Notice of Application

The Spokane County Department of Building and Planning (Review Authority) has published this Notice of Application to provide the opportunity to comment on the described proposal. The comment period ends 14 calendar days from the date issued. During this period written comments may be submitted to the Review Authority. The file may be examined between the hours of 7:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday and 7:30 a.m. and 12:00 p.m. Friday (except holidays) at the Department of Building and Planning in the Public Works Building, 1026 W. Broadway, Spokane, Washington. Questions may be directed to the Project Coordinator listed below.

PROJECT: B1402469
OWNER: HIGHLINE GRAIN LLC
CONTACT: HIGHLINE GRAIN LLC/KEVIN WHITEHALL CWGG
PHONE: 509-745-8551
APPLICATION DATE: 09/17/2014
DETERMINATION OF COMPLETENESS: 09/18/2014
SITE ADDRESS: 9025 S CRAIG RD
LOCATION: CHENEY, WA 99004
PARCEL: 14145.9004; 14144.9011; 14231.0722; 14235.9001; 14232.0723; 14232.0765; 14232.0728
DESCRIPTION: FOOTING & FOUNDATION (BOOT PIT ONLY) FOR SHUTTLE GRAIN FACILITY
ZONING: Rural Traditional
OTHER PERMITS: AVIGATION EASEMENT(S) THRU SIA & FAPB; SECTION 401 OR AO & POSSIBLE NEDES THRU DOE; POSSIBLE SECTION 404 THRU ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS; NOC THRU SPOKANE REGIONAL CLEAN AIR
FURTHER STUDIES: FINAL WETLAND MITIGATION PLAN

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: The Department of Building and Planning has reviewed the proposed project for probable adverse environmental impacts and expects to issue a determination of nonsignificance (MDNS) for this project. The optional DNS process in WAC 197-11-355 is being used. This may be the only opportunity to comment on the environmental impacts of the proposed project. The proposal may include mitigation measures under applicable codes, and the project review process may incorporate or require mitigation measures regardless of whether an EIS is prepared. A copy of the subsequent threshold determination for the specific proposal may be obtained upon request. The Spokane Environmental Ordinance governs any SEPA appeal and such appeal shall be filed within fourteen (14) days after the notice that the determination has been made.

EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS: TRAFFIC DISTRIBUTION LETTER; WETLAND DELINEATION

WRITTEN COMMENTS: Agencies, tribes and the public are encouraged to review and provide written comments on the proposed project and its probable environmental impacts. All comments received within 14 calendar days of the date issued below will be considered prior to making a decision on this application.

DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS: Spokane County Zoning Code, Spokane County Subdivision Ordinance, Spokane County Standards for Roads and Sewer Construction, Spokane County Guidelines for Stormwater Management, Spokane County Critical Area Ordinance and the regulations of the Spokane Regional Health District are the primary regulations applicable to the site.

CONSISTENCY: In consideration of the above referenced development regulations and typical conditions and/or mitigating measures, the proposal is found to be consistent with the "type of land use", "level of development", "infrastructure", and "character of development".

PUBLIC HEARING: This action is not subject to a future public hearing.

REVIEW AUTHORITY: Julie Shatto, Project Coordinator
Randy Vissia, Building Director
Spokane County Building and Planning
1026 W Broadway Avenue
Spokane, WA 99260
(509) 477-3675

Date Issued: 9-22-14  Signature: Julie Shatto

The comment period closes at 4:00 p.m. on October 6, 2014.
Environmental Checklist

Purpose of Checklist:
The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for Applicants:
This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:
Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply."

IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (Part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: Highline Grain LLC – Four Lakes Grain Shuttle Facility

2. Name of applicant: Central Washington Grain Growers dba Highline Grain LLC – P.O. Box 649 – Waterville, WA 98858

3. Address and phone number of applicant or contact person: Kevin Whitehall

   P.O. Box 649
   Waterville, WA 98858
   (509) 745-8551
   750 9-11-14
4. Date checklist prepared: August 5, 2014

5. Agency requesting checklist: Spokane County, WA

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

   The project is anticipated to start construction as soon as September 2014, with construction complete and the facility fully operational in November 2015.

7. a. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

   There are no plans for future additions, expansions, or further activity at this time.

b. Do you own or have options on land nearby or adjacent to this proposal? If yes, explain.

   Highline Grain LLC does not own or have options on land nearby or adjacent to this proposal.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to his proposal.

   A Pre-Application meeting with Spokane County was held on 2/27/14. Environmental documentation that has been prepared directly related to this proposal includes:
   - SEPA
   - Critical Areas Report (Wetlands, Wetland Buffers, and Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas), including a Wetland Mitigation Plan
   - Traffic Distribution Information
   - Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

   There are no applications or proposals pending for governmental approvals directly affecting the property covered by this proposal.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

    Based on the Pre-Application meeting held with Spokane County, the following government approvals or permits are needed for this proposal:
    - Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Signage Permit (Spokane County)
    - Drainage Report (approved by Spokane County)
    - Wetland Permit Application (Ecology) (Spokane County approval)
    - Demonstrated compliance with the Spokane Critical Areas Ordinance, Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas portion (Spokane County)
    - Compliant Disposal System for sanitary wastewater (State Dept of Ecology)
    - Review for Acceptability (Fairchild Air Force Base (FAFB)), Executed Easement (FAFB),
    - Executed Easement (Spokane International Airport (SIA)), Recording of title notice regarding airport noise
    - Notice of intent for NPDES Construction General Permit (Ecology)
    - [illegible - possible Section 404]
11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page.

HighLine Grain proposes to construct a new commercial grain loading facility near Four Lakes, Washington. A project vicinity map is provided as Figure 1. (Figure 1 – Vicinity Map). The facility would be built on land that is currently being used as pasture (for cattle grazing) as well as a minor portion that is being farmed (hay). The project consists of three primary elements: 1) the new grain storage and elevator facility, 2) the required rail infrastructure, and 3) the required access roadway infrastructure (Figure 2 – Site Plan).

The facility would be designed to store up to 2.1 million bushels of grain. The facility structures would include a 1,700 square foot (total) two-story office building, a 5,500 square foot auxiliary pole building for miscellaneous equipment storage, a loading/unloading shed, eight integrated concrete storage bins totaling approximately 1 million bushels, one approx. 550,000 bushel concrete storage bin, and one approx. 550,000 bushel steel bin. A new truck scale, underground utilities, a domestic water well, and a small conventional septic system and drain field would also be constructed as part of this project (Figure 3a and 3b – Facility Side Views and Figure 4 – Facility Top View).

The rail transportation infrastructure that would be required to service the new facility would consist of approximately 7,520 linear feet of new track in a loop configuration and approximately 9,780 linear feet of new auxiliary track (Figure 2 – Site Plan). A new railroad embankment between 22 and 65 feet wide would be created for this length. The new rail infrastructure has been designed to minimize impacts to minor wetlands present on the property. Approximately 0.053 acre of wetland would be filled for the completion of the railroad embankment.

The road transportation infrastructure that would be required to service the new facility would consist of approximately 2,580 linear feet of new paved access road. The new road would be approximately 28 feet wide to accommodate grain trucks. The new roadway would connect to Craig Road.

The project would result in approximately 41,000 cubic yards (cy) of excavation and approximately 39,500 cy of fill. Excavated soil would be used as backfill for the railroad embankment and excess soil would be spread and used at the site. Crushed gravel would be imported to surface the new roadway and railroad ballast would be imported to support the railroad ties and rail line. The new grain loading facility structures would require cast in place concrete foundations. A few small culverts would be installed to accommodate the existing minor drainage patterns.

A potential borrow area (approximately 6.35 acres) has been identified to the northeast of the proposed facility structures. A potential construction and materials staging area (approximately 4.6 acres) has been identified to the southeast of the proposed facility structures. Both of these areas are outside of wetlands.

The project is anticipated to begin construction as soon as September 2014, with the facility fully operational in November 2015.
12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information to a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township and range, if known. If a proposal would cover over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit application related to this checklist.

The project is located near Four Lakes in Spokane County, WA. Four Lakes is situated between Airway Heights, WA on the north and Cheney, WA on the south. The project is bounded by WSDOT railroad on the south, Interstate 90 (I-90) on the east, Craig Road on the west, and White Road on the north. (Figure 1 – Vicinity Map)

The project area includes portions of the NW ¼, the NE ¼, and the SE ¼ of Section 14, Township 24 North, Range 41 East (Figure 5 – Property Map).Parcel numbers include 14145.9601, 14144.9011, 14232.0728, 14232.0728.

13. Does the proposed action lie within the Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA)?

Per the Spokane County Aquifer Susceptibility Map, the project area lies within a CARA of high susceptibility.

14. The following questions supplement Part A.

a. Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA)

(1) Describe any systems, other than those designed for the disposal of sanitary waste, installed for the purpose of discharging fluids below the ground surface (includes systems such as those for the disposal of stormwater or drainage from floor drains). Describe the type of system, the amount of material to be disposed of through the system and the types of material likely to be disposed of (including materials which may enter the system inadvertently through spills or as a result of firefighting activities).

There would be a small conventional septic systems and drain field constructed to accommodate two (2) restrooms and one (1) sink at the office building and one (1) facility restroom and one (1) sink at the facility. The system would normally serve 6 employees at any one time. On occasion, the facility will have up to an additional 6 employees from outlying facilities assisting the normal full time staff.

(2) Will any chemicals (especially organic solvents or petroleum fuels) be stored in aboveground or underground storage tanks? If so, what types and quantities of material will be stored?

No agricultural chemicals, fuels, or solvents would be stored, handled, or discharged at the site.

(3) What protective measures will be taken to insure that leaks or spills of any chemicals stored or used on site will not be allowed to percolate to groundwater. This includes measures to keep chemicals out of disposal systems.

Not applicable; chemicals would not be stored or used onsite.

(4) Will any chemicals be stored, handled or used on the site in a location where a spill or leak will drain to surface or groundwater or to a stormwater disposal system discharging to surface or groundwater?

No agricultural chemicals, fuels, or solvents would be stored, handled, or discharged at the site.
b. Stormwater

(1) What are the depths on the site to groundwater and to bedrock (if known)?

Depths to groundwater and to bedrock on the site are unknown. However, for the soil types found of the property, groundwater depth is typically 80 inches or greater and depth to bedrock has a wide range from 16-80+ inches.

(2) Will stormwater be discharged into the ground? If so, describe any potential impacts?

Water runoff generated from impervious surfaces at the site, such as the paved access road and the grain loading facility's roof would be collected and conveyed in grass-lined swales. Water would infiltrate at the site. Existing minor drainage courses would be maintained with the use of culverts. Replanting of exposed soils would limit the long-term threats of detrimental runoff water impacts. The Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control (TESC) plan developed for the project will address runoff risks associated with construction activities. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be developed for the project.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

   a. General description of the site (circle one):[flat] rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountains, other.

   The majority of the project area occurs within nearly flat rocky ground.

   b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

   The project area includes nearly flat ground and minor slopes. Most of the site contains slopes of 1-2 percent. The steepest slopes are on the east side of the project area, which approach 6 percent.

   c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.

   Per the Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, the project site consists of Silt Loam and Rock Complex Soils. There is no prime farmland onsite; however the site contains soils considered to be "prime farmland if irrigated" per Ecology's Farm Soils map for Spokane County. A geotechnical report has been prepared for the project (Figure 6 – Project Geotech Report).

   d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

   There are no surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity of the site. Minor soil erosion has occurred due to farming and grazing activities.
e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill:

Minor cuts and fills are proposed for development of the new rail infrastructure based on the gently undulating terrain and the need for the rail line to maintain an acceptable grade to allow trains to pass through the facility. To the degree possible, materials that would be excavated in cuts would be used to create the new fill embankments. Additional excavation may be performed to create a borrow source for better fill materials.

The project would result in approximately 41,000 cubic yards (cy) of excavation and approximately 39,500 cy of fill. If possible, soil excavated would be used as backfill for the railroad embankment and excess soil would be distributed at the site. Crushed gravel would be imported as base material for the site access road. Railroad ballast would be imported to support the railroad ties and rail.

Approximately 18,000 cubic yards of railroad ballast (including walkway ballast), conforming to the specifications of BNSF Railroad, would be imported.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

Construction activities could result in soil erosion. The project site is large, relatively flat, and does not have any existing drainage features that leave the site. Erosion and stormwater runoff will be controlled during and after construction.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

The site is about 241 acres. Approximately 2 percent of the site (or approximately 201,000 square feet) would be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion or other impacts to the earth, if any:

A Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control (TESC) plan would be developed to plan for and manage potential erosion during construction. Best management practices (BMPs), such as silt fences, rock check dams and hay bales, would be used to limit and prevent sediment-laden runoff from affecting critical areas or adjacent properties during and immediately following project construction. After construction has been completed, all exposed soil areas will be hydrosseeded with a dryland grass mix.
2. Air

a. What type of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial, wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

Emissions during construction would include fugitive dust associated with use of heavy equipment and exposed fine soils, and diesel emissions resulting from the heavy equipment required to construct the facility. The equipment to be used would include: dozers, trucks, graders, scrapers, and excavators. It is anticipated that water will be used for compaction and dust control during earthwork-related activities.

Operations of the grain facility will generate grain dust. The facility will be designed to include a dust collection system to remove the majority of dust generated during grain conveyance.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

There are no off-site sources of emissions or odors that may affect this proposal.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

Dust abatement practices will be implemented as part of the TESC Plan developed for the project. Equipment will be in good working condition.

Related to dust generated in the processing and conveying grain, the facility has been designed to include an approximately 57,000 Standard Cubic Feet / Minute (SCFM) total dust filter system to remove the majority of dust generated during grain processing.

3. Water

a. SURFACE:

(1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

A wetland delineation was performed for the project in May 2014. The site contains wetlands which range from Category II to Category IV. There are no other surface water bodies on or in the immediate vicinity of the site.

(2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.
The project would require fill of approximately 0.053 acre of Category 4 wetlands. Another approximately 3.34 acres of wetlands would be within 200 feet of the proposed improvements (Figure 7 – Wetland Map).

(3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from the surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

Approximately 1,000 cy of fill material (preferably excess excavated materials from the site) would be used to fill the approximately 0.053 acre of wetlands.

(4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

The proposal would not require surface water withdrawals or diversions.

(5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.

Per FEMA Map Panel 53063C0700D (effective July 6, 2010), the proposal does not lie within a 100-year floodplain.

(6) Does the proposal involve any discharge of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

No waste materials would be discharged to surface waters.

b. GROUND:

(1) Will groundwater be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

A domestic water well would be constructed for the facility if an existing abandoned well cannot be reactivated. A septic system would be developed to treat wastewater at the site.
(2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sanitary waste treatment facility. Describe the general size of the system, the number of houses to be served (if applicable) or the number of persons the system(s) are expected to serve.

There would be a small conventional septic systems and drain field constructed to accommodate two (2) restrooms and one (1) sink at the office building and one (1) facility restroom and one (1) sink at the facility. The system would normally serve six (6) employees at any one time. On occasion, the facility will have up to an additional six (6) employees from outlying facilities assisting the normal full time staff.

c. WATER RUNOFF (INCLUDING STORMWATER):

(1) Describe the source of runoff (including stormwater) and method of collection and disposal if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

Stormwater runoff generated from impervious surfaces at the site, including the paved access road and the grain loading facility’s roof would be collected and conveyed in grass-lined swales. Water would infiltrate at the site. Existing minor drainage courses would be maintained with the use of culverts.

(2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

Waste materials are not anticipated to enter ground or surface waters.

d. PROPOSED MEASURES to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any.

The TESC Plan developed for the project will address runoff risks associated with construction activities. Replanting of exposed soils will limit the long-term threats of detrimental runoff.

Wetland mitigation shall be done in accordance with Spokane County Code 11.20.050(D).

4. Plants

a. Check or circle type of vegetation found on the site:

- Deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other.
- Evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other.
- Shrubs
- Grass
- Pasture
- Crop or grain
- Wet soil plants, cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other.
- Water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other.
b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

The project area has been regularly farmed and grazed. This regular disturbance precludes the establishment of persistent vegetation. Approximately 21.4 acres would be cleared to construct the railroad embankment and related infrastructure, this includes mainly grassy areas and pasture.

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

Per the Washington Department of Natural Resources database, no records of state- or federally-listed threatened or endangered plant species were found on or near the site.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

Exposed soil areas will be reseeded to limit erosion. No formal landscaping is currently proposed.

5. Animals

a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site are known to be on or near the site:

   birds: (hawk), (heron), (eagle), (songbirds), other: __________________________
   mammals: (deer), (bear), (elk), (beaver), other: __________________________
   fish: (bass), (salmon), (trout), (herring), (shellfish), other: __________________________
   other: __________________________

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat and Species (PHS) database was reviewed and no records of state or federally-listed threatened or endangered animal species were found on or near the site. The Four Lakes area, though disturbed, provides some habitat for songbirds, such as sparrows, and finches, and upland game birds. The long history of disturbance and ongoing agriculture at the site limit habitat for threatened and endangered species. The site contains no water bodies or wetlands that are connected to lakes, steams or other drainage systems.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

The site is within the Pacific Flyway, which stretches from the North Slope of Alaska to Central and South America.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

Measures to enhance wildlife are not proposed.

6. Energy and natural resources
a. What kinds or energy (electric, natural gas, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

Electricity would be used to power the facility and associated lights.

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

The project would not affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

Rail is the most efficient mode of transport for bulk commodities over land. This facility would enable more efficient energy use because it would assure that rail is used to transport agricultural commodities for a considerable period of time into the future.

7. Environmental health

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

During construction, fugitive dust associated with the heavy equipment and exposed fine soils and diesel emissions resulting from the heavy equipment may occur.

Facility personnel could be exposed to dust particles emitted during operation of the grain conveyance system. No other environmental health hazards are anticipated to occur as a result of this proposal.

(1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

Fire and emergency response vehicles may be needed in case of a fire or other life-threatening emergency, similar to other facilities. No special emergency services would be required. Highline intends to include as part of the facility a 30,000 gallon dedicated fire protection water tank.

(2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

It is anticipated that water will be used for compaction and dust control during earthwork-related activities. Dust abatement practices will be implemented as part of the TESC Plan developed for the project.

The facility has been designed to include an approximately 57,000 Standard Cubic Feet / Minute (SCFM) total dust filter system to remove the majority of dust generated during grain conveyance.
The facility has also been designed to include a 400-foot long fall protection system for working on top of railcars.

b. NOISE:

(1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

Existing noises within the project area include vehicular traffic and airplanes; these noise sources would not affect the project.

(2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

Short-term noise would result from construction activities, including grading, compacting, hauling ballast, installing rail track, and building the structures. Noise from these types of activities would occur between 7:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Long-term noise would result from grain delivery to and from the facility via rail and trucks year-round. Between 45 and 55 shuttle trains, and between 100 and 110 scoot trains (9,000 to 10,500 railcars) are anticipated to be processed at the facility per year. It is estimated that 6,700 trucks would be processed at the facility per year.

Normal hours of operation would be from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. During harvest in the summer, the hours of operation would be from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday through Sunday. Noise from the facility would occur during the following times: train/truck arrivals and departures, loading the trains with grain, and moving the train to fill the railcars. Train arrivals and departures could be any time of day or night, with railcars loaded upon train arrival.

(3) Proposed measure to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

Construction activities would occur within the hours set forth by Spokane County Code Chapter 6.12 Noise Disturbances. Short-term and long-term noise resulting from the project is not anticipated to affect other people or properties in the area, therefore, no measures to reduce or control noise are proposed.

8. Land and shoreline use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

The site and many of the adjacent properties are currently used as farmland, pasture, or are not actively being farmed or grazed. The property is bounded by railroad track, I-90,
and S Craig Road (paved), and W White Road (gravel). Along these two roads there are number of rural residences.

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.
   
   Yes, most recently this includes hay farming and cattle grazing.

c. Describe any structures on the site.
   
   There no structures at the proposed site with the exception of an abandoned well head.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, which?
   
   No structures would be demolished.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?
   
   Per the Spokane County Generalized Zoning Map, the site is zoned Rural Traditional (RT).

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?
   
   Per the Spokane County Comprehensive Plan Map, the site is designated Rural Traditional.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?
   
   Not applicable; this site is not within the shoreline jurisdiction.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area? If so, specify.
   
   The site contains wetlands.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?
   
   The facility would normally employ up to 6 employees at any given time. On occasion, the facility will have up to an additional 6 employees from outlying facilities assisting the normal full time staff.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?
   
   No one would be displaced by the completed project.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:
   
   As displacement would not occur, mitigation measures are not proposed.
1. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

The project is consistent with the Spokane County Comprehensive Plan, in that it is industrial development directly related to and dependent upon farming operations.

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle or low-income housing.

No housing units would be provided.

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high-, middle- or low-income housing.

No housing units would be eliminated.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

As housing impacts would not occur, mitigation measures are not proposed.

10. Aesthetics

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

The primary grain elevator leg(s) would be the tallest structure(s) at the facility, not to exceed 190 feet. The grain storage facility would be both steel and concrete. The office building exterior would be steel or traditional wood construction.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

No views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed by the project.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

As aesthetic impacts are not anticipated, mitigation measures are not proposed.

11. Light and Glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

The facility would include outdoor lighting features which would be in use at night when loading/unloading grain shipments. The sun hitting steel tanks could produce reflections and glare. The shape of the tank minimizes that effect as the surfaces are not flat.
b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

As the structures would be well set back from public roads and private properties, light or glare is not anticipated to be a safety hazard or interfere with views.

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

There are no existing off-site sources of light or glare which may affect this proposal.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

As light and glare impacts are not anticipated, mitigation measures are not proposed.

12. Recreation

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

There are no designated or informal recreational opportunities in the immediate vicinity of the site.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

The proposed project would not displace any existing recreational uses.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

As impacts on recreation would not occur, mitigation measures are not proposed.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

Based on a review of DAHP’s WISAARD Database, there are no places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers on or next to the site.
b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic archaeological, scientific or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

There are no landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:

As impacts are not anticipated, mitigation measures are not proposed.

14. Transportation

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

The site would be served from Craig Road via construction of a new access road. Craig Road is owned and maintained by Spokane County. Other roads in the vicinity that would be used in normal operations include I-90, Medical Lake-Four Lakes Road, and Highway 902.

b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

The site is not currently served by public transit. The nearest transit stop is near Medical Lake High School (approximately 4 miles to the west), which is served by Spokane Transit Route 62.

c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

The completed project would have 13 parking spaces for passenger vehicles. No parking spaces would be eliminated by the project.

d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

The project would construct a new asphalt paved access road to provide access to the site for delivery trucks and facility personnel. The new access road would be approximately 2,580 lineal feet long and approximately 28 feet wide to accommodate grain delivery trucks. The proposed road would connect to Craig Road. Craig Road is currently not rated as an all season road and typically is restricted during a few weeks in late winter/early spring each year. The part of Craig Road to the south of the connection to the intersection of Medical Lake-Four Lakes Road would be evaluated and improved if necessary as part of the project so that it can be used as an all-season road.

e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail or air transportation? If so, generally describe.
The proposed project is a rail facility to transport grain crops and is being planned and constructed in collaboration with the Washington State Department of Transportation (owners of the existing rail line) and BNSF Railroad (the approved operator using the existing rail system).

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak would occur.

As it is currently envisioned, the facility would receive approximately 26 grain trucks and average 9 employee vehicles per day for a total of approximately 35 vehicle round trips. During peak season operation may double the number of round trips. Normal hours of operation would be from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. During peak season time (harvest in the summer), the hours of operation would be from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday through Sunday. During the day, there will be essentially no peaks within the hours of operation.

g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

A new asphalt paved access road to provide access to the site for delivery trucks and facility personnel. The part of Craig Road to the south of the proposed connection to the intersection of Medical Lake-Four Lakes Road would be evaluated and improved if necessary as part of the project so that it can be used as an all-season road.

15. Public services

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

The project is not anticipated to result in an increased need for public services.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any:

As impacts on public services are not anticipated, mitigation measures are not proposed.

16. Utilities

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other:

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

The project would either reactivate an abandoned well or construct a new domestic water well. There would be a small conventional septic systems and drain field constructed to accommodate two (2) restrooms and one (1) sink at the office building and one (1) facility restroom and one (1) sink at the facility.

C. SIGNATURE
I, the undersigned, swear under penalty of perjury that the above responses are made truthfully and to the best of my knowledge. I also understand that, should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part, the agency must withdraw any determination of Nonsignificance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist.

Date: 8/5/14
Signature: [Signature]

Proponent: [Proponent's Name]
Address: [Address]
Phone: [Phone Number]

Person completing form (if different from proponent): Paul Weber
Address: E1401 Trent Ave. Spokane WA 99202
Phone: 509-343-8511

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Staff member(s) reviewing checklist: [Signature of Staff Member]

Based on this staff review of the environmental checklist and other pertinent information, the staff concludes that:

[ ] A. there are no probable significant adverse impacts and recommends a Determination of Nonsignificance.
[ ] B. probable significant adverse environmental impacts do exist for the current proposal and recommends a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance with conditions.
[ ] C. there are probable significant adverse environmental impacts and recommends a Determination of Significance.