



**Skamania County**  
**Community Development Department**  
Building/Fire Marshal • Environmental Health • Planning  
Skamania County Courthouse Annex  
Post Office Box 1009  
Stevenson, Washington 98648  
Phone: 509-427-3900 Inspection Line: 509-427-3922

February 23, 2022

## **Storedahl and Sons Skamania Quarry EIS**

### Report & Summary of the EIS Scoping Process

#### **1. Introduction & Background Information**

---

The purpose of this document is to summarize the comments received during the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) scoping period for the **Storedahl and Sons Skamania Quarry** Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and to establish the EIS alternatives and areas of investigation that will be included in the EIS. This document also briefly describes the proposal and the County's land use review process. **Attachment A** lists all the scoping commenters who commented during the scoping period and **Attachment B** catalogues specific scoping comment themes. Additional information, including records of public notice actions and a complete mailing list are available for review at the Skamania County Community Development Department.

#### **Proposal & Determination of Significance (DS)**

A significant quantity of high-quality aggregate<sup>1</sup> resource has been determined to be present at the site. The Applicant, J. L. Storedahl and Sons, Inc. (Storedahl), proposes to lease the mineral rights of the property from Weyerhaeuser to operate a crushed aggregate quarry. The total permit area would be 273.6 acres; approximately 180 acres would be disturbed by mining activities. Mining is anticipated to start in 2023, subject to approvals and would occur over 30 to 40 years (depending on market demand). Approximately 24 million cubic yards of resource and overlaying material would be removed. Once mining operations are complete, the mine site would be reclaimed back to forestry use.

Skamania County is the lead agency for SEPA review of projects within the unincorporated County and is responsible for performing the statutory duties required for the **Storedahl and Sons**

---

<sup>1</sup> Aggregate typically consists of crushed stone, sand, and gravel.

**Skamania Quarry.** Alan Peters, the Community Development Department Director, is the designated Responsible Official for conducting SEPA review.

Based on review of the August 20, 2021, Conditional Use Permit application materials submitted on the proposed **Storedahl and Sons Skamania Quarry**, Skamania County determined that this project is likely to have significant adverse impacts on the environment, and that a SEPA EIS should be prepared, consistent with RCW 43.21C.030 (2)(c). The EIS will address the probable significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project.

Skamania County initiated the EIS scoping process for the **Storedahl and Sons Skamania Quarry** on December 8, 2021, by carrying out the following actions:

- Issued a SEPA Determination of Significance (DS)/Request for Comments on the Scope of the EIS. The DS/Request for Comments gave notice of the 33-day extended scoping period, ending on January 8, 2022 (the statutory requirement is for a 21-day scoping period). The DS/Request for Comments is available for review at: <https://www.skamaniacounty.org/home/showpublisheddocument/7557/637744887490830000>
- Mailed copies of the DS/Request for Comments to federal, state, regional, and local agencies, tribes, adjacent property owners, and other interested parties;
- Published the DS/Request for Comments in the Washington State Department of Ecology's (Ecology's) SEPA Register;
- Posted the DS/Request for Comments on the Skamania County website;
- Published the DS/Request for Comments in the *Skamania County Pioneer* newspaper (on December 8, 2021); and,
- Published a project website with information about the proposal and the SEPA process.

The EIS Scoping notification actions meet or exceed all applicable noticing requirements.

The DS/Request for Comments preliminarily identified the following elements of the environment for analysis in the EIS:

- Transportation, including analysis of impacts to traffic, impacts to the existing road system, impacts to pedestrians, and impacts of noise.

## **2. EIS Scoping Process**

---

Scoping provides notice to agencies, tribes, and the public that an EIS will be prepared for a proposal that is likely to cause a significant impact on the environment. The intent of scoping is to identify public, agency, and tribal comments and concerns on the environmental issues and

alternatives that should be addressed in detail in the EIS. The *Storedahl and Sons Skamania Quarry* EIS scoping process provided opportunities for agencies, tribes, and interested members of the public to submit written comments via conventional mail, email, or a portal on the County’s website. Scoping also offers the possibility for the Lead Agency to determine whether changes to the scope identified in the DS are necessary.

### **3. Scoping Comments Received**

---

This section of the report provides a high-level, general summary of the range of comments received during the EIS scoping process. A list of the commenters and the themes of their comments is contained in **Appendices A** and **B**, respectively.

During the EIS scoping period, a total of 298 comment letters/forms were received from 312 unique commenters (some individuals provided multiple comment letters, others provided one comment letter from several family members, and a form was submitted by multiple parties). Comments were largely submitted by individuals (291 letters). Eight (8) letters were from public agencies, tribes, and organizations, including: Washington State Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation, Washington State Department of Natural Resources, Washington State Department of Ecology, Skamania County Department of Public Works, Mt. Pleasant School District, Cape Horn Conservancy, the Columbia River Gorge Commission, and Friends of the Columbia Gorge. Of the comment letters, 192 were received by email, 11 by conventional mail, and 95 through the County’s website portal.

All comment letters are available for review at the Skamania County Community Development Department.

#### **Comments on the SEPA & Approval Processes**

Many commenters requested to be notified of future activity on the SEPA review and approval processes. Others requested that the EIS include another action alternative(s), analyze cumulative impacts, and identify new, appropriate mitigation measures. All commenters will be added to the notification list for the project.

#### **Comments About Impacts to Elements of the Environment**

Most commenters expressed concerns about impacts that the proposal could cause to various elements of the environment. The chart below summarizes the number of letters received containing comments about a particular element of the environment. More details about the comment themes are provided in **Appendix B**.

	Number of Comment Letters with Comments on Each Element
<b>Comments by SEPA Element of the Environment</b>	
• Transportation	260
• Noise	154
• Economic/Fiscal Conditions (including Property Values)	79
• Plants & Animals	70
• Aesthetics	49
• Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions	47
• Surface & Groundwater	36
• Land Use/Relationship to Plans & Policies	24
• Parks & Recreation	21
• Public Services – Emergency Services	21
• Earth	10
• Cultural Resources	5
• Other – Psychological/Social Impacts	4

Following is a brief, high-level overview of concerns expressed in the comments.

#### Impacts to Transportation & Noise

The project’s impacts on transportation and noise were a concern of the largest number of commenters. The transportation comments focused on concerns about traffic congestion, safety, and the operations and conditions of the roadways serving the project (e.g., Mabee Mines Road, Salmon Falls Road, and SR-14). Alternative access routes to the mine were suggested. Concerns related to noise from mining operations and mining traffic and their impacts on rural and recreational uses near the mine and along the mining transport route were raised.

#### Impacts to Land Use, Parks & Recreation, & Aesthetics

The compatibility of the proposed mine with surrounding and nearby uses, including rural residential uses (e.g., near the mine and along the proposed mining transport route) and recreational uses (e.g., the Cape Horn Trail and other local recreational areas) were a concern of a considerable number of commenters. These comments centered on the type and intensity of the proposed mining use – including increases in traffic, noise, and air pollutants. Comments were raised about the consistency of the project with applicable County plans and policies (e.g., the *West End Community Comprehensive Subarea Plan*). Several commenters were concerned about the how the project would affect the scenic qualities of the project area, including the adjacent Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area and the SR-14 scenic byway.

### Impacts to Critical Areas

The project's impacts on critical areas (e.g., earth, water resources, and plants and animals) were a concern of many commenters. Comments were made about the impacts caused by mining on wildlife (including an elk herd and several other wildlife species) and Threatened, Endangered, Sensitive, Candidate, and Proposed (TESCP) animal and plant species. The potential for impacts on the adjacent Columbia Falls Natural Area Preserve were noted. Concerns also included the impacts from mining and stormwater runoff on water resources in the vicinity (e.g., McCloskey Creek and the Washougal watershed). The water quality and quantity impacts of the project on area wells and on aquatic species in nearby waterbodies were noted by several commenters. Concerns were also raised about the possibility for mining activities to destabilize soils/geologic conditions in the area and mining traffic to cause vibrational impacts.

### Impacts to Public Facilities & Services

Numerous comments centered on how the proposal would place a burden on existing public facilities and services. In particular, the impacts of mining truck traffic on the conditions of area roads and utilities (gas lines) were mentioned. The possible impacts of mining traffic on the provision of emergency services (police, fire, and emergency medical service (EMS)) were also noted.

### Impacts to Economic & Fiscal Conditions

Many commenters worried about the effects of the project on property values and the associated impacts on taxes collected by Skamania County. Several commenters expressed concern about the proposal's economic impacts on the County, particularly related to tourism and business activity. Comments were also made about increased costs to the County and State (e.g., for maintenance/repair of roads and utilities, and snow removal) due to the project.

### Impacts to Air Quality

Several comments related to the air quality impacts of the project, including dust and equipment emissions during mining operations, and diesel exhaust from mining truck traffic.

### Impacts to Cultural Resources

A few commenters requested that a cultural resources analysis be prepared to account for the potential impacts of the project on possible cultural resources located on and near the site.

### Impacts to Psychological/Social Issues

A small number of comments were received regarding psychological/social issues. This category of issues is beyond the scope of SEPA review, consistent with the SEPA rules (WAC 197-11-448, 197-11-450). These non-environmental issues are discussed further in **Section 4**, below.

## **Comments Outside the Scope of SEPA**

### Support for & Opposition to the Proposal

A total of 119 commenters letters indicated opposition to and 5 comment letters expressed support for the proposal during the scoping period. While these comments are acknowledged, expressions of support for or opposition to the proposal do not address environmental issues or provide information to help define the scope of the EIS, which are the focus of the scoping process. Therefore, these comments will not change the scope of the EIS.

## **4. Conclusions/Revisions to the EIS Scope**

---

This section of the report contains the County's conclusions about the scope of the *Storedahl and Sons Skamania Quarry* EIS. These conclusions are based on consideration of public and agency comments submitted during the scoping process, and the requirements of SEPA.

### **SEPA Process**

Skamania County used "reasonable methods" to inform the public, tribes, and other agencies that an EIS is being prepared. The County followed the noticing requirements listed in WAC 197-11-510 and the Skamania County Code and elected to provide an expanded scoping process.

The County has expressed its intent and commitment to prepare an EIS that is thorough, complete, and unbiased. The EIS will use existing environmental information to the extent that it is relevant and valid (use of existing environmental information is encouraged by the SEPA rules). Additional and new information and analyses will be prepared in key areas.

The EIS will use and demonstrate the following approach for each element of the environment: (1) summarize existing conditions; (2) identify applicable regulations; (3) analyze the probable significant impacts of the proposal and alternatives; (4) identify appropriate mitigation to address significant impacts; and (5) describe any significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

The technical analyses that will be prepared in support of the EIS will be conducted by the Applicant's technical team using accepted methodologies and in compliance with applicable regulations. Appropriate County staff, including the Community Development and Public Works Departments, will review these analyses to ensure that they are prepared in a professional, impartial manner, and are suitable for inclusion in the EIS.

The County anticipates that the Applicant will provide analysis that is sufficient to prepare a project-specific EIS for the proposed project. To the extent that project-level analysis is prepared for the EIS, future environmental review should not be necessary unless there are substantial changes to the proposal or if determined by additional detailed information (e.g., detailed engineering) in the future. The County will decide whether impacts have been addressed sufficiently in the EIS, or whether and what type of additional review is required by SEPA.

## **EIS Alternatives**

A substantial number of comments related to the estimated number of daily truck trips to and from the site that would be required for mining operations. Therefore, Skamania County has determined that an operational alternative that would reduce truck trips relative to the proposal will be included in the EIS, in addition to the proposal and the no action alternative. These alternatives represent a reasonable range of alternatives for analysis in the EIS, as defined by the SEPA rules (WAC 197-11-440(5)).

### **Alternative 1 – Proposed Mining**

The EIS will analyze the proposed **Storedahl and Sons Skamania Quarry** described in **Section 1** of this Scoping Summary.

### **Alternative 2 – Mining Operations Alternative**

This alternative will include potential changes to mining operations that could reduce the number of truck trips to and from the mine, relative to the proposal. As required by SEPA, this alternative must meet the Applicant's objectives for the project.

### **Alternative 2 – No Action Alternative**

The No Action alternative is required to be included in an EIS, and is typically defined as what would most likely happen if the proposal does not move forward. According to the SEPA Rules, "no action" does not necessarily mean that nothing (no mining in this case) would occur. The No Action Alternative that will be studied in the EIS will include discussion of possible future commercial forestry use of the site in accordance with existing zoning and permits.

## **Elements of the Environment**

As indicated previously, the greatest number of comments received during the public EIS scoping period expressed concerns about **Transportation** and **Noise**, the environmental elements already identified for study in the EIS. A substantial number of comments related to Economic/Fiscal, Conditions, Plants and Animals, Aesthetics, Air Quality, Surface and Groundwater, Land Use, Parks and Recreation, and Public Services (Emergency Response). A few comments were made on Earth, Cultural Resources, and other topics. Many comments raised specific concerns or variations on issues within these topic areas.

Based on the scoping comments, the following additional elements of the environment have been identified by the County for study in the EIS: **Land Use** (with sub-sections on Aesthetics, Parks and Recreation, and Relationship to Plans and Policies), **Critical Areas** (with sub-sections on Earth, Water Resources, and Plants and Animals), **Cultural Resources**, and **Air Quality**.

## Other Elements of the Environment

The purpose of EIS scoping is to narrow the focus of an EIS to significant environmental issues and to eliminate insignificant impacts from detailed study (WAC 197-11-408). Thus, a SEPA EIS is not required to review every element of the environment listed in WAC 197-11-444 and the Skamania County SEPA Rules (SCC Chapter 16.04); to evaluate every element at the same level of detail; or to review every concern that may be evaluated by decision-makers in deciding whether to approve a project.

Many commenters expressed concerns related to the project's possible impacts on "quality of life," property/home values, and fiscal and economic conditions; a few comments were concerned about psychological/social issues. Quality of life is an expression that means different things to different people. In this EIS, what is thought to be meant by quality of life will generally be addressed under Transportation, Noise, Land Use, Critical Areas, and Air Quality. While property/home value and psychological/social concerns may be considered and accounted for during the overall decision-making process on a project, a SEPA document is not required to evaluate these concerns and they will not be addressed in this EIS. Fiscal and economic conditions may be analyzed in an EIS. However, the project is not expected to significantly impact these conditions, and they will not be included in the document. Other considerations that are deemed outside the purview of SEPA include: methods of financing proposals, economic competition, profits and personal income and wages, and social policy analysis (WAC 197-11-448(3)), and monetary costs and benefits (WAC 197-11-450).

## Conclusion

In conclusion, Skamania County has determined the following:

1. The EIS will evaluate three alternatives:
  - **Alternative 1 – Proposed Mining,**
  - **Alternative 2 – Mining Operations Alternative,** and
  - **Alternative 3 – No Action Alternative.**
  
2. The EIS will analyze the following elements of the environment:
  - **Transportation** (including Public Services – Emergency Response),
  - **Noise,**
  - **Land Use** (including Aesthetics, Parks and Recreation, and Relationship to Plans and Policies),
  - **Critical Areas** (including Earth, Water Resources, and Plants and Animals),
  - **Cultural Resources,** and
  - **Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions.**



# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **Public Scoping Commenters List**

# Storedahl and Sons Skamania Quarry EIS

## Public Scoping Commenters List

### Agencies, Tribes, Organizations

Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation

Washington State Department of Natural Resources

Washington State Department of Ecology

Skamania County Department of Public Works

Mt. Pleasant School District

Cape Horn Conservancy

Columbia River Gorge Commission

Friends of the Columbia Gorge

### Individuals

<u>A</u>	Bertaccini, S.	Casper, J.	Dervlin, D.
Abbott, R.	Blackwell, A.	Caudill, G.	Dezso, A.
Alexander, J.	Blakeslee, H.	Caudill, G.	Dimitt, S.
Alexander, R.	Blanchard, C.	Christopherson, S.	Dinas, J.
Alldredge, A.-M.	Blanchard, K.	Cichosz, R.	Dinas, J.
Alldredge, L.	Bodell, M.	Coe, G.	Dobson, R.
Allen, D.	Boggs, B.	Cook, L.	Dohrendorf, R.
Anderson, J.	Boggs, R.	Cooley, T.	Dowdy, K.
Anderson, P.	Brandt, T.	Craine, J.	Duchesneau, M.
Angelo, R.	Breaker, C.	Cuff, C.	Duling, S.
Aspitarte, T.	Brong, C.	<u>D</u>	Dunt, T.
<u>B</u>	Brong, E.	DaCorte, D.	During, S.
Bailey, J.	Brown, K.	Dalen, J.	Dutson, C.
Bailey, J.	Brown, M.	Dalen, W.	Dugson, D.
Baker, D.	Burnett, G.	Davidson, R.	<u>E</u>
K. Bancroft	Burnett, K.	Davies, F.	Eichler, D.
Barrett, J.	Bush, B.	Dayton, A.	Elder, J.
Barstow, J.	Bush, J.	Dayton, A.	Elven, C.
Bea, B.	<u>C</u>	Debrag H.	Emery, D.
Bea, J.	Campbell, S.	Debrag, M.	Field, T.
Bechtel, J.	Cartan, R.	DeLyria, K.	Fraser, C.
Bell, K.	Case, B.	Denman, A.	Fraser, Z.

<u>G</u>	Hovland, P.	Lane, D.	Mitchell, L.
Gale, M.	Hughs, M.	Langston, B.	Morgan, G.
Gamble, S.	Humes, L.	Lasisi, J.	Morgan, R.
Gassaway, J.	Hunt, K.	Lawton, R.	Mudge, S.
Geiger, M.	Huntington, D.	Lee, R.	Mueller, S.
Geisinger, J.	Huntington, K.	Leon, K.	Mulder, I.
George, M.	Huntington, S.	Leon, M.	<u>N</u>
Giles, C.	<u>I</u>	Leonard, M.	Nguyen, L.
Gillis, D.	Irish, S.	Lewis, J.	Niemi, D.
Grams, D.	<u>J</u>	Lewis, T.	Nordquist, A.
<u>H</u>	James, C.	Ligouri, T.	Nordquist, K.
Haigh, S.	James, J.	Litchfield, K.	Norton, J.
Harness, M.	Jennings, J.	Lowe, D.	Norton, S.
Harrison, D.	Johnson, E.	<u>M</u>	Norvell, C.
Harrison, M.	Johnson, G.	Maddox, K.	Nouri, M.
Harrison, N.	Johnson, K.	Malder, D.	<u>O</u>
Hart, B.	Johnson, L.	Malder, L.	Olmstead, R.
Hart, C.	Johnson, S.	Manheim, K.	Olson, F.
Hart, J.	Johnston, S.	Marley, P.	<u>P</u>
Hart, S.	Jones, J.	Mase, M.	Parker, M.
Harvey, M.	Jorge	Masco, K.	Parsley, E.
Haynes, M.	Juarez, M.	Masco, M.	Parsley, K.
Haynes, S.	Juarez, R.	Masco Horan, M.	Patterson, C.
Hays, D.	Jurgens, A.	Mattson, J.	Patterson, J.
Hays, J.	<u>K</u>	McAttee, L.	Patzer, S.
Herschell, R.	Kasper, M.	McGee, D.	Patzer, S.
Herschell, V.	Keefe, M.	McGee, S.	Paul, J.
Hess, D.	Keister, L.	McGinley, M.	Payne, B.
Hess, R.	Klett, J.	McIntosh, F.	Payne, C.
Hiland, W.	Klett, K.	McIntosh, H.	Payne, K.
Hoffman, J.	Klett, S.	McIntosh, W.	Payne, R.
Holmes, M.	Knect, A.	McWhorter, A.	Peabody, D.
Holstad, J.	Knecht, A.	McWhorter, R.	Peabody, S.
Horan, J.	Kolstad, J.	McWhorter, M.	Peloquin, L.
Horning, L.	Kurth, T.	Miller, T.	Perillo, K.
Horning, M.	<u>L</u>	Mills, C.	Perry, G.
Hovland, A.	Laidlaw, T.	Miller, M.	Peeters, B.

Peterson, M.	Samsel, L.	Staros, G.	Wainwright, J.
Pfefer, E.	Schafer, J.	Steelman, T.	Wallin-Sanchez, L.
Pope, B.	Schimpp, B.	Stein, J.	Warren, W.
Pope, K.	Schimpp, T.	Stiles, K.	Wastradowski, M.
Pope, K.	Seaman, A.,	Sutton, K.-M.	Wastradowski, S.
Powell, D.	Seaman, J.	Suzette	Weaver, C.
Price J.	Seaman, S.	<u>T</u>	Weaver, H.
Price, L.	Seekins, T.	Thorp, B.	Weihl, W.
Probstfeld, D.	Shannon, S.	Tekoko, K.	Wilber, E.
<u>R</u>	Shaw, C.	Tkach, R.	Wilber, M.
Rachelle, R.	Silva, N.	Teeters, J.	Wiles, P.
Rachelle, S.	Singh, M.	Tucker, S.	Wilkerson, K.
Ragonesi, A.	Smirnoff, D.	Twain, D.	Williams, C.
Rende, D.	Smith, D.	Twain, L.	Williams, K.
Reude, D.	Smith, H.	Trenary, S.	Wilnoit, D.
Riedl, J.	Smith, P.	Trenary, S.	Wilnoit, L.
Robbins, T.	Snedeker, C.	Traugh, R.	Wright, S.
Root, M.	Snedeker, J.	Tate, K.	<u>Y</u>
Rose, L.	Snedeker, L.	<u>V</u>	Yapp, K.
Russo, J.	Snedeker, S.	Van Dorn, D.	Yockey, K.
Rutter, M.	Snyder, C.	Vaughn, N.	Young, L.
Rutting, C.	Sodja, N.	Verdolin, M.	Young, T.
Rutting, L.	Sodja, P.	Verdolin, M.	<u>Z</u>
<u>S</u>	Soliz, C.	Von Arx, G.	Zentmeyer, M.
Sampson, D.	Sparks Cresswell, N.	<u>W</u>	Zakak, N.
Sampson, T.	Staley, P.	Wagner, B.	

## **ATTACHMENT B**

### **Public Scoping Comment Themes**

## Storedahl and Sons Skamania Quarry EIS

### Public Scoping Comment Themes

Topic Area	Specific Themes
<b>SEPA &amp; Approval Process</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request to receive future notices about the EIS and project</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request that the EIS include another action alternative(s), analyze cumulative impacts, and identify new, appropriate mitigation measures</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that EIS is prepared in an unbiased manner</li> </ul>
<b>Permitting</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecology permits required</li> </ul>
<b>Earth</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stability of site and area soils &amp; geology with blasting, etc.; potential for landslides &amp; impacts on surrounding residences</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soil vibration impacts from mining traffic on areas adjacent to mining access roads (e.g., on utilities &amp; home foundations)</li> </ul>
<b>Surface Water &amp; Groundwater</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surface &amp; groundwater quality impacts due to pollution &amp; hydrologic changes from mining activities &amp; mining traffic (e.g., on area wells &amp; water resources)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Groundwater impacts from potential “rock bursts” &amp; “pop-ups”</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater management system should meet more than minimum requirements given climate change</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a critical areas assessment, including delineation of any wetlands &amp;/or streams onsite</li> </ul>
<b>Plants &amp; Animals</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife impacts (e.g., to elk, deer, bear, cougar, bobcat, salmon, peregrine falcon, eagles, amphibians) due to loss of habitat, road kills, noise/activity, pollution, &amp; light</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Threatened Endangered Sensitive Candidate &amp; Proposed (TESCP) species impacts (e.g., on northern spotted owl, larch mountain salamander &amp; certain salmonid fish species; seven plant species; &amp; two plant conservation communities of concern)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on Columbia Falls Natural Area Preserve</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of invasive weed species</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare wildlife mitigation plan</li> </ul>
<b>Air Quality/GHGs</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dust &amp; exhaust from mining &amp; mining traffic impacts on nearby rural residents (e.g., living near mine &amp; along mine access routes) &amp; recreational area users (e.g., of Cape Horn Trail), including health impacts</li> </ul>
<b>Noise</b>	

Topic Area	Specific Themes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise impacts of mining &amp; mining traffic on nearby rural residents (e.g., living near mine &amp; along mining access routes) &amp; recreational area users (e.g., of Cape Horn Trail), &amp; wildlife, including health impacts</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Account for specific local conditions that carry noise &amp; expectations in rural setting</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyze noise impacts at property lines of residences adjacent to the mine access road</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirm noise levels from trucks is accurate</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyze truck traffic as a “line source”</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measure existing noise levels for noise analysis</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyze noise impacts at other times of the day than peak hours</li> </ul>
<b>Land Use/Plans &amp; Policies</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use impacts of mining use &amp; mining traffic on nearby rural residential &amp; recreational uses</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mining use of property inconsistent with County Comprehensive Plan (e.g., mission to maintain “peace &amp; quiet” &amp; “lack of heavy traffic”</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precedent set by mining for other disruptive uses</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CRL-40 designated lands in locations such as this are usually used less intensively, providing stepped buffers to rural uses</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mining use of property more disruptive &amp; longer term than logging activities</li> </ul>
<b>Aesthetics</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts on scenic resources (e.g., Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area &amp; SR-14 - state scenic byway)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts on aesthetic character of the area</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simulate impacts on views from CRGNSA, SR-14, public trails, &amp; viewpoints in the area</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepare a cultural resources survey of site &amp; vicinity</li> </ul>
<b>Parks &amp; Recreation</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mining traffic impacts on recreation areas (e.g., use of Cape Horn Trail, Ozone Climbing Crag Cliffs, &amp; Cape Horn Overlook)</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic &amp; congestion on area road system from mining traffic, with associated traffic operational impacts</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased potential for accidents from mining traffic on mining access roads (e.g., due to steep, narrow roads with poor sight distance, trucks exceeding safe speeds, treacherous conditions during winter, &amp; rocks strikes) with other vehicles (including school buses &amp; agricultural equipment), pedestrians, bicyclists, equestrians, &amp; animals – wildlife, pets, livestock; of particular concern: SR-14 (including Washougal traffic circles &amp; Cape Horn bridge) &amp; mining access route off SR-14 (including Cape Horn Trail crossing)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for mining traffic to use short cuts/alternate routes on other roads (e.g., Canyon Creek – Mt. Pleasant – Belle Center –SR-14)</li> </ul>

Topic Area	Specific Themes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Expand traffic study to include SR-14 &amp; several intersections on this highway</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Conduct traffic study in spring/summer when traffic is heaviest</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Conduct pedestrian survey in summer</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Assumed annual growth rate in traffic study should be 1.6% through 2025</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Conduct queuing study at crossing of Cape Horn Trail with Salmon Falls Rd.</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Mt. Pleasant Rd. is not a truck route</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Update traffic counts in Washougal that are 3 years old</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Assess existing pavement conditions on mining access route</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Mining traffic is not comparable to logging traffic because amounts &amp; durations differ</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Develop a different access route to the mine</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Discuss “WSDOT &amp; the Scenic National Area FS SR 14 &amp; Dog Mountain Trail Head Congestion &amp; Safety Study” &amp; its applicability to project</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Mitigation suggestions, including: lowering speed limits on rural roads, providing a truck run-out, providing a merge lane onto SR-14, using rail or barge for transport of aggregate, requiring frequent brake inspections, establishing load count maximums, minimizing hours of operation, installing pavement lighting at Cape Horne Trail crossing</i></li> </ul>
<b>Public Services</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Increased need for public services (e.g., police, fire, EMS) due to mining operations &amp; traffic accidents</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Existing public services inadequate to serve additional impacts of project</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Potential to block access roads so that emergency response vehicles could not pass</i></li> </ul>
<b>Economic/Fiscal Impacts</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Decreased property values in area due to proximity to mine; less taxes collected by Skamania County due to lower property values</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Increased County maintenance costs (e.g., for road maintenance due to mining truck traffic impacts on area road surfaces &amp; on underlying utilities, as well as additional need for snow plowing)</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Mining impacts on tourism &amp; area businesses</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Financial impacts to area drivers from rock damage to windshields</i></li> </ul>
<b>Other</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Prepare Social Impact Assessment; prepare Ecopsychological Study</i></li> </ul>