

DRAFT

November 23, 2021

Barbara Kincaid
City of DuPont
Community Development
Planning Services
1700 Civic Drive
DuPont, WA 98327

RE: Founder's Ridge
Responses to Comments - PLNG2021-018 (Site Plan Review & Design Review), -019
(Tree Modification), -020 (Large Lot Division), and -021 (SEPA)
Located along Center Drive, DuPont, Pierce County, Washington
Tax Parcel No: 011927-2005
Our Job No. 21127

Dear Barbara:

We have revised the plans and technical documents for the above-referenced project to address the completeness comments outlined in your letter dated October 27, 2021. Enclosed are the following plans and documents for your review and processing:

1. Two (2) each revised Photometric Plan including Lighting Fixture Details and Specifications
2. Two (2) each revised Narrative Description of Proposed Uses and Compliance with DMC 25.41.060(4)
3. Two (2) each revised Narrative Description of Compliance with Old Fort Lake Subarea Plan
4. Two (2) sets revised Preliminary Civil Engineering Design Plans
5. Two (2) each revised Traffic Impact Analysis
6. Two (2) each Narrative Addressing Large Lot Subdivision Criteria
7. Two (2) each Certified Arborist Report
8. Two (2) each Tree Modification Narrative
9. Two (2) each Light Manufacturing Site Noise Study
10. Two (2) each Geotechnical Information Report
11. Two (2) each Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
12. Two (2) each Phase I Archaeological Survey
13. Two (2) each Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment Report and Voluntary Bat Habitat Restoration Plan
14. Two (2) each revised SEPA checklist
15. One (1) each Thumb Drive containing Electronic Files

The following outline provides each of your comments in italics, along with a narrative response describing how each comment was addressed:

1. *Throughout almost all plans and documents there are descriptions of the proposed use as either industrial/warehouse, light industrial or industrial/manufacturing uses. Industrial, light industrial and warehouse uses are not an allowed use for the MUV-5 property. We refer you back to the City pre- application meeting letter dated June 17, 2020 (comments A.7 and B.1) and the 2nd pre-application meeting comment letter dated January 25, 2021 (comments A.7 and B.1). Revise all of the submitted documents to correctly reference the type of use proposed that is in compliance with DMC 25.41.020(a): Table of Land Uses and the hearing examiner's*

interpretation of the uses dated Aug. 3, 2018. Clarify if it is intended which uses from the table are proposed, which could be contemplated as a future tenant and which will be excluded.

Response: All of the submitted documents have been revised to reflect the use of Light Manufacturing as the proposed use of the project.

2. *The pre-application comment letter included a requirement that you provide a description of compliance with the pedestrian amenity standards provided in DMC 25.41.060(4) (Comment B.17). The narrative you provided describing compliance with the design requirements does not address this. Revise the design narrative to address DMC 25.41.060(4).*

Response: The design narrative has been revised to address compliance with the pedestrian amenity standards of DMC 25.41.060(4).

3. *The pre-application comment letter included a requirement that you provide a narrative response to the large lot subdivision criteria found in DMC 24.06.070 (comment C.1), which wasn't included in the submittal. Provide a response to the review criteria in DMC 24.06.070.*

Response: A response to the review criteria of the large lot subdivision requirements in DMC 24.06.070 has been prepared and is included in the package

4. *The pre-application comment letter included a requirement that you provide spec sheets for the light fixtures (comment #F.3.h.). Provide light fixture spec sheets.*

Response: Specifications for the light fixture sheets have been provided within this submittal.

5. *The following comments pertain to the Cultural Resources Report prepared by Historical Research Associates dated August 20, 2021 and the SEPA checklist, Section B.13.*

- a. *It appears from the SEPA Checklist that additional cultural resources survey work is being completed. Describe the timing associated with additional cultural resources investigations so that we can consider the timing in the scheduling of the EIS.*

Response: The Phase 2 Cultural Study is in progress and the subconsultant anticipates that the fieldwork will be completed by January 15, 2022. During our recent call with you and Lisa, it was agreed that the city would be able to provide a Letter of Completeness without the Phase 2 Cultural Study and continue to review the SEPA and Site Plan review submittal package until the Phase 2 Cultural Study is completed and submitted.

- b. *In Section 8.2 Potential Burial Areas, the report identifies two areas considered to have a high potential to contain human burials in the eastern end of the AI and an area identified by Nisqually Indian Tribe. The consultant recommends avoidance of these areas or an additional phase of investigations to assess whether there are burials in these portions of site. Please clarify whether the current site plan has complied with the avoidance recommendation, and if so, what provisions have been made to preserve these areas and avoid disturbance.*

Response: We anticipate that the fieldwork will determine whether there are actual burial sites in the locations indicated as potential burial locations in the phase 1 study. The results of the field work will indicate if a modification to the road alignment and site plan is required and to what extent.

- c. *As is the norm for archaeological reports, the study does not provide specific location of archaeological resources to prevent disturbance by third parties. Provide an evaluation of submitted plans by the study authors to confirm whether avoidance recommendations have been met.*

Response: An evaluation of the submitted plans will be provided upon completion of the Phase 2 survey as well as any recommended adjustments to the proposed roadways.

- d. *Additional peer review will occur by the city and other agencies through permit and SEPA review. Additional resources and/or different alternatives and recommendations for avoidance, preservation and conservancy may result from this review.*

Response: Comment acknowledged.

6. *DMC 25.41.010 Purpose describes the purpose of the mixed use village as (emphasis underlined) "The mixed use village (MUV) is intended to provide a location for a spectrum of future services, recreation, employment, and living options arranged in a mixed use village. This district is intended to provide area for those uses that desire to conduct business in an atmosphere of prestige location in which environmental amenities are protected through a high level of development standards. Light manufacturing uses with excessive impacts such as noise or emission of significant quantities of dirt, dust, odor, radiation, glare or other pollutants are prohibited. The MUV zoning district is established to implement the Old Fort Lake subarea plan and the applicable goals and policies for the Old Fort Lake area as listed in the city of DuPont subarea plan." Explain how the site/development plan achieves to the highest extent practical the protection of environmental amenities.*

Response: The revised design narrative included with this package explains how the site plan achieves, to the highest extent practicable, the protection of the environmental amenities.

We believe that the above responses, together with the enclosed revised plans and technical documents, address all of the comments in your letter dated October 27, 2021. Please review and approve the enclosed at your earliest convenience. If you have questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at this office. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ben Eldridge, P.E.
Senior Project Engineer

BE/jd
21127c.004.docx
enc: As Noted
cc: Jeffrey Nelson, NorthPoint Development
James Kraatz, NorthPoint Development
Daniel K. Balmelli, Barghausen Consulting Engineers
Betsy Dyer, Barghausen Consulting Engineers