

1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT SUMMARY

1.1 HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT

This document is an abbreviated FEIS. This document, with the DEIS, constitutes the ‘Environmental Impact Statement’ prepared by Lewis County for the Project.

Rather than repeating the extensive analyses presented in the DEIS, this document presents the updated and revised information to complete the environmental analyses presented in the DEIS. This document is organized as follows:

Chapter 1 of the FEIS summarizes the environmental review process conducted to date. Chapter 1 describes the purpose of this FEIS in the context of the analyses conducted by Lewis County to comply with SEPA.

Chapter 2 of the FEIS provides updates and text revisions to the analysis of environmental impacts presented for 13 elements of the natural and human environment described in Chapter 3 (Sections 3.1 through 3.13) and the list of potentially required permits and approvals described in the Fact Sheet of the draft EIS.

These sections update or revise: the descriptions of the affected environment, or current conditions in the Project Area; the impact analyses which describe the effects associated with the Project; and direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts assessed for construction, operation, and decommissioning of the Project. Mitigation measures that can reduce or eliminate identified impacts are presented within each resource section.

An updated summary table of mitigation measures is included in the Executive Summary.

Chapter 3 of the FEIS includes copies of written comments submitted to Lewis County, as well as responses to those comments prepared by the FEIS authors.

The remaining chapters and appendices of the FEIS provide updated supporting information for the EIS, as required by SEPA.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE FEIS

1.2.1 Overview of the Review Process

As described in Section 1.1 of the DEIS, the Project was proposed by the Applicant, Skookumchuck Wind Energy Project, LLC, a subsidiary of Renewable Energy Systems Inc. Pursuant to those SEPA rules, the Project under review consists of up to 38 wind turbine generators (WTGs) with a total Project nameplate capacity of up to 137 megawatts (MW), and associated Project support facilities, including an access road system, electrical collection lines, an onsite substation, meteorological towers, an operation and maintenance (O&M) Facility, and a 115 kilovolt (kV) generation interconnection (gen-tie) line from the Project substation to interconnect at Puget Sound Energy’s (PSE) electrical system at the Tono substation in Tono, Washington

After applying mitigation measures, best management practices (BMPs), and site-specific micrositing, locations will be chosen in an area of approximately 22,000 acres under a lease agreement in Lewis and

Thurston counties. The Project will have a total nameplate capacity of approximately 137 megawatts (MW).

This environmental review process, performed under the authority of Ch. 43.21C RCW (State Environmental Policy Act or SEPA), was triggered when the Applicant submitted a Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application (JARPA) to Lewis County on February 7, 2018, for Project-related shoreline permits. The Applicant also submitted a Special Use Permit application to Thurston County on March 20, 2017. While the Project includes proposed project components in both Lewis County and Thurston County, Lewis County assumed lead agency status pursuant to WAC 197-11-050. Thurston County agreed that Lewis County is the appropriate SEPA Lead Agency and participated in this review as a cooperating agency.

On May 1, 2018, Lewis County issued a SEPA determination of significance, indicating the County's intention to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to describe the environmental impacts of the Project in both Lewis and Thurston counties. At such time when the Applicant seeks to develop any wind energy facilities in Thurston County, as described in this document, Thurston County, as cooperating SEPA agency, will review all local permit applications relying on the EIS.

SEPA requires evaluation of probable significant adverse impacts of a proposal such as this Project. For projects of this scope, SEPA requires preparation of a draft and final environmental impact statement (DEIS and FEIS, respectively). Public scoping is an integral part of the SEPA process and is done to assist in identifying key issues for evaluation in the EIS.

Between May 1 and May 31, 2018, Lewis County conducted a scoping process to solicit input from the public on the issues that should be addressed in the environmental review. A public scoping meeting was held on May 9, 2018 at the Lewis County Courthouse in Chehalis. Nineteen comment letters were received and considered from the public, state and local agencies, and tribes. In addition, one person presented oral comments at the public scoping meeting.

On October 30, 2018, the DEIS was issued with public notice of availability and the comment period appearing in local newspapers. Notice of its availability was also mailed to all adjacent property owners and those who submitted scoping comments and requested notice. Copies of the DEIS were sent to all agencies with jurisdiction and the following Tribes: Nisqually Indian Tribe, Squaxin Island Tribe, Chehalis Tribe, Cowlitz Tribe, Steilacoom, and the Quinault Indian Nation. A copy of the DEIS was also made available on the Lewis County website. The DEIS comment period closed on November 29, 2018.

In addition to the SEPA-related public processes described above, Lewis County made the Applicant's application and the DEIS available for public review at the Lewis County Planning Department.

An EIS is an informational and evaluative tool. It does not mandate approval or disapproval of a project, but informs the public and decision-makers as to the potential substantial adverse impacts to both the built and natural environment, and suggests to decision-makers the means by which those impacts could be avoided or reduced through mitigation.

1.2.2 Purpose of the FEIS

In accordance with WAC 197-11-560, FEIS response to comments, Lewis County has prepared this FEIS. The FEIS authors have considered the comments to the DEIS and have responded using one or more of the following means:

- (a) Modify alternatives including the proposed action.
- (b) Develop and evaluate alternatives not previously given detailed consideration by the agency.
- (c) Supplement, improve, or modify the analysis.
- (d) Make factual corrections.
- (e) Explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response, citing the sources, authorities, or reasons that support the agency's response and, if appropriate, indicate those circumstances that would trigger agency reappraisal or further response.

The comments to the DEIS and the corresponding responses are included as Chapter 3 of this FEIS.

This FEIS, in combination with the DEIS, make up the complete EIS for this Project.

1.3 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, CONSULTATION, AND COORDINATION

As noted above, Lewis County has solicited public input regarding this Project through numerous means. In addition, the County and the Applicant have solicited comments from local, state and Tribal agencies and representatives and, when requested, have participated in meetings.

The Applicant has been communicating and meeting with agencies, Indian Tribes, the public, and nongovernmental organizations throughout the development of the proposed Project and through the EIS process. Local, state, and federal agencies and Tribal representatives the Applicant has consulted with including the following:

1.3.1 Local Agencies

Hillary Hoke, City of Centralia

Deborah King, City of Chehalis

Rick Walk and Andy Ryder, City of Lacey

David Bugher, City of Lakewood

Bryan Morris, City of Napavine

Cheryl Selby, Keith Stahley, and Rich Hoey, City of Olympia

Shirley Schultz, City of Tacoma

Michelle Whitten, City of Toledo

Pete Kmet, City of Tumwater

Gary Cooper, City of Vader

Cris Dodd, City of Winlock

Bill Teitzel, Erik Martin, Tiffany Alexander, Martin Roy, Doyle Sanford, Dianne Dorey, Eric Eisenberg, and Bob Amrine, Lewis County

Robert Smith, Thurston County

Andrew Martin, Lewis County Fire District 1 Chief
Mark King, Thurston Fire Authority Fire Chief
Mike Kytta, Riverside Fire Authority #99
Tim Kinder, Lewis County Fire District #6 Fire Chief
Dakota Chamberlain, Port of Tacoma
Uri Papish, Southwest Clean Air Agency
Lauren Whybrew and Aaron Manley, Olympic Region Clean Air Agency
Ralph Munoz, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency

1.3.2 State Agencies

Kelly McLain, Washington State Department of Agriculture
Scott Sampson, Washington State Department of Revenue
Rob Whitlam, Gretchen Kaehler, and Stephanie Jolivette, Washington State Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation
Deborah Reynolds, Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission
Stephen Posner, State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
Scott Brummer, Justin Allegro, and Michael Ritter, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
Elizabeth O’neal, Jasa Holt, Carrie Gillum, and Rian Skov, Washington Department of Natural Resources
Kelly Cooper, Washington State Department of Health
Scott Morrison, Zach Meyer, Derek Rockett, Thomas Middleton, Andrew Smith, Vicki Cline, Joseph Kasperski, Chris Montague-Breakwell, and Jessica McConnell, Washington State Department of Ecology
Jessica Logan, Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission
Jeff Barsness, Washington State Department of Transportation

1.3.3 Federal Agencies

Kevin Connally, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mark Strom, NOAA Fisheries
Evan Carnes, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Cayla Morgan, Federal Aviation Administration
Gretchen Pinkham, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

1.3.4 Tribal

David Troutt, Nisqually Indian Tribe
Arnold Cooper, Squaxin Island Tribe
Glen Connelly, Dan Penn, and Amy Loudermilk, Chehalis Tribe
William Iyall, Nathan Reynolds, James Gordon, and Taylor Aalvik, Cowlitz Tribe

Fawn Sharp, Quinault Indian Nation

Danny Marshall, Steilacoom Tribe

Bill Sterud, Puyallup Tribe of Indians

1.4 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

As described in Section 1.6 and Table 1.6-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation of the DEIS (with table revisions as proposed on FEIS pages 2.2-4 to 2.2-7), the Applicant will provide mitigation for a number of impacts associated with the Proposed Action. The impact analysis documented in the DEIS and FEIS identifies that although unavoidable adverse impacts may occur as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Action, the Applicant has avoided, minimized, or mitigated such impacts such that no probable significant adverse environmental impacts will result.