**WAC 197-11-960 Environmental checklist.**

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

*Purpose of checklist:*

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

*Instructions for applicants:*

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

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

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

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will 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.

*Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:*

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

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

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: Designation of the Mazama Pocket Gopher as a State Threatened Species (WAC 232.12.011) and the Taylor's Checkerspot Butterfly and Streaked Horned Lark as State Endangered Species (WAC 232.12.014), and delisting of the Aleutian Canada Goose from State Threatened status.

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: 10/14/05

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

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): January 13-14, 2006

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 recovery plans for the species if listed.*

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 classified. The Draft Status Reporst were available for a 3-month public review (July 1 - September 30, 2005), and the Final Status Review for 1 month (November 1 - December 1, 2005).*

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

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) is evaluating the Mazama pocket gopher for possible listing as a state threatened species (WAC 232.12.011); the Taylor's checkerspot butterfly and streaked horned lark as state endangered species, and is evaluating the Aleutian Canada goose for possible delisting from state threatened status. Two rules are proposed to be amended: WAC 232.12.014, which identifies endangered species that are at risk of extirpation in the state and are in need of recovery actions to restore populations to healthy levels; and WAC 232.12.011, which identifies species in need of protection in Washington. The proposed amendments would classify the Taylor's Checkerspot Butterfly and Streaked Horned Lark as state endangered species, the Mazama Pocket Gopher as a state threatened species and would remove the Aleutian Canada goose from the state list of threatened species.

Native prairies are among the most endangered ecological communities in North America. Western Washington is generally known for its forests; it is less well known that the south Puget Sound area historically had large expanses of prairie and oak savannahs. These prairies and woodland communities developed during a warm dry period from 10,000 to 7,000 years ago on the droughty, gravelly soils deposited by the Vashon Glacier. In the recent past, glacial outwash prairie still existed on at least 150,000 ac, and grassland and oak woodlands occurred in smaller patches throughout the Puget Trough and south to the Columbia River. Local Native American tribes adapted to use the plants and game of these communities and maintained prairie in the area by burning the vegetation every few years during the last 4,000 years. Since settlement by Euro-Americans, the extent of these prairies has steadily declined with their use for agriculture and the cessation of burning that has allowed succession to Douglas-fir forest. Only about 8% of the original prairie still supports grassland vegetation and 2-3% is still dominated by native prairie vegetation. In addition to prairies on glacial outwash, native grasslands existed on perhaps 10,000 ac of coastal headlands, islands and rocky balds. Some of the wildlife of prairies, though now locally rare, are little different from abundant and widespread forms found across much of eastern Washington and in grassland communities elsewhere. A few of the wildlife species that inhabited these prairies and grasslands have been genetically isolated from their ancestral stocks for a long period of time and have evolved endemic forms found nowhere else. These unique forms have become rare with their habitat, and some are threatened with extinction. This report summarizes what is known about the natural history and status of three species that have their center of abundance in Washington on the prairies of the southern Puget Sound: the Mazama pocket gopher; streaked horned lark; and Taylor's checkerspot butterfly.

### Taylor's Checkerspot Butterfly

Taylor's checkerspot (*Euphydryas editha taylori*), a subspecies of Edith's checkerspot, is a medium-sized butterfly with a striking checkered pattern of orange to brick-red, black and cream. It was historically found on grassland habitats from over 70 sites from southeastern Vancouver Island, British Columbia through northwestern Oregon, including about 38 known locations in Washington. The direct loss of grassland habitats to

human development coupled with degradation of grasslands by the invasion of shrubs and succession to Douglas-fir forest has eliminated most of its habitat. The subspecies is now restricted to 1 known population in British Columbia, small populations in 2 areas in Oregon, and a small scattering of 10 populations in Washington. Butterfly populations can be extemely variable from year-to-year. Among 5 or 6 populations that appear to have gone extinct over the last 10 years is one population that was estimated at 7,000 in 1997; it declined precipitously and appeared to be extinct by 2001. Most populations in Washington support no more than a few hundred individuals, and several of the populations are extremely small and may be on the verge of extinction. The subspecies became a candidate for listing under the federal Endangered Species Act in 2001 (USFWS 2001).

Butterfly populations are known to fluctuate dramatically with weather. The critical phases of the life cycle of Edith's checkerspot have often been described as a race by the larvae to develop before their food plants dry out in early summer; larvae that do not mature sufficiently before entering a prolonged diapause which extends through winter, do not survive. Because of this interaction with host plants, local populations sometimes go extinct and the habitat is vacant until being recolonized by dispersing adults. Some populations appear to be dependent on the non-native English plantain or ribwort (*Plantago lanceolata*), a weedy introduced species. Dependence on this species may negatively affect *E. e. taylori* population dynamics and lead to more frequent local extinctions.

Butterflies often occur as metapopulations; metapopulations are collections of smaller subpopulations that occupy patches of habitat, and the patches are successively vacant and occupied as local butterfly extinctions are followed by recolonizations. *E. editha* is a relatively sedentary species and rarely disperses > 5 km. Taylor's checkerspot sites in Washington are located in 4 distinct areas, and may comprise 3 or more metapopulations. Habitat loss has increased isolation of the remaining populations, however, so that many are unlikely to be recolonized when they become extinct. The small size of many populations put them at higher risk of extinction due to fires, disturbance, insecticides, and weather extremes, as well as the potential for reduced survival and reproductive success due to inbreeding.

Several of the largest remaining populations occur on public lands, but most of these lands have uses that can conflict with butterfly conservation, including military training and recreation. Private lands occupied by Taylor's checkerspot are subject to development, agriculture, and gravel extraction that can eliminate habitat. Grassland sites, except where actively maintained, are being degraded by the invasion of Scotch broom, Douglas-fir, and numerous non-native forbs and sod-forming grasses. The remaining populations of Taylor's checkerspot are unlikely to persist without management intervention in the form of habitat restoration and maintenance.

Long-term persistence of isolated populations also requires genetic exchange between subpopulations and recolonization of vacant patches. Taylor's checkerspot may occur as 3 or more, small metapopulations in Washington. Maintaining the genetic diversity of populations will require either restoration of many intervening stepping stones of habitat or physical transport of individual butterflies between patches. The subspecies is unlikely to survive without recovery actions. For these reasons, the WDFW recommends that Taylor's checkerspot butterfly be listed as endangered in the State of Washington.

### Streaked Horned Lark

The streaked horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris strigata*) is arguably the most distinct subspecies of horned lark. Its historic breeding range included prairies and open grassland habitats in southwestern British Columbia, western Washington, and western Oregon. The center of abundance of the streaked horned lark in Washington was the prairies of southern Puget Sound, primarily in Pierce and Thurston counties. Streaked horned larks have declined with the loss of prairie habitats to development and succession to forest. With the cessation of burning of the prairies by Native Americans, Douglas-fir has spread over much of the prairie and introduced grasses, weeds, and Scotch broom have degraded much of the remainder. Streaked horned larks may have also been restricted to portions of the prairie where the vegetation was short and sparse due to excessive dryness or repeated burns.

There is little information on historical populations. Streaked horned larks were reported to be a "very abundant summer resident of the gravelly prairies near Fort Steilacoom" in the 1850s (Suckley and Cooper 1860). Bowles (1900) estimated that there were "fully one hundred pairs must have nested" on the Tacoma golf links at the turn of the century. Streaked horned lark breeding in Washington is now limited only to 13 known sites: 6 sites in the south Puget Sound area; 4 sites along the outer coast; and 3 sites on islands in the lower Columbia River. The subspecies has also greatly declined in Oregon and may be extinct in British Columbia. The total breeding population is estimated to be 780, with about 330 birds in Washington and about 450 in Oregon. All remaining nesting sites in the south Puget Sound area are on airports or military bases where grassland is maintained. Columbia River sites are affected by management of the islands, including deposition of dredge spoil, and

vegetation manipulation to discourage nesting by Caspian terns. Coastal sites may be affected by the spread of European beachgrass and disturbance by recreational activities.

For these reasons, the Department recommends that the streaked horned lark be listed as endangered in the State of Washington.

**Mazama Pocket Gopher**

The Mazama pocket gopher (*Thomomys mazama*) is a regional endemic found only in western Washington, western Oregon and northern California. The subspecific taxonomy of *T. mazama* is in the process of being revised, but in Washington, *T. mazama* is likely represented by 3 surviving subspecies: *T. m. yelmensis* is found on locations scattered on the remnants of prairie in Pierce and Thurston counties; *T. m. couchi* is found on grassland at a few localities near Shelton in Mason County, including the airport; *T. m. melanops* is found on a few alpine meadows in Olympic National Park in Clallam County. Two additional subspecies that occurred around Tacoma (*T. m. tacomensis*) and in Wahkiakum County (*T. m. louiei*) appear to be extinct. The Washington population of the Mazama pocket gopher became a candidate for federal listing under the Endangered Species Act in 2002. Mazama pocket gophers are known to persist at about 27 sites scattered across the southern Puget Sound grasslands and on alpine meadows in the Olympics. These may total in the low thousands, but encompass three geographically isolated subspecies and many small populations on marginal sites that are unlikely to persist. Pocket gophers play an important a role in ecological communities by altering soil structure and chemistry, affecting plant occurrences, and serving as prey for many predators; their burrows provide a retreat for a wide variety of other species, including the western toad.

With the exception of *T. m. melanops* and the apparently extinct *T. m. louiei*, *T. mazama* is a creature of the south Puget Sound prairie landscape. Most gopher populations are restricted to grassland on remnant and former prairie sites. Mazama pocket gophers are not constrained to live on native vegetation and will eat many introduced grasses and weedy forbs. Soil type seems to affect their distribution, because they are absent from most prairies with particularly rocky soils. Habitat loss to succession, agriculture and development has eliminated most of the prairie vegetation, and habitat continues to be lost to residential development. Existing habitat is being degraded by heavy grazing of pastures and the invasion of Scotch broom and other weedy non-native plants.

Perhaps half of the known gopher populations are on private lands, where they are threatened by residential development and may be rapidly dwindling due to degraded habitat and high mortality. Pocket gophers may not persist in residential areas due to persecution by trapping, poisoning, and predation by cats and dogs. The last records of the *T. m. tacomnesis* were of individuals killed by domestic cats. Gravel mining affects gopher habitat on some private lands. Most occupied habitat on public lands is affected by non-conservation uses including military training and recreation. Gopher populations at airports can be affected by development of airport-related facilities and businesses, and management of airport grassland.

The small size and isolation of most remaining populations of Mazama pocket gopher put them at risk of local extinction, and without increased protection, all but *T. m. melanops* in Olympic National Park could go extinct. Historically, local gopher populations probably exchanged genetic material by individuals occasionally dispersing through intervening oak woodlands and forest; prairie patches where gophers went extinct would eventually be re-colonized. Today, these prairie patches are increasingly surrounded by roads and suburbs that are inhospitable to dispersing gophers. Populations that become extinct are unlikely to be re-colonized without re-introductions. For these reasons, it is recommended that the Mazama pocket gopher be listed as threatened by the State of Washington.

**Aleutian Canada Goose**

The Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and California population of Aleutian Canada goose (Branta canadensis leucopareia) was first added to the U.S. Department of Interior's list of endangered species in 1967. The primary cause of the population decline was attributed to predation by introduced arctic (Alopex lagopus) and red foxes (Vulpes vulpes). Aleutian geese were eliminated on many islands in the Aleutian chain after arctic and red foxes were introduced. Control programs started in the 1950s have been successful in significantly reducing and eliminating foxes from several key islands. Aleutian Canada geese can be distinguished from most other Canada geese by their small size and a complete ring of white feathers at the base of the neck in birds older than 8 months. They migrate from their breeding grounds in the Aleutian Islands in September, stopping along coastal areas of Washington and Oregon en route to their wintering grounds in California and southwest Oregon.

Hunting of Aleutian Canada geese is prohibited in Washington. Washington contains migratory, not wintering, habitat. Principal migratory habitat in Washington is located in the Willapa National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and surrounding fields and farms.

In 1991, the species was downlisted by the USFWS from endangered to threatened. The 1991 revised federal recovery plan for the goose outlined 3 major delisting criteria: 1) maintain a wild population of at least 7,500 animals; 2) re-establish self-sustaining populations of geese on three former breeding areas, and 3) maintain adequate migration and winter habitat. The subspecies exceeded 28,000 birds and was proposed for removal from the list of endangered and threatened wildlife in August 1999 (USFWS 1999). The population was delisted in March 2001 (USFWS 2001, Appendix A). Aleutian geese have continued to increase, and currently number over 70,000 as indicated by surveys during the winter of 2003-200 In response to its federal endangered status, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) listed the Aleutian Canada goose as a state endangered species in 1980. The federal action downlisting the goose from endangered to threatened in 1991 resulted in a similar downlisting of the population by WDFW in 1997. However, the federal action delisting the subspecies in 2001 has not yet resulted in state delisting. No significant circumstances exist specific to Washington State to deviate from following the federal lead in delisting. It is recommended that the Aleutian Canada goose be removed from the list of endangered and threatened species in Washington.

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. Draft status reports and listing recommendations were prepared for the four species in 2004-05. The draft reports and listing recommendations were made available to the public for a 90-day review period July 1 - September 30, 2005. 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. At the close of the public review period on September 30, 2005, the WDFW began preparing the final status reports and listing recommendations for the four species. The public will have an opportunity to review the final report and recommendation from November 1 to December 1, 2005. The final listing recommendation will be presented to the Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission for action on January 13-14, 2005.

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.

The **Mazama pocket gopher** (*Thomomys mazama*) is a regional endemic found only in western Washington, western Oregon and northern California. The subspecific taxonomy of *T. mazama* is in the process of being revised, but in Washington, *T. mazama* is likely represented by 3 surviving subspecies: *T. m. yelmensis* is found on locations scattered on the remnants of prairie in Pierce and Thurston counties; *T. m. couchi* is found on grassland at a few localities near Shelton in Mason County, including the airport; *T. m. melanops* is found on a few alpine meadows in Olympic National Park in Clallam County. Two additional subspecies that occurred around Tacoma (*T. m. tacomensis*) and in Wahkiakum County (*T. m. louiei*) appear to be extinct. Mazama pocket gophers are known to persist at about 27 sites scattered across the southern Puget Sound grasslands and on alpine meadows in the Olympics.

The **Taylor's checkerspot butterfly** was historically found on grassland habitats from over 70 sites from southeastern Vancouver Island, British Columbia through northwestern Oregon, including about 38 known locations in Washington. The subspecies is now restricted to 1 known population in British Columbia, small populations in 2 areas in Oregon, and a small scattering of 10 populations in Thurston, Pierce and Clallam counties in Washington.

The **streaked horned lark** historic breeding range included prairies and open grassland habitats in southwestern British Columbia, western Washington, and western Oregon. The center of abundance of the streaked horned lark in Washington was the prairies of southern Puget Sound, primarily in Pierce and Thurston counties. Streaked horned lark breeding in Washington is now limited only to 13 known sites: 6 sites in the south Puget Sound area; 4 sites along the outer coast; and 3 sites on islands in the lower Columbia River.

The **Aleutian Canada goose** migrates from breeding grounds in the Aleutian Islands in September, stopping along coastal areas of Washington and Oregon en route to wintering grounds in California and southwest Oregon. Washington contains migratory, not wintering, habitat. Principal migratory habitat in Washington is

located in the Willapa National Wildlife Refuge, Pacific County, and surrounding fields and farms.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATION FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

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 types 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: N/A

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.
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? If so, note location on the site plan.
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.

b. Ground: N/A

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.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater): N/A

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.

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

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT EVALUATION FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

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, 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?
c. List threatened or endangered species 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** **N/A**

a. Circle any birds and 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 or 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? If so, describe.

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 a short-term or a 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:

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATION FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

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?
b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.
c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

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 not, 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?

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

EVALUATION FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

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**

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: .....

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (do not use this sheet 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? N/A

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are: N/A

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

*The proposal would benefit animals in Washington by listing the Taylor's checkerspot butterfly and streaked horned lark as state endangered species and the Mazama pocket gopher as a state threatened species. These species are at risk of extirpation from the state and recovery actions would be developed following listing to address limiting factors and threats to the populations.*

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

*As endangered or threatened species, the Taylor's checkerspot butterfly, streaked horned lark and Mazama pocket gopher would be Priority Species under the WDFW Priority Species and Habitats (PHS) program. The WDFW prioritizes listed species for research, monitoring, enforcement, management, recovery, and education. The department would work with other managers, other state agencies, local governments, and the public to develop and implement recovery strategies for the species.*

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

*It wouldn't.*

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

*If the species were listed, the WDFW would work with other entities to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts to the species and gain management consideration for them when projects are proposed that might adversely impact the species or their habitats.*

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

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? N/A

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

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

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.

*Listing the 3 species would be complementary to the US Fish and Wildlife Service, which has designated the streaked horned lark, Mazama pocket gopher and Taylor's checkerspot butterfly as candidate species. The FWS has also delisted the Aleutian Canada goose from the federal list of threatened species.*