Seufert 75. Nancy Pullen-Seufert 76. Amanda Heins</p>	<p>This is not an issue relevant to the permit process. However, property values for both residential and commercial properties around other Lakeside plants, e.g. in Issaquah, Seattle and Monroe, have increased substantially.</p>
<p>Property line issue/inaccuracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property line issue along south boundary of site – surveys show discrepancy in location of property line. 	<p>32. Paul Berger</p>	<p>Lakeside and the property owner entered into an agreement addressing the property line issue.</p>
<p>Propose alternative park and ride</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better alternative use for the site is as a park and ride. 	<p>54. Ike Kielgass</p>	<p>No response required.</p>
<p>PSCAA Air Permits Needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plant is not “portable” and therefore additional air permits are required. 	<p>73. GMVUAC</p>	<p>The plant is portable by design and was properly permitted in accordance with PSCAA regulations.</p>

Public Records Request	47. Angela Flick	No response required.
Sewer/Septic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noting sanity sewer is not available and concern re use of septic on an industrial site so close to the river. 	30. Larry Krall 102. Cedar River Council/incl. list of public comments	Septic flow from the small job office on site will flow to an approved holding tank on site that will be regularly pumped per County regulations.
Site Contamination Cleanup <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lakeside should be required to clean up site contamination before use. 	30. Larry Krall 102. Cedar River Council/incl. list of public comments	Lakeside has proposed to clean up the site and this proposal has been included in all application materials.
Site Management Plans	107. Muckleshoot Tribe	Site Management Plans will be prepared by Lakeside Industries, Inc. to ensure compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Sand and Gravel Permit requirements. The plan will be based on details that will be considered and determined during this permitting process.
Support for Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the encroachment issue was addressed, visited Covington site and did not detect odors, impressed with scrubbing process, believes noise will not be an issue. Lakeside will be a good neighbor. 	80. Charles Vowell	No response required.
Traffic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in vehicles trips and traffic will generate pollution (emissions and oil from vehicles) that will adversely impact the residents and environment. SR 169 is already very dangerous and trip generated by the Plant will increase danger. 	2. Christian Sandstrom 3. Jillene Seiver 7. Tasha Quinn 10. John Desimone Hittman 12. Robin Cahill-Myers 13. Dorothy 14. Amanda Krig 15. Tim Hayes 16. Brian & Tammera Widell	Transportation Engineers Northwest (TENW) conducted a comprehensive traffic analysis for the project based on King County and WSDOT guidelines and standards. A Level 1 Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was initially prepared in June 2017 which documented trip generation, sight distance

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient improvements to deal with additional traffic will create dangerous driving conditions. • Cedar River trail access and popularity creates a traffic and parking overflow issue that will exacerbated by plant. Proposal to construct acceleration lane and improvements will further adversely impact traffic and parking and is incompatible with the SMA. Could set dangerous precedent to allow siting of more facilities within the shoreline. • Traffic analysis improperly discounts trips from previous Sunset Materials facility, and information provided by Lakeside to evaluate trip distribution should be verified - a supplemental report should be prepared. • Discrete request for response to specific traffic concerns, e.g., sight line distance, blind spots, increase in recreational traffic during summer months, limited movability of freight traffic, etc. • Traffic analysis incomplete and based on unsupported presumptions. • WSDOT analysis of TIA and request for additional information. • Concern re traffic impacts to City of Renton. • Approval from WSDOT required. • Treatment of runoff from roadwork should be addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 21. Meaghan Lodahl 23. Ron Bick 24. Christian Sandstrom 25. Ike Kielgass & Brenda Chrystie 27. Hendrick Haynes 28. Janet Dobrowolski 30. Larry Krall 31. WSDOT 34. Hendrick Haynes 35. Stephanie Schaeewe 39. Liz Clayworth-Scott 41. George Sellhorn 46. Wendy Sarino 48. Rhys Sterling / Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council 52. Betty Willis 53 Linda Stark 54. Ike Kielgass 60. Scott Boone 61. Thomas and Judith Rohm 63. Mark Ditzler 64. Fred Akerlund 67.1 Scott Boone 73. GMVUAC 74. Hank Haynes 75. Nancy Pullen-Seufert 76. Amanda Heins 109. Carol Husmann 92. Hank Haynes (contributors – LarKen Buchanan, Stephen Deutchman, Celia Parker) 94. Scott Giordano 95. Green River Coalition (Greg Wingard) 103. City of Renton 107. Muckleshoot Tribe 	<p>at the driveway, LOS at the driveway, parking demand, and identified frontage and right-of-way requirements.</p> <p>An updated and more comprehensive Traffic Impact Analysis was prepared in November 2018 to update the Level 1 TIA and also address comments received from WSDOT, City of Renton, and King County. Issues related to treatment of runoff from the road improvements and potential impacts on culverts are addressed in the updated DEA Report dated July 6, 2020 and The Watershed Company letter to Karen Deal dated June 4, 2020. Also see below on pages 18-19 concerning culverts under SR 169.</p> <p>The updated TIA documented trip generation and compared it to Lakeside’s Covington operation, evaluated LOS and sight distance at the site access, evaluated LOS and queues at the two intersections to the east and west of the site on SR 169, confirmed there will be adequate sight distance at the access onto SR 169, identified frontage improvements, and proposed mitigation with widening of SR 169 at the site access to provide deceleration and acceleration lanes and a wider driveway to accommodate the larger truck/trailer combo units. Increased surface water runoff will be treated and infiltrated by the on-site stormwater treatment systems.</p>
--	---	--

		<p>The TIA determined that traffic impacts to SR 169 would be minimal with increases of less than 3 percent and no degradation in LOS at either of the adjacent intersections. The section of SR 169 in the site vicinity has not been identified as a high accident location by WSDOT, and the documented collision rates are not significant. Trucks and heavy equipment have been accessing the site from SR 169 for many decades. The improvements to SR 169 at the site and the access to the site have been approved by WSDOT.</p> <p>Adequate parking will be provided to accommodate on-site uses, and no off-site parking spillover is anticipated.</p> <p>The project will mitigate its impact to SR 169 by widening SR 169 to provide a deceleration lane for vehicles and trucks entering the site, and an acceleration lane for exiting trucks and vehicles, which will help maintain traffic flow on the highway. The TIA addresses comments provided by all neighboring and interested agencies including WSDOT, City of Renton, and King County.</p>
<p>Use of Recycled Asphalt Pavement (RAP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If recycled asphalt is processed at the plant, there is no way to guarantee it is free of contaminants. • Negative explanation re use of RAP and prohibition in Nisqually Valley. 	<p>28. Janet Dobrowolski 58. Howard Glastetter</p>	<p>Hundreds of jurisdictions across the country allow the use of recycled asphalt. RAP is the most recycled product in the country and the recycling preserves landfill capacity and natural resources. Numerous studies confirm there is no risk of contaminants from RAP. Nevertheless, the</p>

		RAP storage at the Plant will be covered and all runoff from the site will be treated in a multi-part system and then infiltrated.
<p>Water supply/groundwater contamination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that domestic water will be provided via an existing class B well and potential contamination to groundwater. • King County Water District objects and indicates site is within a well recharge area, and will result in water contamination “when” a spill occurs. • Fault lines, potential earthquakes and aquifer recharge area creates potential for contamination of water. • General opposition statement re locating plant over an “EPA-designated sole source aquifer” and noting District 90’s opposition. • There have not been any studies re adverse impacts to drinking water supply and effects on salmon. • Soils are “well drained” such that any spill or leak poses a serious threat to groundwater. • Document that all uses of the existing well are within the water right. 	<p>30. Larry Krall 48. Rhys Sterling / Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council 50. Stuart Rutledge 53 Linda Stark 54. Ike Kielgass 55. Jean Coy 61. Thomas and Judith Rohm 65. Meaghan Lodahl 73. GMVUAC 74. Hank Haynes 76. Amanda Heins 85. Rhys Sterling 90. Joe and Susan Zahniser 91. Susan Zahniser 92. Hank Haynes (contributors – LarKen 94. Buchanan, Stephen Deutchman, Celia Parker) 93. Stephen Deutschman (submitting letter from Rhys Sterling) 94. Scott Giordano 95. Green River Coalition (Greg Wingard) 101. KCWD 90 107. Muckleshoot Tribe 116. Save the Cedar River/Carla Broom</p>	<p>The proposed development will improve water quality by treating all stormwater discharged from pollutant generating surfaces, consistent with all current stormwater requirements. The site will be paved in order to capture all stormwater discharge, prevent pollutant discharge to surface water and prevent untreated infiltration to groundwater. The water treatment infrastructure will include lined biofilter swales, oil/water separators, a settling vault, a large sand filter, and an infiltration gallery. This treatment system will provide “enhanced basic” treatment for all stormwater discharged from pollutant generating surfaces before being released into the environment.</p> <p>Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARA’s) were evaluated in AESI’s Critical Area Assessment (CAA) dated October 2, 2018. The CAA specifically discloses the relevant King County CARA code (KCC 21A.06.253C), which identifies both areas with high and medium susceptibility to contamination. The referenced <i>King County Code</i> (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.</p>

		<p>Figure 4 of the letter-report includes the map areas identified by King County as having either a high 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. Please see the AESI Letter of July 16, 2020 that addresses these issues in great detail.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Environmental documents developed by Farallon Consulting (Farallon) and</p>
--	--	---

		<p>referenced in the CAA specifically identified both soil and groundwater contamination on the site. Based on their subsurface investigation and laboratory testing Farallon (9/1/2016) specifically concluded “no further groundwater characterization is recommended at the Site”. Previous activities on the site led to the contamination. The current proposal is to conduct remediation of the site by removing the contaminated soil from the site. The CAA disclosed that Farallon described historical site uses and identified recognized environmental conditions onsite, including the discovery of an environmental release onsite and the planned independent cleanup of petroleum hydrocarbon.</p> <p>The CAA disclosed the high susceptibility to contamination rating of the project site, identified the site specific environmental documents developed by Farallon, and indicated the KCWD #90 wells are located within the 5-year time of travel (TOT) from the project site. The <i>King County Water District #90 2014 Wellhead Protection Plan (WHPP)</i> 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 “<i>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-</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>13 feet above ground surface</i>". The CAA conservatively assumes the wells are not protected by any intervening low-permeability units.</p> <p>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 <i>Enhanced Basic</i> water quality treatment is the applicable standard. This standard is met by provision of the large sandfilter 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.</p> <p>The project proposes to provide primary and secondary containment areas and a spill protection plan for hazardous materials and aboveground storage tanks.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Beneficial uses of groundwater and connected surface water resources will be maintained by implementing the proposed BMPs, development of a SWPPP, and a Spill Plan.</p> <p>Lakeside has an on-site well that has been employed for industrial uses for decades. The well is subject to a King County Group B Water Use Agreement.</p>
<p>Zoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is not zoned for Plant. • Plant is inconsistent with surrounding property uses. 	<p>21. Meaghan Lodahl 22. Kate Bauwer 26. Mark Ditzler 30. Larry Krall 39. Liz Clayworth-Scott 40. Michael Hagen 41. George Sellhorn 48. Rhys Sterling / Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council 54. Ike Kielgass 71. Matt Wexler 73. GMVUAC 78. Julie Stachowiak</p>	<p>The site is zoned Industrial and the Plant is expressly permitted by the King County Code. This issue was definitively addressed, and the zoning was confirmed, in the 2018 King County DPER Cedar River Sites Industrial Moratorium Study. Industrial uses at the site have been ongoing for almost a century. There are no other uses proximate to the site. The Vowell residence is south of the Plant site and Mr. Vowell supports approval of the Plant.</p>

EXHIBIT A

Index and Summary of Public Comments on
Lakeside Industries – Maple Valley Asphalt Plant/WSDOT-Lakeside Transportation Facility
King County Application Numbers: COMM18-0014 & SHOR18-0032

Lakeside Industries - Maple Valley Asphalt Plant
Public Comment Summary Chart
Last Rev. 6/17/20

No.	Topic	Comment	Submitted by	Date
1.	1. Procedural 2. Critical Areas	1. Primarily a request for documentation. 2. Express concern re drainage to Cedar River.	Muckleshoot Tribe	10/19/17
2.	1. Emissions/Health 2. Noise Pollution 3. Traffic 4. Property devaluation 5. Lack of transparency and collaboration	1. Asphalt fumes are injurious to health (cite to New Hampshire Department of Env. Services study) 2. Excessive noise pollution will be created. 3. Increase in large tractor-trailers on highway, without any traffic alterations, will create dangerous traffic conditions. 4. Locating an “industrial plant” next to neighborhoods will decrease the value of homes. 5. Lack of transparency and working with the community.	Christian Sandstrom	10/25/17
3.	1. Critical Areas 2. Emissions/Health 3. Traffic	1. Proximity to Cedar River will result in chemicals leeching into the River. 2. Neighbors will be exposed to asphalt fumes. 3. The exit/entry to the plant is dangerous and will exacerbate dangerous driving conditions.	Jillene Seiver	10/25/17
4.	Emissions/Health	Asphalt fumes are injurious to health (cite to OSHA and Nat’l Inst. For Occupational Safety and Health studies)	Jean Coy	10/25/17
5.	Emissions/Health	Asphalt fumes are injurious to health (cite to OSHA and Nat’l Inst. For Occupational Safety and Health studies)	Kate Lawson	10/25/17
6.	1. Driveway Encroachment 2. Emissions/Health	1. Reference to prior correspondence re access driveway encroachment, which appears to have been resolved. 2. Inquiry re whether the plant will emit noxious fumes.	Chuck Vowell	10/26/17
7.	1. Emissions/Health 2. Noise 3. Traffic	1. Air quality will be negatively impacted and compromise her son’s breathing. 2. Noise will increase. 3. Traffic will increase.	Tasha Quinn	10/27/17

8.	1. Emissions/Health 2. Noise 3. Critical Areas	1. Fumes will adversely impact health (reference to OSHA report). Comparison with Cedar Grove Composting Plan. 2. Concern re noise. 3. Trail system with Lake Desire and Spring Lake, and the Cedar River will be adversely impacted.	Crystal McDonald	10/27/17
9.	1. Emissions/Health 2. Noise 3. Critical Areas	1. Fumes will adversely impact health 2. Adverse noise impacts at all hours. 3. Adverse impacts to Cedar River.	Stephanie Mcaloon	10/27/17
10.	1. Critical Areas 2. Traffic	1. Pollution will adversely impact the environment and community. 2. Adding more trucks will make traffic worse.	John Desimone Hittman	10/27/17
11.	1. Critical Areas 2. Emissions	1. Pollution will adversely impact the environment and community. Groundwater in the area is very shallow and located in Cedar River floodplain. 2. Toxins in the air and transference into the soil.	Stephen Deutschman	10/27/17
12.	1. Emissions 2. Critical Areas 3. Traffic	1. Fumes and odor will make the area unlivable. Reference to existing Cedar Hills Composting Site. 2. Adverse impact to Cedar River, wildlife, adjacent bike and running trail. 3. Adverse impacts and increase in traffic.	Robin Cahill-Myers	10/31/17
13.	1. Emissions 2. Traffic	1. Lists numerous carcinogenic pollutants created by asphalt plants. 2. Adverse impacts and increase in traffic. (duplicate of comments #13, 14)	Dorothy	10/31/17
14.	1. Emissions 2. Traffic	1. Lists numerous carcinogenic pollutants created by asphalt plants. 2. Adverse impacts and increase in traffic. (duplicate of comments #12, 14)	Amanda Krig	10/31/17
15.	1. Emissions 2. Traffic	1. Lists numerous carcinogenic pollutants created by asphalt plants. 2. Adverse impacts and increase in traffic. (duplicate of comments #12, 13)	Tim Hayes	10/31/17

16.	1. Traffic 2. Emissions/Health 3. Critical Areas 4. Noise	1. Adverse impacts and increase in traffic. 2. Plant will cause odor and toxic fumes. 3. Adverse impacts to wildlife and Cedar River. 4. Plant will create noise.	Brian & Tammera Widell	11/4/17
17.	Emissions	Inquiry to Puget Sound Clean Air Agency re review procedures.	King County	11/7/17
18.	Emissions	Evaluation and proposal of mitigation measures re blue smoke, volatile organic compounds and particulate matter. Response to comment # 17.	Brian Renniger/Puget Sound Clean Air Agency	11/7/17
19.	Emissions	Additional information in response to comment #17.	Brian Renniger/Puget Sound Clean Air Agency	11/8/17
20.	1. Emissions/Health 2. Odor and Noise	1. Plant will produce toxic emissions. 2. Plant will produce odor and noise.	Vivian Huynh	11/8/17
21.	1. Emissions/Health 2. Critical Areas 3. Zoning 4. Transparency 5. Traffic	1. Plant and unique topography with slopes creates an enclosed environment for pollutants 2. Adverse impacts on Cedar River and wildlife; need to evaluate potential for mudslides given steep slopes 3. Only industrial uses permitted are existing uses, and plant is a new use and therefore not permitted. 4. Lack of transparency in communicating with public. 5. Adverse impacts and increase in traffic.	Meaghan Lodahl	11/8/17
22.	Zoning	Plant is not an existing use and therefore is not permitted and constitutes an illegal spot zone.	Kate Bauwer	11/13/17
23.	1. Emissions/Health 2. Property devaluation 3. Traffic	1. Brief reference to adverse impacts to health. 2. Brief reference to concern re devaluing homes. 3. Brief reference re traffic increases.	Ron Bick	11/13/17

24.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Emissions/Health 2. Noise Pollution 3. Traffic 4. Property devaluation 5. Lack of transparency and collaboration 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Asphalt fumes are injurious to health (cite to New Hampshire Department of Env. Services study) 2. Excessive noise pollution will be created. 3. Increase in large tractor-trailers on highway, without any traffic alterations, will create dangerous traffic conditions. 4. Locating an “industrial plant” next to neighborhoods will decrease the value of homes. 5. Lack of transparency and working with the community. (duplicate submittal of comment #2) 	Christian Sandstrom	11/13/17
25.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic 2. Property devaluation 3. Critical Areas 4. Emissions/Health 5. Noise 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SR 169 is already overly trafficked and project will result in adverse impacts, particularly if a signal is added. 2. Property values will decrease due to noise, air and water pollution, and traffic. 3. Adverse environmental impacts to Cedar River and wildlife, and the biking/hiking trail. 4. Emissions will adversely impact public health. 5. Noise will be generated and adversely impact properties. 	Ike Kielgass & Brenda Chrystie	11/13/17
26.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 2. Emissions 3. Critical Areas 4. Property devaluation 5. Zoning 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1&2. Public health impacts due to dust and odor. 3. Adverse impacts to the Cedar River and likely significant spill and contamination to groundwater, wetlands and culvert flowing into the River. 4. All properties will be devalued. 5. Plant should be located in a different area more suitable for industrial use and “already zoned for industrial use.” 	Mark Ditzler	11/19/17
27.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Critical Areas 2. Noise 3. Traffic 4. Emissions/Health 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Air and water pollutants will enter the wetlands and river system and adversely impact habitat and wildlife. 2. Industrial level noise will be created. 3. Traffic nuisances and congestion will be created. 4. Emissions will impact health and specifically, rain will attach to particulates and result in toxic rain, and thermo clines will be created with pollutants trapped in a pocket of air above the site. 	Hendrick Haynes	11/20/17

28.	1. Critical Areas 2. Traffic 3. RAP	1. General attack on pollution to the Cedar River and impacts to the trail. 2. Adverse impacts and increase in traffic. 3. If recycled asphalt is processed at the plant, there is no way to guarantee it is free of contaminants.	Janet Dobrowolski	11/22/17
29.	Critical Areas/Salmon	Plant has a high potential to adversely impact threatened Cedar River Chinook and Coho salmon, and therefore endangered orcas.	Defenders of Wildlife	11/22/17
30.	1. Traffic 2. Geologic Concern 3. Zoning 4. Site contamination cleanup 5. Fire/public services 6. Water supply/groundwater contamination 7. Sewer/Septic	1. Significant increases to traffic flow. 2. Inquiry whether site is within an earthquake liquefaction zone and adequate mitigation. 3. Site should be rezoned consistent with surrounding area. 4. Lakeside should be required to clean up site contamination before use. 5. Concern whether adequate fire/public services – statement that there is one fire hydrant about a mile away. 6. Concern that domestic water will be provided via an existing class B well and potential contamination to groundwater. 7. Concern noting sanitary sewer is not available and use of septic on an industrial site so close to the river.	Larry Krall	12/1/17
31.	Traffic	Analysis of TIA and request for additional information.	WSDOT	12/4/17
32.	1. Odor & Noise 2. Property line issue	1. Noise and odor will be significant due to topography. 2. Property line issue along south boundary of site – surveys show discrepancy in location of property line.	Paul Berger	12/6/17
33.	1. Emissions/Health 2. Critical Areas 3. Property devaluation	1. Emissions and fumes will adversely impact respiratory conditions and health generally 2. Adverse impacts to Cedar River, salmon, and trail. 3. Concern re depreciation of homes.	Joan Hains	12/10/17

34.	1. Emissions/Health 2. Noise 3. Traffic	1. Emissions will impact health and specifically, rain will attach to particulates and result in toxic rain, and thermo clines will be created with pollutants trapped in a pocket of air above the site; topography of canyon will intensify these impacts. 2. Excessive industrial noise will be created that is intensified by the topography of the canyon. 3. Traffic is already creating adverse impacts and additional trips will add to these impacts.	Hendrick Haynes	12/14/17
35.	1. Critical Areas 2. Traffic 3. Noise 4. Emissions/Health	One sentence general statement expressing concerns of all noted issues.	Stephanie Schaeewe	5/3/18
36.	1. Critical Areas 2. Historic Landmark 3. Light	1. Adverse impacts to Cedar River, Chinook salmon, trail, wetlands, groundwater, drinking water supply. Site is located within a critical aquifer recharge area, and need to assess seismic hazards and landslide risk. 2. Site is located in or near a King County Historic Landmark. 3. Artificial light will adversely impact spawning Chinook.	Barbara Rutledge (Citizens to Stop the SR169 Asphalt Plant)	5/4/18
37.	1. Critical Areas 2. Emissions/Health	1. Plant will poison the river and kill fish. 2. Plant will release toxic fumes into the air.	Beth Stoddard	5/7/18
38.	1. Critical Areas 2. Emissions/Health	1. Plant will poison the river and kill fish. 2. Plant will release toxic fumes into the air.	Danielle Patton	5/8/18
39.	1. Critical Areas 2. Traffic 3. Emissions/Health 4. Zoning 5. Fire/Public Services	1. Adverse impacts to Cedar River, salmon and trail. 2. Highway is already dangerous and the plant will increase likelihood of accidents. 3. There are existing fumes and odors that will be intensified and become constant nuisances. 4. Site is not zoned for proposed industrial use 5. Concern re adequate fire protection due to proximity of only one hydrant.	Liz Clayworth-Scott	5/11/18
40.	Zoning	Site is not zoned for proposed industrial use	Michael Hagen	4/14/18

41.	1. Critical Areas 2. Traffic 3. Emissions/Health 4. Zoning 5. Fire/Public Services	1. Adverse impacts to Cedar River, salmon and trail. 2. Highway is already dangerous and the plant will increase likelihood of accidents. 3. There are existing fumes and odors that will be intensified and become constant nuisances. 4. Site is not zoned for proposed industrial use. 5. Concern re adequate fire protection due to proximity of only one hydrant (duplicate of comment #39)	George Sellhorn	4/17/18
42.	1. Critical Areas 2. No Burn Area	1. Concern re adverse impacts to Cedar River and salmon. 2. Facility is located in a “no burn area” and burning is specifically prohibited, therefore industrial uses requiring burning should be prohibited. Site is also designated a “CO Maintenance Area and State law and PSCAA regulations both prohibit outdoor burning in this area, with the exception as ‘Recreational, Ceremonial and Cooking Fires.’”	Liz Nedeff	4/21/18 4/23/18
43.	Emissions/Health	List of complaints re “similar Lakeside facility” and emissions causing health issues, odors, etc.	Kevin Groesbeck	7/12/18
44.	Emissions/Health Odor	List of complaints re “similar Lakeside facility” and emissions causing health issues, odors, etc. (duplicate of comment # 43)	Lisa Hollibaugh	7/12/18
45.	Emissions/Health Odor	List of complaints re “similar Lakeside facility” and emissions causing health issues, odors, etc. (duplicate of comment # 43)	Love Natural Beauty	7/12/18
46.	1. Traffic 2. Critical Areas	1. Plant will significantly increase traffic to the already heavy-vehicle load and will compromise safety to roads and health of River. Ties emissions and oil from vehicles to damaging Cedar River. 2. Impacts from traffic and onsite activities will adversely impact the Cedar River and salmon.	Wendy Sarino	8/8/18
47.	Public Records Request	Request to review documents.	Angela Flick	11/26/18

48.	<p>12/5/17</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Landmark Designation 2. Zoning 3. Comp. Plan Inconsistency 4. Groundwater 5. Traffic <p>1/8/18</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Zoning <p>2/28/18</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Zoning <p>5/3/18</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Zoning/Comp. Plan Inconsistency <p>10/12/18</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Zoning 2. Groundwater <p>10/22/18 & 10/26/18 Transmittal correspondence</p>	<p>12/5/17</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site designated a landmark because of location on the Pacific Coast Coal Company Administration Building site. 2. Spot zone and improperly sited use in a rural area. 3. Inconsistent with Comp. Plan re rural character. 4. Existing or likely contamination of groundwater. 5. Traffic analysis incomplete and based on unsupported presumptions. 6. Provides brief commentary on each item of the SEPA Checklist. <p>1/8/18</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site is not zoned for industrial use (moratorium). <p>2/28/18</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site is not zoned for industrial use (moratorium). <p>5/3/18</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comp. Plan should govern over permitted uses and zoning. <p>10/12/18</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site is not zoned for industrial use. 2. Existing or likely contamination of groundwater. 	Rhys Sterling Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council (enclosure of all correspondences)	<p>11/30/18</p> <p>12/5/17</p> <p>1/8/18</p> <p>2/28/18</p> <p>5/3/18</p> <p>10/12/18</p> <p>10/22/18</p> <p>10/26/18</p>
49.	Emissions/Health	Noxious fumes have serious adverse health effects and devalue property.	Ada Liu & Chris Turner	1/3/19
50.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Critical Areas 2. Groundwater/Surface water 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adverse impacts to Cedar River, salmon, and other wildlife. 2. Contamination to water systems. 	Stuart Rutledge	1/5/19
51.	Response to comment	Project will comply with applicable laws.	DPER	1/7/19
52.	Traffic	Discrete request for response to specific traffic concerns, e.g., sight line distance, blind spots, increase in recreational traffic during summer months, limited movability of freight traffic, etc.	Betty Willis	1/19/19

53.	1. Emissions 2. Traffic 3. Water supply 4. Property devaluation	General statement listing each topic of concern.	Linda Stark	1/22/19
54.	1. Propose alternative park and ride 2. Fire safety 3. Critical Areas 4. Zoning 5. Traffic 6. Water contamination 7. Emissions/Health	1. Argues a better alternative use for the site is as a park and ride. 2. Notes sole fire hydrant is one mile away and indicates concern re fire safety given lack of direct water, sewer or gas lines. 3. Landslides frequently occur in the area; threat to wildlife, including salmon, bear etc. 4. Site is not zoned for asphalt plant. 5. Significant increase in traffic will have adverse impacts. 6. King County Water District objects and indicates site is within a well recharge area, and will result in water contamination “when” a spill occurs. 7. Plant will produce known toxins and carcinogens (based on first-hand work experience with asphalt).	Ike Kielgass	1/23/19
55.	1. Emissions/Health 2. Critical Areas 3. Noise 4. Water contamination	1. Fumes will adversely impact residents 2. Fumes and light will adversely impact salmon and Cedar River. 3. Noise will adversely impact residents. 4. King County Water District objects and indicates site is within a well recharge area, and will result in water contamination “when” a spill occurs.	Jean Coy	1/23/19
56.	Procedural Question		Peter Rimbo	1/23/19
57.	Procedural Question		Phil Kitzes	1/23/19
58.	Use of RAP	Explanation re use of RAP and prohibition in Nisqually Valley. .	Howard Glastetter	1/24/19
59.	Critical Areas	Adverse impacts to Cedar River and salmon from production of asphalt and transport.	Lawrence Fisher	1/26/19
60.	1. Emissions/Health 2. Traffic 3. Property devaluation	General and brief statements re each concern.	Scott Boone	1/27/19

61.	1. Traffic 2. Emissions/Health 3. Critical Areas 4. Water Contamination	1. Adverse impacts from increase in heavy transport on crowded highway. 2. Release of harmful emissions will adversely impact health. 3. Cedar River and salmon run will be damaged. 4. Plant is located within 10-year well field recharge area of KCWD.	Thomas and Judith Rohm	1/27/19
62.	Emissions/Odors	Emissions and odors will adversely impact residents.	Darla Bennett	1/27/19
63.	1. Emissions/Health 2. Property devaluation 3. Critical Areas 4. Traffic	1. Emissions and noise will adversely impact residents. 2. Properties will be devalued. 3. Cedar River will likely be contaminated with run-off and dust. 4. Significant increase in traffic will have additional adverse impacts.	Mark Ditzler	1/28/19
64.	1. Traffic 2. Critical Areas 3. Emissions/Health	1. Highway is already a traffic jam that creates excessive pollution in a “stagnant air zone” 2. Adverse impacts to Cedar River and salmon – contrary to protective and costly efforts. 3. Adverse impacts to health of residents.	Fred Akerlund	1/29/18
65.	1. Fossil Fuel Moratorium should apply 2. Critical Areas 3. Emissions/Health 4. Water Contamination	1. The Unincorporated King County Moratorium on new Fossil Fuel Infrastructure (1/28/19) should apply, which prohibits installation of tanks of LNG, Diesel, and Propane. 2. Adverse impacts to Cedar River and salmon. 3. Emissions will result in significant air pollution increased by topography and air inversions. 4. Water contamination is likely.	Meaghan Lodahl	1/29/19
66.	Critical Areas	“Unpermitted landfill” displaces a sensitive wetland on the east side of the property, with likely adverse impacts to the Cedar River.	Tom Allyn	1/29/19
67.	Health/Critical Areas	Brief statement expressing concern re adverse impacts to health and environment.	Alain Balland	1/29/19

67.1	Health/Critical Areas Traffic Property Devaluation	Brief and general statement that adverse impacts in the noted areas will occur.	Scott Boone	1/30/19
68.	Procedural Question		Angela Flick	1/30/19
69.	Emissions/Health	Significant increase in emissions from plant and associated traffic that will worsen air quality.	Joe Schmutzler	1/29/19
70.	1. Emissions/Health 2. Property devaluation	1. Emissions will adversely impact health of residents. 2. Properties will decrease in value.	Nancy Pullen-Seufert	1/30/19
71.	1. Critical Areas 2. Emissions/Health 3. Zoning	1. Cedar River has a dwindling salmon population that will be adversely impacted. 2. Emissions will adversely impact health of residents. 3. Lakeside is “bending” zoning to allow use.	Matt Wexler	1/30/19
72.	1. Critical Areas 2. Emissions/Health	1. Adverse impacts to Cedar River and salmon. 2. Emissions will adversely impact health of residents.	Christian Lodahl	1/30/19
73.	1. PSCAA Air Permits Needed 2. Emissions/Health 3. Water Contamination 4. Wildlife/Critical Areas 5. Noise 6. Traffic 7. Improvements within Shoreline Jurisdiction require SSDP 8. Zoning	1. The plant is not “portable” and therefore additional air permits are required. 2. An EIS should be required to evaluate emissions and impact on air quality. 3. An EIS should be required to evaluate issues re water contamination. 4. Not true that animals are not within site – EIS should be required to analyze. Allege there is a missing geotechnical report that is referenced, but not provided. Classification as a steep slope, erosion hazard, and seismic hazard area merit an EIS. 5. Ramboll’s study shows many locations for sound levels exceed daytime and nighttime permissible limits. 6. Traffic analysis improperly discounts trips from previous Sunset Materials facility, and information provided by Lakeside to evaluate trip distribution should be verified - a supplemental report should be prepared. 7. Improvements within the shoreline jurisdiction require a shoreline substantial development permit and evaluation in an EIS. 8. Asphalt facility is not an allowed use.	GMVUAC	1/30/19

74.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Critical Areas 2. Native land/archeological value 3. Traffic 4. Federal SIC 5. Geological Concern/ Soil instability 6. Water contamination 7. Emissions/Health 8. Maps 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plant will adversely impact food source for salmon and general health of salmon, thereby also adversely impacting orcas. This will also have adverse economic impacts generated from recreation and wildlife. Disregards the monetary investment from the public and to enhance ecology of this area. 2. Strong likelihood site was once used by native peoples and it therefore has strong archeological value. 3. Cedar River trail access and popularity creates a traffic and parking overflow issue that will exacerbated by plant. Proposal to construct acceleration lane and improvements will further adversely impact traffic and parking and is incompatible with the SMA. Could set dangerous precedent to allow siting of more facilities within the shoreline. 4. Federal Standard Industrial Classification is not listed, suggests 295103 “Paving Materials – manufacturer” 5. Coal mining activity undermined the soil and lands thereby creating instability and an earthquake hazard. 6. Fault lines, potential earthquakes and aquifer recharge area creates potential for contamination of water. 7. Emissions and topography will create thermo clines and adverse health impacts. 8. Requests numerous and extensive additional maps. 	Hank Haynes	1/30/19
75.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Emissions/Health 2. Traffic 3. Property devaluation 	General and brief statements re each concern.	Nancy Pullen-Seufert	1/30/19
76.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Emissions/Health 2. Traffic 3. Critical Areas 4. Water Contamination 5. Property devaluation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plant will release harmful emissions that will adversely impact public health. 2. Insufficient improvements to deal with additional traffic will create dangerous driving conditions. 3. Cedar River is critical to ecosystem and will be adversely impacted. 4. Significant risk of contamination to water supply as expressed by District 90. 5. Will result in significant decrease in property value. 	Amanda Heins	1/30/19

77.	Critical Areas	Will result in adverse impacts to Cedar River.	R. Brian Bell	1/30/19
78.	Zoning	Just because site is zoned industrial does not mean it should be used for industrial, and should instead be used in a manner less harmful to the community.	Julie Stachowiak	1/30/19
79.	Procedural Question		Manny Mankowski	2/13/19
80.	Project Support	Corrected encroachment issue, visited Covington site and did not detect odors, impressed with scrubbing process, believes noise will not be an issue. Lakeside will be a good neighbor.	Charles Vowell	2/22/19
81.	Procedural Question		Rita Haselman	2/28/19
82.	Geological Concerns	Reiterating comments above and adding information regarding fault lines, soil instability and potential for settling, earth shifting, landslides, etc. that would damage structures, result in contamination and other adverse impacts to the community and Cedar River. Concern re site water permeability study.	H. W. Hank Haynes	3/1/19
83.	Critical Areas	Adverse impacts to the environment and particularly salmon.	Paula and Dai Murakami	3/3/19
84.	Critical Areas	Lack of information re impacted wildlife and impacts from emissions to the river.	Tammie Lindholm	3/4/19
85.	1. Jefferson County Code 2. Water Contamination	1. Apply Jefferson County Code to require facility be fully enclosed within a structure. 2. General statement re locating plant over an "EPA-designated sole source aquifer" and noting District 90's opposition. And resubmittal of prior comments.	Rhys Sterling	3/8/19
86.	Procedural Question		Manny Mankowski	3/8/19
87.	Critical Areas	Cedar River is too sensitive such that an EIS should be required.	Karen White	3/8/19
88.	Response to comment 86		DEPR	3/11/19
89.		General request that an EIS be required	Manny Mankowski	3/11/19
90.	1. Critical Areas 2. Water Contamination	1. Concern re adverse impacts to Cedar River and salmon. 2 Reference to comments from R. Sterling	Joe and Susan Zahniser	3/11/19
91.	Water Contamination	2. Reference to comments from R. Sterling	Susan Zahniser	3/11/19

92.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic Parking 2. Emissions/Health 3. Noise 4. Critical Areas 5. Water contamination 6. Geological 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acceleration lane, improvements and increased traffic will eliminate safe parking for Cedar River Trail and create a safety hazard. 2. Emissions coupled with canyon topography will create thermal inversion and trap pollutants, ultimately resulting in acid rain or some other contamination of soil and environment. 3. Canyon topography will enhance noise pollution to the detriment of the community. 4. Pollutants will harm the environment, and particularly salmon runs 5. High likelihood of water contamination 6. Mapped and unmapped prior coal mines that could cause subsidence; worsened by fault lines and likelihood of earthquakes 	Hank Haynes (contributors – LarKen Buchanan, Stephen Deutchman, Celia Parker)	3/11/19
93.	Water Contamination	AESI Study demonstrated permeability of soils, which then means contaminants will enter the water system quickly.	Stephen Deutschman (submitting letter from Rhys Sterling)	3/11/19
94.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Critical Areas 2. Water Contamination 3. Noise 4. Emissions/Health 5. Light 6. Traffic 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adverse impacts to the Cedar River from the plant and associated traffic. 2. There have not been any studies re adverse impacts to drinking water supply and effects on salmon. 3, 4, 5. Plant will have adverse impacts on all areas noted as it relates to the surrounding residential homes and residents. 6. Substantial increases to traffic. 	Scott Giordano	3/11/19
95.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water Contamination 2. Critical Areas 3. Traffic 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Soils are well drained such that any spill or leak poses a serious threat to groundwater. 2. Stream traverses the site and discharges into Cedar River, which is critical to salmon. 3. Highway is well trafficked with numerous accidents – an accident with a truck of asphalt will pose a high risk to the environment. 	Green River Coalition (Greg Wingard)	3/11/19
96.	Cover Letter to 1,000 pages of supporting reports from Hank Haynes			

97.	Cover Letter to 1,000 pages of supporting reports from Hank Haynes			
98.	Cover Letter to 1,000 pages of supporting reports from Hank Haynes			
99.	Procedural Question			
Additional Agency Comments				
100.	Critical Areas/Groundwater contamination	AESI's opinion is valid in assessing potential impacts to critical areas, but DPER needs to review the stormwater plan to ensure BMPs provided in 2016 KCSDDM and the General Permit including development of SWPPP and a Spill Plan do not degrade the quality of groundwater.	Eric Ferguson, Water and Land Resources Division, DNR	1/16/18
101.	Critical Areas/Groundwater contamination	Facility is located within 10-year recharge area of Water District 90's wellfield and well contamination could jeopardize the wellfield for years and be extremely costly. "Strongly opposed to potential industrial activities that could ultimately cause harm to the District's public water supply." Desires a permanent moratorium on industrial use along the Cedar River.	Darcey Peterson, King County Water District 90	3/14/18
102.	1. Critical Areas 2. Site Contamination Cleanup 3. Sewer/Septic	1. Concern re impact to nearby colony of bald eagles. Air pollution will negatively impact bees. 2. Inquiry re whether onsite sealed coal mines will be tested for contaminants. 3. Concern re sewage system as it relates to impacts on the Cedar river due to employees and sanitation.	Max Prinsen, Cedar River Council (brief letter expressing concern and providing a summary list of public comments; only those not already addressed elsewhere are noted)	3/17/18
103.	Traffic	Concern re traffic impacts to City of Renton.	Gregg Zimmerman, Public Works Administrator, City of Renton	6/4/18
104.	Misc.	Long list of brief public comments that are already addressed.	Rep. Steve Bergquist Survey Results	12/18

105.	Critical Areas/Shoreline Substantial Development Permit	Instruction to County that its analysis of the SSDP/transportation facility/access should evaluate impacts from the entire project site.	Misty Blair, Department of Ecology	3/17/19
106.	1. Procedural 2. Critical Areas 3. EIS Request 4. Wildlife/Critical Areas	1. Request to address issues with obtaining copies of application documents. 2. Concern regarding the classification of onsite streams. 3. Request for an EIS due to impacts to fish species designated as "Species of Greatest Concern." 4. Concern regarding degradation to habitat, particularly in light of the millions of dollars spent on salmon recovery and restoration in the Cedar River watershed.	Suquamish Tribe	3/9/19
107.	1. Wildlife/Critical Areas 2. EIS Request 3. SR 169 Improvements 4. SR 169 Improvements 5. Critical Areas 6. Lighting/Critical Areas 7. Cedar River Levee 8. Onsite Well 9. Critical Areas 10. Critical Areas 11. Water contamination/stormwater 12. Prior Covington NPDES issues. 13. Site Management Plans.	1. Need to protect current efforts to restore salmon and historic fishing rights. 2. Demand for an EIS to evaluate impacts and site alternatives. 3. SR 169 frontage improvements should be confirmed as acceptable by WSDOT. 4. SR 169 frontage improvements need to be detailed further to evaluate roadway design, culvert extensions, compliance with stormwater detention and treatment, and location of stormwater discharge. This information is missing from the TIR, which only discusses onsite improvements and upstream drainage. 5. WDFW recently determined to be potential fish habitat above SR 169 crossing at Stream C and the existing culvert a fish passage barrier – it should be made passable. 6. Impacts of artificial lighting on Cedar River and salmon recovery. 7. Need analysis re Cedar River levee condition. Request copy of AESI Revised Critical Area Assessment (10.2.18) 8. Need more information re existing well onsite. 9. Stream A classification is lacking streambed gradient data to support classification. Stream C should be classified as Type F.	Muckleshoot Tribe	1/30/19

		<p>10. Need information re potential changes to culvert conveying Stream B under SR 169.</p> <p>11. Request confirmation the proposed stormwater management approach is feasible.</p> <p>12. NPDES permit issues at Covington site need to be explained and information provided re future prevention.</p> <p>13. Site Management Plan, including an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, a SWPPP, a Stormwater Monitoring Plan, a Spill Control Plan, and a detailed water quality pollution prevention plan, should be prepared now.</p>		
Public Comments After March 20, 2019				
108.	Procedural Question	Request for copies of the comments submitted by the Muckleshoot Tribe.	Rita Haselman	3/21/19
109.	<p>1. Critical Areas</p> <p>2. Traffic</p> <p>3. Noise</p>	<p>1. General statement to not locate the facility near the Cedar River.</p> <p>2. Traffic disruption due to large trucks will adversely impact the surrounding area.</p> <p>3. Noise due to large trucks will adversely impact the surrounding area.</p>	Carol Husmann	4/1/19
110.	<p>1. Health</p> <p>2. Critical Areas</p> <p>3. EIS</p>	<p>1. Concern the facility will damage the health of the community.</p> <p>2. Concern the facility will damage the environment.</p> <p>3. Request preparation of an “environmental impact survey.”</p>	Megan Llewellyn	4/30/19
111.	Critical Areas	General statement to not locate the facility near the Cedar River and a link to “Save the Cedar River” website.	Valerie O’Halloran	5/7/19
112.	Critical Areas	Oppose the location of the facility in relation to the Cedar River due to potential adverse impacts on the environment, specifically, water contamination and salmon.	Siobhan Costello	9/4/19
113.	<p>1. Critical Areas</p> <p>2. Odor</p>	<p>1. Opposition to the location of the facility in relation to the Cedar River due to potential impacts to water.</p> <p>2. Concern regarding air quality and primarily odor.</p>	Patricia F. Nedeff	9/6/19
114.	Procedural Question	Inquiry re status and request for a thorough evaluation of impacts.	Tammera Widell	5/3/20

115.	Critical Areas/Geological	Allegation of a recent landslide onsite.	Tammera Widell	5/3/20
116.	1. Critical Areas/Wildlife 2. Groundwater Contamination 3. Emissions/Air Pollution 4. Health 5. HMA Composition 6. EIS Request 7. NPDES violations at Lakeside's Covington Plant	1. Concern re contamination to Cedar River and impacts to wildlife, particularly Coho and Chinook. 2. Concern re contamination to drinking water via groundwater/wellfield. 3. Concern re air pollution/emissions. 4. Impacts to human health. 5. Hot Mix Asphalt is particularly harmful to the environment and human health in light of various potential chemical compounds and resulting impacts. 6. Request for an EIS.	Save the Cedar River/Carla Broom	6/13/20
117.	1. Critical Areas/Wildlife 2. EIS Request	1. Concern re contamination to Cedar River and impacts to salmon and trout. 2. Request for an EIS.	Trout Unlimited	6/16/20