SEPA[1] Environmental Checklist

Purpose of checklist

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization, or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

Instructions for applicants

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. **You may use "not applicable" or "does not apply" only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown.** You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

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 help 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.

Instructions for lead agencies

Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B, plus the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions (Part D). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in "Part B: Environmental Elements" that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

[1] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/Checklist-guidance

A.Background

Find help answering background questions[2]

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Mineral Lake Resort Redevelopment
Eastside Environmental Pros, Inc. Project EE-700; Lewis County Master Site Review MSR26-0280.

2. Name of applicant:

Mike Neghina, Elite Holdings Group, Inc.

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

Applicant
Mike Neghina, Elite Holdings Group, Inc.
2114 Marshall Avenue, Tacoma, WA 98421
Phone 206-832-6168 · mike@eliteone.org

Contact person / authorized agent
Kellen Maloney, PWS, Principal Ecologist
Eastside Environmental Pros, Inc.
15620 NE Woodinville Duvall Place, Suite 3, Woodinville, WA 98072
Phone (425) 864-6025 · KMaloney@wetland-consulting.com

4. Date checklist prepared:

22 October 2026

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Lewis County Community Development (SEPA lead agency).
A SEPA checklist is required by Master Site Review MSR26-0280, Condition 3, "due to proposed development on lands covered by water."

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

All permits are sought for a September 1, 2027 start (applicant's project manager, 21 August 2026); construction start and completion dates are to be confirmed by the applicant. The phasing below governs sequence. The project is phased: demolition of the existing structures and construction of the five new cabins occur first, and the existing docks are not removed — nor the replacement dock installed — until all new cabins are constructed, so the in-water work is the final phase.
Two timing constraints frame the schedule: mitigation planting is specified for installation between 1 November and 1 March unless supplemental watering is provided at installation, and all in-water work must occur within the fish work window set by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Hydraulic Project Approval. Master Site Review MSR26-0280 requires the Traffic Impact Analysis (submitted 31 July 2026) to be approved prior to issuance of SEPA, and Step 2 land use approvals before Step 3 development permits.

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

No further additions, expansions, or connected activity are proposed beyond the redevelopment described in this checklist. The applicant's project manager confirmed on 14 August 2026 that, as stated in the Master Site Review, no other changes are contemplated.
Master Site Review MSR26-0280, Condition 1, provides that any change in the project from the current proposal requires further review by Lewis County.

[2] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-A-Background

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

Prepared:
· Critical Areas Report and Mitigation Plan, Mineral Lake Resort Redevelopment — Eastside Environmental Pros, Inc., 5 August 2026 (wetland delineation, wetland rating, buffer analysis, impact quantification, mitigation plan, and no-net-loss analysis).
· Mineral Lake Resort Bulkhead Study — Geotechnical Investigation, Quality Geo NW, PLLC, Project No. QG22-195, 30 November 2022, revised 30 June 2026 (three hand auger borings to 4.8 feet, two dynamic cone penetrometer tests, three slope profiles).
· Engineered Drainage Report, The Land Developer, Inc. (Erik B. Ainsworth, PE), 2 April 2026, with the Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and the Homeowner's Stormwater Maintenance Plan (3 April 2026); and the Mineral Lake Drainage Plan, Project 26-006, 3 June 2026.
· Preliminary Water System Project Report, Mineral Lake Resort, Water System ID 20465 — Vector Engineering, Inc. (Ryan Moore, PE), 16 April 2026, incorporating the constant-rate pumping test memorandum of Insight Geologic, Inc. (William Halbert, LEG, LHg), 12 April 2026.
· Level 1 Traffic Impact Analysis, William Popp Associates, 31 July 2026.
· Dock replacement drawings, Northwest Dock Systems, LLC, Sheets A0.1 through A0.5, issued 25 September 2025, with float load analysis by MC Squared, Inc., Project 2025-0355, 3 December 2025; these drawings depict the previously proposed dock and are to be revised to show in-kind replacement of Docks 3 and 4.
· Topographic survey, C.E.S. NW, Inc., drawing 22199-TOPO (2023).
· Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application (JARPA) — Eastside Environmental Pros, Inc., 11 August 2026.
To be prepared:
· Septic design, Sheet SD-1 — McNair Septic Design & Consulting (Cory S. McNair). Listed in the plan set index but not yet provided; it carries the septic design flow, drainfield sizing, and the separation between the drainfield and the existing wellhead.
· Onsite sewage design parameters (1,320 gpd, NuWater aerobic treatment Level B, 63-by-40-foot drainfield) — McNair Septic Design & Consulting; revised in-kind dock replacement drawings and dock installation and removal methodology — Northwest Dock Systems, LLC. Received 14 September 2026: Critical Aquifer Recharge Area assessment — Insight Geologic, Inc.

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.

No applications are pending for other proposals affecting this property by other parties. Applications associated with this proposal are:
· Master Site Review MSR26-0280 — Step 1 Site Analysis CONDITIONALLY APPROVED 16 June 2026 (Tara Snelson, Planner II). Step 2 and Step 3 approvals remain outstanding.
· Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application and Shoreline Substantial Development Permit — in preparation, not yet submitted.
Closed prior actions on the parcel: Boundary Line Adjustment BLA23-0013 (recorded 2023), Master Site Review MSR23-0128 (maintenance and repair of an existing dock), and Site Plan Review SPRC25-016.
The applicant's project manager confirmed on 14 August 2026 that no other applications are pending on the subject parcel or on the parcel across Mineral Hill Road held in the same ownership.

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

Lewis County
· Master Site Review MSR26-0280, Steps 2 and 3
· SEPA threshold determination (this checklist)
· Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SMP §7.04.01; MSR26-0280 Condition 6)
· Special Use Permit (identified in the MSR Step 2 permit list)
· Critical Areas Ordinance review under LCC Chapter 17.38
· Building, grading, and demolition permits
· Floodplain Development Permit, LCC Chapter 15.35, and a pre/post elevation certificate, due to the proximity of the site to a mapped 100-year floodplain (Flood Zone A)
· Lewis County Environmental Health approval of the onsite sewage system; and, for the existing water system, a well site inspection, well log, arsenic testing, and water availability notification
Washington State
· Hydraulic Project Approval, Department of Fish and Wildlife (in-water work)

· Ecology concurrence on the shoreline permit; Ecology is the final authority on any Shoreline Conditional Use Permit (SMP §7.04.02(E); WAC 173-27-200)
· Construction Stormwater General Permit, Department of Ecology — not required: total disturbed area is less than one acre (project civil engineer, 2 September 2026).
· Department of Health approval of the Group A Transient Non-Community public water system (PWS ID 20465P), including a well site inspection and Engineering Source Approval under WAC 246-290-140
· Decommissioning of the unused hand-dug well by a licensed driller under WAC 173-160-381
Federal
· None presently identified. The replacement dock is secured by piling installed at the locations of the existing piling. Piling placed for structural support is excluded from the regulatory definition of "fill material" at 33 CFR 323.3(c)(2), and Mineral Lake does not appear on the Seattle District list of Section 10 navigable waters. On that basis no Department of the Army authorization — and therefore no Clean Water Act Section 401 certification and no Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation obligation — is presently identified.
Status, 17–21 August 2026: the Lewis County Environmental Health septic permit has been applied for and reviewed, with issuance to follow Department of Health approval of the water system source; the Critical Aquifer Recharge Area assessment (Insight Geologic, Inc.) was received 14 September 2026 and is submitted separately by the applicant's team.

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. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

The proposal is the redevelopment of the existing Mineral Lake Resort, a small-town mixed use lodging and accommodation facility on a single parcel of 64,136 square feet (1.47 acres) abutting Mineral Lake. The project:
· Constructs five new cabins (Cabins A through E) — A-frame structures with metal roofs and wood and glass end walls — replacing the four existing guest cabins, the storage/restroom outbuilding, the resort office, the south shed, and all seven recreational vehicle spaces, which are removed (architect and project manager, 21 August 2026);
· Replaces Docks 3 and 4 in kind — 3,191 square feet of existing over-water structure. The existing floats, decking, and piling are removed; new piling is installed at the locations of the existing piling, and new floats and decking are installed in the same location, orientation, and dimensions as the existing docks. Over-water structure area is unchanged;
· Installs a new onsite septic system — NuWater aerobic treatment, Treatment Level B, designed for 1,320 gallons per day with a 63-by-40-foot pressure-distribution drainfield and a 100 per cent reserve area (McNair Septic Design & Consulting, 17 August 2026);
· Retains the existing well — no new well is proposed — with rehabilitation, approximately 4,000 to 4,500 gallons of atmospheric storage, duplex booster pumping and reverse-osmosis arsenic treatment serving DOH Public Water System ID 20465P (Vector Engineering, Inc., 16 April 2026). MSR26-0280's reference to a "Well Site" is being corrected with Lewis County under MSR Condition 1 to reflect retention of the existing source;
· Removes the existing gravel embankment along the waterline and reestablishes 4,300 square feet of native shoreline planting in an emergent-to-upland gradient.
Construction start and completion dates are to be confirmed by the applicant, with all permits sought for a September 1, 2027 start; the in-water work is the final phase, after all cabins are complete. Landward redevelopment occurs largely over existing legally established impervious and compacted gravel surfaces. Site-wide impervious coverage decreases from 50.7 to 49.8 per cent, and impervious surface within the 150-foot shoreline buffer decreases by 910 square feet (Engineered Drainage Report, 2 April 2026).

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for 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 occur 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 applications related to this checklist.

Address: 148 Mineral Hill Road, Mineral, Washington 98355, unincorporated Lewis County.
Tax parcel: 037061000000 (Lewis County). Parcel configuration reflects Boundary Line Adjustment BLA23-0013, recorded 2023.

Legal location: southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 4, Township 14 North, Range 5 East, Willamette Meridian.
Coordinates: approximately 46.7221° N, -122.1814° W (NAD 83).
Section, township, and range are provided above; a vicinity map, existing conditions plan (Sheet CA1.0), and proposed site plan with impacts and mitigation (Sheet CA1.1) accompany the Critical Areas Report.
The Site abuts Mineral Lake along its southwestern boundary and is bounded to the northeast by Mineral Hill Road. From State Route 7 at the town of Mineral, turn east onto Mineral Hill Road and continue to the Mineral Lake Resort.
Range: 5 East, W.M. Township: 14 North. Section: 4. County: Lewis.

B.Environmental Elements

1. Earth

Find help answering earth questions[3]

a. General description of the site:

The Site slopes from Mineral Hill Road down to Mineral Lake along its southwestern boundary. The slope descends at approximately 24 degrees from the crest to the lake surface, with measured profile inclinations of approximately 10 to 26 degrees across the three slope profiles evaluated by the project geotechnical engineer (Profile A, height approximately 12 feet; Profile B, approximately 18 feet; Profile C, approximately 20 feet). Mineral Lake lies at approximately 1,421 feet elevation. Master Site Review MSR26-0280, Condition 5, identifies that the proposed development location lies within the buffer of a steep slope hazard area.
Elevations across the Site range from 1,418 feet to 1,466 feet, a relief of about 48 feet (project civil engineer, from the 2023 C.E.S. NW topographic survey, 2 September 2026). The vertical datum is NAVD88 per the Washington State Reference Network, and the site benchmark is a 60d nail set in power pole #044160 on the westerly side of Mineral Hill Road at elevation 1,428.25. Proposed finished floor elevations are 1,442.0, 1,432.0, 1,423.0, 1,424.0 and 1,425.0, with daylight basement finished grades at 1,432.0 and 1,422.0.

Circle or highlight one: Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other:

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

Approximately 49 percent (26 degrees). This is the steepest of the profile inclinations measured by Quality Geo NW, PLLC across slope Profiles A, B, and C (Project No. QG22-195, revised 30 June 2026), which ranged from approximately 10 to 26 degrees. The slope descends at approximately 24 degrees (approximately 45 percent) from the crest to the Mineral Lake surface.

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 agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

Site soils are mapped by the Natural Resources Conservation Service as Newaukum gravelly silt loam (Map Unit 146). Site geology is mapped as Pleistocene alpine glacial drift (Qap(h)) — till and outwash sand and gravel. Three hand auger borings advanced to a maximum depth of 4.8 feet below grade and two dynamic cone penetrometer tests were completed on 27 October 2022 (Quality Geo NW, QG22-195). Soils immediately adjacent to Mineral Lake were observed to be saturated and to underlie aquatic vegetation; slope face soils were covered by grasses and shrubs. Native site soils are not suitable for reuse as structural fill, wall backfill, or drainage material due to elevated fines content. No prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance classification is expected to be located onsite due to the Site's developed history.

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

Quality Geo NW, PLLC concluded that the Site is not within an active landslide hazard area and recommended no further exploration or slope stability modeling. No headscarps, downslope accumulations of soil, or evidence of rotational or translational failure were observed, and no groundwater was observed daylighting from the slope

[3] https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-b-environmental-elements/environmental-elements-earth

face.
One indication was noted: trees on neighbouring properties are significantly tilted from vertical, indicating localized soil creep.
The Site does lie within the buffer of a mapped steep slope hazard area, which is why Lewis County required the geotechnical report as a condition of Master Site Review MSR26-0280 (Condition 5). Groundwater was encountered at 3.5 feet below present grade at boring HA-1, and the geotechnical engineer concluded the groundwater table sits at approximately the elevation of the Mineral Lake surface beneath the property.

e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

Grading, excavation, and fill are proposed for four purposes:
1. Gravel embankment removal and shoreline regrading. The existing gravel embankment along the waterline and portions of the adjoining compacted gravel areas are removed and the shoreline regraded to a stable profile. Total area reestablished as vegetated shoreline buffer is 4,300 square feet. Organic topsoil and weathered overburden are removed and the subgrade benched near flat, with maximum vertical steps of 2.0 feet at horizontal spacing of at least 4.0 feet. This work is within the 150-foot shoreline buffer and partly within the mapped 100-year floodplain.
2. Cabin foundations and daylight basement retaining walls. Excavation for five cabin foundations, largely over existing legally established impervious and compacted gravel surfaces. Daylight basement retaining walls are proposed at cabins near Profiles B and C.
3. Onsite septic system and water system improvements. Trenching and excavation landward of the cabins for a pressure-distribution drainfield of eleven 40-foot lines at 6-foot centres with a 40 per cent reduction and a 100 per cent reserve area, three NuWater BNR-500 advanced treatment units, a 2,700-gallon pump chamber, and a distribution box; and for water system improvements serving the existing well, comprising an atmospheric storage tank of approximately 4,000 to 4,500 gallons, a booster pump station, and treatment equipment. No new well is proposed.
4. Stormwater tightline. Trenching for rigid PVC tightline conveying gathered stormwater away from the slope to an approved discharge point.
Imported fill, where required, will conform to WSDOT Standard Specification 9-03.14(1) Gravel Borrow or an approved alternative; wall drainage material to WSDOT 9-03.12(4) or 9-03.12(5); wall backfill to WSDOT 9-03.12(2); trench backfill to WSDOT 9-03.19. Fill is placed in maximum 12-inch horizontal lifts and compacted to a firm and unyielding condition. Areas receiving imported fill are benched, placed, and compacted per WSDOT Standard Specifications 2-03.3(14) through 2-03.3(14)D. Excavation across the Site is limited to the smallest practicable extent.
Upland excavation and imported fill volumes are established at grading permit; excavation is limited to the smallest practicable extent, imported fill conforms to WSDOT 9-03.14(1) Gravel Borrow, and surplus excavated material is disposed of at an approved upland facility. No fill or excavation occurs below the Mineral Lake ordinary high water mark: the only in-water elements are the replacement dock piling, installed at the locations of the existing piling, and the float-supported dock, which is replaced in kind at the existing location, orientation, and dimensions.

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

Yes, during construction. The Site slopes to Mineral Lake, groundwater sits at approximately lake elevation beneath the property, and shoreline work occurs immediately adjacent to and partly below the ordinary high water mark, so exposed soils during the gravel embankment removal and shoreline regrading present the principal erosion risk. Cabin foundation excavation, utility trenching, and construction traffic on exposed subgrade present a secondary risk. Under existing conditions the shoreline band delivers uncontrolled sheet flow across compacted gravel directly to the lake.
Long-term erosion potential is reduced relative to existing conditions: 4,300 square feet of compacted gravel is converted to vegetated shoreline, all site slopes are permanently stabilized, and all gathered stormwater is tightlined away from the slope rather than discharged over it.

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

Within the 150-foot shoreline buffer — the area for which impervious surface has been quantified — the project adds 3,390 square feet and removes 4,300 square feet, a net reduction of 910 square feet. Existing legally established impervious and compacted gravel surfaces recorded on the existing conditions survey (Sheet CA1.0)

include a north gravel parking lot (1,947 sf), a lower gravel area (15,021 sf), and a west gravel area (9,402 sf), together with the resort office, the cabin-series structures, and a shed.
Site-wide, on a parcel of 64,136 square feet (1.47 acres), the Engineered Drainage Report (The Land Developer, Inc., 2 April 2026) records existing impervious coverage of 31,650 square feet, or 50.7 per cent, and post-construction impervious coverage of 31,968 square feet, or 49.8 per cent. Total landscaped area is 32,486 square feet.
Parcel area: the surveyed figure of 64,136 square feet is used throughout the civil calculations and is consistent with the 1.53 acres recorded by the Lewis County Assessor and the Level 1 Traffic Impact Analysis to within deed and survey rounding. The 3.06 acres previously carried in the Critical Areas Report is not supported by any source document and is corrected here. The project civil engineer confirms the record-of-survey area — 27,824 square feet west of Mineral Hill Road and 36,312 square feet east — as the governing figure.
The parcel comprises contiguous areas on both sides of Mineral Hill Road (Parcels A and B of the legal description, per First American Title Subdivision Guarantee No. 5003353-0003532E); the developed resort and all proposed work lie on the lakeside portion east of the road.

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

The following measures are recommended by Quality Geo NW, PLLC (QG22-195, revised 30 June 2026) and are incorporated into the proposal as project design elements:
· Erosion and sediment control best management practices installed prior to any ground-disturbing activity and maintained through construction until permanent stabilization is achieved.
· All site slopes permanently stabilized from erosion. New permanently graded and fill slopes inclined no steeper than 2H:1V, catching natural topography at top and toe.
· All gathered stormwater, new and existing, tightlined in rigid PVC of adequate size, sufficiently anchored, away from the slope and toe to an existing catch basin, approved dispersion area, stormwater system, or established channel, with energy-dissipating features at the outfall to minimize point erosion. Slope tightlines inspected periodically by the owner for damage or displacement.
· Dispersion and infiltration of collected stormwater on or near the base of the slope avoided, because increased runoff or localized inundation can negatively affect long-term erosional and global slope stability.
· Exposed soil subgrades protected during wet weather with crushed rock, lean concrete, or plastic tarp; construction traffic kept off approved subgrade.
· Earthen berms or equivalent to prevent runoff from draining into excavations, with all runoff collected and disposed of properly.
· Temporary excavations and slopes covered with plastic sheeting or similar impermeable material, overlapped at least 12 inches and secured against wind. Excavations behind walls remain open only as long as necessary before backfilling.
· Excavation limited to the smallest practicable extent.
· The limits of the mitigation enhancement area staked and protected from construction traffic, staging, and stockpiling for the duration of the work.
· Permanently, 4,300 square feet of compacted gravel converted to native vegetated shoreline buffer.

2. Air

Find help answering air questions[4]

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

Construction: exhaust emissions (carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, particulate matter) from conventional earthmoving equipment, delivery trucks, and worker vehicles; fugitive dust from excavation, grading, gravel removal, and haul routes; and short-term odour from asphalt, sealants, paints, and solvents. Emissions are temporary and limited to the construction period.
Operation: vehicle emissions from guest and staff trips, comparable to the existing resort operation; and emissions from cabin space heating. The new cabins are all-electric — heat-pump space heating and heat-pump water heating (architect,

[4] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-Air

21 August 2026). No wood stove or other solid fuel appliance subject to WAC 173-433 is proposed, and no residential combustion emissions result.
Maintenance: landscape equipment and periodic vehicle trips. No industrial process emissions are proposed.

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

No off-site sources of emissions or odour that would affect the proposal have been identified. The surrounding area is rural and predominantly single-family residential, undeveloped residential land, and designated forest land. Seasonal smoke from regional wildfire or from permitted outdoor burning may occur, as it does throughout the area, but no specific off-site source has been identified.

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

· Watering or otherwise stabilizing exposed soils and haul routes during dry weather to control fugitive dust.
· Covering exposed subgrades and stockpiles with plastic sheeting or crushed rock, as already required for erosion control, which also suppresses dust.
· Covering truck loads of excavated or imported material.
· Maintaining construction equipment in good working order and limiting unnecessary engine idling.
· Sweeping paved access points to prevent track-out.
· Compliance with Clean Air authority requirements for the construction period.

3. **Water**

Find help answering water questions[5]

a. Surface:

Find help answering surface water questions[6]

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.

Yes. Three surface water features are present on or adjacent to the Site:
· **Mineral Lake** — a lake greater than 20 acres (approximately 275 acres) abutting the Site along its southwestern boundary. It is a Shoreline of the State and a Type S water, regulated under the Lewis County Shoreline Master Program. Standard shoreline buffer is 150 feet from the ordinary high water mark plus a 15-foot building setback; shoreline jurisdiction extends 200 feet landward of the OHWM. Mineral Lake is in the Nisqually basin (HUC 17110015, WRIA 11) and drains north via Mineral Creek to the Nisqually River.
· **Wetland A** — a Category III wetland (total score 17; water quality 5, hydrologic 4, habitat 8), Riverine hydrogeomorphic class, located in the northwestern portion of the Site north of the resort office and inland of the shoreline. Standard buffer 150 feet plus a 15-foot building setback.
· **Stream 1** — a Type F water within the Study Area that discharges to Mineral Lake through a culvert. Standard buffer 150 feet.
A culvert conveys drainage to Mineral Lake from the property across Mineral Hill Road, which is under the same ownership.
The wetland delineation was completed 6 January 2026 and is documented in the Critical Areas Report and Mitigation Plan; a wetland rating form and datasheets accompany that report.

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.

[5] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-3-Water
[6] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-3-Water/Environmental-elements-Surface-water

Yes. The entire Site lies within shoreline jurisdiction, which extends 200 feet landward of the Mineral Lake ordinary high water mark, and the majority of the parcel is encumbered by the Mineral Lake shoreline buffer and the Wetland A buffer.
Work in the waterbody, below the OHWM:
· Removal of the existing floats, decking, and piling of Docks 3 and 4 — 3,191 square feet of existing over-water structure.
· In-kind replacement of Docks 3 and 4: new piling at the locations of the existing piling, and new floats and decking in the same location, orientation, and dimensions as the existing docks. Over-water structure area is unchanged.
· Emergent zone planting of 96 square feet at and below the OHWM with hardstem bulrush, softstem bulrush, and common cattail.
Work adjacent to the waterbody, within the shoreline buffer:
· Removal of the existing gravel embankment along the waterline and shoreline regrading, and reestablishment of 4,300 square feet of vegetated shoreline buffer.
· Cabin construction and associated improvements, adding 3,390 square feet and removing 4,300 square feet of impervious and compacted surface within the 150-foot shoreline buffer, a net reduction of 910 square feet.
No work is proposed in Wetland A, in Stream 1, or in the Stream 1 buffer.
Plans: Existing Conditions (Sheet CA1.0), Proposed Site Plan / Impacts and Mitigation Overview (Sheet CA1.1), and Mitigation Planting Plan (Sheets CA2.0 and CA2.1) accompany the Critical Areas Report and are attached to the JARPA.

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

No dredging is proposed. No fill is proposed within a wetland. Below the Mineral Lake ordinary high water mark the only material placed is structural piling — new piling installed at the locations of the existing Dock 3 and 4 piling, replacing it in kind. The dock is float-supported and is not founded on the lake bed.
Areas affected, by activity:
· Dock removal (Docks 3 and 4), in waterbody — the existing floats and decking (3,191 square feet) are floated off, towed to the county boat ramp, and disposed of offsite, and the existing piling is removed for replacement at the same locations.
· Dock replacement, in waterbody — new floats and decking totaling 3,191 square feet, delivered by water and installed in the same location, orientation, and dimensions as the existing docks; no net change in over-water structure area.
· Emergent zone planting, at and below OHWM — 96 square feet; no fill.
· Gravel embankment removal and shoreline regrading, adjacent to the waterbody — part of 4,300 square feet reestablished as vegetated buffer; excavated material is disposed of at an approved upland facility.
No excavation extends below the ordinary high water mark, and the dock work does not disturb the shoreline (Northwest Dock Systems, 18 August 2026). The access ramp bears on a concrete pad at the shoreline; the pad's location landward of the OHWM will be shown on the dock installation drawings.

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

No. No surface water withdrawal or diversion from Mineral Lake, Stream 1, or Wetland A is proposed. Potable water continues to be supplied by the existing onsite well (see B.3.b.1).
The preliminary water system report recommends that, should Lewis County Fire District No. 9 require dedicated fire-suppression flow, it be served by a standpipe drawing from Mineral Lake rather than from the potable system. No such requirement has been established and no standpipe is part of this proposal; any future fire-suppression intake would require separate shoreline and hydraulic project review and is not authorized by this checklist.

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

Yes, in part. Master Site Review MSR26-0280 identifies that a Floodplain Development Review may be required "due to the proximity of the site to a 100-year floodplain (Flood Zone A)," and a query of the Lewis County Critical Areas GIS FEMA 100-Year layer against the parcel polygon returned an intersection with mapped Zone A. The gravel embankment removal and shoreline regrading occur partly within the mapped zone.

The zone boundary is to be plotted on the existing conditions sheet.
The effective FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (panel 5301020120B) does not establish a base flood elevation for Zone A at this location; the project civil engineer reports that the surveyor will determine the Zone A flood elevation against the surveyed ordinary high water mark (2 September 2026). Any structure found to lie within Zone A carries pre- and post-construction elevation certificates and the LCC Chapter 15.35 requirements, administered through the Floodplain Development Permit.
Effect on flood storage: the Site does not contain a meaningful quantity of natural flood storage under existing conditions. The shoreline band between the resort structures and the OHWM is occupied by legally established impervious and compacted gravel surfaces rather than by lake-fringe wetland or emergent marsh. The redevelopment does not fill, grade, or displace any natural flood storage volume; it reduces impervious surface within the shoreline buffer by 910 square feet and converts 4,300 square feet of compacted gravel to vegetated shoreline, producing a softer profile with greater surface roughness and infiltration capacity than the condition it replaces.

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

No. No discharge of waste materials to Mineral Lake, Stream 1, or Wetland A is proposed. There is no process water discharge, no dewatering discharge to surface water is proposed, and domestic wastewater is directed to a new onsite septic system with primary and reserve drainfields rather than to surface water.
All gathered stormwater is tightlined in rigid PVC away from the slope to an approved discharge point with energy-dissipating features at the outfall, replacing the uncontrolled sheet flow across compacted gravel to the lake that occurs under existing conditions.

b. Ground:

Find help answering ground water questions[7]

1. Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give a general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

Yes — from the existing well, which is retained. No new well is proposed.
The resort is served by an approved Group A Transient Non-Community public water system, Washington State Department of Health PWS ID 20465P (seasonal designation 20465A). The source is a well drilled in 1977 to a depth of 63 feet with 6-inch steel casing to 60 feet, unslotted and unscreened (Lewis County Tag AGN-991, also cited AGH991, designated "Well 2"). A constant-rate pumping test conducted 1 and 2 April 2026 recorded a yield of 13 gallons per minute reducing to 9.2 gallons per minute, total drawdown of 33.27 feet, specific capacity of 0.27 gallons per minute per foot, and transmissivity of approximately 5,000 gallons per day per foot; the well recovered to within 90 per cent of static level in about 200 minutes. Original yield at drilling was 20 gallons per minute at 10 feet of drawdown.
Design demand for the completed project is a maximum daily demand of 2,600 gallons per day and a peak hourly demand of 43 gallons per minute, based on five cabins with 13 bedrooms and a peak occupancy of 26 guests (Preliminary Water System Project Report, Vector Engineering, Inc., 16 April 2026).
Because the well yield is below the peak hourly demand, atmospheric storage of approximately 4,000 to 4,500 gallons and a duplex booster pump station are proposed. Source water carries arsenic at 35 to 45 parts per billion against a maximum contaminant level of 10 parts per billion, together with silica at 60 ppm, iron at 1.4 ppm and total dissolved solids at 320 ppm, so a full treatment train including reverse osmosis is proposed. The existing system is described by the project engineer as pre-existing and unapproved; a well site inspection, Engineering Source Approval under WAC 246-290-140, and full system approval are required before development.
Groundwater conditions: groundwater was encountered at 3.5 feet below present grade at boring HA-1, and the project geotechnical engineer concluded the groundwater table is likely at an elevation similar to the surface of Mineral Lake beneath the property — that is, there is a direct hydraulic connection between

[7] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-3-Water/Environmental-elements-Groundwater

site groundwater and the lake. This is the basis for the stormwater tightlining measures described elsewhere in this checklist.
Water right: the withdrawal continues an existing use from the 1977 well and serves a maximum daily demand of 2,600 gallons per day, below the 5,000 gallon-per-day groundwater exemption of RCW 90.44.050; the well predates the 2018 Streamflow Restoration Act provisions applicable to WRIA 11. Formal documentation of the permit-exempt status, together with a predictive evaluation of withdrawal effects on nearby wells and surface water features, is carried in the Critical Aquifer Recharge Area assessment by Insight Geologic, Inc., received 14 September 2026 and submitted separately by the applicant's team.
System classification: Group A Transient Non-Community public water system, DOH PWS ID 20465P (seasonal designation 20465A), per the Preliminary Water System Project Report. The well site inspection and Engineering Source Approval under WAC 246-290-140 are in process; the Lewis County Environmental Health septic permit has been reviewed and issues upon that approval (McNair Septic Design & Consulting, 17 August 2026).
Reverse-osmosis concentrate will be managed and disposed of in accordance with Department of Health and Department of Ecology requirements, with the disposal method specified in the DOH engineering submittal; no discharge of concentrate to Mineral Lake is proposed. The drainfield maintains the separations at B.3.b.2 relative to the wellhead protection radius shown on the civil plans.

2. Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals…; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

Domestic sewage only. A new onsite sewage disposal system replaces the existing arrangement serving the resort. As shown on the proposed site plan revised 9 April 2026, the system comprises three NuWater BNR-500 advanced treatment units, a 2,700-gallon pump chamber, a distribution box with leveler, and a pressure-distribution drainfield of eleven 40-foot lines at 6-foot centres with a 40 per cent reduction and a 100 per cent reserve area. The system serves five replacement guest cabins with 13 bedrooms and 11 bathrooms. No industrial waste, process water, or waste containing chemicals is proposed for discharge to the ground.
The system is subject to Lewis County Environmental Health review and approval under WAC 246-272A. Replacement of the existing arrangement with a permitted system meeting current standards is one of the measures relied upon in the water quality analysis, because Mineral Lake carries a Category 2 (Water of Concern) listing for total phosphorus.
Design flow is 1,320 gallons per day (McNair Septic Design & Consulting, 17 August 2026). The Lewis County Environmental Health permit has been applied for and reviewed; issuance follows Department of Health approval of the water system source. The existing onsite sewage system is decommissioned by pumping out, crushing and filling the tanks in place, with the existing drainfield left in place. Setbacks: tanks 50 feet and drainfield 75 feet (McNair, 17 August 2026), with wellhead protection per the 100-foot radius shown on the civil plans.

c. Water Runoff (including stormwater):

1. Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) 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.

Sources of runoff are rainfall on cabin roofs, on the retained and new compacted gravel circulation and parking areas, and on remaining landscaped and vegetated surfaces. A culvert also conveys drainage to Mineral Lake from the property across Mineral Hill Road, which is under the same ownership.
Under existing conditions, runoff sheet flows uncontrolled across compacted gravel in the shoreline band directly to Mineral Lake.
Under the proposal, all gathered stormwater sources — new and existing — are tightlined in rigid PVC of adequate size, sufficiently anchored, away from the slope and toe to an existing catch basin, approved dispersion area, stormwater system, or established channel, or released beyond the base of the slope using energy-dissipating features at the outfall to minimize point erosion. Dispersion and infiltration of collected stormwater on or near the base of the slope are expressly avoided on the geotechnical engineer's

recommendation, because increased runoff or localized inundation there can negatively affect long-term erosional and global slope stability. Slope tightlines are to be inspected periodically by the owner.
Waters ultimately receiving site runoff are Mineral Lake and, downstream, Mineral Creek and the Nisqually River.
Discharge point: the Engineered Drainage Report (2 April 2026) states that roof stormwater is discharged directly to Mineral Lake at the location of the existing 36-inch culvert on site, by way of a perforated stub-out connection without the perforated pipe, because the geotechnical report finds the onsite soils not feasible for infiltration and there is insufficient room to disperse. The plan sheet directs roof drains to the existing 36-inch culvert outfall through 6-inch PVC at a minimum 2 per cent grade. Total proposed discharge is stated as less than 0.15 cubic feet per second.
The design is certified to the Lewis County Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington — the 2024 Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, as adopted by Lewis County (Engineered Drainage Report certification, 2 April 2026; edition confirmed by the project civil engineer, 2 September 2026).
The piped conveyance replaces uncontrolled sheet flow across the shoreline with a controlled discharge at an existing outfall location. Total disturbed area is less than one acre (project civil engineer, 2 September 2026), so no Ecology Construction Stormwater General Permit is required; the SWPPP will be finalized on that basis.

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

The project is designed to prevent waste materials from entering ground or surface waters.
Construction-phase pathways: sediment mobilized from exposed soils during gravel embankment removal, shoreline regrading, foundation excavation, and utility trenching; and accidental release of fuels, lubricants, or hydraulic fluid from equipment operating near the water. The direct hydraulic connection between site groundwater at 3.5 feet below grade and Mineral Lake means a spill on the ground surface near the shoreline could reach the lake.
Operational pathways: failure of the onsite sewage system, and untreated runoff from circulation and parking areas.
Controls: erosion and sediment control best management practices installed before ground disturbance and maintained until permanent stabilization; stormwater tightlining away from the shoreline with energy dissipation at the outfall; a new permitted onsite septic system replacing the existing arrangement; spill prevention and response materials kept onsite with equipment fuelling and maintenance conducted away from the shoreline; and conversion of 4,300 square feet of compacted gravel to vegetated buffer providing permanent filtration.

3. Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

Yes, and the alteration is intended and beneficial. Under existing conditions, runoff from compacted gravel surfaces sheet flows down the slope and discharges uncontrolled across the shoreline into Mineral Lake. Under the proposal, gathered stormwater is collected and tightlined away from the slope to an approved discharge point with energy dissipation at the outfall, and 4,300 square feet of compacted gravel in the shoreline band is converted to vegetated buffer, increasing surface roughness and infiltration at the water's edge.
Impervious surface within the 150-foot shoreline buffer decreases by 910 square feet. No stream, wetland, or off-site drainage course is rerouted; the existing culvert conveying drainage from the parcel across Mineral Hill Road is unchanged. Drainage patterns on adjacent properties are not altered.
The detailed drainage design is carried by the Mineral Lake Drainage Plan (Project 26-006, 3 June 2026). The tightline discharges at an existing discharge point to Mineral Lake, and the civil engineer confirms that no new concentrated discharge to the lake or onto a neighbouring parcel results (2 September 2026).

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any:

· All gathered stormwater, new and existing, tightlined in rigid PVC away from the slope and toe to an approved discharge point, with energy-dissipating features at the outfall to minimize point erosion.
· Dispersion and infiltration of collected stormwater on or near the base of the slope avoided, protecting long-term erosional and global slope stability.
· Slope tightlines inspected periodically by the owner for damage or displacement.
· Net reduction of 910 square feet of impervious surface within the 150-foot shoreline buffer, and conversion of 4,300 square feet of compacted gravel to a native emergent-to-upland vegetated gradient providing filtration, nutrient uptake, and infiltration at the shoreline.

· New onsite septic system with primary and reserve drainfields, permitted through Lewis County Environmental Health, replacing the existing resort waste disposal arrangement.
· Erosion and sediment control best management practices installed prior to ground disturbance and maintained until permanent stabilization; earthen berms preventing runoff from draining into excavations; exposed subgrades protected during wet weather.
· Removal of all invasive plant species from the enhancement area prior to planting, and a three-inch mulch layer throughout the mitigation area.
· Five years of mitigation monitoring under LCC §17.38.090.
These measures respond directly to the two records Ecology carries for Mineral Lake in the 2022 Water Quality Assessment — Category 2 (Water of Concern) for total phosphorus, Listing ID 18898, and Category 4C (impaired by a non-pollutant) for non-native aquatic plants, Listing ID 104405. Mineral Lake is not on the Section 303(d) list and no TMDL applies.

4. Plants

Find help answering plants questions

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:

☒ **deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other**

☒ **evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other**

☒ **shrubs**

☒ **grass**

☐ **pasture**

☐ **crop or grain**

☐ **orchards, vineyards, or other permanent crops.**

☒ **wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other**

☒ **water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other**

☒ **other types of vegetation**

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

No tree removal is proposed. All existing native trees onsite are to be retained and protected through construction. No acreage is converted from forest to other land uses.
Vegetation removed or altered:
· Within the 4,300-square-foot shoreline enhancement area, existing cover is predominantly compacted gravel and impervious surface supporting little or no vegetation, together with invasive species. All invasive plant species within the enhancement area, including Himalayan blackberry (Rubus armeniacus) and English ivy (Hedera helix), are removed prior to planting.
· Herbaceous and shrub cover within the footprints of the five replacement cabins, the septic drainfields, the well, and utility trenching. Landward redevelopment is sited largely over existing legally established impervious and compacted gravel surfaces rather than over vegetated ground.
Existing site vegetation, for context: near the Mineral Lake shoreline the tree stratum is Pacific willow (Salix lasiandra), Douglas fir (Pseudotsuga menziesii), and English holly (Ilex aquifolium); inland it is Douglas fir, black cottonwood (Populus trichocarpa), and red alder (Alnus rubra). The shrub stratum is dominated by Himalayan blackberry throughout, with black twinberry (Lonicera involucrata) and common hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna) inland. The herbaceous stratum near the shoreline is dominated by bluegrass (Poa sp.) and common velvetgrass (Holcus lanatus), with reed canarygrass (Phalaris arundinacea) and common dandelion (Taraxacum officinale); inland, reed canarygrass and giant horsetail (Equisetum telmateia) occur at low cover. Soils immediately adjacent to the lake are saturated and underlie aquatic vegetation.

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

A desktop Endangered Species Act and Essential Fish Habitat screening analysis was completed 11 August 2026 and accompanies this checklist. No listed plant species were identified on or near the Site.
Taylor's checkerspot (Euphydryas editha taylori), federally Endangered, has designated critical habitat 15 to 20 kilometres from the Site; it is a prairie and grassland species and no suitable habitat is present at a forested lakeshore resort. No designated critical habitat of any species, under either the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or NOAA Fisheries, intersects the project site or lies within one kilometre of it.
See B.5.b for the full list of listed animal species evaluated and the effect determinations reached.

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

The proposal includes a mitigation planting plan that reestablishes and enhances 4,300 square feet of degraded critical area buffer along the Mineral Lake shoreline, offsetting 3,390 square feet of permanent shoreline buffer impact. Mitigation is sited where existing impervious and compacted gravel surfaces are removed, so the plan converts hardened, unvegetated surface into vegetated buffer rather than relocating impacts elsewhere.
Four planting zones establish an emergent-to-upland vegetation gradient (Sheets CA2.0 and CA2.1):
· Restored graded and cleared lake buffer, seeded with bunchgrasses — 1,906 square feet.
· Emergent zone at and below the ordinary high water mark, planted with hardstem bulrush, softstem bulrush, and common cattail — 96 square feet.
· Wet meadow transition, planted with slough sedge, tufted hairgrass, and Pacific silverweed — 677 square feet.
· Upland fringe, planted with red-osier dogwood, Pacific ninebark, and salmonberry — 1,333 square feet.
All plants are to be nursery grown in western Washington or Oregon for at least one year, free from disease or pests, well-rooted but not root-bound, and true to species. Installation is specified between 1 November and 1 March unless supplemental watering is provided immediately at installation. A three-inch mulch layer is placed throughout the mitigation area. All existing native trees are retained. The mitigation area is monitored for five years under LCC §17.38.090.

e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

Terrestrial, observed on the Site:
· Himalayan blackberry (Rubus armeniacus) — dominant in the shrub stratum throughout the Site.
· English ivy (Hedera helix) — present within the shoreline enhancement area.
· English holly (Ilex aquifolium) — in the tree stratum near the shoreline.
· Reed canarygrass (Phalaris arundinacea) — in the herbaceous stratum near the shoreline and inland.
· Common hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna) — in the shrub stratum inland.
· Common velvetgrass (Holcus lanatus) — dominant in the herbaceous stratum near the shoreline.
Aquatic, in Mineral Lake:
· Mineral Lake carries a Category 4C listing in Ecology's 2022 Water Quality Assessment for non-native aquatic plants (Assessment Unit 17110015000535_001_001, Listing ID 104405). Category 4C means the water body is impaired by a non-pollutant and no TMDL is required.

NOTE: All invasive plant species within the enhancement area, including Himalayan blackberry and English ivy, are removed prior to planting. Establishing a vegetated native shoreline in place of bare compacted gravel reduces the disturbed, unvegetated substrate along the water's edge that favours invasive colonization. Maximum permissible invasive and exotic species cover will be set as a monitoring performance standard.

5. Animals

Find help answering animal questions[8]

a. List any birds and other animals that have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site.

Examples include:

- **Birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:**

[8] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-5-Animals

- **Mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:**
- **Fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:**

Birds: songbirds and waterfowl associated with lowland lake habitat and its forested margin are expected. The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitats and Species database search of 7 January 2026 returned a sensitive-location record for northern spotted owl (Strix occidentalis caurina). No bald eagle nests, osprey nests or roosts, or great blue heron rookeries were returned by that search, and none were observed onsite or within the Study Area during the 6 January 2026 field evaluation.
Mammals: the Site lies within the Nisqually Deer Wintering Area (mule and black-tailed deer, Odocoileus hemionus, regular concentration) and the Nisqually Elk Wintering Area (Rocky Mountain elk, Cervus elaphus nelsoni, regular concentration). PHS sensitive-location records were also returned for little brown bat (Myotis lucifugus) and Yuma myotis (Myotis yumanensis).
Fish: WDFW reports Mineral Lake as a stocked lowland lake supporting brown trout, resident coastal cutthroat trout, rainbow trout, and largemouth bass, with brown bullhead, pumpkinseed, and yellow perch also documented in a June 2024 survey. The state stocks more than 100,000 rainbow trout fry annually plus several thousand brown trout. The lake is approximately 274.80 acres at approximately 1,421 feet elevation. No anadromous species occur — see B.5.b.
Source: WDFW Priority Habitats and Species database report generated 7 January 2026; WDFW Mineral Lake lowland lake fishing page and 2024 survey data; field evaluation 6 January 2026.

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

A desktop Endangered Species Act and Essential Fish Habitat screening analysis was completed 11 August 2026 and accompanies this checklist. Its controlling finding is that Mineral Lake lies above a complete anadromous barrier: the lake drains north via Mineral Creek to the Nisqually River above the Nisqually River Project dams (FERC No. 1862 — Alder Dam and La Grande Dam), which have no upstream fish passage facilities and lie above natural falls and cascades that historically precluded anadromous access. The licensing record states that separate fish populations occur above and below the project. The fish community of Mineral Lake reported by WDFW is entirely resident.
Species evaluated and effect determinations:
· Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha), Puget Sound ESU, NMFS Threatened — no effect.
· Steelhead (O. mykiss), Puget Sound DPS, NMFS Threatened — no effect.
· Coho salmon (O. kisutch), Lower Columbia River ESU, NMFS Threatened — no effect.
· Bull trout (Salvelinus confluentus), Coastal-Puget Sound DPS, USFWS Threatened — no effect. No designated critical habitat within 15 kilometres and no critical habitat water body within 20 kilometres; not reported by WDFW for Mineral Lake nor in the Alder Reservoir assemblage. Confirmation is being sought from the USFWS Washington Fish and Wildlife Office.
· Northern spotted owl (Strix occidentalis caurina), USFWS Threatened — no effect. Sensitive-location record in the WDFW PHS search of 7 January 2026; nearest designated critical habitat more than 4 kilometres away; no trees removed and no forest cleared.
· Marbled murrelet (Brachyramphus marmoratus), USFWS Threatened — no effect. No potential nesting structure is removed.
· Taylor's checkerspot (Euphydryas editha taylori), USFWS Endangered — no effect.
· Oregon spotted frog (Rana pretiosa), USFWS Threatened — presence undetermined; the determination is to be confirmed before the application is finalized, because the mitigation design plants 96 square feet of emergent vegetation at and below the ordinary high water mark, which is the habitat type this species uses.
No designated critical habitat of any species, under either agency, intersects the project site or lies within one kilometre of it (USFWS ECOS Final Critical Habitat Features and NOAA Fisheries critical habitat services, queried 11 August 2026). No Essential Fish Habitat is present, because the site is above the anadromous barrier.

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

The Site lies within two mapped seasonal-use areas rather than a migration corridor as such: the Nisqually Deer Wintering Area and the Nisqually Elk Wintering Area, both returned as regular concentration areas by the WDFW Priority Habitats and Species search of 7 January 2026. The redevelopment is confined to an existing developed resort footprint bounded by Mineral Hill Road and the lake, removes no trees, and clears no forest, so it does not fragment or obstruct movement through those areas.
Mineral Lake is not part of an anadromous fish migration route. The lake lies above the Nisqually River Project dams and above natural falls and cascades that historically precluded upstream passage; separate fish

populations occur above and below the project, and the Mineral Lake fish community is entirely resident.
The Site lies within the Pacific Flyway in the general sense that all of western Washington does. No designated migratory bird concentration area was returned by the PHS search for this site.

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

· Reestablishment and enhancement of 4,300 square feet of shoreline buffer with a native emergent-to-upland vegetation gradient, replacing compacted gravel with structural complexity, overhanging vegetation, and organic input at the water's edge.
· Retention and protection of all existing native trees through construction.
· In-kind replacement of Docks 3 and 4 (3,191 square feet of existing over-water structure) in the same location, orientation, and dimensions, with new piling at the locations of the existing piling, so over-water coverage does not increase.
· Net reduction of 910 square feet of impervious surface within the shoreline buffer, and stormwater tightlining away from the shoreline, reducing untreated runoff to the lake.
· Removal of all invasive plant species from the enhancement area prior to planting.
· In-water work confined to the work window established by the WDFW Hydraulic Project Approval.
· Five years of mitigation monitoring under LCC §17.38.090.
· Staking and protection of the mitigation enhancement area from construction traffic, staging, and stockpiling for the duration of the work.

e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

No invasive animal species were returned by the WDFW Priority Habitats and Species database search of 7 January 2026, and none were observed during the 6 January 2026 field evaluation.
For completeness: WDFW survey data record several non-native warmwater fish in Mineral Lake — largemouth bass, brown bullhead, pumpkinseed, and yellow perch — together with brown trout. These are established introduced species managed as a recreational fishery rather than species regulated as invasive, and the proposal neither introduces nor spreads them.

6. Energy and natural resources

Find help answering energy and natural resource questions[9]

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, 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 will meet the completed project's principal energy needs, serving lighting, appliances, water supply pumping, and space and water heating in the five replacement cabins and the resort office. Natural gas is not available at the Site and none is proposed. No public sanitary sewer or gas main serves the property.
The serving electric utility is Lewis County PUD (Preliminary Water System Project Report, Vector Engineering, Inc., 16 April 2026, which records that coordination with Lewis County PUD will be required early in the design process).
The water system alone is expected to draw 8 to 15 kilowatts for the booster pumps and variable frequency drive controls, and a dedicated 100 to 200 amp, 230 volt single-phase service is anticipated. Depending on the existing service capacity and total connected load, a service upgrade or a new transformer may be necessary.
Space heating is by electric heat-pump mini-split systems and water heating by electric heat-pump water heaters (architect, 21 August 2026). No wood stove, propane, or solar installation is proposed; the project is all-electric.
Electric-vehicle-capable parking will be provided as required by the Washington State Energy Code, with the count established at building permit.

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

No. The replacement cabins are sited within the existing developed resort footprint, between Mineral Hill Road and the lake, and replace existing cabins and recreational vehicle spaces in approximately the same locations. No

[9] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-6-Energy-natural-resou

tree removal is proposed, so no change in existing shading of adjacent properties results.

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.

Beyond Washington State Energy Code compliance, the design employs electric heat-pump space conditioning and heat-pump water heaters selected for WSEC energy-credit purposes (architect, 21 August 2026); no additional conservation features are proposed at this time.
The following also apply: the new cabins are subject to the Washington State Energy Code, which governs building envelope, fenestration, lighting, and mechanical efficiency for new construction; and the replacement of aged cabins and recreational vehicle spaces with code-compliant new construction is itself an efficiency gain relative to existing conditions.

7. Environmental health

Health Find help with answering environmental health questions[10]

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

No unusual environmental health hazards are known to occur as a result of this proposal. The risks are those ordinary to construction adjacent to a water body:
· Accidental release of fuel, lubricant, or hydraulic fluid from equipment operating near or below the ordinary high water mark. This risk is heightened here because groundwater sits at approximately lake elevation, 3.5 feet below grade, giving a direct hydraulic connection between the ground surface and Mineral Lake.
· Ordinary risk of fire during construction and in operation of guest accommodations.
· Excavation and slope work adjacent to a mapped steep slope hazard area buffer, addressed through the geotechnical recommendations incorporated into the proposal.
· Arsenic in the source water. The existing water supply well carries arsenic at 35 to 45 parts per billion, against a maximum contaminant level of 10 parts per billion (Preliminary Water System Project Report, Vector Engineering, Inc., 16 April 2026). A full treatment train including reverse osmosis is proposed to bring the supply within primary drinking water standards before the system serves guests.
· An unused hand-dug well. The same report records that there are no records of decommissioning the original hand-dug well on the parcel. An unused well is a direct conduit to the aquifer and must be decommissioned by a licensed driller under WAC 173-160-381. Its location has not been established.
No toxic chemicals are proposed to be produced, no explosive materials are proposed to be used or stored, and no hazardous waste is generated by the proposed use.
Fuel and heating oil tanks: no above-ground or underground fuel or heating oil tank is known or of record for the resort structures. Should any tank be encountered during demolition, it will be decommissioned and reported in accordance with Ecology requirements.
Structures proposed for demolition may contain asbestos-containing materials or lead-based paint given their age; a good-faith asbestos survey by an AHERA building inspector will be completed before demolition, with demolition notification to the Southwest Clean Air Agency (see B.8.d).

1. Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.

No known contamination. The property has operated as the Mineral Lake Resort, a lodging and accommodation facility with rental cabins, recreational vehicle spaces, and lake access docks. No industrial, manufacturing, fuelling, or waste handling use is recorded in the property's permit history, which includes Master Site Review MSR23-0128 (maintenance and repair of an existing dock), Site Plan Review SPRC25-016, and Boundary Line Adjustment BLA23-0013. The project site is not located in or adjacent to a designated state or federal contaminated or clean-up site, and no contaminated sediment is known at the project site.
This conclusion rests on the project record and county permit history; EEP will document a search of Ecology's What's In My Neighborhood confirmed and suspected contaminated sites list and the Leaking Underground Storage Tank list for the parcel and its vicinity, and retain the result in the project file.

[10] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-7-Environmental-health

2. **Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.**

   None known. No underground hazardous liquid or gas transmission pipelines are known to cross the Site. The existing onsite sewage disposal system and the existing water supply are present below ground and are both to be replaced under this proposal; the existing septic system is to be decommissioned under Lewis County Environmental Health direction.
   No fuel or heating oil tank is known or of record for the resort structures (see B.7.a), and the only known unused well — the original hand-dug well — will be located and decommissioned under WAC 173-160. Utility locates will be called before any excavation.

3. **Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.**

   Construction: diesel and gasoline fuel, motor oil, hydraulic fluid, and lubricants in equipment and in limited quantities onsite; concrete and concrete admixtures; adhesives, sealants, paints, and solvents associated with cabin construction.
   No preservative-treated wood — creosote, pentachlorophenol, or ACZA — is used for any in-water or over-water component: the dock is steel-framed with glass-filled polypropylene decking, polyethylene floats and composite fascia (Northwest Dock Systems Sheets A0.1–A0.5; project manager, 17 August 2026).
   Operation: household-scale cleaning products, and fuel for landscape maintenance equipment. No toxic or hazardous chemicals are produced by the proposed use, and no bulk storage is proposed.

4. **Describe special emergency services that might be required.**

   No special emergency services are anticipated. The completed project replaces existing guest accommodations with equivalent guest accommodations at comparable capacity and does not introduce a use requiring specialized response capability. Fire protection and emergency medical response continue to be provided by the existing serving agencies, and vehicular access from Mineral Hill Road through the existing onsite circulation and parking areas is retained for emergency vehicles.
   One condition warrants mention: the resort provides guest access to Mineral Lake, so water rescue capability is relevant, as it is under existing conditions. Docks 3 and 4 are replaced in kind, in the same location, orientation, and dimensions, so lake access conditions are unchanged.

5. **Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any.**

   · Spill prevention and response materials kept onsite for the duration of construction, with equipment fuelling, maintenance, and staging conducted away from the shoreline and outside the mitigation enhancement area.
   · Erosion and sediment control best management practices installed before ground disturbance and maintained until permanent stabilization, limiting the pathway from a surface release to the lake.
   · Stormwater tightlined away from the slope with energy dissipation at the outfall, rather than discharged across the shoreline.
   · Construction in accordance with the geotechnical recommendations incorporated into the proposal, including slope stabilization, setbacks from retaining walls, wet weather subgrade protection, and prompt backfilling of temporary excavations.
   · New onsite septic system permitted through Lewis County Environmental Health, and decommissioning of the existing system.
   · Utility locates before excavation.
   · Compliance with WISHA and OSHA construction requirements, and with the conditions of the WDFW Hydraulic Project Approval for in-water work.
   · Asbestos and lead-based paint survey and abatement, if required, before demolition.

b. Noise

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

   Existing noise sources are: vehicle traffic on Mineral Hill Road; recreational use of Mineral Lake, including motorized and non-motorized boating; and the ordinary activity of the operating resort and neighbouring

single-family residences. The setting is rural and ambient noise levels are low. No industrial, airport, or highway noise source has been identified that would affect the proposal.

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 (construction): conventional earthmoving equipment for gravel embankment removal and shoreline regrading, excavation for cabin foundations and utilities, delivery and haul trucks, and hand and power tools during cabin construction. Noise is intermittent, confined to daytime working hours, and limited to the construction period.
Pile driving is proposed and is the loudest element of the work. The replacement dock is secured by new piling driven at the locations of the existing piling with an impact hammer (Collins CPH0306 air hammer, per Northwest Dock Systems Sheets A0.1 and A0.5, issued 25 September 2025). Impact driving of steel piling in a fish-bearing water body generates underwater sound pressures well above ambient and is the element most likely to attract conditions under the WDFW Hydraulic Project Approval, including restriction to the in-water work window and, potentially, sound attenuation such as a bubble curtain together with hydroacoustic monitoring.
The driving scope is limited to one-for-one replacement of the existing piling, installed from a barge — a short-duration operation confined to the WDFW-approved work window. Dock removal involves vessel operation and extraction of the existing piling; the floats and decking are floated off.
Long-term (operation): noise levels comparable to existing conditions — guest vehicle arrivals and departures, ordinary guest activity, and periodic landscape maintenance. Five replacement cabins take the place of the existing guest cabins and recreational vehicle spaces, and the Level 1 Traffic Impact Analysis (31 July 2026) finds a net reduction of about three vehicle trips per day, so no increase in operational noise is anticipated. Booster pumps and treatment equipment for the water system are housed within the daylight basement of Cabin A. No other mechanical equipment generating sustained noise is proposed.
Construction will observe Lewis County's permitted construction hours and the maximum environmental noise levels of WAC 173-60 for the receiving residential EDNA class.

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

· Construction limited to the daytime hours permitted by Lewis County code.
· Equipment maintained in good working order with functioning mufflers and exhaust systems.
· Unnecessary engine idling avoided; noisiest activities scheduled to avoid early morning and evening periods.
· Staging, loading, and equipment maintenance located away from shared property lines where practicable.
· In-water work confined to the work window and any noise conditions established by the WDFW Hydraulic Project Approval.
· Compliance with WAC 173-60 maximum environmental noise levels for the operating project.
· Neighbouring property owners notified in advance of the highest-noise phases of the work.

8. Land and shoreline use

Find help answering land and shoreline use questions[11]

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.

Site: the property operates as the Mineral Lake Resort, a small-town mixed use lodging and accommodation facility. The resort operates seasonally, from early April through late September, and is closed the remainder of the year (Level 1 Traffic Impact Analysis, William Popp Associates, 31 July 2026). Existing uses comprise four rental cabins and an associated storage/restroom outbuilding; seven recreational vehicle spaces, four of which occupy the lakeside portion of the parcel east of Mineral Hill Road and three the inland portion west of the road; a resort office; an accessory shed; gravel parking and circulation areas; and four in-water dock structures providing lake access for guests. The resort was established in 1975.
Adjacent properties: predominantly single-family residential and undeveloped residential land along Mineral Hill

[11] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-8-Land-shoreline-use

Road, with one adjoining parcel in designated forest land. Adjoining owners of record are Lou Ann Groth (Tax Parcel 037062000000), Michael R and Linda G Gordon (037049003000), and Michael F and Kathryn M Libengood (037055001001). The parcel across Mineral Hill Road from the Site is under the same ownership and contains a culvert conveying drainage to Mineral Lake. Mineral Lake abuts the Site along its southwestern boundary and supports recreational use.
Effect on nearby land uses: no. The proposal continues the existing resort use at comparable capacity within the existing developed footprint. It does not change the character, intensity, or type of use on the Site and does not restrict the use of adjoining properties.

b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses because of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?

No. The Site has not been used as working farmland or working forest land. It has operated as a lodging and accommodation facility, and the recorded permit history is limited to resort-related actions — Master Site Review MSR23-0128, Site Plan Review SPRC25-016, and Boundary Line Adjustment BLA23-0013. No agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance is converted by this proposal, and no tree removal or forest clearing is proposed.

1. Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how?

No. No working farm or forest operation adjoins the Site on any side that would be affected by the proposal, and the proposal does not restrict oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, or harvesting on any adjoining parcel. Access is from Mineral Hill Road, an existing county road, and no new road or road crossing is proposed.
One adjoining parcel is in designated forest land; the redevelopment is confined to an existing developed resort footprint and does not extend toward or encumber it.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

Above ground, recorded on the existing conditions survey (Sheet CA1.0) and itemised in the architect's area schedule: five structures in the cabin series — Cabin 1 (1,063 square feet), Cabin 2 (416), Cabin 3 (210), Cabin 4 (213) and Cabin 5 (326) — of which four are guest cabins and the fifth ("Cabin 5," 326 square feet) is a storage/restroom outbuilding rather than a guest cabin (architect, 21 August 2026); a resort office (196 square feet); a south shed (46 square feet); seven recreational vehicle spaces (RV 1 through RV 7, of 234, 627, 192, 216, 559, 549 and 432 square feet respectively); perimeter fencing; and four in-water dock structures (Docks 1 through 4) providing guest lake access. Total existing building area is 5,279 square feet, consistent with the 5,280 square feet of existing roof area recorded on the civil plan set.
Legally established impervious and compacted gravel surfaces: a north gravel parking lot (1,947 square feet), a lower gravel area (15,021 square feet), and a west gravel area (9,402 square feet). A gravel embankment is present along the waterline, and a 48-foot wood bulkhead is shown on the site plan.
Below ground: an existing onsite sewage disposal system, to be decommissioned in place — tanks pumped out, crushed and filled, with the existing drainfield left in place (McNair Septic Design & Consulting, 17 August 2026) — and replaced under this proposal; and the existing water supply well, which is retained — drilled in 1977 to 63 feet with 6-inch steel casing (Lewis County Tag AGN-991; DOH PWS ID 20465P). An original hand-dug well is also recorded on the parcel with no evidence of decommissioning.
The existing cabins are wood-frame with wood shingle siding, estimated by the project manager at roughly 40 years old; the resort was established in 1975 and the well drilled in 1977. Construction dates will be confirmed from the Lewis County Assessor record before demolition — see B.13.a.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

Yes. Structures identified for removal are noted "TBR" (to be removed) on Sheet CA1.1 and comprise:
- The existing cabins, replaced by five new cabins (Cabins A through E).
- The seven recreational vehicle spaces and associated improvements.
- The floats, decking, and piling of Docks 3 and 4 — 3,191 square feet of over-water structure — removed for in-

kind replacement in the same location, orientation, and dimensions.
· The gravel embankment along the waterline.
· The existing onsite sewage disposal system and water supply, both replaced.
The demolition scope is resolved: all existing structures are removed — the four guest cabins, the storage/restroom outbuilding, the resort office, the south shed, all seven recreational vehicle spaces, and Docks 3 and 4, the docks in the final phase after cabin construction (architect and project manager, 21 August 2026). Demolition follows permit issuance — all permits are sought for a September 1, 2027 start — under a demolition permit to be obtained by the applicant's project manager.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

Small Town Mixed Use (STMU), Lewis County. The proposed use is a commercial resort.

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

The Site is zoned Small Town Mixed Use.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

Shoreline Residential. Mineral Lake is a Shoreline of the State and the Site is within shoreline jurisdiction, which extends 200 feet landward of the OHWM. The Lewis County Shoreline Master Program was adopted 21 September 2021.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.

Yes. Lewis County has classified the following on or affecting the Site:
· Mineral Lake — a Shoreline of the State and a Type S water. Standard shoreline buffer 150 feet from the ordinary high water mark plus a 15-foot building setback under LCC 17.38.1030; shoreline jurisdiction extends 200 feet landward. The county's own stream buffer layer carries an S150 polygon corroborating the 150-foot figure.
· Wetland A — Category III wetland, Riverine hydrogeomorphic class, total rating score 17 (water quality 5, hydrologic 4, habitat 8) under the Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington. Standard buffer 150 feet plus a 15-foot building setback. Located in the northwestern portion of the Site.
· Stream 1 — a Type F water that discharges to Mineral Lake through a culvert. Standard buffer 150 feet. No work is proposed in the stream or its buffer.
· Steep slope hazard area buffer — Master Site Review MSR26-0280, Condition 5, identifies that the proposed development location is within the buffer of a steep slope hazard area, and required a geotechnical report with SEPA on that basis.
· Frequently flooded area — the parcel intersects mapped FEMA Zone A (see B.3.a.5).
Master Site Review MSR26-0280 states that "[t]he current proposal is in compliance with the Critical Area Ordinance." Critical areas are addressed in full in the accompanying Critical Areas Report and Mitigation Plan.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

The resort operates seasonally, early April through late September, and is closed the remainder of the year (Level 1 Traffic Impact Analysis, William Popp Associates, 31 July 2026). Cabin floor areas in the current site plan are Cabin A 3,000 sf, Cabin B 2,107 sf, and Cabins C, D and E 540 sf each.
Guest capacity: the five replacement cabins provide 13 bedrooms and 11 bathrooms — Cabin A with 2 bedrooms, Cabin B with 8, and Cabins C, D and E with 1 each. The water system is designed on a peak occupancy of 26 guests, calculated at two occupants per bedroom (Preliminary Water System Project Report, Vector Engineering, Inc., 16 April 2026). That figure is the engineer's design assumption rather than an operator statement, but it is the capacity the potable supply and the septic system are sized to serve.
Resort operations are managed by an onsite caretaker (project manager, 14 August 2026). Staffing beyond the caretaker has not been finalized and is expected to be minimal given the scale — five cabins, a 26-guest design peak, and seasonal April-through-September operation.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

None anticipated. The proposal replaces transient guest accommodation with equivalent transient guest accommodation on the same site, under the same ownership and the same use.
The onsite caretaker identified by the project manager (14 August 2026) remains with the resort operation through and after redevelopment; all other occupancy is short-stay guest use. No person or residence is displaced.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any.

None proposed, because no displacement is anticipated — the project replaces guest accommodations with guest accommodations at comparable capacity within the same operating resort.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any.

· The proposal continues an established use on a parcel zoned Small Town Mixed Use, at comparable capacity, within the existing developed footprint.
· Landward redevelopment is sited over existing legally established impervious and compacted gravel surfaces rather than extending into undisturbed buffer.
· The project reduces impervious surface within the shoreline buffer by 910 square feet, and reduces site-wide impervious coverage from 50.7 to 49.8 per cent. Docks 3 and 4 are replaced in kind, with no increase in over-water structure area.
· Compliance with the Lewis County Shoreline Master Program is demonstrated through the Shoreline Substantial Development Permit, a No Net Loss of Ecological Function Report, and a Burden of Proof Statement addressing SMP Sections 4.02–4.07, 5.07, 5.13, and 6.03, all required by MSR26-0280 Condition 6.
· Compliance with the Critical Areas Ordinance is addressed in the accompanying Critical Areas Report and Mitigation Plan; Lewis County found at Step 1 that the current proposal is in compliance.
· A Traffic Impact Analysis, required by MSR26-0280 Condition 4, will be submitted with SEPA and approved before the threshold determination is issued.
· Mitigation sequencing under LCC §17.38.080 and SMP §4.03.02(B) — avoidance, minimization, rectification, and compensation — has been applied and is documented in the Critical Areas Report.

m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

Not applicable. No agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance is present on the Site or converted by this proposal. No tree removal is proposed and no acreage is converted from forest to other land uses; all existing native trees are retained and protected through construction.

9. Housing

Find help answering housing questions[12]

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

None. The five replacement cabins are transient guest lodging within an operating resort, not housing units, and no permanent dwelling unit is proposed. High, middle, and low-income housing categories therefore do not apply. The project manager confirmed (14 August 2026) that the only person on the property is the caretaker, whose quarters continue with the resort operation; no dwelling unit is created or offered for long-term tenancy.

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

None anticipated. The proposal removes existing guest cabins and recreational vehicle spaces and replaces them with five new guest cabins, all within the same transient lodging use.
The project manager confirmed on 14 August 2026 that no recreational vehicle space is occupied on a long-term basis — occupancy is short-stay guests only, with the caretaker the sole person on the property — so no housing unit is eliminated.

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

None proposed, because no housing units are provided or eliminated by the proposal as currently understood.

[12] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-9-Housing

10. Aesthetics

Find help answering aesthetics questions[13]

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

Maximum cabin height will be less than 35 feet — the Shoreline Master Program limit for the Shoreline Residential environment — with the final figure set by the average building elevation calculation once survey topography is incorporated (architect, 21 August 2026). The cabins are A-frame structures with metal roofs and wood and glass end walls. Final colors have not been selected; muted, natural tones consistent with the shoreline setting will be specified with the building permit plans. No antennas are proposed.
Cabins near geotechnical Profiles B and C incorporate daylight basement retaining walls, which affects measured height from existing grade on a sloping site (Quality Geo NW, QG22-195, revised 30 June 2026).

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

No public view is obstructed. Views across Mineral Lake from Mineral Hill Road and from neighbouring residences are the principal views in the immediate vicinity, and the proposal improves rather than obstructs the shoreline view: it replaces Docks 3 and 4 in kind, with no change in their location, orientation, or dimensions, and replaces the hardened gravel embankment along the waterline with a native emergent-to-upland vegetation gradient across 4,300 square feet.
Landward, the five replacement cabins occupy approximately the footprint of the existing cabins and recreational vehicle spaces they replace.
Cabin height is limited to less than 35 feet (B.10.a) and the cabins are sited within the existing developed footprint, so no material change to views from the adjoining residential parcels or from the lake results.

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

· Siting the replacement cabins within the existing developed resort footprint rather than extending development along the shoreline.
· In-kind replacement of Docks 3 and 4 (3,191 square feet of existing over-water structure) in the same location, orientation, and dimensions.
· Removal of the gravel embankment and reestablishment of 4,300 square feet of native vegetated shoreline in an emergent-to-upland gradient, replacing a hardened, unvegetated edge.
· Retention of all existing native trees.
· Removal of invasive vegetation, including Himalayan blackberry and English ivy, from the enhancement area, and a three-inch mulch layer throughout the mitigation area.
· Shielded, downward-directed exterior lighting — see B.11.d.
Exterior materials are metal roofing with wood and glass end walls on A-frame forms (architect, 21 August 2026); muted, natural, non-reflective colors will be specified with the building permit plans.

11. Light and glare

Find help answering light and glare questions[14]

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

Exterior lighting on the five replacement cabins and at the resort office, pathway and parking area lighting, interior light spill through windows, and vehicle headlights from guest arrivals and departures. Light occurs mainly at night, with the highest use in the evening hours and seasonally highest in summer.
Glare is limited to daytime reflection from cabin glazing and from vehicles.
This is comparable to existing conditions; the resort currently operates with cabins, recreational vehicle spaces, and associated lighting.

[13] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-10-Aesthetics
[14] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-11-Light-glare

The site lighting plan is in preparation by Robison Engineering, Inc. (19–20 August 2026) to the shielded, full-cutoff, downward-directed specification described at B.11.a.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

Exterior lighting comprises building-mounted fixtures on the five replacement cabins and the resort facilities, controlled by photo sensors; one streetlight within the site; pathway and parking area lighting; interior light spill through windows; and vehicle headlights from guest arrivals. All exterior fixtures are specified as shielded, full-cutoff and downward-directed so that no direct illumination extends waterward of the ordinary high water mark. The site lighting plan implementing this specification, including the streetlight location, is being prepared by Robison Engineering, Inc. (19–20 August 2026). Operational lighting is comparable in kind to the existing resort, and photo-sensor control limits operation to dusk-to-dawn needs during the April-through-September season.

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

None significant. The setting is rural, with low ambient light from neighboring single-family residences along Mineral Hill Road and from occasional vehicle traffic. No street lighting, commercial lighting, or other substantial off-site source has been identified that would affect the proposal.

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

· Shielded, full-cutoff, downward-directed exterior fixtures, so that no direct illumination extends waterward of the ordinary high water mark or onto adjoining residential parcels.
· Lighting limited to the minimum necessary for guest safety and wayfinding, at the lowest practicable mounting height.
· Warm color temperature lamps, which reduce short-wavelength light spill toward wildlife habitat.
· Timers, motion sensors, or curfew controls on non-essential fixtures.
· Non-reflective exterior materials and finishes.
· The reestablished native shoreline planting provides a vegetated screen between the cabins and the water, further limiting light spill toward the lake.
These measures are being incorporated into the Robison Engineering site lighting plan and will be reviewed against the applicable Lewis County and Shoreline Master Program lighting standards.

12. Recreation

Find help answering recreation questions

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

Mineral Lake itself is the principal recreational resource in the immediate vicinity. It is a stocked lowland lake of approximately 274.80 acres at approximately 1,421 feet elevation, supporting fishing for brown trout, rainbow trout, resident coastal cutthroat trout, largemouth bass, brown bullhead, pumpkinseed, and yellow perch. The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife stocks more than 100,000 rainbow trout fry annually plus several thousand brown trout. Boating and other water recreation occur on the lake.
The Site itself provides recreational lodging and guest lake access — the resort's cabins, recreational vehicle spaces, and four dock structures. These are private facilities for resort guests.
The Site lies in the upper Nisqually corridor, an area of dispersed outdoor recreation.
Public access to Mineral Lake in the vicinity includes the county boat ramp on the lake (identified as the haul-out point for dock removal) and dispersed lake access; the resort's docks are private facilities serving guests.

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

No public recreational use is displaced. The docks are private facilities serving resort guests, not public access. Within the resort, guest lake access is retained: Docks 3 and 4 (3,191 square feet) are replaced in kind in the same location, orientation, and dimensions, so guest lake access continues unchanged. The seven recreational vehicle spaces are removed and replaced by cabin lodging, which changes the type of accommodation offered rather than eliminating recreational opportunity.
No public trail, park, boat launch, or shoreline access is affected, and no public access across the Site exists to be displaced.

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

· Guest lake access is retained through Dock 1 and the in-kind replacement of Docks 3 and 4.
· Reestablishment of 4,300 square feet of native vegetated shoreline in place of a hardened gravel embankment improves the shoreline setting for guests and for lake users generally.
· Replacement of Docks 3 and 4 in kind adds no over-water area, so no new shading of the nearshore results.
· Stormwater tightlining and the net reduction in impervious surface within the shoreline buffer reduce untreated runoff to a lake that carries a Category 2 listing for total phosphorus — a direct benefit to water-contact recreation and to the fishery.
· In-water work confined to the WDFW work window, avoiding the most sensitive period.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

Find help answering historic and cultural preservation questions[15]

a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers? If so, specifically describe.

Yes. The Mineral Lake Resort was established in 1975 (SVS Architecture plan set, project notes), and the existing water supply well was drilled in 1977. Structures of original vintage therefore exceed 45 years of age, and they are proposed for demolition or replacement.
No building, structure, or site on or near the Site has been evaluated for listing in, or eligibility for, the National Register of Historic Places, the Washington Heritage Register, or a local historic register, and no cultural resource survey has been performed.

b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.

None identified. No landmarks, features, or evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation have been observed on the Site. The Site lies on the shoreline of a natural lowland lake in the Nisqually watershed (WRIA 11), a setting with elevated potential for precontact archaeological material, so a DAHP WISAARD and predictive-model review and written notification to DAHP and the Nisqually Indian Tribe precede submittal (B.13.c), and an Inadvertent Discovery Plan governs all ground-disturbing work.

c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.

Methods applied to date: review of the Lewis County permit history for the parcel (MSR23-0128, SPRC25-016, BLA23-0013, MSR26-0280), review of the project record and existing conditions survey, and the field evaluation of 6 January 2026, during which no surface cultural material was observed.

d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.

· An Inadvertent Discovery Plan will be prepared and kept onsite for the duration of construction, and all ground-disturbing personnel will be briefed on it before work begins.
· Stop-work protocol: if any archaeological material, cultural feature, or human remains is encountered, work stops immediately in the vicinity of the discovery, the area is secured, and DAHP, Lewis County, and the affected tribes are notified. Human remains are additionally reported to the county coroner and law enforcement under RCW 68.50.645, and no further disturbance occurs until the process under RCW 27.44 and RCW 27.53 is

[15] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-13-Historic-cultural-p

complete.
· Ground disturbance is limited to the smallest practicable extent, consistent with the geotechnical recommendations, which also limits the volume of soil disturbed in the shoreline band where potential is highest.
· Landward redevelopment is sited over existing legally established impervious and compacted gravel surfaces — previously disturbed ground — rather than over undisturbed soil.

14. Transportation

Find help with answering transportation questions[16]

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

The Site is served by Mineral Hill Road, a Lewis County road forming the northeastern boundary of the parcel. Mineral Hill Road connects to State Route 7 at the town of Mineral, approximately 3 miles northwest of Mineral Lake; SR 7 is the regional route connecting to US 12 to the south and to SR 706 and SR 161 to the north.
Access to the Site is from the existing driveway on the Mineral Hill Road frontage into the existing onsite gravel circulation and parking areas. No new access point, driveway, or road is proposed. No new road is proposed within 200 feet of Mineral Lake and no new road crossings are proposed.
Access and circulation are shown on the existing conditions survey (Sheet CA1.0) and the proposed site plan (Sheet CA1.1).
Roadway characteristics, from the Level 1 Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by William Popp Associates dated 31 July 2026: Mineral Hill Road is classified as a local access road on the WSDOT Functional Classification Map. In the vicinity of the Site it is a two-lane, two-way asphalt roadway with a double yellow centerline and fog lines, 20 feet of pavement between fog lines (one 10-foot lane each direction), sporadic gravel shoulders of 1 to 5 feet, a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour, and a 60-foot right-of-way. Main access to and from the Site is via Mineral Road N or Mineral Road S, both classified as minor collectors, which connect to SR 7.
Three driveways serve the resort from Mineral Hill Road. The south driveway serving the lakeside portion of the parcel is gated, with 28 feet between gate posts and approximately 24 feet of driveway pavement plus gravel shoulder. Lewis County Road Standard 3-3 requires 28 feet for this roadway width, and the TIA concludes the driveway meets that standard.

b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

No fixed-route public transit is known to serve the town of Mineral or Mineral Hill Road

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

No new road is proposed. Access is from the existing Mineral Hill Road frontage and the existing onsite gravel circulation and parking areas; no new, relocated, or extended roadway is proposed within shoreline jurisdiction, and no new road crossings are proposed. No new pedestrian, bicycle, or state transportation facility is proposed.
The Level 1 Traffic Impact Analysis (William Popp Associates, 31 July 2026) was prepared at Lewis County Public Works' request because the site plan indicated the south driveway would widen beyond the allowable width for commercial use in a rural setting, which requires a Level 1 TIA to justify the modification under LCC 12.60.290. The analysis concludes the driveway, at 28 feet between gate posts, meets Lewis County Road Standard 3-3 for a roadway of this width. No frontage improvement is identified as necessary.
Lewis County Public Works requested the Level 1 TIA to justify the south driveway width; the TIA concludes the driveway meets County Standard 3-3 with no frontage or sight-distance work identified, and county acceptance occurs through the TIA approval that MSR26-0280 Condition 4 requires before SEPA issuance.

d. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

[16] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-14-Transportation

Water: yes, in the sense that the proposal includes in-water dock structures on Mineral Lake used for private guest access and small-craft moorage. Docks 3 and 4 are replaced in kind, in the same location, orientation, and dimensions, with new piling at the locations of the existing piling. Mineral Lake is not a navigable commercial waterway and no commercial water transportation is involved.
Rail: no rail facility is used by the proposal.
Air: no air transportation facility is used by the proposal.

e. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates? The applicant has since confirmed that all seven recreational vehicle spaces are removed (architect and project manager, 21 August 2026), rather than the partial removal assumed in the TIA; the removed-trip total is accordingly larger, and the TIA's conclusion of no net trip increase is conservative.

Trip generation is established in the Level 1 Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by William Popp Associates dated 31 July 2026, submitted with this checklist. It was required by Lewis County under LCC 12.60.420 and MSR26-0280 Condition 4, and uses rates from the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition, Land Use Code 416 (Campground / Recreational Vehicle Park).
Proposed use — five cabins: approximately 5.2 average weekday daily trips; 0.35 trips in the AM street peak hour (27 percent in, 73 percent out); 0.45 trips in the PM street peak hour (54 percent in, 46 percent out).
Existing uses to be removed — four cabins and five RV spaces: approximately 8.3 average weekday daily trips; 0.56 AM peak hour; 0.72 PM peak hour.
Net change: approximately 3.1 fewer average weekday daily trips, and a decrease of less than one trip in each of the AM and PM peak hours. The redevelopment therefore generates slightly less traffic than the existing resort.
Peak volumes occur in the PM street peak hour. The resort operates seasonally, early April through late September, and is closed the remainder of the year, so trip generation is concentrated in that period.
Truck traffic: the analysis estimates up to one delivery vehicle per month (AASHTO Single Unit Truck SU-30), entering and exiting to the south.
The project does not meet the 50 PM peak hour trip threshold in LCC 12.60.420(1)(a); the Level 1 TIA was required at the County's discretion in connection with the south driveway width and SEPA review.
Construction-period truck trips (demolition debris, surplus excavated material, imported fill and deliveries) are temporary, begin at construction start, route via Mineral Hill Road to Mineral Road and SR 7, and cease at completion; the TIA separately identifies about one SU-30 delivery vehicle per month during operations.

f. Will the proposal interfere with, affect, or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.

No. The proposal does not interfere with, and is not affected by, the movement of agricultural or forest products on Mineral Hill Road or other area roads. Access uses the existing driveway and no new road, road crossing, or frontage change is proposed. One adjoining parcel is in designated forest land, but no haul route across or adjacent to the Site is affected and no restriction on oversize equipment access results.
Construction-period truck traffic is temporary and will use the existing Mineral Hill Road access.

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

· Use of the existing driveway access and the existing onsite gravel circulation and parking areas, with no new access point or roadway.
· A net reduction in trip generation. The Level 1 Traffic Impact Analysis (William Popp Associates, 31 July 2026) estimates approximately 3.1 fewer average weekday daily trips than the existing resort, with peak-hour decreases of less than one trip in each period.
· A construction traffic and staging plan keeping equipment, material deliveries, and stockpiles onsite and off the Mineral Hill Road right-of-way, with paved access points swept to prevent track-out.
· Emergency vehicle access from Mineral Hill Road maintained throughout construction.
· The south driveway, at 28 feet between gate posts, meets Lewis County Road Standard 3-3 for a roadway of this width, as concluded by the Level 1 Traffic Impact Analysis.
The Traffic Impact Analysis identifies no required transportation mitigation, consistent with its finding that the redevelopment reduces trip generation relative to existing conditions.
The TIA identifies no frontage improvement as necessary; any traffic impact fee is determined by Lewis County at permit issuance.

15. Public services

Find help answering public service questions[17]

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

No substantial increase in the need for public services is anticipated. The proposal replaces existing guest accommodations with equivalent guest accommodations on the same site under the same ownership and the same transient lodging use, and reduces the number of accommodation units from five cabins plus seven recreational vehicle spaces to five cabins.
By service:
· Fire protection and emergency medical response — continued service from the existing serving agency. New construction to current building code, with access from Mineral Hill Road and the existing onsite circulation retained for emergency vehicles.
· Police protection — no change; the use and its intensity are unchanged.
· Schools — none. The use is transient lodging and generates no permanent residents or students.
· Public transit — no change; see B.14.b.
· Health care — no change.
· Water and sewer — no public service demand. Water is supplied by the existing onsite well — retained, with new storage, booster pumping and treatment — and wastewater is handled by a new onsite septic system with primary and reserve drainfields; neither connects to a public system.
· Maintenance of public roads — no change; no new road or frontage change is proposed. Construction-period truck traffic is temporary.
The resort operates seasonally, early April through late September, and is closed the remainder of the year, so demand on emergency services is concentrated in that period and unchanged from existing conditions.
Guest capacity does not increase: the existing four guest cabins and seven recreational vehicle spaces are all removed and replaced by five new cabins with a 26-guest design peak (architect and project manager, 21 August 2026).

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

· New cabins constructed to current building, energy, and fire code, reducing fire risk relative to the aged structures they replace.
· Emergency vehicle access from Mineral Hill Road and onsite circulation maintained during construction and in the completed project; site addressing retained and kept visible.
· A new onsite septic system with primary and reserve drainfields, permitted through Lewis County Environmental Health, and the existing well retained with new storage, booster pumping and treatment — so the project places no demand on public water or sewer.
· Decommissioning of the existing onsite sewage system under Lewis County Environmental Health direction.
· No net increase in accommodation units, so no increase in demand on fire, police, or road maintenance services.
· Implementation of any mitigation identified by the Traffic Impact Analysis required under MSR26-0280 Condition 4.

16. Utilities

Find help answering utilities questions[18]

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

[17] https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-b-environmental-elements/environmental-elements-15-public-services
[18] https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-b-environmental-elements/environmental-elements-16-utilities

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.

Note on the utilities circled above: electricity and telephone service the existing resort; water is supplied by an existing onsite well operating as an approved Group A Transient Non-Community public water system (DOH PWS ID 20465P); and wastewater is handled by an existing onsite septic system. Natural gas and public sanitary sewer are not available at the Site and none is proposed. The serving electric utility is Lewis County PUD. Telephone service continues from the existing serving carrier; no new telephone infrastructure is proposed. Refuse continues to be collected and hauled offsite as under existing resort operations, and construction debris is hauled to a permitted facility by the contractor.

Utilities proposed:
· Water — the existing well is retained; no new well is proposed. Landward improvements comprise rehabilitation of the well by bailing and surging or the installation of a screened interval, an atmospheric storage tank of approximately 4,000 to 4,500 gallons, a duplex variable-frequency-drive booster pump station sized at 45 to 55 gallons per minute per pump, and a treatment train comprising pre-filtration, chlorine and anti-scalant injection, pH adjustment, carbon filtration, reverse osmosis, remineralisation and ultraviolet disinfection to address arsenic at 35 to 45 parts per billion. A well house is provided within the daylight basement of Cabin A. The system is subject to Department of Health approval under WAC 246-290, including a well site inspection and Engineering Source Approval under WAC 246-290-140, and to Lewis County Environmental Health review. Groundwater was encountered at 3.5 feet below grade at boring HA-1 and is at approximately the elevation of the Mineral Lake surface beneath the property. Reverse-osmosis concentrate is managed per B.3.b.1, with no discharge to Mineral Lake. The storage tank and treatment equipment are sited landward of the cabins and will be shown on the DOH engineering submittal and final civil plans.
· Sanitary sewer — none. A new onsite septic system replaces the existing arrangement: three NuWater BNR-500 advanced treatment units, a 2,700-gallon pump chamber, a distribution box with leveler, and a pressure-distribution drainfield of eleven 40-foot lines at 6-foot centres with a 40 per cent reduction and a 100 per cent reserve area, permitted by Lewis County Environmental Health under WAC 246-272A. The existing system is decommissioned. Design flow is 1,320 gallons per day; the existing system is decommissioned by pumping, crushing and filling the tanks in place (McNair Septic Design & Consulting, 17 August 2026).
· Electricity — Lewis County PUD, serving the five replacement cabins, the resort office and the water system. The booster pumps and controls alone are expected to draw 8 to 15 kilowatts, and a dedicated 100 to 200 amp, 230 volt single-phase service is anticipated; a service upgrade or a new transformer may be required, and coordination with the PUD is to occur early in design. Service adequacy and any transformer upgrade are being coordinated directly with Lewis County PUD and Robison Engineering, Inc., the project electrical engineer (19–20 August 2026).
· Stormwater — rigid PVC tightline conveying all gathered stormwater, new and existing, away from the slope and toe to an approved discharge point with energy-dissipating features at the outfall. Dispersion and infiltration on or near the base of the slope are avoided on the geotechnical engineer's recommendation. Design is carried by the Mineral Lake Drainage Plan (Project 26-006, 3 June 2026).
· Telephone and communications — existing service retained from the serving carrier; no new connection type is proposed.

General construction activities: utility trenching landward of the cabins for water, electrical, and stormwater lines, and excavation for the septic tank and the primary and reserve drainfields. Trench backfill will conform to WSDOT Standard Specification 9-03.19. Utility locates will be obtained before excavation. Erosion and sediment control best management practices will be installed prior to any ground-disturbing activity and maintained until permanent stabilization is achieved, and excavation will be limited to the smallest practicable extent. No utility work is proposed within Wetland A, within Stream 1 or its buffer, or below the ordinary high water mark of Mineral Lake. Lightweight surface improvements such as septic components, uncovered decks, patios, walkways, landscaping, and pathways are permitted within the geotechnical setback from proposed walls where approved by the project engineer.

C.Signature

Find help about who should sign[19]

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Type name of signee: Robert Plummer

Position and agency/organization: agent/consultant

Date submitted: 10/22-26

D.Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

Find help for the nonproject actions worksheet[20]

Do not use this section for project actions.

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. **How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?**

Not applicable. This is a project action, not a nonproject action. Per the instruction above — "Do not use this section for project actions" — the supplemental sheet is not completed. Sections A and B above are the operative responses.

- **Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:**

2. **How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?**

- **Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:**

3. **How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?**

- **Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:**

4. **How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection, such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic**

[19] https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-C-Signature

[20] https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-d-non-project-actions

rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

- **Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:**

5. **How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?**

   - **Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:**

6. **How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?**

   - **Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:**

7. **Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.**