

Reeck, Amanda

Subject: GRDE15-0004, Raging River Quarry, Response to Permit Revision Application Request for Additional Information

From: Araki and Priebe [<mailto:jcpmka@msn.com>]
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 8:38 AM
To: Reeck, Amanda <areeck@kingcounty.gov>
Cc: Courtney Flora <cflora@mhseattle.com>
Subject: RE: Raging River Quarry, Response to Periodic Review Comments

Amanda,

Thank you for the clarification regarding conflicting information/ conflicting estimates.

With regard to the geotechnical and blasting related items from your November 20, 2018 letter, we have now received two proposals from GeoEngineers and are awaiting those from Core Design and Riley Group. We will need to submit these proposals to JMB/ERP for approval.

Items complicating GeoEngineer's geotechnical report timing are first, GeoEngineer's recommendation that they have a conversation with Steve Bottheim regarding his observations and secondarily, the need to contract with an arborist who can accompany them on their next site visit, in order to complete the requested items. Once this site visit can be accomplished, they estimate 2-3 weeks for completion of that report.

GeoEngineers has agreed that they will coordinate with JMB/ERP to review blast plans and to be present at the next blast in order to provide requested reporting to KCDPER. Date for the next blast is unknown at this time.

We have various other pieces of input regarding your June 5, 2018 request for information:

1. There are multiple ecological and/or wetland issues that would likely best be clarified in a meeting. Specifically, under paragraph A. Ecological Review, items 1- 7, there are several assertions that we either disagree with or we do not understand the specific language of the letter and are unclear how to proceed. These are issues for which we contemplated a meeting in June, which is now in the process of being scheduled. We will provide you with additional details of the questions we hope to address in that meeting.

2. Regarding the Traffic and Road Standards review:

Items 1 & 2, we are proposing a traffic mitigation to resolve the ESD issue. We have had in person conversations with the KC Road Maintenance division in Fall City which maintains a schedule for periodically clearing vegetation in the area of Carmichael Road to the extent of the Western ROW, as approached from the North. They are aware of the site distance question and are confident that their ROW clearing protocol will keep vegetation in check. Additional ROW maintenance beyond KC scheduled periodic efforts

would be redundant and ineffective. The required ETD traveling to the North from Fall City is determined to be 544 feet with a possibility of 560 feet with vegetation clearing to the edge of the ROW. Further study is unlikely to resolve the nominal differences in measurements by parties resulting from the speed analysis conducted (result...49MPH). Thus, RRQ proposes to install the suggested signage as mitigation as outlined in our previously submitted Gibson Traffic Consultants Memo of September 13, 2016 to Robert Eichelsdoerfer. This mitigation solution is both practical and readily accomplished and complies with operating condition 38.

Item 3, subsequent to discussions with Aaron Hally of KC Real Estate Services, a ROW use permit is currently in process and will be obtained to clarify legal liability responsibilities within the ROW.

Item 4, we have emailed Rey Sugui, KC DOT Road Service Division to get a better understanding of the parameters of the Haul Road Agreement several times. We will continue attempting to contact him.

Item 5, the information requested is now in your hands.

Please let us know if you have additional open items you are looking for more information about.

Raging River Quarry, LLC
John Priebe