

# C e d a r R i v e r C o u n c i l

Staff: Nathan Brown  
201 South Jackson Street, Suite 600  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
(206) 477-4800

April 17, 2018

The Honorable Dow Constantine, King County Executive  
The Honorable Reagan Dunn, King County Council  
The Honorable Jeanne Kohl-Welles, King County Council  
The Honorable Dave Upthegrove, King County Council

Dear Executive Constantine and Councilmembers:

We are writing to you about the proposed Lakeside Industries asphalt plant on Maple Valley Highway. It is our understanding that there is currently a three-month Cedar River Sites Industrial Moratorium (CRSIM) Study in place for this proposed project (K.C.C. Ordinance 18611). The Cedar River Council (CRC) requests your consideration and response to the following issues:

- Please review the attached list of comments. The CRC received these comments from concerned residents in the Cedar River Basin, Renton, and Maple Valley areas about the proposed asphalt plant. These comments are directly aligned with the CRC's mission of promoting the health of the Cedar River and to be a public forum for local residents where they can be informed and engaged with local government officials on Cedar River issues. The CRC requests that King County provide responses to the comments listed.
- The CRC held two public meetings discussing the proposed asphalt plant in February and March of 2018. Both meetings had large attendance from the community, and representatives from King County Department of Permitting and Environmental Review as well as Lakeside Industries. From those discussions, the CRC learned that not all information or studies about the asphalt plant have been made available to the public. The CRC requests all asphalt plant-related studies and information be made public for review. In addition the CRC requests that enough time be given for the proper review of such materials.

The Cedar River Council is a long-standing watershed council in King County that has served residents in the Cedar River basin for over 20 years. The CRC was originally established through King County's adoption of the Lower Cedar River Basin Non-Point Pollution Action Plan (King County Ordinance 12809; 1997). Since its establishment, the CRC has been a reliable public forum for King County's rural residents to engage with the county and other public agencies. The CRC greatly appreciates King County's continued support and collaboration.

Constantine and Councilmembers

Page 2

April 17, 2018

The Cedar River Council eagerly awaits King County's response to this letter. Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me if you wish to discuss the contents of this letter further.

Sincerely,



Max Prinsen

Chair, Cedar River Council

Enclosure

cc: Christie True, Director, Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)  
Josh Baldi, Division Director, Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD), DNRP  
Nathan Brown, Cedar River Council Coordinator, WLRD, DNRP  
James Chan, Interim Director, Department of Permitting and Environmental Review  
John Stokes, Chair, WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council  
Tim Lee, Chief Executive Officer, Lakeside Industries  
Michael Lee, President, Lakeside Industries

**Public Comments Received by the Cedar River Council**

**As of April 10, 2018**

- Concerned about the environmental impacts to the colony of nearby bald eagles.
- Mitigation concerns: what environmental mitigation will be required for the plant? If a SEPA determination of non-significance is awarded, there will be no Environmental Impact Review for the proposed plant; therefore, no possibility of environmental mitigation.
- Trail impacts: the air quality from the asphalt plant will have negative impacts to trail users.
- Concerns about the fragileness of the Cedar River ecosystem.
- Storage of materials on site leaching into the Cedar River.
- Soil Testing: Coal mines that are sealed; will the areas be tested for contaminants?
- Copper and zinc outputs from trucks: what will be done to account for the increase of hard metal contaminants that come from increased industrial truck traffic?
- What will be done to control the emissions and smells from the plant and trucks?
- What will be done to address noise impacts from increased industrial activities, which will be detrimental to the wildlife and people in the area?
- Sewage system: employees and sanitation, and the plant's proximity to the Cedar River.
- Asphalt, new vs. recycled: what will be done to ensure that the recycled asphalt being processed does not bring in contaminants that will harm the Cedar River or nearby habitat?
- How will the increase in truck traffic be addressed to minimize impacts to the environment?
- An unpermitted landfill has operated on the site for over 15 years. During this time an old coal plant settling pond that has existed for 80 years was excavated and moved. We don't know what was in this pond, where it went, or if it now lies in the unpermitted landfill. What will be done to research this?
- The soil testing report has not been released to the public or CRC. We don't know which areas were tested, which were missed, nor what was found in the areas tested. This directly impacts the water quality of the Cedar River. When will the public get a chance to review this information?
- The unpermitted landfill has displaced a wetland on the east site of the site. This also directly affects the water quality of the Cedar River; what will be done to address/remedy this issue?
- Increased air pollution from the plant will affect bees. What will be done to address/prevent this?
- King County is not listening to the rural residents and we do not feel represented! Local residents feel that King County does not listen to or respect their rural citizens because of the lack of early and substantive communication with rural residents, as in the case of the proposed asphalt plant.
- Lack of community communications: the community feel they have no choice in this matter. Often actions are taken in the rural area with little to no notice or communication.
- Spot-Zoning: Concerned that the current zoning for the site is an example of illegal spot-zoning.
- Per what I saw in the SEPA checklist, the presence of wildlife on or near the site was not acknowledged. A special study could be warranted to address impacts of noise, light, and air pollution on wildlife, including pollinators, deer, bear, cougar, songbirds, etc.
- There are apparently issues with unpermitted activities in the form of wetland fill which have persisted at the site over the years and don't seem to have been addressed by the current records we have seen.