

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

### A. Background

**1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:**

Iron Horse State Park Master Plan Amendment, Iron Horse Palouse – Malden to Idaho Border.

**2. Name of applicant:** Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission (State Parks).

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

Jamie Van De Vanter, RLA, Parks Planner  
Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission  
P.O. Box 42650  
Olympia, WA 98504-2650  
(360) 755-2839 / [Jamie.VanDeVanter@Parks.WA.Gov](mailto:Jamie.VanDeVanter@Parks.WA.Gov)

**4. Date checklist prepared:** February 19, 2014

**5. Agency requesting checklist:** State Parks

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

Present proposal to the Washington State Parks & Recreation Commission for consideration at the regularly scheduled Commission meeting on March 27, 2014 in Chehalis, WA.

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

Yes; subject to future funding and regulatory approvals, potential future project actions may include the following:

- Phased development of trailheads and other facilities identified in the master plan.
- Maintenance and operation activities; including, but not limited to, adding gravel to the existing trail surface, grading, and routine culvert and ditch cleaning.
- Grading of the embankments at county road crossings where former railroad crossing structures have been removed.

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

- Repair and maintenance of bridges and trestles, including re-decking.

Additional SEPA documentation will be prepared for any future proposals, as necessary.

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

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation. 1991. Washington State Trails Plan Policy and Action Document. June.

Wert, Fred. 1989. Washington State Rails-to-Trails Conservancy. Washington State Rail-Trail Plan. June.

Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission. 1995. SEPA DNS and Environmental Checklist for the revision of the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission's Land Classification System. October.

Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission. 1999. SEPA DNS and Environmental Checklist for the adoption of the Iron Horse State Park Master Plan, Rattlesnake Lake to the Columbia River. June 24.

Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission. 2000. Iron Horse State Park and the John Wayne Pioneer Trail Management Plan. June 29.

Washington Department of Natural Resources. 2013. Natural Heritage Program database information inquiry. December 3.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2013. Priority Habitats and Species program database inquiry. December 3.

United State Fish and Wildlife Service. 2013 National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) database inquiry. December 3.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2013. Listed and Proposed Endangered and Threatened Species and Critical Habitat; Candidate Species, and Species of Concern. Spokane County, WA. Revised March 15, 2012. Database inquiry. December 3.

David Evans and Associates, Inc. 2012. Environmental Site Report, John Wayne Pioneer Trail Iron Horse State Park East Palouse Section. Prepared for the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission. April.

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

SalmonScape. 2012. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, salmon distribution. <http://wdfw.wa.gov/mapping/salmonscape/>  
Accessed on December 5, 2013.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2013. Web Soil data base inquiry. December.

Luttrell, Charles T. 2014. Iron Horse State Park Master Plan Amendment, Iron Horse Palouse – Malden to Idaho Border, Spokane and Whitman Counties, Washington Cultural Resources Report. Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission, Olympia.

- 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:**

No.

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

Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission (Commission) approval will be needed for the current proposal (SEPA nonproject actions). No external permits or approvals are required.

Future site-specific project actions identified in the master plan may require the following approvals and permits:

- Shoreline Substantial Development Permit or Exemption (Rosalia Trailhead only).
- Local land use approvals; including zoning, building, and health department.
- Cultural resources consultation(s) and compliance with applicable regulations.
- General Construction Stormwater Permit Coverage.

- 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.).**

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission proposes an amendment to the Iron Horse State Park Master Plan adopted in 2000 and to approve Land Classifications and Long-Term Boundary for the eastern 34-mile portion of the Iron Horse Palouse Section from Malden to the Idaho Border. Refer to Appendix 1 – Draft Master Plan, January 2014 for further.

These are SEPA non-project actions which will be considered by the State Parks' Commission on March 27, 2014 in Chehalis, Washington.

The purpose of this proposal is to identify a long-term boundary for the state park which represents the areas which the agency believes are desirable for management, consistent with the park mission; to adopt specific land classifications<sup>1</sup> that will provide general policy guidance to agency staff on appropriate management and use of park holdings; and, to adopt a master plan to guide future development of the state park area for continued and enhanced recreational use.

The proposed actions are consistent with state statutes<sup>2</sup> governing cross-state trail development and management, the Washington State Trails Plan<sup>3</sup>, Commission Trail Goals and Policies<sup>4</sup>, and State Parks' Centennial 2013 Plan<sup>5</sup> and Transformation Strategy<sup>6</sup>.

---

1 State Parks' land classification system is codified under WAC 352-16

2 RCW 79A.05.115, RCW 79A.05.320

3 Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation. 1991. Washington State Trail Plan - Policy and Action Document. January.

4 Commission Policy 65-04-2. Adopted December 2, 2004.

5 Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission 2013 Centennial Plan, Adopted in 2003.

6 Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission. 2013. Transformation Strategy - Adapting to a new way of operating Washington's state parks. March 21.

# SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

## Land Classification and Long Term Boundaries

**Important note:** Proposed land classifications and long-term boundaries are for State Parks policy direction only. Those land classification have never been, and should not be, used as a basis for local government decisions on private land holdings within the proposed long-term boundaries.

The purpose of long-term boundaries is to identify those lands that State Parks' staff believes are desirable for long-term management, consistent with the park mission. The purpose of land classification is to provide general policy guidance to State Parks' staff on appropriate management and use of park holdings. The classification system evaluates state park lands and places them into one of six land classifications.

The land classification system is similar in function to a city or county comprehensive plan designation or zoning designation. This system provides a framework that can generally guide the style and amount of development and use within the corridor. This system was officially adopted by the State Parks in 1995 and is a guiding policy for the development and use within all state park properties. These classification categories include *Recreation*, *Resource Recreation*, *Natural*, *Heritage*, *Natural Forest*, and *Natural Area Preserves*. Use limitations imposed by specific classifications are detailed in WAC 352-32-020, *Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission Land Classification System*. (Appendix 3)

The following are key excerpts from applicable designations outlined within the land classification system that are of particular importance in considering the nonproject action of adopting a particular set of land classification designations for the trail corridor:

***Recreation Areas*** are suited and/or developed for high-intensity outdoor recreational use, conference, cultural and/or educational centers, or other uses serving large numbers of people. A...Primary emphasis is on the provision of quality recreational services and facilities with secondary recognition given to protection of areas=natural qualities.@

***Resource Recreation Areas*** are suited and/or developed for natural and/or cultural resource-based medium-intensity and low-intensity outdoor recreational use. A...Management of these areas must stress the centrality of preserving the quality of the natural and cultural

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

resources while allowing appropriate and sustainable levels of human use and enjoyment.®

*Heritage Areas* are designated for preservation, restoration, and interpretation of outstanding, unique or unusual archaeological, historical, scientific, and/or cultural features, and traditional cultural properties, which are of state-wide or national significance

The existing Iron Horse State Park Land Classifications are outlined below:

- A) Resource Recreation Areas: trail and all trailheads/camping areas (except listed as Recreational Areas) to insure a more primitive, remote recreational experience as compared to standard and utility campgrounds permitted in Recreation Areas,
- B) Recreation Areas: listed trailheads/camping areas with potential for high-intensity recreational use and development including comfort stations (flush toilets, showers), formal picnic areas, standard and utility campground hookups, and potential space for enterprise activity, and
- C) Heritage Areas: the Kittitas Depot/area and South Cle Elum Properties, identified on, or eligible to be listed on, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), are classified as Heritage Areas to ensure that any recreational use of development is conditioned to protect the long-range integrity of the area's character defining cultural features.

The proposed Master Plan Amendment Area Land Classifications under current consideration in this proposed Draft Master Plan Amendment area, and as depicted in Appendix 1 - Attachment 1 Draft Master Facilities Site Plan, are outlined below:

Due to the rural agricultural nature and the likelihood that growth will not increase significantly over time in the Iron Horse Palouse area, the following Land Classifications are recommended:

- A) Resource Recreation Areas: classify all areas within trail corridor Resource Recreation except the Tekoa Trailhead to insure a more primitive, remote recreational experience as compared to standard and utility campgrounds permitted in Recreation Areas.
- B) Recreation Areas: classify the Tekoa Trailhead a Recreation Area due to the site's proximity within the Town of Tekoa providing the opportunity for more high-intensity recreational use and development including comfort stations (flush toilets, showers), and

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

- C) Heritage Areas: Trestles, bridges, and structures eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) would be classified as Heritage at the following locations:
- 1) Concrete Rosalia RR Bridge (MP 153.7) listed on NRHP in 1982.
  - 2) Iron Through-Truss Bridge (MP 163.7) recommended for NRHP eligibility in 2013.
  - 3) Steel Tekoa Trestle (MP 171.25) recommended for NRHP eligibility in 2013.

The proposed Long-Term Boundary under current consideration in this proposed Draft Master Plan Amendment area, and as depicted in Appendix 1 - Attachment 1 Draft Master Facilities Site Plan, are outlined below:

Existing trail corridor property boundaries and identified ownership gaps are proposed to define the Long-Term Boundary within the Master Plan Amendment area. During DNR land transfer to State Parks, not all legal property easement information was provided to State Parks. Verification of “permitted trail access” agreements noted on Plans, obtaining long-term leases and/or acquisition of lands is recommended at the following ownership gap locations within the Master Plan Amendment area:

- 1) MP 156.9 to MP 157.6 private property with “permitted trail access” (0.66 miles, 5-miles east of Rosalia)
- 2) MP 170.4 to MP 171.7 private property pending funded WSPRC acquisition (Washington Street in Tekoa)
- 3) MP 173.8 to MP 174.1 private property with “permitted trail access” (0.3 miles, 3.24 miles from of Idaho border)

### ***Trestles, Bridges, and Other NRHP-Eligible Structures***

The environmental impacts associated with designation of the trestles, bridges, and NRHP-eligible structures as ***Heritage Area*** would likely result in a greater amount of effort being spent in preserving and interpreting the historic aspects of these features relative to the other potential designations (such as ***Recreation***).

***Heritage Area*** designation recognizes the historic and interpretive values of these features as being foremost. Appropriate development actions necessary for protection and interpretation of the feature, and for the education and safety of the users, would be permitted. Recreational uses would be allowed, provided that they do not detract from the aesthetic, educational, or quality of the area or its setting or value for scientific

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

research.

### *Trail Corridor and Trailheads*

The **types** of environmental impacts associated with designation of the non-motorized trail corridor and trailheads as either **Resource Recreation** or **Recreation** would most likely be similar. However, there could be a difference in the degree of environmental impacts. This is because the **Recreation Area** designation allows for high-intensity outdoor recreational uses for high concentrations of people and gives secondary recognition to protection of the area's natural qualities. The **Resource Recreation** designation allows only for medium or low intensity natural and/or culturally-oriented recreational uses and stresses the centrality of preserving the quality of the natural and cultural resources.

### **Draft Master Plan**

The Draft Master Plan (Appendix 1) will help guide future development of the trail corridor for continued and enhanced use as a non-motorized recreational trail. Development could be provided to support the following primary uses: hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding and wagon train rides. Development could also support the following secondary uses: picnicking, primitive camping, birding, natural and historical interpretation, environmental education and other uses.

Trail and related support facilities could include trailhead parking areas, toilets, primitive campsites, equestrian camp sites and special activity event use areas (e.g., staging and camping areas for wagon rides), and domestic water (if available). General locations and typical facilities for trailheads, rest stops, and camp areas are shown on the master plan. The master plan is consistent with all land classifications options.

12. **Location of proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section township, and range if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.**

The 34-mile long trail corridor planning area covered by this proposal starts

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

at the town of Malden and continues in a generally northeastern direction, passing through the communities of Rosalia and Tekoa, and ending at the Washington/Idaho State line. (Appendix 1 – Draft Master Facilities Site Plan) The John Wayne Pioneer Trail is a designated cross-state trail and part of the Palouse Section of Iron Horse State Park. The proposal is located in Whitman and Spokane Counties, WA.

It is located within those portions of:

- Sections 13, 14, Township 20 North, Range 42 East, W.M.
- Sections 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 18, 22, 23, 24, Township 20 North, Range 43 East, W.M.
- Sections 31, 32, 33, 34, Township 21, North, Range 43 East, W.M.
- Sections 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 36, Township 20, North, Range 44 East, W.M.
- Sections 13, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 29, 30, 31, Township 20, North, Range 45 East, W.M.
- Sections 7, 18, Township 20, North, Range 46 East, W.M.
- Sections 24, 25, 36, Township 21, North, Range 45 East, W.M.
- Sections 19, 30, Township 21, North, Range 46 East, W.M.

**Note:** The above-noted description does not represent a true legal description of all park properties within the study area covered by the proposal.

### B. Environmental Elements

#### 1. Earth

- a. **General description of the site (circle one): flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other:**

The trail corridor (former rail bed) is generally flat with inclines of 1-3%. It also passes through several areas with adjacent steep slopes and near vertical rock cuts.

- b. **What is the steepest slope in the site (approximate percent slope)?**

Rock cuts are near vertical. Fill embankments and side slopes up to 100%. Trail grade is 1-3% max.

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

- c. **What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the general classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farm land.**

The trail corridor (former rail bed and siding areas) generally consists of crushed rock fill (basalt) over native soils.

Major soils in the study area include:

- Thatuna silt loam, 7-25% slopes - Farmland of statewide importance.
- Caldwell silt loam, drained - Prime farmland
- Gwin-Linville complex, 30 to 65 percent slopes - Not prime farmland
- Gwin-Tucannon complex, 3 to 30 percent slopes - Not prime farmland
- Palouse silt loam, 7 to 25 percent slopes - Farmland of statewide importance
- Naff-Thatuna complex, 8 to 25 percent slopes - Farmland of statewide importance
- Cheney silt loam, 0 to 7 percent slopes - Prime farmland

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

Yes. The trail corridor passes through several areas with adjacent steep side slopes and cut embankments.

- e. **Describe the purpose, type and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.**

None. This is a nonproject action. There may be filling and grading if development occurs.

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

None. This is a nonproject action. Erosion could occur if development takes place.

- g. **About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious**

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

**surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?**

None. This is a nonproject action. Any new impervious surfacing is expected to be negligible when compared to the amount of impervious surfacing that already exists within the corridor.

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

None. This is a nonproject action. Use of Best Management Practices (BMP-S) would be part of development, if it occurs.

### 2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities, if known.**

None. This is a nonproject action. Minor exhaust and minor fugitive dust emissions (particulate matter) would likely occur should development take place.

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

None.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emission, or other impacts to the earth, if any.**

None. This is a nonproject action. Specific measures to reduce emissions, such as watering during construction, would be implemented in the event of development.

### 3. Water

- a. Surface**

**1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams,**

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

**saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.**

Yes; Pine Creek, tributary to Rock Creek; Squaw Creek, tributary to Pine Creek; Cabbage Creek, tributary to Pine Creek; Hangman Creek, tributary to the Spokane River; and several un-named tributaries to those streams. Several seasonal and persistent wetlands occur within and adjacent to the trail corridor, including Palustrine Scrub-Shrub (PSS1C), Palustrine Emergent (PEM1C), and a Forested Needle-Leaved Evergreen (PFO4A) wetland.

**2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) of the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.**

No. This is a nonproject action; however, if development were to occur in the future, it is likely that portions of the work would occur within 200 of those waters; including trailhead development at Rosalia, which would be within 200 feet of Pine Creek. Routine maintenance and repair of the approximately 94 culverts, ditches, and 11 bridges within the study area would also likely require work within or over some of these waters.

**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.**

None. This is a nonproject action. It is unlikely that any fill or dredge activities would take place as part of future development activities, since the work would likely occur within areas previously developed by the railroad. Routine culvert and ditch maintenance would likely require removal of accumulated sediments and debris to keep them in a properly functioning condition.

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

No surface water withdrawals or diversions are anticipated.

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

Yes. The proposed trailhead area at Rosalia appears to be adjacent to or partially within the 100-year floodplain of Pine Creek (Appendix 2); however, it is believed that the rail bed is elevated above the 100-year flood elevation.

**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. This is a nonproject action. It is possible that future development activities could involve a discharge of waste materials to surface waters during construction activities; anticipated volumes unknown at this time.

### **b. Ground**

**1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose and approximate quantities if known.**

None. This is a nonproject action. Future development activities may involve the reconstruction or new development of domestic wells, withdrawals less than 5000 gallons per day.

**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 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.**

None. This is a nonproject action. Future trailhead development will likely include installation of sealed vault toilets that will be routinely maintained, with waste hauled to an approved disposal site by a licensed contractor.

### **c. Water Runoff (including stormwater)**

**1) Describe the source of runoff (including stormwater) and**

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

**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.**

None. This is a nonproject action. In the event of future trailhead development, stormwater would be likely collected, treated and disposed, in accordance with local governmental stormwater regulations and best management practices. It is possible that runoff waters could enter ground or surface waters.

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

No. This is a nonproject action. Should development occur in the future, it is likely that waste materials would be removed from runoff prior to entering ground or surface waters.

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

None. This is a nonproject action. Should development occur in the future, local governmental stormwater regulations and best management practices would be implemented during construction.

### 4. Plants

**a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:**

- deciduous tree:** alder, maple, aspen, other:
- evergreen tree:** fir, cedar, pine, other:
- shrubs**
- grass**
- pasture**
- crop or grain**
- wet soil plants:** cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other:
- water plants:** water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other:
- other types of vegetation: noxious weeds**

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

None. This is a nonproject action. Noxious weeds would be controlled within the right-of-way by licensed applicators. Future

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

development activities would likely cause the removal of vegetation, primarily grasses and small trees/shrubs.

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

The WDNR NHP database does not identify any threatened or endangered species on or near the site.

The USFWS database identifies the following listed species as occurring in Spokane County: *Silene spaldingii* (Spalding's catchfly), *Spiranthes diluvialis* (Ute ladies'-tresses).

The USFWS database identifies the following listed species as occurring in Whitman County: *Howellia aquatilis* (Water howellia), *Silene spaldingii* (Spalding's silene), *Spiranthes diluvialis* (Ute ladies'-tresses).

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

None. This is a nonproject action. Rare plant surveys will be undertaken, as necessary, prior to any future development actions.

### 5. Animals

- a. **Bold and underline any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:**

birds: **hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds**, other: **falcon, owl, woodpecker**

mammals: **deer**, bear, **elk**, beaver, other: **coyote, porcupine, cougar, bats**

fish: bass, salmon, **trout**, herring, shellfish, other: **sucker**

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

The WDFW PHS database does not identify any threatened or endangered species on or near the site. The USFWS database identifies the following listed species as occurring within Whitman and Spokane Counties: *Salvelinus confluentus* (Bull Trout)

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

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

Yes. A portion of the area is identified as priority habitat for Rocky Mountain Elk (*Cervus elaphus*) and wintering range for Mule Deer (*Odocoileus hemionus hemionus*). The site is also within the broad boundaries of the Pacific Flyway, the major migrating corridor for birds in North America west of the continental divide. However, the principal migration route for the flyway is further to the west along the Columbia River.

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

None.

### 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.**

None. This is a nonproject action.

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

No. This is a nonproject action. Should future development occur, it is unlikely that the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties would be impacted.

**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.**

None. This is a nonproject action.

### 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.**

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Yes. An Environmental Site Assessment report was completed for the 34-mile trail planning study area (David Evans 2012). The report documents ten types of Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) within the study area. None of these RECs present an immediate risk to human health requiring immediate action; however, due to their proximity to project areas identified in the master plan, they represent the potential for a release or a material threat of a release on the property or into the air, soil, groundwater, or surface water of the property.

The identified RECs primarily relate to previous railroad development and operation, and potentially include materials such as treated railroad ties, spilled or leaked liquids (e.g., oil, gasoline, diesel fuel, herbicides, etc.) and heavy metals (i.e., zinc, arsenic, cadmium, and lead). Other items include two natural gas pipelines that intersect the trail, building roofing shingles that may contain asbestos and solid waste, debris, and dumping.

### **1) Describe special emergency service that might be required.**

None. This is a nonproject action. In the event that development occurs in the future, there is a potential that additional fire, police and medical services may be required.

### **2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any.**

Recommendations contained within the Environmental Site Assessment report will be followed for sites with known or suspected RECs. In the event of a spill or hazardous material release, Ecology's spill response unit would be notified.

## **b. Noise**

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

None.

### **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.**

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

None. This is a nonproject action. Should development occur in the future, then it is likely that voices from trail users and motor vehicles would be audible near the trailheads.

### **3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any.**

None. This is a nonproject action.

## **8. Land and Shoreline Use**

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

The site is currently an undeveloped state park linear trail used for recreation. It is a former railroad right-of-way. Adjacent properties are used for primarily used for agriculture, but other uses include transportation, recreation, residences, and fish and wildlife habitat.

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

Yes. Agricultural uses occurred within sections of the corridor prior to development of the railroad.

### **c. Describe any structures on the site.**

Several former railroad structures, including:

- 240' long bridge east of Malden at MP 143.77
- 225' long bridge east of Malden at MP 147.8
- 750 long bridge south of Rosalia MP 153.6
- bridge east of Rosalia at MP 155.4
- bridge east of Rosalia at MP 158.0
- 14' long bridge east of Rosalia at MP 160
- 25' long bridge east of Rosalia at MP 162.7
- bridge east of Rosalia at MP 163.69
- 260' long bridge east of Rosalia at MP 163.7
- bridge at MP 166.3 and
- 975' length bridge at Tekoa MP 171.25

---

<sup>7</sup> All site locations are identified by Railroad Mile Posts, for example, Malden is MP 143, Rosalia is MP 152, Tekoa is MP 171.5, and the WA/ID Stateline is MP 177.

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

There are also many cross-drainage culverts along the trail and former railroad structures and foundations.

Refer to Appendix 1 - Draft Master Plan for further information.

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

No. This is a nonproject action; however, future project actions may result in the demolition of former railroad structures for public safety, economic, planning or other considerations. Any proposed alteration (including demolition) to an existing structure older than 40 years will require review and possibly approval by the Washington State Park's Historic Preservation Officer and the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.

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

Spokane County: Agricultural Use  
Whitman County: Agricultural Use  
Malden: none  
Rosalia: Residential Use  
Tekoa: Industrial, Urban Residential and Rural Residential Uses

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

Spokane County: Agricultural Use  
Whitman County: Agricultural Use  
Malden: none  
Rosalia: Residential Use  
Tekoa: Industrial, Urban Residential and Rural Residential Uses

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

Pine Creek – Rural (future Rosalia Trailhead only)

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

Yes; portions of the trail corridor study area contain Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas, wetlands, and floodplains.

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

- I. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?**

None; this is a non-project action.

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

None; this is a non-project action.

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

None; this is a non-project action.

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

Project planners met with local planning officials to consult on the proposal. Public meetings were held in Malden, Tekoa, and Rosalia to receive public input. At this time, the proposal appears to be compatible with existing and projected lands uses and plans. Local governments would further help ensure consistency when any proposed site-specific project development permit applications are submitted for consideration.

Also, as noted in Section A.11., the proposed actions are consistent with state statutes governing cross-state trail development and management, the Washington State Trails Plan, Commission Trail Goals and Policies, and State Parks Centennial 2013 Plan and Transformation Strategy.

### **9. Housing**

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

None.

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

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

None.

- c. **Proposed measures to reduce or housing impacts if any.**

None.

### 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?**

None. This is a nonproject action. Should development occur in the future, it is likely that the tallest structure (e.g., vault toilet vent pipes, picnic shelters) would be approx. 15' high.

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

None. This is a nonproject action. Should development occur in the future, it is unlikely that views would be altered by trail developments.

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

None. This is a nonproject action. Should development occur in the future, site plans could include measures to control or reduce any aesthetic impacts.

### 11. Light and Glare

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

None. This is a nonproject action. If development were to occur, it is unlikely that lighting would be provided to the facilities.

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

None. This is a nonproject action. If development were to occur, it is unlikely that light or glare would be a safety issue due to the

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

nature of the developments that would be likely be installed.

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

None. This is a nonproject action.

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

None. This is a nonproject action. Should facility development occur in the future that does have exterior lighting, any such lighting would be directed and shielded to reduce impacts.

### 12. Recreation

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

Hiking, picnicking, hunting, snowmobiling, mountain biking, fishing, horseback riding, wagon-rides, etc.

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

No. This is a nonproject action. Should development occur in the future, it is likely that increased designated public use would help displace illegal or unauthorized uses, such as ORV-s, on the trail.

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

The purpose of the proposed actions is to allow for, and enhance, recreational values along the trail corridor.

### 13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

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

Yes. Two railroad bridges within the corridor (Bridge #EE-90A

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

and #EE-90B) are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Additionally, two other bridge structures (#EE-62 and #EE-70A) may be eligible. These bridges are significant spans and are intact representatives of their type and method of construction. Finally, one building in the former Tekoa station area (former water tower) also appears to be National Register eligible. Historic Property Inventory Forms have been prepared for these resources, which will be submitted for review with the cultural resources report for the project. No significant archaeological sites have been identified within the project area.

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

Significant structures remain within the former Milwaukee Road corridor, including those four bridge structures and one building noted in 13.a above. The grade itself and runs of trestles and other structures in the former Milwaukee Road corridor do not appear eligible for the National Register.

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

Project actions within the corridor will be designed in such a way that the character defining features of the historic properties within the corridor will not be affected. Adverse impacts to listed or eligible properties are not anticipated as a result of the project.

### 14. Transportation

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

The proposed master plan identifies potential future trailheads which can be accessed by existing public roads, as indicated below.

The Malden Trailhead will be accessed from 11<sup>th</sup> Street, Railroad Avenue and 14<sup>th</sup> Street which is immediately adjacent to the proposed trailhead.

The Rosalia Trailhead will be accessed from Gashous Road and 7<sup>th</sup>

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Street which is immediately adjacent to the proposed trailhead.

The Pandora Trailhead will be accessed from Pandora Road which is immediately adjacent to the proposed trailhead.

The Tekoa Trailhead will be accessed from Washington Street which is immediately adjacent to the proposed trailhead.

Refer to Appendix 1 – Attachments 3 to 6 for further information.

**b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

No. There is no transit access to the trail corridor at this time.

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

The Malden Trailhead will include 8-12 trailer parking spaces and 10-15 single vehicle parking spaces.

The Rosalia Trailhead will include 10-15 trailer parking spaces and 15-20 single vehicle parking spaces.

The Pandora Trailhead will include 10-15 trailer parking spaces and 10-20 single vehicle parking spaces.

The Tekoa Trailhead will include 8-12 trailer parking spaces and 15-20 single vehicle parking spaces.

Refer to Appendix 1 – Attachments 3 to 6 for further information.

None. This is a nonproject action. Should trail development occur in the future, it is likely that parking at the trailheads would be developed.

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

None. This is a nonproject action. Should trail development occur in the future, it is likely that some road improvements to access the

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

trailheads would need improvements, depending upon the size and location of the proposed development.

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

No.

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

The master plan identifies four trailhead facilities in the planning area. Should development occur, it is estimated that each trailhead could generate approximately 15-20 vehicles per day (VPD) on weekends during the peak usage seasons of March-May and September-November. More use will likely occur on holidays. Approx., 5-10 VPD are expected on weekdays and the off-peak period of June-August.

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

None. This is a nonproject action. Should development occur in the future, trailhead design would consider peak trip volumes.

### 15. Public Services

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

None. This is a nonproject action. Should development occur in the future, there may be a need for fire suppression services from the Department of Natural Resources and local fire departments. Additional support may also be needed from county law enforcement departments and emergency management services (EMS) from organizations serving the corridor area.

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

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Park staff will continue to coordinate emergency response with local fire, police and EMS. Park rangers will continue to provide periodic enforcement and patrol activities for the trail. Open fires will be prohibited. Trailheads will be signed to inform visitors of use regulations.

### 16. Utilities

- a. **Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other:**

This is a nonproject action. Some of the above-noted utilities are available along portions of the corridor, primarily within city limits.

- 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.**

None. This is a nonproject action. Should development occur, there could be a need for potable water and other utilities from providers in the area, if such utilities are available.

- c. **Signature**

**The above answers are true to the best of knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.**

Signature

James G. Van der Vort

Date Submitted

2/12/2014

### D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

1. **How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or**

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

### production of noise?

The master plan will help guide future development of the corridor. Master plan implementation will likely result in a small net increase in impervious surfacing associated with development of the trailhead parking areas. This could cause a minor increase in stormwater discharges. Likewise, vehicular use at the trailhead parking areas would cause a minor localized increase in automobile emissions. Increased human use of the trail would cause a net increase in human waste and noise levels above that which currently exists.

#### **Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:**

Future development and use will follow the guidelines of the land classifications and master plan. Although there will be an increase in emissions and noise levels beyond that which currently exists, such levels would be minor and greatly reduced from the period when the railroad was in active operation. In general, the parking areas will be designed such that stormwater runoff is directed to grassy swales for biofiltration and infiltration. Such development will be in compliance with stormwater regulations and best management practices. Sanitary facilities (e.g., vault toilets) will be placed at appropriate locations for the collection of human waste. These facilities will be routinely maintained with waste taken to an approved waste treatment plant for disposal.

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

Plants, animals and fish will be minimally impacted by the application of the land classifications and master plan. This is primarily because future development and uses will be largely limited to the existing trail corridor which is a former railroad right-of-way with little high quality habitat remaining within it. Increased pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle use may displace some wildlife species in more remote areas of the trail where current human use is low.

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

All land classifications options recognize the trail corridor as *Resource Recreation*. This classification stresses the importance of preserving the quality of the natural resources, including wildlife, while allowing appropriate levels of human use. Efforts will be made to minimize habitat loss by locating trailheads and primitive campsites in areas previously disturbed through railroad construction activities, existing sites managed by other agencies, or in areas with low habitat value. Consultation with WFDW area habitat biologists would help

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

identify management options for reducing site-specific impacts to priority species. Volunteer projects, such as the installation of nesting platforms and boxes, could help enhance populations of selected wildlife species.

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

None.

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

Trailhead development could help encourage energy conservation by allowing alternative modes of transportation, such as walking or bicycling, between population centers.

### 4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

While land classifications do not authorize a particular development for a given area, they do specify the types of developments and uses which could be allowed. Land classification could set the stage for future developments and uses which may have the potential for causing negative impacts to a sensitive species and environmentally sensitive areas; such as, habitat loss, disturbances, increased competition, loss of forage or prey resources, etc. The proposal will designate certain areas of the parks as *Resource Recreation* to protect quality natural systems, as well as priority habitat and species by restricting high intensity recreational uses from those areas. It will restrict development activities from wetlands and other sensitive areas. Development and use of the park will provide access to certain lands and shoreline areas, but will only do so as approved and/or conditioned by local shoreline and land use ordinances. Only permitted development will be constructed.

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

This proposal seeks to achieve a balance between providing adequate recreational opportunities and providing adequate protection of important natural and cultural resources. Public ownership and the proposed land classifications accomplish many of the aims noted above. Any future developments will be subject to regulations administered by federal, state and local governments. All required permits and approvals will be obtained prior to any development.

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

**5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?**

Proposal would provide for increased designated access and recreational opportunities to publicly-owned lands and shorelines of the state. Enhancement of recreational resources and public access are recognized goals of the Shoreline Act. State Parks' staff will work closely with local governments to insure consistency and compliance with local land use ordinances and development regulations.

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

State Parks will work closely with federal, state and local government agencies to assure compatible management objectives on all State Parks owned and/or managed lands. Any future project actions will be consistent with the designated land class for such areas and permitted uses outlined in the Washington State Parks Land Classification and Use Matrix. All required permits and approvals will be obtained prior to development.

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

Demands on emergency services and law enforcement could increase with an increase in human use of the area, although this increase is expected to be minor since recreational use of the corridor has been occurring for several years now. Likewise, minor traffic increases could occur on public roadways serving the trail and related facilities, but increases are expected to be minor.

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

State Parks' staff will continue to coordinate emergency response with local emergency service providers and law enforcement personnel. Access for emergency vehicles will be provided to the trail. Park rangers will patrol the trail and provide emergency response and law enforcement when in the area.

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

The proposal does not appear to be in conflict with any known local, state or federal laws or requirements for protection of the environment. Future developments will be compliant with local, state, and federal requirements and

## **SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

regulations. Conditions within any required land use permits for future project actions will further ensure compatibility with applicable land use plans.

[Statutory Authority: RCW 43.21C.110 84-05-020 (Order DE83-89), 197-11-960, filed 2/10/84, effective 4/4/84.