



State of Washington
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mailing Address: 600 Capitol Way N - Olympia, Washington 98501-1091 - (360) 902-2200, TDD (360) 902-2207
Main Office location: Natural Resources Building - 1111 Washington Street SE - Olympia, WA

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

Name of Proposal: RECLASSIFICATION OF THE PEREGRINE FALCON FROM STATE ENDANGERED TO STATE SENSITIVE SPECIES (PROTECTED WILDLIFE) (WAC 232.12.011)

Description of Proposal: The proposal would reclassify the peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) from a state endangered species (WAC 232-12-014) to a state sensitive species (WAC 232.12.011). A management plan will be developed if the proposed action becomes final.

The final status report are available at our the Department of Fish and Wildlife's headquarters, (360) 902-2534, and regional offices, and libraries throughout the state. Locations to obtain copies, and electronic copies of the final status report may be obtained online at the address <http://www.wa.gov/wdfw/wlm/diversty/soc/status/>

Proponent: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Endangered Species Section, 600 Capitol Way North, Olympia, Washington 98501-1091. Contract Person: Endangered Species Section Manager.

Location of Proposal, including street, if any: Statewide

Lead Agency: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of the completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for 29 days from the date of issue below. Comments must be submitted by: **March 12, 2002**

Responsible Official: Cynthia R. Pratt
Position/Title: SEPA/NEPA Coordinator, Regulatory Services Section
Address: 600 Capitol Way North, Olympia, WA 98501

Please contact: Cynthia R. Pratt **Phone:** (360) 902-2575 **Fax:** (360) 902-2946 or
e-mail: prattcrp@dfw.wa.gov if you have questions or comments about this determination.

DATE OF ISSUE: February 11, 2002 **SIGNATURE:**

Distribution of Environmental Document:

Department of Ecology, Environmental Review Section, Olympia
Department of Natural Resources, SEPA Center, Olympia
Washington Parks and Recreation Commission, Olympia
Washington Department of Transportation, Olympia
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Western Washington Office, Lacey
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Upper Columbia River Basin Field Office, Spokane
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Seattle
U. S. Forest Service, Region 6, Portland
U.S. National Parks Service, Seattle
U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service, Portland OR
U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service, Lacey
Adams County Planning Department, Othello
Asotin County Planning Commission, Asotin
Benton County Planning and Building Department, Prosser
Chelan County Planning Department, Wenatchee
Clallam County Department of Community Development, Port Angeles
Clark County Planning Division, Vancouver
Columbia County Planning Department, Dayton
Cowlitz County Department of Building and Planning, Kelso
Douglas County Regional Planning Commission, East Wenatchee
Ferry County Planning Department, Republic
Franklin County Planning Department, Pasco
Garfield County Board of County Commissioners, Pomeroy
Grant County Planning Department, Ephrata
Grays Harbor Planning and Building Department, Montesano
Island County Planning Department, Coupeville
Jefferson County Planning and Building Department, Port Townsend
King County Department of Development and Environmental Services, Renton
Kitsap County Department of Community Development, Port Orchard
Kittitas County Planning Department, Ellensburg
Klickitat County Planning Department, Goldendale
Lewis County Planning Department, Chehalis
Lincoln County Planning Department, Davenport
Mason County Planning Department, Shelton
Okanogan County Planning Department, Okanogan
Pacific County Planning Department, South Bend
Pend Oreille County Planning Department, Newport
Pierce County Department of Planning and Natural Resource Management, Tacoma
San Juan County Planning Department, Friday Harbor
Skagit County Planning Department, Mount Vernon
Skamania County Planning Department, Stevenson
Snohomish County Department of Planning and Community Development, Everett

(Continued)

Distribution of Environmental Document (Continued):

Spokane County Planning Department, Spokane
Stevens County Planning and Community Development, Colville
Thurston County Planning Department, Olympia
Wahkiakum County Planning Department, Cathlamet
Walla Walla Regional Planning Department, Walla Walla
Whatcom County Planning and Development Services, Bellingham
Whitman County Planning Office, Colfax
Yakima County Planning Department, Yakima
Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, Olympia
Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fisheries Commission, Portland
Point No Point Treaty Council, Kingston
Upper Columbia United Tribes, Wellpoint
Skagit System Cooperative, La Conner
Chehalis Tribe, Oakville
Colville Confederated Tribes, Nespelem
Cowlitz Indian Nation, Longview
Hoh Tribal Fisheries, Forks
Jamestown Klallam Indian Tribes, Sequim
Kalispell Tribe, Usk
Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe, Port Angeles
Lummi Indian Natural Resources, Bellingham
Makah Tribal Council, Neah Bay
Muckleshoot Tribal Fisheries, Auburn
Nisqually Tribe, Olympia
Nooksack Tribe, Deming
Port Gamble Klallam Tribe, Kingston
Puyallup Tribe of Indians, Tacoma
Quileute Tribe, La Push
Quinault Indian Nation, Taholah
Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe, Darrington
Shoalwater Bay Tribe, Tokeland
Skokomish Tribe, Shelton
Snoqualmie Tribe, Carnation
Spokane Tribe, Wellpoint
Squaxin Island Tribe, Shelton
Stillaguamish Tribe, Arlington
Suquamish Tribe, Suquamish
Swinomish Tribe, La Conner
Tulalip Tribes, Marysville
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Pendelton
Upper Skagit Tribe, Sedro Wooley
Yakima Indian Nation, Toppenish
1000 Friends of WA, Seattle
The Nature Conservancy, Seattle
Washington Environmental Council, Seattle
Washington Ornithological Society, Seattle
State Audubon Society, Olympia
(Continued)

Distribution of Environmental Document (Continued):

WDFW, Habitat Program, Region 1, Spokane
WDFW, Habitat Program, Region 2, Ephrata
WDFW, Habitat Program, Region 3, Yakima
WDFW, Habitat Program, Region 4, Mill Creek
WDFW, Habitat Program, Region 5, Vancouver
WDFW, Habitat Program, Region 6, Montesano
WDFW, Fish Program, Region 1, Spokane
WDFW, Fish Program, Region 2, Ephrata
WDFW, Fish Program, Region 3, Yakima
WDFW, Fish Program, Region 4, Mill Creek
WDFW, Fish Program, Region 5, Vancouver
WDFW, Fish Program, Region 6, Montesano
WDFW, Wildlife Program, Region 1, Spokane
WDFW, Wildlife Program, Region 2, Ephrata
WDFW, Wildlife Program, Region 3, Yakima
WDFW, Wildlife Program, Region 4, Mill Creek
WDFW, Wildlife Program, Region 5, Vancouver
WDFW, Wildlife Program, Region 6, Montesano



State of Washington
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
Habitat Program: 600 Capitol Way N, Olympia, Washington 98501-1091 - (360) 902-2534

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
(WAC 197-11-960)

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Reclassification of the Peregrine Falcon from State Endangered to State Sensitive species (Protected Wildlife) (WAC 232.12.011).

2. Name of Applicant: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

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

Endangered Species Section Manager
Washington Dept. Fish and Wildlife
600 Capitol Way N
Olympia, WA 98501-1091
360-902-2515

4. Date checklist prepared: 1/22/02

5. Agency requesting checklist: *Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife*

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): April 12-13, 2002

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

Yes. Will develop management plan for listed species.

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

Draft and final status reports were prepared for the species proposed to be reclassified. The Draft Status Report was available for a 3-month public review (August 1 - November 1, 2001), and the Final Status Review for 1 month (February 1 - March 4, 2002).

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.

N/A

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

Approval of the Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission.

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.

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) is evaluating the peregrine falcon for possible listing as a state sensitive species. Two rules are proposed to be amended: WAC

232.12.011 and WAC 232.12.014. WAC 232.12.011 identifies threatened and sensitive species in Washington which are in need of special management consideration to keep them from becoming endangered or threatened; WAC 232.12.014 identifies species which are in danger of extirpation in the state. The proposed amendment would reclassify the peregrine falcon from a state endangered species to a state sensitive species.

The peregrine falcon experienced a dramatic population decline over much of its nearly global range following the widespread use of the insecticide DDT shortly after World War II. Peregrines are aerial hunters of birds and it was through the accumulation of DDT and other organochlorine contaminants obtained from their prey that led to eggshell thinning and other toxic effects. The thinned eggshells broke on nest ledges or were not viable, and this facilitated a rapid population decline that exterminated the species in eastern North America and greatly reduced its abundance in western North America. The peregrine was listed as an endangered species by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1970 and by the Washington State Fish and Wildlife Commission in 1980. As defined in Washington Administrative Code, an endangered species is a species native to the state "... that is seriously threatened with extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range within the state" (WAC-232-12-297). DDT use in North America ceased in the 1970s. At about that same time efforts to breed peregrines in captivity were proving successful and beginning in the 1980s and extending through much of the 1990s captive-bred falcons were released annually at various locations in the Columbia Gorge, Cascade Mountains and eastern Washington via "hacking." Hacking efforts proved to be successful in providing recruits to Washington's breeding population.

With the banning of DDT and management of peregrines that included protection of nest sites and release of captive bred birds to the wild, the population has increased over the last 20 year period. Historically, 12 breeding territories were known prior to 1980, although historical accounts likely underestimated population size. WDFW began monitoring the population in the late 1970s and found only 4 pairs in the state by 1980. Since 1980 the population has increased substantially and in 2001 there were 72 pairs and 89 known territories. Over the last five year period productivity has averaged 1.53 young per territorial pair, a rate associated with a stable population, and new sites continue to be found annually. The peregrine falcon now breeds in most portions of the state where there are prominent cliffs for nesting and an abundance of prey. Eggshell-thinning has averaged 11.4 -12.6% over the last two decades and remains below critical thresholds (15-20%) associated with reproductive impairment at the population level..

Although Washington's peregrine population is small, given the dramatic increase in number and distribution in the last 20 years, WDFW believes a change in the species' status is warranted. Peregrines still exhibit eggshell-thinning compared to pre-DDT values, but the thinning level is below critical threshold values and appears to have stabilized. In addition, the population continues to increase in the state, occupancy remains high at known sites and productivity appears consistent with healthy populations. Peregrines are now well distributed in Washington, and their way of life as a solitary predator limits the impact that most threats would have to a more social animal. Environmental contamination is one of the few threats that can impact such a sparsely dispersed species. For these reasons, we do not believe the species is likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future and therefore do not recommend a down-listing to threatened status.

Washington's peregrine population remains vulnerable due to its small numbers (72 pairs in 2001). DDT impacted peregrine populations across the species' broad geographic range. Because of the widespread presence of various industrial and agricultural chemicals in the environment, accumulations of harmful pollutants may pose a threat to the ongoing recovery of Washington's population. Although eggshell thickness values have not returned to levels considered normal in the pre-DDT era, this does not appear to impair the growth of Washington's population. However, the small population warrants continued monitoring and management of potential disturbance at nest sites on an individual basis.

The outlook for Washington's peregrine population is promising, although monitoring is warranted due to its small size, exposure to contaminants, and continued need to address management issues at individual sites. As of 2001 there were 72 occupied territories in the state. This population remains vulnerable due to its limited numbers. Environmental pollutants such as DDT have been

demonstrated to impact peregrine populations across the species' broad geographic range. Because of the widespread presence of various industrial and agricultural chemicals in the environment, accumulations of these or other harmful pollutants may pose a threat to the ongoing recovery of Washington's population. Although eggshell thickness values have not returned to levels considered normal in the pre-DDT era, this does not appear to impair the growth of Washington's population. However, WDFW and cooperators continue to monitor the small number of known sites; and WDFW interacts with various landowners and agencies on disturbance and other issues that could jeopardize nest site occupancy at individual sites.

For these reasons WDFW believes Washington's peregrine population should be down-listed but requires continued cooperative management. WDFW believes the appropriate status for the peregrine is sensitive. A state sensitive species is considered "a species native to the state of Washington that is vulnerable or declining and is likely to become endangered or threatened in a significant portion of its range within the state without cooperative management or removal of threats" (WAC 232-12-297).

Listing of species is based solely on the biological status of the species. The procedures WDFW uses to evaluate species for possible listing were developed by a citizen/agency group representing a variety of interests. The WDFW sought information from the public during 1999 to help develop the status report. A draft status report and listing recommendation was prepared for the peregrine falcon. The draft report and listing recommendation were made available to the public for a 90-day review period August 1 - November 1, 2001. The purpose of the public review was to allow interested persons to submit new scientific information applicable to the status report and classification recommendation and to comment on the Department's interpretation of existing information.

The WDFW held three public meetings on this issue during the review period in Olympia (August 7, 2001), Yakima (August 8, 2001), and Mill Creek (August 14, 2001). At the close of the public review period on November 1, 2001, the WDFW began preparing the final status report and listing recommendation for the peregrine falcon. The public will have an opportunity to review the final report and recommendation from February 1 to March 4, 2001. The final listing recommendation is planned to be presented to the Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission for action on April 12-13, 2001².

12. **Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including 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.**

The peregrine falcon is found statewide.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS N/A

1. Earth N/A

- a. **General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other _____.**
- b. **What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?**
- c. **What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.**
- d. **Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.**
- e. **Describe the purpose, type and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed.**

Indicate source of fill.

- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction or use? If so generally describe.
- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?
- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

2. Air N/A

- a. What type of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.
- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

3. WATER N/A

a. Surface

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes ponds or wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.
- 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.
- 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.
- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.
- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? YES. NO.
If so, note location on the site plan.
- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste material to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

3. WATER N/A

b. Ground

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description purpose, and approximate quantities, if known.
- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: 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.

3. WATER N/A

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal,

if any (including quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

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

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

4. PLANTS N/A

a. Check or circle 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
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other
- water plants: waterlily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- other types of vegetation

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

c. List threatened and endangered species [of plants] known to be on or near the site.

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

5. ANIMALS See Project Description, A11.

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

- Birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
- Mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:
- Fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

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

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

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

6. ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES N/A

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.

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

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:

7. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH N/A

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

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

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

b. Noise

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

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

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

8. LAND AND SHORELINE USE N/A

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

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so describe?

c. Describe any structures on the site.

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

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

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

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

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

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

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

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

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

9. HOUSING N/A

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

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

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

10. AESTHETICS N/A

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

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

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

11. LIGHT AND GLARE N/A

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

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

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

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

12. RECREATION N/A

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

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.
No.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreational opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:
None.

13. HISTORIC AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION N/A

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

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

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

14. TRANSPORTATION N/A

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

b. Is site currently served by public transit? If no, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

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

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

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

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

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

15. PUBLIC SERVICES N/A

15. PUBLIC SERVICES N/A

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

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

16. UTILITIES N/A

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: ELECTRICITY, NATURAL GAS, WATER, REFUSE SERVICE, TELEPHONE, SANITARY SEWER, SEPTIC SYSTEM, OTHER.

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

C. SIGNATURE

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.

SIGNATURE:



DATE SUBMITTED: 1/22/02



State of Washington
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
Habitat Program: 600 Capitol Way N, Olympia, Washington 98501-1091 - (360) 902-2534

SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

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?

N/A

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

Reclassification will result in accurately reflecting the biological status of the species in Washington and focusing management consideration for this species. A management plan will be developed for the peregrine falcon. It may also lead to the opportunity for some limited take of nestling peregrine falcons for purposes of falconry. The federal guideline for this take is no more than 5% of the annual production. The state could allow less than 5% take, but no more than that. If a proposal were made for take for falconry in the future, this would go through a separate SEPA evaluation.

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

As a sensitive species, the peregrine falcon would be a Priority Species under the WDFW Priority Species and Habitats program. The WDFW will be working with landowners to conserve and protect peregrine falcon nesting sites in the state, which may include individual site management plans. A species management plan will be developed for the peregrine falcon if it is a sensitive species. It would include land management activities to consider the needs of the species, habitat protection, enforcement, information and education. The WDFW will continue to conduct annual monitoring surveys of peregrine occupancy and productivity at nest sites.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

If the peregrine falcon were reclassified to a sensitive species it would continue to be a WDFW Priority Species and would be considered by some, but not all, counties in growth management critical areas. It would not continue to be considered for critical habitat in the Washington State Forest Practices rules.

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

The WDFW would work with landowners to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts to peregrine nesting habitat and gain management consideration for peregrine falcons when projects are proposed that might adversely impact nesting or foraging habitat or cause disturbance at nest sites. Site specific management plans could be written for individual nest sites.

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?

The peregrine falcon is currently classified as endangered and, as such, has an effect on land and shoreline use if counties, local governments, or other agencies such as Department of Natural Resources, address species protection in planning efforts, e.g. for the Growth Management Act, Forest Practices Critical Habitat rules, etc. Reclassification from endangered to sensitive status may reduce land or shoreline habitat protection, depending on the county they occur in and the landowner. A number of nesting sites in Washington are on US Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service lands. These will continue to be protected. As a sensitive species, the peregrine falcon would not continue to be considered for critical habitat on state and private land under the Washington State Forest Practices rules.

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

As a sensitive species, the peregrine falcon will continue to be a WDFW priority species. WDFW will work with agencies and landowners to gain management consideration for the peregrine falcon. Agencies, counties in management planning and decision-making process, may structure to try to balance needs of species with impacts. Will be up to land managers, local governments, and on a case-by-case basis. The US Forest Service has policies to continue to protect nesting habitat.

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

It wouldn't.

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

N/A

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

The proposal will not conflict with federal laws since the peregrine falcon has been delisted by the US Fish and Wildlife Service.