



CITY OF DUPONT

DEPARTMENT of Community Development
1700 Civic Drive, DuPont, WA 98327
Telephone: (253) 964-8121
www.dupontwa.gov

PLANNING DIVISION

ERRATA SHEET FOR STAFF REPORT & RECOMMENDATION TO THE HEARING EXAMINER

Project: Pioneer Aggregates South Parcel Mine Expansion Project

File Numbers: PLNG2021-006 (Site Plan Review)
PLNG2021-009 (Tree Modification)
PLNG2021-010 (Critical Areas Permit)
PLNG2021-002 (SEPA)

Date of Report: June 19, 2025

From: Barb Kincaid, Director of Public Services

Barb K

Pg. 3, Sec. f, 1st sentence should read: “Two amendments to the City’s Comprehensive Plan were of particular importance to the North Parcel application and the current South Parcel application.”

Pg. 3, Sec. f, date at end of paragraph should read: July 25, ~~2012~~ 2006.

Pg. 7, Sec. 4(i), should read: “The City issued a revised Notice of Public Hearing on June ~~12~~ 11, 2025,...”

Pg. 10, Last Paragraph should read: “*As described above, the Sequalitchew Creek Restoration Plan and its adaptive management plan, together with the Monitoring and Response Plan and its adaptive management will likely avoid or reduce significant unavoidable impacts in keeping with policies LU-3.6, LU-10 and LU 10.2. However, no mitigation is provided for ~~the any~~ significant unavoidable impacts to the surface water bodies located to the south of Sequalitchew Creek (~~Wetland 1D~~-Pond*

Lake; Wetland#8, #9, #10, and #11; and Old Fort Lake) and Wetland 1D. While the EIS finds that the natural seasonal fluctuations in water levels may make it difficult to observe changes to these water bodies, and anticipates any effects will be minor, the City has conditioned the proposal to require additional analysis of these impacts to ensure do not alignment with Comprehensive Plan policies for protection of the long-term integrity of the natural environment.

Pg. 11, Sec 2(a), second Paragraph should read: “The City has conditioned approval so that upon completion of all mining activities and the 10-year maintenance and monitoring period, subject to existing agreements, the City will obtain ownership of the land, and the public will have access to this area via a new trail network.

Pg. 14, Middle of First Full Paragraph should read: “*To the extent ~~of~~ required under existing agreements,*”

Pg. 14, Middle of Second Full Paragraph should read: “*To the extent ~~of~~ required under existing agreements,*”

Pg. 17, Sec. 3(a), Beginning of Second Paragraph should read: “*The GMA ~~encourages~~ requires cities to designate natural resource lands*”

Pg. 18, Sec. 3(e), Beginning of Fourth Paragraph should read: “*Visual Screening – The proposal includes an approximate 20-foot tall, 125-foot ~~tall~~ wide and 1,500-foot-long landscaped berm along the south property edge in order to mitigate the visual and noise impacts to incompatible uses (residential uses to the south).*”

Pg. 29, Sec. 9(h), Staff Analysis should read: “*director will review the Restoration Plan to determine compliance with the DMC prior to ~~issuing Site Development~~ the commencement of mining activities for the South Parcel Project.*”

Pg. 32, First Full Paragraph, should read: “*Staff Analysis and Conclusions: The report concludes that the proposal will have no effect on habitat or ESA-listed species. No information has been*

provided, including within the EIS, related to FEMA requirements for work within or changes to the floodplain areas. The report does not describe/discuss the floodplain associated with Sequalitchew Creek. The applicant shall complete all assessments required by FEMA for work within or changes to the floodplain areas, including, if required, providing compensatory storage. Alternatively, and if appropriate, the applicant shall process a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) with FEMA [following completion of Mining Activities](#) (see Condition #22)."

Pg. 34, Sec. 13(a), should read: "All of the OWO and ~~19~~ 76 of the other non-oak landmark trees are proposed to be removed [\(a total of 89 landmark trees to be removed\)](#) for the South Parcel Project..."

Pg. 42, Cond. 2(d), should read: "The monitoring and reporting requirements for the implementation of the Restoration Plan shall be consistent with an [agreed-upon](#) South Parcel project notification schedule."

Pg. 46, Cond. 24(a) First Sentence should read: "Characterize the [Sequalitchew Creek Open Area](#) (SCOA) and the Mine Setback Area for Tacoma Smelter Plume contamination."

Pg. 47, Cond. 28(g) should read: "~~Runoff in~~ [Stormwater in the South Parcel](#) mine area shall be treated using two-celled wetponds constructed upstream of the infiltration ponds. The wetponds shall be constructed, operated and maintained consistent with Dept. of Ecology and City standards."

Pg. 47, Cond. 28(h) Middle of Paragraph should read: "Stormwater inputs to the groundwater infiltration pond will be minimized to the extent feasible but [may](#) include stormwater from slopes above the groundwater collection system."