



National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior



## LWCF Proposal Description and Environmental Screening Form

The purpose of this Proposal Description and Environmental Screening Form (PD/ESF) is to provide descriptive and environmental information about a variety of Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) state assistance proposals submitted for National Park Service (NPS) review and decision. The completed PD/ESF becomes part of the “federal administrative record” in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and its implementing regulations. The PD portion of the form captures administrative and descriptive details enabling the NPS to understand the proposal. The ESF portion is designed for States and/or project sponsors to use while the LWCF proposal is under development. Upon completion, the ESF will indicate the resources that could be impacted by the proposal enabling States and/or project sponsors to more accurately follow an appropriate pathway for NEPA analysis: 1) a recommendation for a Categorical Exclusion (CE), 2) production of an Environmental Assessment (EA), or 3) production of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The ESF should also be used to document any previously conducted yet still viable environmental analysis if used for this federal proposal. The completed PD/ESF must be submitted as part of the State’s LWCF proposal to NPS.

Name of LWCF Proposal:

Date Submitted to NPS:

January 24, 2011

Conversion and Replacement for portion of Yakima River site (Martin)

Prior LWCF Project Number(s) *List all prior LWCF project numbers and all park names associated with assisted site(s):*  
53-00068

Local or State Project Sponsoring Agency *(recipient or sub-recipient in case of pass-through grants):*  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Local or State Sponsor Contact:

Name/Title: Elyse Kane, Property Management Supervisor  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Office/Address: 600 Capitol Way North, Olympia, WA 98501-1091

Phone/Fax: (360) 902-8415; fax: (360) 902-8140 Email: elyse.kane@dfw.wa.gov

Using a separate sheet for narrative descriptions and explanations, address each item and question in the order it is presented, and identify each response with its item number such as Step 1-A1, A2; Step 3-B1; Step 6-A1, A29; etc.

## Step 1. Type of LWCF Proposal

### Project Amendment

6(f) conversion proposal. Complete Steps 3B, and 5 through 7.

## Step 3. Project Amendment (See LWCF Manual for guidance.)

### B. Section 6(f)(3) Conversion Proposal

Prior to developing your Section 6(f)(3) conversion proposal, you must consult the LWCF Manual and 36 CFR 59.3 for complete guidance on conversions. Local sponsors must consult early with the State LWCF manager when a conversion is under consideration or has been discovered. States must consult with their NPS-LWCF manager as early as possible in the conversion process for guidance and to sort out and discuss details of the conversion proposal to avoid mid-course corrections and unnecessary delays. **A critical first step is for the State and NPS to agree on the size of the Section 6(f) park land impacted by any non-recreation, non-public use, especially prior to any appraisal activity.** Any previous LWCF project agreements and actions must be identified and understood to determine the actual Section 6(f) boundary.

The Section 6(f)(3) conversion proposal including the required NEPA environmental review documents (CE recommendation or an EA document) must focus on the loss of public outdoor recreation park land and recreational usefulness, and its replacement per 36 CFR 59, and **not** the activities precipitating the conversion or benefits thereof, such as the impacts of constructing a new school to relieve overcrowding or constructing a hotel/restaurant facility to stimulate the local economy. Rather, the environmental review must 1) focus on "resource impacts" as indicated on the ESF (Step 6), including the loss of public park land and recreation opportunities (ESF A-15), and 2) the impacts of creating new replacement park land and replacement recreation opportunities. A separate ESF must be generated for the converted park area and each replacement site. Section 6(f)(3) conversions always have more than minor impacts to outdoor recreation (ESF A-15) as a result of loss of parkland requiring an EA, except for "small" conversions as defined in the LWCF Manual Chapter 8.

For NPS review and decision, the following elements are required to be included in the State's completed conversion proposal to be submitted to NPS:

1. **A letter of transmittal from the SLO recommending the proposal.** (Attachment A.)
2. **A detailed explanation of the sponsor's need to convert the Section 6(f) parkland including all efforts to consider other practical alternatives to this conversion, how they were evaluated, and the reasons they were not pursued.**

**Proposal Description.** The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) is attempting to resolve a boundary dispute with an adjacent landowner, Canyon River Ranch (CRR). The dispute concerns the southern boundary of WDFW's 13-acre property in the Yakima River Canyon, which was funded by LWCF (#53-00068) for public access to the river. WDFW and CRR are proposing a land exchange as a way to avoid the cost and uncertainty of litigation over their boundary dispute.

Both properties are bisected by the Yakima River; the proposal is to reconfigure the two ownerships by putting WDFW entirely on the west side of the river and CRR entirely on the east side. WDFW's 13-acre parcel would be increased to 30 acres on the west side of the river; CRR's 67-acre parcel would be reduced to 50 acres on the east side of the river. WDFW also would

receive a three-acre site on the Yakima River at Old Highway 10 near Thorp, and an 83-acre property with ponds near Mesa, Franklin County. Both of these additional properties would become LWCF property as well.

WDFW has held a public notice and comment period for 30 days and presented the proposal in open public forum to the Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission and to the Washington Recreation and Conservation Funding Board. There have been no adverse comments.

**Background.** George Martin owned both the WDFW and CRR properties as one 80-acre parcel until 1963 when he sold most of the parcel (67 acres) to CRR's predecessor. Martin's remaining 13 acres was a narrow strip (225 feet wide) along the north boundary of the CRR property. Martin sold this northern strip to WDFW in 1968. The understanding was that WDFW's strip was undeveloped.

However, a recent survey shows that two of Martin's old buildings are on WDFW's property and that a significant portion of WDFW's site has been used by CRR. CRR has asserted a claim of adverse possession against WDFW. In an effort to avoid litigation, the parties are considering a land exchange to block up their respective ownerships on opposite sides of the river.

Ownership of CRR's property west of the river is extremely attractive to WDFW because this is one of the last private inholdings in thousands of acres of state land that stretch to the north, south and west to form WDFW's Wenas Wildlife Area, a 1970 LWCF acquisition (#53-00087). WDFW's acquisition of CRR's western 26 acres would fill in a significant gap in LWCF's 6(f) boundary around the Wenas Wildlife Area.

**Discussion of Alternatives.** The following alternatives have been evaluated:

- WDFW evaluated the alternative of resolving the matter in court. CRR has alleged facts that, if proven, would give title to CRR to the central portion of the property. This is the only portion of the property that is usable for public access to the Yakima River. (The western portion has no road access; the eastern portion has no river access.) Loss of the central portion of the property would make the entire property useless for the purpose of the LWCF grant. And, loss of that portion of the property through a court ruling would not generate funds for replacement land.
- A second risk with litigation is that if CRR were successful, CRR would continue to own its 26 acres on the west side of the Yakima River and would demand an easement through WDFW's surrounding Wenas Wildlife Area for an access road. A road would be detrimental to WDFW's conservation objectives in the Wenas and, likely, prohibited by the conversion rules of the LWCF grant that purchased the land.
- WDFW considered the alternative of only selling to CRR the disputed area (and retaining the rest of the property). The value of this portion of the site, however, is insufficient to purchase a viable replacement site as is required under LWCF rules.
- WDFW evaluated the alternative of converting its property east of the river (as proposed here), but purchasing replacement land nearer to the converted site. WDFW and CRR approached all

private owners with river access in the area. No private owner is willing to sell at this time. Since most of this stretch of the Yakima River is already in public ownership with numerous campgrounds and boat launches, WDFW concluded that local replacement is not critical from a public access standpoint.

**3. An explanation of how the conversion is in accord with the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP).**

The on-line version of the 2003-2007 State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) provides the most up to date assessment of recreation in Washington State. The SLO believes that this conversion is consistent with the SCORP in the following respects:

Page 2

It is the policy of the State of Washington:

- To recognize outdoor recreation sites and facilities as vital elements of the public infrastructure, essential to the health and well-being of Washington citizens, and important to visitors.
  
- To assist local and state agencies in providing recreation sites and facilities that benefit our citizens' health and well-being.

Page 12

Success in outdoor recreation is defined by the following characteristics:

- The state resources people want to enjoy, from state forests to ocean beaches, are available for use while being protected for future generations.

Page 29

The proposed level of service for state agency sites and facilities begins with the assumption that the state's primary role is in resource recreation. Resource recreation demands sufficient stewardship of resources to allow sustainable access and recreation.

RCO recommends that state agencies use existing processes and available data to self-assess this indicator. Sustainable access is management of appropriate recreation over time in a manner that maintains resources qualities for future generations.

**4. Completed "State Appraisal/Waiver Valuation Review form in Step 7 for each of the converted and replacement parcels certifying that the appraisals meet the "Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions." States must retain copies of the appraisals/waiver valuations and make them available for review upon request.**

(In process. Will be sent separately.)

**5. For the park land proposed for conversion, a detailed description including the following:**

- a. Specific geographic location on a map, 9-digit zip code, and name of park or recreation area proposed for conversion.**

(Map attached.)

- b. **Description of the area proposed for the conversion including the acreage to be converted and any acreage remaining. For determining the size of the conversion, consider not only the physical footprint of the activity precipitating the conversion, but how the precipitating activity will impact the entire 6(f) park area. In many cases the size of the converted area is larger than the physical footprint. Include a description of the recreation resources, facilities, and recreation opportunities that will be impacted, displaced or lost by the proposed conversion. For proposals to partially convert a Section 6(f) park area, the remaining 6(f) park land must remain recreationally viable and not be impacted by the activities that are precipitating the conversion. If it is anticipated that the precipitating activities impact the remaining Section 6(f) area, the proposed area for the conversion should be expanded to encompass all impacted park land.**

The Yakima River Canyon is a 27-mile scenic/recreation area between Ellensburg and Yakima in Kittitas County. The 13 acres purchased from Martin in 1968 with LWCF funds are about midway through the Canyon. The property has no facilities. It offers 225 feet of riverbank for catch-and-release fishing and river rafting. WDFW estimates that there will be very little, if any, reduction in public access to the river through the conversion of this site because WDFW currently has three other river access sites in the Canyon and the federal Bureau of Land Management maintains four additional public sites in the Canyon.

The portion of the property that is not proposed for conversion (a 4- acre parcel) is on the western side of the Yakima River. It is not accessible from the Canyon highway. However, it is important for WDFW to keep this parcel from becoming a private inholding within the Wenas Wildlife Area that surrounds it. As part of the wildlife area, the parcel provides hunting and wildlife viewing recreation for the public.

- c. **Description of the community and population served by the park, including users of the park and uses.**

Although the Yakima River Canyon is a popular destination for catch-and-release fishermen from local and distant parts of Washington, this parcel has little, if any, use because it has no facilities. The public wishing to access the river for fishing and boating prefer the other seven nearby sites (3 WDFW and 4 BLM) that have restrooms, parking areas, and launches.

- d. **For partial conversions, a revised 6(f) map clearly indicating both the portion that is being converted and the portion remaining intact under Section 6(f).**

(Map attached.)

6. **For each proposed replacement site:**
  - a. **Specific geographic location on a map, 9-digit zip code, and geographical relationship of converted and replacement sites. If site will be added to an existing public park/outdoor recreation area, indicate on map.**

(Maps attached.)



Ponds site fits a specific niche for people who only have small watercraft and those looking for the opportunity to fish lakes. Fishing here includes bass, crappie, perch and bluegill. The Mesa Ponds site is 25 miles north of the Tri-Cities, and a shorter distance from Othello and Connell. It is one mile off Highway 395, the main thoroughfare between the Tri-Cities and Spokane. We have registration slips from nearby locations that show a great many hunters in this area come from Spokane and Western Washington as well.

According to *The Open Space Coalition of Benton and Franklin Counties*, “It is unusual to find a property with this much diversity [wetland, riparian, and shrub-steppe habitat] and it needs to be protected from development in our rapidly growing area. Franklin County is one of the fastest growing counties in the nation. The expansion of the nearby facility, the Coyote Ridge Corrections Center in Connell, will bring several hundred additional families to the area. This will put all the more pressure on special land. There is a rare opportunity here to make a diverse habitat easily available to young families and all who love the outdoors for generations to come.”

**c. Identification of the owner of the replacement site and its recent history of use/function up to the present.**

The Canyon replacement site and the Thorp replacement site are owned by Canyon River Ranch (Red’s Fly Shop), which does not currently use the sites.

The Mesa Ponds replacement site is owned by Mesa Lake Investments, a group of six Seattle-area families that use the site as a private vacation retreat.

**d. Detailed explanation of how the proposed replacement site is of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location as the property being converted, including a description of the recreation needs that will be met by the new replacement parks, populations to be served, and new outdoor recreation resources, facilities, and opportunities to be provided.**

The three replacement sites offer equivalent or superior usefulness and location as the property being converted. In this exchange, we are able to include an adjacent replacement and an upstream replacement, as well as an additional site in a nearby county that currently has insufficient opportunity for public water access. We are replacing nine acres with 113 acres; we are replacing 225 feet of stream bank with 1,649 feet; we are replacing one site with three sites; we are adding hunting opportunity; we are adding fishing opportunity that is not catch-and-release.

**e. Identification of owner and manager of the new replacement park?**

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife will own and manage the replacement sites.

- f. **Name of the new replacement park. If the replacement park is added to an existing public park area, will the existing area be included within the 6(f) boundary? What is the name of the existing public park area?**

The Canyon replacement site is adjacent to the retained portion of the conversion site and, so, it also will be called "Yakima River" under "Statewide Water Access" Project Number 53-00068.

The replacement site on the Yakima River near Thorp is on Old Highway 10 and, so, will be called "Old Highway 10 near Thorp."

The replacement site near Mesa in Franklin County includes three ponds and, so, will be called "Mesa Ponds."

- g. **Timeframe for completing the new outdoor recreation area(s) to replace the recreation opportunity lost per the terms of conversion approval and the date replacement park(s) will be open to the public.**

WDFW needs approval for this conversion and replacement immediately in order to close this transaction before Option on the Mesa Ponds property expires on March 31, 2011.

- h. **New Section 6(f) map for the new replacement park.**

(Maps attached.)

7. **NEPA environmental review, including NHPA Section 106 review, for both the converted and replacement sites in the same document to analyze how the converted park land and recreational usefulness will be replaced. Except for "small" conversions (see LWCF Manual Chapter 8), conversions usually require an EA.**

## Step 5. Summary of Previous Environmental Review (including E.O. 12372 - Intergovernmental Review)

To avoid duplication of effort and unnecessary delays, describe any prior environmental review undertaken at any time and still viable for this proposal or related efforts that could be useful for understanding potential environmental impacts. Consider previous local, state, federal (e.g. HUD, EPA, USFWS, FHWA, DOT) and any other environmental reviews. At a minimum, address the following:

1. Date of environmental review(s), purpose for the environmental review(s) and for whom they were conducted.
2. Description of the proposed action and alternatives.
3. Who was involved in identifying resource impact issues and developing the proposal including the interested and affected public, government agencies, and Indian tribes.
4. Environmental resources analyzed and determination of impacts for proposed actions and alternatives.
5. Any mitigation measures to be part of the proposed action.
6. Intergovernmental Review Process (Executive Order 12372): Does the State have an Intergovernmental Review Process? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_. If yes, has the LWCF Program been selected for review under the State Intergovernmental Review Process? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_. If yes, was this proposal reviewed by the appropriate State, metropolitan, regional and local agencies, and if so, attach any information and comments received about this proposal. If proposal was not reviewed, explain why not.
7. Public comment periods (how long, when in the process, who was invited to comment) and agency response.
8. Any formal decision and supporting reasons regarding degree of potential impacts to the human environment.
9. Was this proposed LWCF federal action and/or any other federal actions analyzed/reviewed in any of the previous environmental reviews? If so, what was analyzed and what impacts were identified? Provide specific environmental review document references.

Use resource impact information generated during previous environmental reviews described above and from recently conducted site inspections to complete the Environmental Screening Form (ESF) portion of this PD/ESF under Step 6. Your ESF responses should indicate your proposal's potential for impacting each resource as determined in the previous environmental review(s), and include a reference to where the analysis can be found in an earlier environmental review document. If the previous environmental review documents contain proposed actions to mitigate impacts, briefly summarize the mitigation for each resource as appropriate. The appropriate references for previous environmental review document(s) must be documented on the ESF, and the actual document(s) along with this PD/ESF must be included in the submission for NPS review.

**Environmental Site Assessments:** A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment was conducted on the 26-acre Canyon replacement site by Pacific Crest Environmental, LLC. Its report, dated November 10, 2010, concludes that there is no evidence of recognized environmental conditions, including hazardous substances and petroleum products, in connection with the site.

A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment was conducted on the "Old Highway 10 near Thorp" replacement site by Pacific Crest Environmental, LLC. Its report, dated November 8, 2010, concludes that there is no evidence of recognized environmental conditions, including hazardous substances and petroleum products, in connection with the site.

A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment was conducted on the Mesa Ponds replacement site by The Empirical Company. The report, dated June 2009, concludes that there are no hazardous substances, petroleum products, improvements or structures on the LWCF replacement site.

**Public Comment Periods:** WDFW published notice of the proposed conversion and replacement on the Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission's website and in the largest local newspaper, the Yakima Herald. No adverse comments were received during the 30-day comment period or in the 90 days since.

The Fish and Wildlife Commission reviewed the exchange in open public forum, as did the Recreation and Conservation Office (SLO). No adverse comments were received and each review board gave enthusiastic support.

The acquisition at Mesa Ponds is the third of a phased purchase beginning in 2009 with other fund sources. Letters of support have been received from the Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society, the Pasco School District, Franklin County, and The Open Space Coalition of Benton and Franklin Counties.

**Notice to Adjacent Landowners:** All of the landowners adjacent to the conversion property have been notified. No adverse comments have been received.

***Proceed to Steps 6 through 7***



## Step 6. Environmental Screening Form (ESF)

This portion of the PD/ESF is a working tool used to identify the level of environmental documentation which must accompany the proposal submission to the NPS. By completing the ESF, the project sponsor is providing support for its recommendation in Step 7 that the proposal either:

1. meets criteria to be categorically excluded (CE) from further NEPA review and no additional environmental documentation is necessary; or
2. requires further analysis through an environmental assessment (EA) or an environmental impact statement (EIS).

An ESF alone does not constitute adequate environmental documentation unless a CE is recommended. If an EA is required, the EA process and resulting documents must be included in the proposal submission to the NPS. If an EIS may be required, the State must request NPS guidance on how to proceed.

The scope of the required environmental analysis will vary according to the type of LWCF proposal. For example, the scope for a new LWCF project will differ from the scope for a conversion. Consult the LWCF Manual for guidance on defining the scope or extent of environmental analysis needed for your LWCF proposal. As early as possible in your planning process, consider how your proposal/project may have direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on the human environment for your type of LWCF action so planners have an opportunity to design alternatives to lessen impacts on resources, if appropriate. When used as a planning tool in this way, the ESF responses may change as the proposal is revised until it is ready for submission for federal review. Initiating or completing environmental analysis after a decision has been made is contrary to both the spirit and letter of the law of the NEPA.

The ESF should be completed with input from resource experts and in consultation with relevant local, state, tribal and federal governments, as applicable. The interested and affected public should be notified of the proposal and be invited to participate in scoping out the proposal (see LWCF Manual Chapter 4). At a minimum, a site inspection of the affected area must be conducted by individuals who are familiar with the type of affected resources, possess the ability to identify potential resource impacts, and to know when to seek additional data when needed.

At the time of proposal submission to NPS for federal review, the completed ESF must justify the NEPA pathway that was followed: CE recommendation, production of an EA, or production of an EIS. The resource topics and issues identified on the ESF for this proposal must be presented and analyzed in an attached EA/EIS. Consult the LWCF Manual for further guidance on LWCF and NEPA.

The ESF contains two parts that must be completed:

### Part A. Environmental Resources

### Part B. Mandatory Criteria

**Part A:** For each environmental resource topic, choose an impact estimate level (none, negligible, minor, exceeds minor) that describes the degree of potential negative impact for each listed resource that may occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively as a result of federal approval of your proposal. For each impacted resource provide a brief explanation of how the resource might be affected, how the impact level was determined, and why the chosen impact level is appropriate. If an environmental review has already been conducted on your proposal and is still viable, include the citation including any planned mitigation for each applicable resource, and choose an impact level as mitigated. If the resource does not apply to your proposal, mark NA in the first column. Add any relevant resources (see A.24 on the ESF) if not included in the list.

Use a separate sheet to briefly clarify how each resource could be adversely impacted; any direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that may occur; and any additional data that still needs to be determined. Also explain any planned mitigation already addressed in previous environmental reviews.

**Part B:** This is a list of mandatory impact criteria that preclude the use of categorical exclusions. If you answer "yes" or "maybe" for any of the mandatory criteria, you must develop an EA or EIS regardless of your answers in Part A. Explain all "yes" and "maybe" answers on a separate sheet.

**Conversion Site: Yakima River (Martin)**

A. ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES	Not Applicable- Resource does not exist	No/Negligible Impacts-Exists but no or negligible impacts	Minor Impacts	Impacts Exceed Minor EA/EIS required	More Data Needed to Determine Degree of Impact EA/EIS required
1. Geological resources: soils, bedrock, slopes, streambeds, landforms, etc.	Yakima River is not within conversion site.				
2. Air quality		No impact to air quality.			
3. Sound (noise impacts)	X				
4. Water quality/quantity	X				
5. Stream flow characteristics	X				
6. Marine/estuarine	X				
7. Floodplains/wetlands		No impact to floodplain.			
8. Land use/ownership patterns; property values; community livability		No negative impact: will sell at appraised value.			
9. Circulation, transportation	X				
10. Plant/animal/fish species of special concern and habitat; state/federal listed or proposed for listing	X				
11. Unique ecosystems, such as biosphere reserves, World Heritage sites, old growth forests, etc.	X				
12. Unique or important wildlife/wildlife habitat	X				
13. Unique or important fish/habitat	X				
14. Introduce or promote invasive species (plant or animal)	X				
15. Recreation resources, land, parks, open space, conservation areas, rec. trails, facilities, services, opportunities, public access, etc. <i>Most conversions exceed minor impacts. See Step 3.B</i>		This site has little, if any, use because the public prefers the 7 other sites in the Canyon that have parking lots & restrooms.			
16. Accessibility for populations with disabilities	X				
17. Overall aesthetics, special characteristics/features	X				
18. Historical/cultural resources, including landscapes, ethnographic, archeological, structures, etc. Attach SHPO/THPO determination.	X				
19. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure	X				
20. Minority and low-income populations	X				
21. Energy resources (geothermal, fossil fuels, etc.)	X				
22. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	X				
23. Land/structures with history of contamination/hazardous materials even if remediated	X				
24. Other important environmental resources to address.	X				

B. MANDATORY CRITERIA <i>Conversion Site: Yakima River (Martin)</i> If your LWCF proposal is approved, would it...	Yes	No	To be determined
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?		No.	
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands, wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (E.O. 11990); floodplains (E.O. 11988); and other ecologically significant or critical areas.		No.	
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA section 102(2)(E)]?		No.	
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		No.	
5. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		No.	
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		No.	
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office. (Attach SHPO/THPO Comments)		No.	
8. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.		No.	
9. Violate a federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		No.	
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		No.	
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		No.	
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?		No.	

### Environmental Reviewers

The following individual(s) provided input in the completion of the environmental screening form. List all reviewers including name, title, agency, field of expertise. Keep all environmental review records and data on this proposal in state compliance file for any future program review and/or audit. The ESF may be completed as part of a LWCF pre-award site inspection if conducted in time to contribute to the environmental review process for the proposal.

- Elyse Kane**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 6, WDFW, B.S.(1979), J.D.(1985), environmental law, real estate law, and public land management.
- Leah Hendrix**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 3, WDFW, real estate agent and recreation site manager.

The following individuals conducted a site inspection to verify field conditions.

List name of inspector(s), title, agency, and date(s) of inspection.

- Elyse Kane**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 6, WDFW, March 2 and Sept. 30, 2010
- Leah Hendrix**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 3, WDFW, Sept. 30, 2010
- Jim Anest**, Conversion Specialist, Recreation & Conservation Office, Sept. 30, 2010

State may require signature of

LWCF sub-recipient applicant here: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Replacement Site #1: 26-acre Canyon parcel**

A. ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES Indicate potential for adverse impacts. Use a separate sheet to clarify responses per instructions for Part A on page 9.	Not Applicable- Resource does not exist	No/Negligible Impacts- Exists but no or negligible impacts	Minor Impacts	Impacts Exceed Minor EA/EIS required	More Data Needed to Determine Degree of Impact EA/EIS required
1. Geological resources: soils, bedrock, slopes, streambeds, landforms, etc.		No negative impact.			
2. Air quality		No negative impact.			
3. Sound (noise impacts)	X				
4. Water quality/quantity	Yakima River is not accessible (below cliff).				
5. Stream flow characteristics	X				
6. Marine/estuarine	X				
7. Floodplains/wetlands		Protected; no access.			
8. Land use/ownership patterns; property values; community livability		No negative impact: will pay appraised value.			
9. Circulation, transportation	X				
10. Plant/animal/fish species of special concern and habitat; state/federal listed or proposed for listing	X				
11. Unique ecosystems, such as biosphere reserves, World Heritage sites, old growth forests, etc.	X				
12. Unique or important wildlife/ wildlife habitat	X				
13. Unique or important fish/habitat	X				
14. Introduce or promote invasive species (plant or animal)	X				
15. Recreation resources, land, parks, open space, conservation areas, rec. trails, facilities, services, opportunities, public access, etc. <i>Most conversions exceed minor impacts. See Step 3.B</i>		No change. Site is surrounded by Wenas Wildlife Area.			
16. Accessibility for populations with disabilities	X				
17. Overall aesthetics, special characteristics/features	X				
18. Historical/cultural resources, including landscapes, ethnographic, archeological, structures, etc. Attach SHPO/THPO determination.	Not triggered: no ground disturbance and no structures.				
19. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure	X				
20. Minority and low-income populations	X				
21. Energy resources (geothermal, fossil fuels, etc.)	X				
22. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	X				
23. Land/structures with history of contamination/hazardous materials even if remediated	X				
24. Other important environmental resources to address.	X				

B. MANDATORY CRITERIA <i>Replacement Site #1: 26-acre Canyon parcel</i> If your LWCF proposal is approved, would it...	Yes	No	To be determined
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?		No.	
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands, wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (E.O. 11990); floodplains (E.O. 11988); and other ecologically significant or critical areas.		No.	
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA section 102(2)(E)]?		No.	
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		No.	
5. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		No.	
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		No.	
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office.(Attach SHPO/THPO Comments)		No.	
8. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.		No.	
9. Violate a federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		No.	
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		No.	
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		No.	
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?		No.	

### Environmental Reviewers

The following individual(s) provided input in the completion of the environmental screening form. List all reviewers including name, title, agency, field of expertise. Keep all environmental review records and data on this proposal in state compliance file for any future program review and/or audit. The ESF may be completed as part of a LWCF pre-award site inspection if conducted in time to contribute to the environmental review process for the proposal.

1. **Elyse Kane**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 6, WDFW, B.S.(1979), J.D.(1985), environmental law, real estate law, and public land management.
2. **Leah Hendrix**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 3, WDFW, real estate agent and recreation site manager.
3. **Gregory Lish**, Associate Geologist, Pacific Crest Environmental, Environmental Professional as defined in 312.10 of 40 CFR Part 312, prepared the Phase I Environmental Assessment Report.

The following individuals conducted a site inspection to verify field conditions.

List name of inspector(s), title, agency, and date(s) of inspection.

1. **Gregory Lish**, Associate Geologist, Pacific Crest Environmental, Oct. 12, 2010.
2. **Elyse Kane**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 6, WDFW, Sept. 30, 2010 [viewed from river].
3. **Leah Hendrix**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 3, WDFW, Sept. 30, 2010 [viewed from river].

State may require signature of

LWCF sub-recipient applicant here: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Replacement Site #2: Old Highway 10 near Thorp on Yakima River**

<b>A. ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES</b> Indicate potential for adverse impacts. Use a separate sheet to clarify responses per instructions for Part A on page 9.	<b>Not Applicable-</b> Resource does not exist	<b>No/Negligible Impacts-</b> Exists but no or negligible impacts	<b>Minor Impacts</b>	<b>Impacts Exceed Minor EA/EIS required</b>	<b>More Data Needed to Determine Degree of Impact EA/EIS required</b>
1. Geological resources: soils, bedrock, slopes, streambeds, landforms, etc.		No change. Gravel launch already exists.			
2. Air quality		No negative impact.			
3. Sound (noise impacts)	X				
4. Water quality/quantity		No impact.			
5. Stream flow characteristics		No impact.			
6. Marine/estuarine	X				
7. Floodplains/wetlands	X				
8. Land use/ownership patterns; property values; community livability		No negative impact: will pay appraised value.			
9. Circulation, transportation	X				
10. Plant/animal/fish species of special concern and habitat; state/federal listed or proposed for listing	X				
11. Unique ecosystems, such as biosphere reserves, World Heritage sites, old growth forests, etc.	X				
12. Unique or important wildlife/ wildlife habitat	X				
13. Unique or important fish/habitat	X				
14. Introduce or promote invasive species (plant or animal)	X				
15. Recreation resources, land, parks, open space, conservation areas, rec. trails, facilities, services, opportunities, public access, etc. <i>Most conversions exceed minor impacts. See Step 3.B</i>		No negative impact.			
16. Accessibility for populations with disabilities	X				
17. Overall aesthetics, special characteristics/features	X				
18. Historical/cultural resources, including landscapes, ethnographic, archeological, structures, etc. Attach SHPO/THPO determination.	Not triggered: no ground disturbance and no structures.				
19. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure	X				
20. Minority and low-income populations	X				
21. Energy resources (geothermal, fossil fuels, etc.)	X				
22. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	X				
23. Land/structures with history of contamination/hazardous materials even if remediated	X				
24. Other important environmental resources to address.	X				

B. MANDATORY CRITERIA <i>Replacement Site #2: Old Hwy 10/Thorp</i> If your LWCF proposal is approved, would it...	Yes	No	To be determined
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?		No.	
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands, wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (E.O. 11990); floodplains (E.O. 11988); and other ecologically significant or critical areas.		No.	
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA section 102(2)(E)]?		No.	
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		No.	
5. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		No.	
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		No.	
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office. (Attach SHPO/THPO Comments)		No.	
8. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.		No.	
9. Violate a federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		No.	
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		No.	
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		No.	
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?		No.	

### Environmental Reviewers

The following individual(s) provided input in the completion of the environmental screening form. List all reviewers including name, title, agency, field of expertise. Keep all environmental review records and data on this proposal in state compliance file for any future program review and/or audit. The ESF may be completed as part of a LWCF pre-award site inspection if conducted in time to contribute to the environmental review process for the proposal.

1. **Elyse Kane**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 6, WDFW, B.S.(1979), J.D.(1985), environmental law, real estate law, and public land management.
2. **Leah Hendrix**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 3, WDFW, real estate agent and recreation site manager.
3. **Gregory Lish**, Associate Geologist, Pacific Crest Environmental, Environmental Professional as defined in 312.10 of 40 CFR Part 312, prepared the Phase I Environmental Assessment Report.

The following individuals conducted a site inspection to verify field conditions.

List name of inspector(s), title, agency, and date(s) of inspection.

1. **Elyse Kane**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 6, WDFW, Sept. 30, 2010.
2. **Leah Hendrix**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 3, WDFW, Sept. 30, 2010.
3. **Gregory Lish**, Associate Geologist, Pacific Crest Environmental, Oct. 12, 2010.

State may require signature of

LWCF sub-recipient applicant here: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Replacement Site #3: Mesa Ponds, Franklin County**

A. ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES Indicate potential for adverse impacts. Use a separate sheet to clarify responses per instructions for Part A on page 9.	Not Applicable- Resource does not exist	No/Negligible Impacts- Exists but no or negligible impacts	Minor Impacts	Impacts Exceed Minor EA/EIS required	More Data Needed to Determine Degree of Impact EA/EIS required
1. Geological resources: soils, bedrock, slopes, streambeds, landforms, etc.		Soils exist, but no impact.			
2. Air quality		No impact to air quality.			
3. Sound (noise impacts)	X				
4. Water quality/quantity		No impact to water quality.			
5. Stream flow characteristics	X				
6. Marine/estuarine	X				
7. Floodplains/wetlands		No impact to wetlands.			
8. Land use/ownership patterns; property values; community livability		No negative impact: will pay appraised value.			
9. Circulation, transportation	X				
10. Plant/animal/fish species of special concern and habitat; state/federal listed or proposed for listing	X				
11. Unique ecosystems, such as biosphere reserves, World Heritage sites, old growth forests, etc.	X				
12. Unique or important wildlife/ wildlife habitat	X				
13. Unique or important fish/habitat	X				
14. Introduce or promote invasive species (plant or animal)	X				
15. Recreation resources, land, parks, open space, conservation areas, rec. trails, facilities, services, opportunities, public access, etc. <i>Most conversions exceed minor impacts. See Step 3.B</i>		No negative impact.			
16. Accessibility for populations with disabilities	X				
17. Overall aesthetics, special characteristics/features	X				
18. Historical/cultural resources, including landscapes, ethnographic, archeological, structures, etc. Attach SHPO/THPO determination.	Not triggered: no ground disturbance and no structures.				
19. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure	X				
20. Minority and low-income populations	X				
21. Energy resources (geothermal, fossil fuels, etc.)	X				
22. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	X				
23. Land/structures with history of contamination/hazardous materials even if remediated	X				
24. Other important environmental resources to address.	X				

<b>B. MANDATORY CRITERIA Replacement Site #3: Mesa Ponds</b> If your LWCF proposal is approved, would it...	Yes	No	To be determined
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?		No.	
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands, wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (E.O. 11990); floodplains (E.O 11988); and other ecologically significant or critical areas.		No.	
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA section 102(2)(E)]?		No.	
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		No.	
5. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		No.	
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		No.	
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office.(Attach SHPO/THPO Comments)		No.	
8. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.		No.	
9. Violate a federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		No.	
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		No.	
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		No.	
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?		No.	

### Environmental Reviewers

The following individual(s) provided input in the completion of the environmental screening form. List all reviewers including name, title, agency, field of expertise. Keep all environmental review records and data on this proposal in state compliance file for any future program review and/or audit. The ESF may be completed as part of a LWCF pre-award site inspection if conducted in time to contribute to the environmental review process for the proposal.

1. **Elyse Kane**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 6, WDFW, B.S.(1979), J.D.(1985), environmental law, real estate law, and public land management.
2. **Leah Hendrix**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 3, WDFW, real estate agent and recreation site manager.
3. **Tammy Ulvan**, Environmental Scientist, The Empirical Company, prepared the Phase I Environmental Assessment Report.

The following individuals conducted a site inspection to verify field conditions.

List name of inspector(s), title, agency, and date(s) of inspection.

1. **Elyse Kane**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 6, WDFW, Nov. 7, 2010.
2. **Leah Hendrix**, Property & Acquisition Specialist 3, WDFW, Nov. 19, 2010.
3. **Tammy Ulvan**, Environmental Scientist, The Empirical Company, June 18, 19, 2009.

State may require signature of

LWCF sub-recipient applicant here: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Step 7. Recommended NEPA Pathway and State Appraisal/Waiver Valuation

First, consult the attached list of "Categorical Exclusions (CEs) for Which a Record is Needed." If you find your action in the CE list **and** you have determined in Step 6A that impacts will be minor or less for each applicable environmental resource on the ESF **and** you answered "no" to all of the "Mandatory Criteria" questions in Step 6B, the proposal qualifies for a CE. Complete the following "State LWCF Environmental Recommendations" box indicating the CE recommendation.

If you find your action in the CE list **and** you have determined in Step 6A that impacts will be greater than minor or that more data is needed for any of the resources **and** you answered "no" to **all** of the "Mandatory Criteria" questions, your environmental review team may choose to do additional analysis to determine the context, duration, and intensity of the impacts of your project or may wish to revise the proposal to minimize impacts to meet the CE criteria. If impacts remain at the greater than minor level, the State/sponsor must prepare an EA for the proposal. Complete the following "State Environmental Recommendations" box indicating the need for an EA.

If you do not find your action in the CE list, regardless of your answers in Step 6, you must prepare an EA or EIS. Complete the following "State Environmental Recommendations" box indicating the need for an EA or EIS.

### State NEPA Pathway Recommendation

I certify that a site inspection was conducted for each site involved in this proposal and to the best of my knowledge, the information provided in this LWCF Proposal Description and Environmental Screening Form (PD/ESF) is accurate based on available resource data. All resulting notes, reports and inspector signatures are stored in the state's NEPA file for this proposal and are available upon request. On the basis of the environmental impact information for this LWCF proposal as documented in this LWCF PD/ESF with which I am familiar, I recommend the following LWCF NEPA pathway:

- This proposal qualifies for a Categorical Exclusion (CE).
  - CE Item #:
  - Explanation:
- This proposal requires an Environmental Assessment (EA) which is attached and has been produced by the State/sponsor in accordance with the LWCF Program Manual.
- This proposal may require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). NPS guidance is requested per the LWCF Program Manual.

*Reproduce this certificate as necessary. Complete for each LWCF appraisal or waiver valuation.*

### State Appraisal/Waiver Valuation Review

**Property address:**

**Date of appraisal transmittal letter/waiver:**

**Real property value: \$**

**Effective date of value:**

I certify that:  a State-certified Review Appraiser has reviewed the appraisal and has determined that it was prepared in conformity with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions.

OR

the State has reviewed and approved a waiver valuation for this property per 49 CFR 24.102(c)(2)(ii).

SLO/ASLO Original Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Typed Name, Title, Agency