

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. You may use "not applicable" or "does not apply" only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown. You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

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.

Instructions for Lead Agencies:

Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B plus the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in Part B - Environmental Elements –that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

A. Background

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Addendum to the Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan

2. Name of applicant:

Grays Harbor County

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

Mark Cox, Director of Utilities and Community Development
100 West Broadway, Suite 31
Montesano, WA 98563
(360) 249-4222
Email - pbd@co.grays-harbor.wa.us

4. Date checklist prepared:

September 25, 2020

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Washington State Department of Ecology

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

The Streamflow Restoration law mandated that the Chehalis Basin Partnership, acting under authority of RCW 90.82, update the Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan to explicitly address future permit-exempt domestic groundwater withdrawals over the next 20 years, the potential impacts of those forecasted withdrawals on streamflows, and strategies to offset those impacts. The deadline for Partnership approval and Ecology adoption of the Plan Addendum is February 1, 2021. Individual offset projects or actions were implemented starting in 2019 and will continue through 2040.

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

Following the adoption of the addendum to the Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan by Grays Harbor, Lewis, Mason and Thurston Counties and other Partnership member groups, the Chehalis Basin Partnership will start working on implementation, including prioritizing projects and supporting sponsors to take on projects to ensure the Plan is implemented into the future. Individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed by the Partnership at the time they are proposed for Ecology funding.

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

- Northwest Hydraulic Consultants Inc. (2020). Chehalis Watershed (WRIA 22/23) Response to 2018 Streamflow Restoration Law: Addendum to the Chehalis Watershed Management Plan —DRAFT.
- Final EIS for Watershed Planning under Chapter 90.82 RCW, Department of Ecology Publication #03-06-013. In addition, the Partnership compiled all known water-related information about the geographic area, including reports from various agencies. A bibliography is included as a supplemental appendix to the Plan.
- SEPA Environmental Checklist for the Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan, April 9, 2004, DNS Issued.
- Chehalis Basin Salmon Restoration and Preservation Strategy (Lead Entity Program) and Chehalis Basin Aquatic Species Restoration Program, on which the Chehalis Basin Partnership based the Net Ecological Benefit (NEB) of the proposed projects to offset forecasted withdrawals on streamflows.

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.

Considering the scope (both with respect to location and time involved) of this project, there are undoubtedly applications on file.

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

RCW 90.94 requires an update to the Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan related to future permit-exempt wells be developed by the Planning Unit and approved by the Department of Ecology by February 1, 2021. The Chehalis Basin Partnership (i.e., full voting rights participants with or without formal membership) will adopt the addendum to the plan. Individual offset actions or projects will be subject to any government approvals or permitting processes in place at the time they are proposed.

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 Partnership was formed through an intergovernmental agreement on August 31, 1998 and consists of tribes, counties, cities, water supply utilities, state agencies, major stakeholder interests, and citizens at-large from each county. The Partnership works collaboratively on water management issues to promote environmentally sound, economical, and equitable management of the water in the Chehalis Basin (Water Resource Inventory Areas [WRIA] 22 and 23). The Partnership is unique in the Chehalis Basin, with inclusive membership that spans governmental agencies, tribes, and stakeholder interests and a full consensus decision-making model.

Acting under authority of the 1998 Watershed Management Act (chapter 90.82 RCW), with Grays Harbor County as the Lead Agency, the Chehalis Basin Partnership developed and

approved the Plan on April 13, 2004 (Chehalis Basin Partnership, 2004), which was adopted by each of its participating counties. It was the second watershed plan adopted by a local Planning Unit in the state, highlighting the successful collaborative nature of the Partnership. As a follow-up to the Plan, the Partnership developed and approved the Detailed Implementation Plan in June 2009 (Chehalis Basin Partnership, 2009), further outlining a comprehensive approach for accomplishing the 2004 Plan's goals through prioritized strategies and interim milestones.

In January 2018, the Washington State Legislature passed ESSB 6091, a new law addressing the 2016 Whatcom County vs. Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board Washington Supreme Court decision, commonly referred to as the "Hirst Decision." The Hirst Decision required counties, not the Department of Ecology (Ecology), to independently determine that the impacts from proposed new domestic permit-exempt well connections required for development applications would not impair senior water rights, including established minimum instream flow rules. The Legislature responded to the court ruling by passing the Streamflow Restoration law, which was codified in Chapter 90.94 Revised Code of Washington (RCW). The law directs Planning Units in each WRIA with approved watershed plans, such as the Partnership, to assess potential streamflow impacts from future permit-exempt well Chehalis Watershed (WRIA 22/23) Response to 2018 Streamflow Restoration Law 2 Addendum to the Chehalis Watershed Management Plan Draft Addendum use, and to identify projects and actions to offset those impacts, resulting in a Net Ecological Benefit (NEB) to the WRIA.

The Streamflow Restoration law directs Ecology to work with the Partnership to develop the watershed plan addendum. The law also requires that each county in the Partnership record limitations associated with water supply with the property title, collect a fee of \$500 from each building permit application (\$350 of which is transmitted to Ecology), record the number of building permits and transmit an account of building permits and subdivision approvals subject to the law annually, and limit the withdrawal exemption for an application to a maximum annual average of 3,000 gallons per day (gpd)/connection.

Individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed. At this time, these projects or actions have not been identified or described and cannot be evaluated for specific impacts, but are acknowledged in general as potentially occurring.

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.

WRIA 22 and WRIA 23 (Chehalis Basin), which cover portions of Grays Harbor, Lewis, Thurston, Mason, Pacific, Cowlitz, Jefferson, and Wahkiakum Counties.

B. Environmental Elements

1. Earth

a. General description of the site:

(circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other _____

The Chehalis Basin is the largest river basin in Western Washington, extending over eight counties and encompassing approximately 2,800 square miles. The Basin is bounded on the west by the Pacific Ocean, on the east by the Deschutes Basin, the north by the Olympic Mountains, and the south by the Cowlitz Basin.

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

Elevations vary from sea level at Grays Harbor to approximately 5,000 feet on Capitol Peak in the Olympic Mountains.

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.

The geology of the Chehalis Basin varies widely and reflects the complex geologic history of the area (Chehalis Basin Partnership, 2004). The Basin has three distinct eco-regions: the Cascade ecoregion, the Puget Lowlands, and the Coast Range. The Cascade ecoregion and Coastal range are characterized by bedrock of both sedimentary and volcanic origin that is exposed on hill slopes and ridges. More recent depositions of glacial and alluvial sediments overlie these rock units in the Puget Lowlands.

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

Given the scope of this project and the area involved, there are likely areas of unstable soils within the project boundaries.

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.

No filling, excavation, or grading would occur as part of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

No clearing or construction will occur, thus no erosion would be expected as part of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

No impervious surfaces will be added to the action area as part of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

No impervious surfaces will be added and no filling, excavation, or grading will occur as part of the addendum approval, therefore no erosion control measures are required. However, as stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

2. Air

- 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.

No emissions would occur as part of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

No off-site sources of emissions or odor would affect the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

No measures would be required to reduce or control emissions as a result of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

3. Water

- 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.

The Chehalis Basin drainage system comprises the Chehalis River and several major river tributaries, including South Fork Chehalis, Newaukum, Skookumchuck, Black, Satsop, Wynoochee, Wishkah, and Hoquiam Rivers, and numerous tributary creeks. In addition, the Humptulips, Grays, Johns, and Elk Rivers flow directly into Grays Harbor and are part of the Chehalis Basin. Grays Harbor is the terminus for all rivers within the Chehalis Basin.

- 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.

The Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan makes recommendations that would guide work that will likely be adjacent to waters (lakes, streams, wetlands and salt water bodies). As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

- 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.

No fill or dredge material would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands as a result of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

Approval of The Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan addendum will not require withdrawals or diversions but would affect the location, timing, and amounts of diversions and withdrawals as part of individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum, each of which will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

Yes. The project area is 2,800 square miles and encompasses the 100-year floodplains of the river and tributary systems as noted in 3.a.1.

- 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.

No discharges of waste materials to surface water would occur as part of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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.

No withdrawals or discharges to groundwater would occur directly as part of this action. Refer to 3.a.4 of this checklist. The project will evaluate consumptive domestic water use from future permit-exempt domestic groundwater withdrawals and propose and develop and implement projects to offset these impacts. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

- 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.

No waste material would be discharged to groundwater as part of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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.

No runoff would occur as part of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

No waste materials would enter ground or surface water as part of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

Approval of the addendum would not directly alter or affect drainage patterns within the action area. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed for potential impacts.

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

No surface, ground, or runoff water impacts would occur as a direct result of the addendum approval. However, the Watershed Management Plan addendum proposes to evaluate forecasted groundwater withdrawals over the planning timeframe within the Chehalis Basin and propose strategies as appropriate to offset impacts to streamflows.

4. **Plants**

a. Check the 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
- ☒ orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
- ☒ wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
- ☒ water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- ☒ other types of vegetation

Because of the size of the action area, it is likely that all types of vegetation would be found within the Chehalis Basin boundaries.

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

No vegetation will be removed or altered as part of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

Grays Harbor County

Latin Name	Common Name	WA State Status
<i>Arcteranthus cooleyae</i> (<i>Ranunculus cooleyae</i>)	Cooley's buttercup	Threatened
<i>Arenaria paludicola</i>	swamp sandwort	Endangered
<i>Carex anthoxanthea</i>	yellow-flowered sedge	Threatened
<i>Carex circinata</i>	coiled sedge	Threatened
<i>Claytonia multiscapa ssp. pacifica</i>	Pacific lanceleaved spring beauty	Endangered
<i>Cochlearia groenlandica</i>	scurvygrass	Threatened
<i>Dodecatheon austrofrigidum</i>	frigid shootingstar	Endangered
<i>Erigeron peregrinus var. thompsonii</i>	Thompson's wandering daisy	Threatened
<i>Erythronium quinaultense</i>	Quinault fawn-lily	Threatened
<i>Polemonium carneum</i>	great polemonium	Threatened
<i>Sanguisorba menziesii</i>	Menzies' burnet	Threatened
<i>Sanicula arctopoides</i>	bear's-foot sanicle	Endangered

Lewis County

Latin Name	Common Name	WA State Status
<i>Delphinium leucophaeum</i>	pale larkspur	Endangered
<i>Eryngium petiolatum</i>	Oregon coyote-thistle	Threatened
<i>Lathyrus holochlorus</i>	thin-leaved peavine	Endangered
<i>Lathyrus torreyi</i>	Torrey's peavine	Threatened
<i>Lathyrus vestitus var. ochropetalus</i>	Pacific pea	Endangered
<i>Lupinus oreganus var. kincaidii</i>	Kincaid's sulphur lupine	Endangered
<i>Polemonium carneum</i>	great polemonium	Threatened
<i>Potentilla breweri</i> (<i>P. drummondii ssp. b.</i>)	Brewer's cinquefoil	Threatened
<i>Sidalcea hirtipes</i>	bristly-stemmed checkermallow	Threatened
<i>Sidalcea nelsoniana</i>	Nelson's checkermallow	Endangered

Thurston County

Latin Name	Common Name	WA State Status
<i>Castilleja levisecta</i>	golden paintbrush	Threatened
<i>Howellia aquatilis</i>	water howellia	Threatened
<i>Lathyrus vestitus</i> var. <i>ochropetalus</i>	Pacific pea	Endangered
<i>Nuttallanthus texanus</i> (<i>Linaria canadensis</i> var. <i>texana</i>)	Texas toadflax	Threatened
<i>Pityopus californicus</i>	pine-foot	Threatened
<i>Polemonium carneum</i>	great polemonium	Threatened
<i>Polystichum californicum</i>	California swordfern	Threatened
<i>Sidalcea virgata</i> (<i>S. malviflora</i> ssp. <i>virgata</i>)	rose checkermallow	Threatened
<i>Symphyotrichum hallii</i> (<i>Aster hallii</i>)	Hall's aster	Threatened
<i>Whipplea modesta</i>	yerba de selva	Threatened

Mason County

Latin Name	Common Name	WA State Status
<i>Claytonia multiscapa</i> ssp. <i>pacifica</i>	Pacific lanceleaved springbeauty	Endangered
<i>Cochlearia groenlandica</i>	scurvygrass	Threatened
<i>Howellia aquatilis</i>	water howellia	Threatened

Pacific County

Latin Name	Common Name	WA State Status
<i>Abronia umbellata</i> var. <i>acutalata</i> (<i>A. u.</i> ssp. <i>breviflora</i>)	pink sand-verbena	Endangered
<i>Baccharis pilularis</i> ssp. <i>consanguinea</i>	coyotebush	Threatened
<i>Carex macrochaeta</i>	longawn sedge	Threatened
<i>Dodecatheon austrofrigidum</i>	frigid shootingstar	Endangered
<i>Poa unilateralis</i> ssp. <i>pachypholis</i>	ocean-bluff bluegrass	Threatened
<i>Polemonium carneum</i>	great polemonium	Threatened
<i>Sanicula arctopoides</i>	bear's-foot sanicle	Endangered

Cowlitz County

Latin Name	Common Name	WA State Status
<i>Corydalis aquae-gelidae</i>	Clackamas corydalis	Threatened
<i>Sidalcea nelsoniana</i>	Nelson's checkermallow	Endangered

Jefferson County

Latin Name	Common Name	WA State Status
<i>Carex circinata</i>	coiled sedge	Threatened
<i>Castilleja levisecta</i>	golden paintbrush	Threatened
<i>Claytonia multiscapa</i> ssp. <i>pacifica</i>	Pacific lanceleaved springbeauty	Endangered
<i>Cochlearia groenlandica</i>	scurvygrass	Threatened
<i>Erigeron peregrinus</i> var. <i>thompsonii</i>	Thompson's wandering daisy	Threatened
<i>Erythronium quinaultense</i>	Quinault fawn-lily	Threatened

Wahkiakum County

Latin Name	Common Name	WA State Status
<i>Erigeron oreganus</i>	gorge daisy	Threatened
<i>Samolus parviflorus</i> (<i>S. valerandi</i> ssp. <i>p.</i>)	water pimpernel	Threatened
<i>Sidalcea hirtipes</i>	bristly-stemmed checkermallow	Threatened

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

No landscaping to preserve or enhance vegetation will occur as part of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

Grays Harbor County: The Grays Harbor County Noxious Weed Control Board has identified the following noxious weeds as species that must be controlled within the county: yellow archangel (*Lamiastrum galeobdolon*), gorse (*Ulex europaeus*), poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*), spotted knapweed (*Centaurea stoebe*), purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*), wand loosestrife (*Lythrum virgatum*), and tansy ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea*) (<https://www.nwcb.wa.gov/pdfs/Grays-Harbor-County.pdf>). Aquatic species identified as plants of concern include Brazilian elodea, parrotfeather, Japanese knotweed, and spartina in the tidal basin (<https://extension.wsu.edu/graysharbor/weeds/chehalis/>). Many other noxious and invasive weed species have been identified in Grays Harbor County (<https://www.nwcb.wa.gov/pdfs/Grays-Harbor-County.pdf>).

Lewis County: Lewis County has identified meadow knapweed (*Centaurea x moncktonii*), purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*), Brazilian elodea (*Egeria densa*), eurasian watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum* x *M. sibiricum*), tansy ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea*), knotweed species (*Polygonum* sp.), Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*), butterfly bush (*Buddleja davidii*), poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*) as priority weeds. Many other noxious and invasive weed species have been identified in Lewis County (https://lewiscountywa.gov/media/documents/2020__Lewis_Co_Weed_List_whole_page.pdf and <https://lewiscountywa.gov/departments/weed-control/identification/lewis-county-priority-weeds/>).

Thurston County: Widespread invasive species include: Evergreen blackberry (*Rubus laciniatus*), Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*), Eurasian watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*), Policeman's Helmet (*Impatiens glandulifera*), Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense*), Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*), yellow nutsedge (*Cyperus esculentus*), and the invasive cultivars of English Ivy (*Hedera* spp.). In addition, Thurston County has targeted 40 species of noxious weeds for control and monitors for the appears of others not yet found in the county (<https://www.co.thurston.wa.us/tcweeds/index.htm>).

Mason County: Noxious and invasive species of concern include poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*), European coltsfoot (*Tussilago farfara*), giant hogweed (*Heracleum mantegazzianum*), hawkweed (all non-native species of *Hieracium*), purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*), spotted knapweed (*Centaurea stoebe*), tansy ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea* also known as *Jacobaea vulgaris*). In addition, Mason County has identified more than 70 species that must either be eradicated or controlled (<https://www.co.mason.wa.us/forms/ac/noxious-weed/noxious-weed-list.pdf> and <https://extension.wsu.edu/mason/noxious-weed-program/weeds/>).

Pacific County: Noxious and invasive species of concern include gorse (*Ulex europaeus*), Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*), tansy ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea*), policeman's helmet (*Impatiens glandulifera*), parrotfeather (*Myriophyllum aquaticum*), purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*), and knotweed (four species, including giant knotweed (*Polygonum sachalinense*)). In addition, Pacific County has identified more than 60 species that must either be eradicated or controlled (<http://www.pcweeds.org/common-weeds.html> and http://www.pcweeds.org/uploads/9/8/2/7/98270862/2020_pacific_county_noxious_weed_list.pdf).

Cowlitz County: Noxious and invasive species of concern include knotweed (spp. including *Polygonum sachalinense*), spotted knapweed (*Centaurea stoebe*), purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*), yellowflag iris (*Iris pseudacorus*), yellow archangel (*Lamium galeobdolon*), policeman's helmet (*Impatiens glandulifera*), orange hawkweed (*Hieracium aurantiacum*), and Dalmatian toadflax (*Linaria dalmatica* ssp. *dalmatica*). In addition, Cowlitz County has identified more than 80 species that must either be eradicated or controlled (<https://www.co.cowlitz.wa.us/DocumentCenter/View/19664/2020-County-Noxious-Weed-List> and <https://www.co.cowlitz.wa.us/222/Noxious-Weeds>).

Jefferson County: The Jefferson County noxious weed list includes approximately 50 species that must either be eradicated or controlled, including purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*), variable-leaf milfoil (*Myriophyllum heterophyllum*), knapweed (*Centaurea* sp.), cordgrass (*Spartina* sp.), and policeman's helmet (*Impatiens glandulifera*), kudzu (*Pueraria montana* var. *lobata*). Jefferson County has also selected nine species from Class B and C lists for mandatory control, including yellow archangel (*Lamium galeobdolon*), poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*), and tansy ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea*) (<https://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/1082/2019-Weed-Lists>).

Wahkiakum County: Wahkiakum County has identified a number of noxious and invasive weeds that must either be controlled or eradicated, including purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*), tansy ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea*), (four species, including giant knotweed (*Polygonum sachalinense*), Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense*), Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*), poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*) (<https://www.waheagle.com/story/2009/06/18/news/war-against-noxious-weeds-begins-at-home/5021.html> and <https://www.co.wahkiakum.wa.us/255/Noxious-Weed-Control-Board>).

5. Animals

- 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.

Examples include: See below*

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:

mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:

fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other _____

- Because of the size and habitat diversity of the action area, it is likely that most types of birds and mammals listed above would be found within the Chehalis Basin boundaries.

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

Threatened and endangered species known to exist within the action area (Chehalis Basin) include:

- Northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis*); Federal status = threatened; State status = threatened (WDFW Priority Habitats and Species maps on the Web)
- Snowy Plover (*Charadrius nivosus*); Federal status = threatened; State status = endangered (<https://wdfw.wa.gov/sites/default/files/publications/01542/wdfw01542.pdf>)
- Marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*); Federal status = threatened; State status = endangered (<https://wdfw.wa.gov/species-habitats/species/brachyramphus-marmoratus>)
- Columbian white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus leucurus*); Federal status = threatened; State status = endangered
- Mazama pocket gopher (*Thomomys mazama* and *ssp.*); Federal status = threatened; State status = threatened; designated critical habitat
- Oregon spotted frog (*Rana pretiosa*); Federal status = threatened; State status = endangered; designated critical habitat
- Taylor's checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha taylori*); Federal status = endangered; State status = endangered; designated critical habitat
- Streaked horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris strigata*); Federal status = threatened; State status = endangered (<https://wdfw.wa.gov/species-habitats/species/eremophila-alpestris-strigata#conservation>)
- Western pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata*); Federal status = n/a; State status = endangered
- Oregon vesper sparrow (*Pooecetes gramineus affinis*); Federal status = species of concern; State status = candidate (<https://www.thurstoncountywa.gov/planning/Pages/hcp-species.aspx> and cross-references with USFWS and WDFW)
- Bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*); Federal status = threatened; State status = candidate (<https://wdfw.wa.gov/species-habitats/species/salvelinus-confluentus#locations>)
- Olympic mudminnow (*Novumbra hubbsi*); Federal status = not listed; State status = Sensitive (WDFW Priority Habitats and Species maps on the Web)

Sources:

- Washington Department Fish and Wildlife, Threatened and Endangered Species, <https://wdfw.wa.gov/species-habitats/at-risk/listed>
- WDFW Priority Habitats and Species maps on the Web, <https://wdfw.wa.gov/species-habitats/at-risk/phs/maps>
- State of Washington Threatened and Endangered Wildlife, Annual Report 2012, <https://wdfw.wa.gov/sites/default/files/publications/01542/wdfw01542.pdf>

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

Because of the size of the action area, it is quite certain that bird, mammal, or fish migration routes would be found within the Chehalis Basin boundaries. It is within the Pacific Flyway for water fowl. Elk and deer migrate out of high elevations during winter months.

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

The Chehalis Basin Water management Plan includes measures that will protect, and in some cases enhance, wildlife habitat. One of the intents of the Plan is to identify and

recommend areas where instream flows can be increased and that could potentially increase fish and wildlife habitat.

This action would include the following offset projects and actions:

- Focus on developing projects that provide water offset in areas of the basin where projected consumptive use is highest.
- Seek to include projects in all areas of the basin where impacts are projected, recognizing that in some areas those projected impacts are very small and NEB may best be attained through habitat projects.
- Support project sponsors with good projects throughout the basin that will contribute to NEB even if those projects do not provide water offsets. Project sponsors who are committed to implementing projects increase the likelihood that projects will be delivered in a timely manner.

As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

Non-native mollusks (e.g., New Zealand mudsnails, zebra mussels, etc.), nutria, non-native fish (e.g., Atlantic salmon, sunfish, bullhead catfish, etc.), and chordata (e.g., club tunicate, etc.) (http://www.chehalisleadentity.org/wp-content/uploads/2011_CBP_strategy_update_20111.pdf).

6. Energy and Natural Resources

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.

No energy would be required as part of the addendum approval, therefore no changes to energy use would occur. However, as stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

N/A

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:

N/A

7. Environmental Health

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

No environmental health hazards would occur as part of the addendum approval. As

stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

- 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.

Because of its large size, there exists the potential for contamination from past or present uses within the action area. Existing contamination could potentially affect offset projects, as described in B.5.d of this checklist, but this would be considered in the planning phases of individual projects.

- 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.

No toxic or hazardous chemicals would be stored, used, or produced as part of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

- 4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

No special emergency services would be required as part of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

No environmental health hazards are anticipated as part of the addendum approval, therefore no control measures are required. However, as stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

b. Noise

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

No sources of noise in the area would affect the addendum approval and would be unlikely to affect potential offset projects or actions. However, as stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

- 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.

No noise would be generated by the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

Noise impacts are not anticipated as part of the addendum approval, therefore no control measure are required. However, as stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

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.

The project area encompasses natural areas, developed urban/suburban areas, and commercial/industrial use areas. No current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties would be affected by approval of this addendum. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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?

Yes, areas within the large action area described in this checklist are or have been used as working farmlands or forest lands. No farmland or forest land would be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use as a result of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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:

The addendum approval will not affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations. However, as stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

Refer to B.8.a above.

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

No structures would be demolished as part of the addendum approval. However, as stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

The planning area contains virtually all zoning classifications for Grays Harbor, Lewis, Thurston, Mason, Pacific, Cowlitz, Jefferson, and Wahkiakum Counties.

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

Because of its large size, the action area contains virtually all designations.

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

Shoreline designations within the action area for the Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan vary depending on the county and the types and locations of shoreline located within those counties. For example, in Grays Harbor County, shoreline designations range from natural environment to rural development environment to high intensity environment. In Lewis County, shoreline designations range from rural conservancy along streams and rivers such as the Skookumchuck and Chehalis, and shoreline residential and high intensity on Mineral Lake.

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

Yes, there are areas within the Chehalis Basin (action area) that are classified as critical area through various planning efforts.

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

N/A

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

No people would be displaced as a result of this action.

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

No people would be displaced as a result of this action.

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

Approval of the Chehalis Basin Watershed Management Plan addendum proposed in this checklist is designed to evaluate impacts from existing and projected land uses through evaluation of impacts from forecasted groundwater withdrawals and the associated impacts to streamflows. The action would propose strategies to offset these streamflow impacts. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

No impacts to agricultural and forest lands would occur as part of the addendum approval, therefore no control measure are required. However, as stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

9. Housing

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

No housing units would be provided as a result of the addendum approval.

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

No housing units would be eliminated as a result of this action.

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

No impacts to housing would occur as a result of this action.

10. Aesthetics

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

No new structures would be built as part of this action

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

N/A

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

No aesthetic impacts would occur as a result of this action, therefore no control measure are required.

11. Light and Glare

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

No new sources of light or glare would be produced by this action.

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

N/A

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

No off-site sources of light or glare would affect this action.

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

No new sources of light or glare would be produced by this action, therefore no control measure are required.

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

Numerous recreational opportunities are available in the Chehalis Basin (action area), including fishing, hunting, hiking, biking, boating, camping, and wildlife viewing

(https://chehalisbasinpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Chehalis_Basin_Recreation_Map_smallmap.pdf).

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

No existing recreational uses would be displaced as a result of the addendum approval. As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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

No measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation are needed. However, as stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

- 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.

Because of the Chehalis Basin's large size, many historic and/or cultural sites exist in the action area. For example, historic sites include US Post Office buildings in Montesano, Centralia, and Chelalis; Centralia and Chelalis downtown historic districts, historic homes in Centralia and Chehalis; Mima Mounds Natural Area Preserve; Glacial Heritage Preserve.

- 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.

Native American tribes have historically inhabited the region and it is likely that locations within the action area have artifacts or areas of cultural importance. The Shoalwater Bay Tribe and Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation Tribes are currently located within the action area. In addition, the Quinault Indian Nation Reservation, Squaxin Island Tribe, and Nisqually Tribe are located near the action area

(<https://www.washingtontribes.org/tribes-map>). As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

- 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.

As stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

- 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.

No disturbance to the action area or adjacent lands would occur as part of the addendum approval, thus no disturbance to historic or cultural sites would be anticipated. However, as stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

14. Transportation

- 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.

State Highway Routes 8, 12, 105, and 107, U.S. Highway 101, and Interstate 5 run through the planning area. There are numerous city, county, and forest service roads, along with many miles of privately held roads.

- 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?

Grays Harbor, Lewis, Mason, Jefferson, Pacific, Thurston, and Wahkiakum Counties have public transit systems, and Cowlitz County is serviced by River Cities Transit.

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

N/A

- d. 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).

N/A

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

N/A

- 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?

N/A

- 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.

N/A

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

No transportation impacts would occur as a result of this action, therefore no control measures are required.

15. Public Services

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.

No increase in need for public services would occur as a result of this action.

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

No increase in need for public services would occur as a result of this action, therefore no control measures are required.

16. Utilities

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:

electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other _____

Because of the size of the action area, all utilities are located within its boundaries and are managed by various city, county, and state entities.

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.

No utilities are proposed as part of the addendum approval. However, as stated under question A.11, individual offset projects or actions identified in the addendum will be reviewed at the time they are proposed.

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: James W. Hurst for MARK COX

Name of signee MARK COX

Position and Agency/Organization Director, Utilities and Community Development

Date Submitted: 9/28/20