SEPA
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. Background [help]

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: [help]
   North Potholes and Frenchman Prescription Burn

2. Name of applicant: [help]
   Emily Grabowsky – Northern Leopard Frog Biologist, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person: [help]
   Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
   c/o Emily Grabowsky
   1550 Alder Street NW
   Ephrata, WA 98823

   509-699-9859
   Emily.grabowsky@dfw.wa.gov

4. Date checklist prepared: [help]
   December 20, 2019

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

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): [help]
   January 2020 – February 2020
   Work would occur when water levels are lowest, vegetation is dormant, and amphibians are still over-wintering, which would occur between January and February.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain. [help]
   Yes- additional prescribed burns may be necessary when emergent vegetation grows back. However, vegetation dense enough to impede Northern leopard frog reproduction/ foraging likely won't be grow back for several years.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal. [help]
   Cultural Resources Survey (attached)
   NEPA- Environmental Assessment

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. [help]

None known

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

Cultural Resource Survey (attached)

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.) [help]

The overarching goal of this project is to use prescribed burning to improve wetland habitat for native wildlife in Columbia Basin Wildlife Area (CBWA). Specifically, the project objectives are to improve breeding and foraging habitat in the North Potholes unit for northern leopard frogs (*Lithobates pipiens*; WA State Endangered Species and Species of Special Concern) and improve nesting habitat in the Frenchman unit for waterfowl and other migratory birds.

Northern leopard frogs are negatively associated with tall emergent vegetation (TEV) and select for environments with less than 20% TEV (Germaine and Hays 2007; WDFW SWAP 2015, page A3-31, NLF Stressor). Management is required in CBWA to address shallow wetlands dominated by tall emergent vegetation. Current vegetation management strategies last about 1-3 years before conditions return to pre-treatment levels. By combining burning and spraying TEV treatments will last 3-5 years.

Vegetation control was initiated in late summer 2019 with a herbicide treatment. The herbicide that was used was Imazapyr (tradenames Polaris and others), formulated labeled for aquatic use. Prescribed burning will target the shorelines of approximately 35 defined ponds in North Potholes, roughly 100 shoreline acres. Approximately 151 acres of wetland habitat will be targeted for burning in the Frenchman area (Figure 1- attached). In both areas, shoreline wetland vegetation will be converted to an early successional state more conducive to northern leopard frog reproduction and waterfowl nesting through prescribed burning. The prescribed burn would be implemented between January and February 2020.

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. [help]

The location of these proposed prescribed burn sites are in two distinct areas, both within Columbia Basin Wildlife Area (CBWA). The North Potholes project area is ~ 7 miles southwest of Moses Lake in Grant County Washington. The access point for these burn areas is approximately 2 mi southwest of the intersection of Hansen Rd. and Interstate 90. Project coordinates include 47 5.800 N -119 24.427 W

(pond unit West C), 47 5.633 N -119 23.420 W (pond unit C), 47 5.779 N -119 21.813 W (pond unit G), 47 4.900 N -119 22.199 W (pond unit B). The townships/ranges/sections for these areas are T19 R28 S31, T19 R27 S34-S36, T18 R27 S1 (see Figure 2- attached).

The Frenchman area is located off of Frenchman Hills Rd E, approximately 0.7 mi north of the intersection of Hwy 262 and Frenchman Hills Rd E. Project coordinates for the Frenchman area are 46 58.023 N -119 28.209 W and township/range/section are T17 R27 S17 (see Figure 3- attached).

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS [help]

1. Earth [help]

a. General description of the site: [help]
(circle one): **Flat**, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other _____

The landscape is generally flat with a series of shallow depressions with riparian habitat (pothole ponds) between low ridges less than 5m in height.

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

0-15% (sources: Soil Survey of Grant County, USDA 1984, Frenchman Hills Wetland Delineation Report 2016)

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils. [help]

The North Potholes site is composed of 97- Quincy fine sand and 176- Wanser-Quincy fine sand. The Frenchman site is composed of 69- Koehler loamy fine sand and 36- Ekrub fine sand. These soil types have low available water capacity, though they are often used as rangeland and crops can be grown with the aid of frequent irrigation. All these soils can classified as VIe when irrigated (limitations for agriculture due to wind erosion) and VIIe, nonirrigated (Soil Survey of Grant Co., USDA 1984, Frenchman Hills Wetland Delineation Report 2016).

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

The soils on this site are prone to wind erosion and there is evidence of past active dune movement; however, most sites within the project area are now stabilized by vegetation to control wind erosion.

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

This project will not involve filling, excavation, or grading.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe. [help]

No, only riparian vegetation already treated with herbicide will be effected. Additionally, annual forbs and grasses are prolific and should stabilize wetland shorelines.

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

None

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

None

2. Air [help]

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

Emissions from the prescribed fire would be released during burning. Agreements with the North Coast Air Quality Management District (NCAQMD) Smoke Management Plan (SMP) will be established before burning. The Burn Boss will determine if conditions meet standards set by the agreement.

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

No

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

Personal will monitor weather conditions in the area and ignition operations will be modified/halted if these conditions are deemed to result in excessive emissions per the NCAQMD SMP plan.

3. **Water** [help]

a. Surface Water:

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. [help]

The project site is a series of wetlands within close-proximity to Potholes Reservoir and Frenchman Hills Wasteway. Potholes Reservoir and Frenchman Hills Wasteway are both part of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Project, facilitating irrigation of hundreds of acres of agricultural land. Potholes Reservoir is a permeant water body fed by several wastways and Crab Creek Channel. The Frenchman Hills Wasteway is used to carry irrigation run-off from agricultural lands to the southwestern portion of Potholes Reservoir.

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. [help]

The proposed work will clear tall emergent vegetation in wetlands surrounding the Frenchman Hills Wasteway (Figure 1- attached).

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. [help]

None

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

No

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

Yes.

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. [help]

No waste material would be discharged into surface waters, though charred debris will likely enter ponds in North Potholes and the Frenchman Hills Wasteway.

b. Ground Water:

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

No

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. [help]

Not Applicable

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe. [help]

Low precipitation (< 9"/year) combined with permeable soils should allow for very little runoff in the project areas. If runoff occurs, it will collect in the ponds targeted for prescribed burn or the Frenchman Wasteway. Runoff is unlikely to be increased because of the proposed project.

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

Not Applicable

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

No

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

Not applicable

4. **Plants** [help]

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site: [help]

___ deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
___ evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
_x_ shrubs
_x_ grass
___ pasture
___ crop or grain
___ Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
_x_ 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? [help]

Approximately 100 shoreline-acres of late-successional emergent wetland vegetation would be burned (*Phragmites* species, bulrush, cattails). Adjacent upland vegetation will not be targeted and will experience minimal alteration (<2 acres).

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

No federally threatened or endangered species are known to use the site. One state endangered species (Northern leopard frog) is found in the North Potholes site.

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

None, all vegetation will reestablish naturally

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

Phragmites spp. (non-native), reed canary grass, Russian olives, carp, mosquitofish, bullfrogs

5. **Animals** [help]

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

Birds: American white pelican, 9 hawk species, 5 owl species, great-blue herons, 19 duck species, Canada geese, grebes, swans, double-crested cormorants, terns, gulls, killdeer, rails, doves, and many songbird species

Mammals: deer, coyote, muskrat, beaver, raccoons, small rodents and insectivores, bats, mink, skunks and weasels

Herpetofauna: northern leopard frogs (state endangered), bullfrogs (non-native), tiger salamanders, painted turtles, garter snake, gopher snakes, pacific chorus frogs, spadefoot toads

Fish: Non-natives, including carp, largemouth bass, bluegill, mosquitofish. Remote possibility a few native species survive the water conditions and are able to make their way into this stretch of the waterway from Potholes Reservoir or Crab Creek.

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

Northern leopard frogs (state endangered)

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

Yes. The site is located within the Pacific Flyway and is used extensively by waterfowl, raptors, shorebirds and songbirds during annual migrations.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any: [help]

Proposed burning is intended to improve wetland function and increase open water, improve amphibian breeding/foraging habitat, and improve bird nesting/loafing habitat.

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

Bullfrogs, carp, bluegill, mosquitofish, largemouth bass

6. **Energy and Natural Resources** [help]

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. [help]

Not applicable

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

No

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: [help]

Not applicable

7. **Environmental Health** [help]

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. [help]

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

Burn equipment could leak small quantities of fuel accidentally. Equipment will be checked prior to work to ensure no leaks are evident.

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

Not applicable

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

Small (<5 gallon) cans of gasoline and oil may be brought to the site and stored on trucks for refueling burn equipment.

4) Describe special emergency services that might be required. [help]
Human injuries would be dealt with by on-site staff. 911 would be called for any emergency situation, with the nearest hospital approximately 9 miles from the project area. Staff will have cell phones, cell reception, and no one will work alone while burning.

5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any: [help]
Exposure of the burn team to poor air quality could occur. The burn crew will wear all required equipment to prevent any unnecessary exposure to smoke.

b. Noise [help]

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)? [help]
No local activities are expected to affect the project.

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. [help]
Short-term noise would include that produced by vehicle traffic and burning activities. No long-term noise will arise.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any: [help]
None. There will be minimal noise and the project area is over 1.5km from residential areas.

8. Land and Shoreline Use [help]

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe. [help]
The project site provides valuable habitat for waterfowl and other wildlife. It is used by recreationists for hiking, bird-watching, and hunting. Adjacent properties are natural areas including a wildlife reserve, which provides valuable habitat and refuge for wildlife. A field adjacent to the burn area is used for crops (i.e. mint) and will not be effected by the burn.

b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use? [help]
No

1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how: [help]
No

c. Describe any structures on the site. [help]
There are no structures on site.

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

No

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site? [help]

Public open space

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

Fish and wildlife management areas within the Columbia Basin Wildlife Area (Critical Area Ordinance, Grant County GMA).

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

Natural

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

No

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

None

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

None

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

Not applicable

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

The work will not change the land uses in any way. The proposed work will help us achieve management objectives outlined in the Northern leopard frog .

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

Not applicable

9. **Housing** [help]

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

10. **Aesthetics** [help]

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any: [help]

Not applicable

11. **Light and Glare** [help]

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

12. **Recreation** [help]

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

Hunting, fishing, hiking, bird-watching, camping, boating

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

No

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

Not applicable

13. **Historic and cultural preservation** [help]

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

No

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

No

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

The WDFW State Lands cultural resource specialist meets federal and state standards for a professional archaeologist, and led the state review for this project. Because the project has a federal nexus with the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR, the landowner), this project will be subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Information and recommendations developed during the state review will be used in the Section 106 review, led by BOR archaeologist Karina Bryan.

Actions taken thus far for cultural resource review include informal tribal consultation with Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation archaeologists, desktop review, and field reconnaissance. Because the project will undergo Section 106 review, it will be subject to further examination by the BOR archaeologist and consultation with the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) and interested Tribes.

Desktop review included examination of the APE and a two-mile buffer in the WISAARD database to identify recorded archaeological and historical resources, to find and read prior cultural resource studies in the vicinity, and to consider the APE with regard to the Statewide Archaeological Predictive Model (SAPM). In addition, historical maps were examined, including the following:

GLO Cadastral Survey Maps, 17E/27N (1882), 18N/27E (1884), 19N/27E (1884), 19N/28E (1882)
USGS 1:62,500 Moses Lake Quad, 1912 edition and reprints dated 1933, 1939, 1945, and 1949
USGS 1:62,500 Moses Lake Quad, 1960 edition
USGS 1:62,500 Corfu quad, 1923 edition, 1951 edition and reprint dated 1965
USGS 1:24,000 Mae quad, 1956 edition and reprint dated 1960
USGS 1:24,000 Moses Lake South quad, 1956 edition

Additional desktop review considered the findings of previous archaeological studies and ethnographic information in relation to environmental factors, in order to evaluate the overall likelihood and specific functional and chronological aspects of cultural resources in and near the APE. Emphasis is placed on ethnographic and historic knowledge of land use, geological and soil substrate, hydrology (in particular, effects caused by irrigation and prior climate change), terrain and topography, and natural resources with cultural values that may be present.

Finally, WDFW archaeologists Maurice Major and Katherine Kelly performed field reconnaissance in order to search for buildings or other above-ground structures of historic age and to evaluate survey conditions (mineral soil visibility, access, intactness/disturbance). Because not all areas were directly accessible, this reconnaissance included a combination of windshield surveys, pedestrian survey, and binocular surveys of unreachable areas.

Detailed description of the Area of Potential Effect, review methodology, findings, and conclusions have been

included in a Cultural Resource Assessment Report prepared by Maurice Major in December, 2019. The report is titled "Cultural Resource Assessment for Columbia Basin Weed Control and Habitat Improvement Project" and will be submitted to DAHP by BOR as part of the Section 106 review.

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

Desktop review and reconnaissance have concluded that there are no historical structures and a low potential for archaeological resources in the project area. No further work prior to project implementation has been recommended, but the following actions have been recommended during and after the prescribed burn:

- The project will be conducted subject to an Inadvertent Discovery Plan (IDP)
- Prescribed burn crews be advised of possible cultural resources and IDP procedures
- WDFW archaeologists or contractors will conduct surface survey of at least 50% of burned areas following prescribed fire.
- WDFW will work with tribal cultural resource professionals to survey portions of the APE after burning to identify culturally important plants.

Staff cultural resource specialists at WDFW will remain in contact with BOR through the Section 106 review process, and will work with BOR to address any additional cultural resource requirements that may emerge from that process.

14. **Transportation** [help]

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

The site is not within ¼ mile of any paved public road. Dirt roads are adjacent to the project area and allow public access, but will not be impacted by the proposed burn.

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

No. The nearest public transportation (bus or train stop) is over 5 miles from the site.

c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate? [help]

No new parking areas will be created.

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

No

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

No

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates? [help]

None

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

No

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any: [help]

Not applicable

15. **Public Services** [help]

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

No

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

Not applicable

16. **Utilities** [help]

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

None

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. [help]

None

References

Germaine, S. and D. Hays. 2009. Distribution and Post-breeding Environmental Relationships of Northern Leopard Frogs (*Rana* [*Lithobates*] *pipiens*) in Grant County, Washington. Western North American Naturalist: 537-547.

WDFW SWAP. 2015. Washington's State Wildlife Action Plan: 2015 Update. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia

C. Signature [help]

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: _____

Name of signee Emily Grabowsky

Position and Agency/Organization Biologist - WDFW

Date Submitted: 1/15/2020