

Appendix E. GIS Summary for Spatial Analysis of Captan Uses

Use List

The following use list is derived from label use information. It is used as a basis for the spatial analysis of captan uses.

Orchards/ Vineyards

almonds
apples
apricots
cherries, sweet
grapes
nectarines
peaches, all
pears, all
plums
prunes

cotton, pima
cotton, pima (irrigated)
cotton, upland
cotton, upland (irrigated)
cucumbers and pickles
ginseng
green onions
kale
lima beans - dry (irrigated)
mustard cabbage (bok choy)
mustard seed
mustard seed (irrigated)
nursery and greenhouse crops - other
nursery stock
nursery, floriculture, vegetable & flower
seed crops, sod harvested, etc., grown in the
open, irrigated
nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, aquatic
plants, mushrooms, flower seeds, vegetable
seeds, and sod harvested, total
oats for grain
oats for grain (irrigated)
onions - dry
peanuts for nuts
peanuts for nuts (irrigated)
peas - dry edible
peas, chinese (sugar and snow)
peas, green (excluding southern)
peas, green southern (cowpeas) - blackeyed,
crowder, etc.
peppers, chile (all peppers - excluding bell)
potatoes
pumpkins
radishes
raspberries, all
rye for grain
rye for grain (irrigated)
sod harvested
sorghum for grain

Agriculture

barley for grain
barley for grain (irrigated)
beans - dry edible, excluding limas
beans - dry edible, excluding limas
(irrigated)
beans - snap
beets
berries, all
blackberries
blueberries, tame
broccoli
brussels sprouts
bulbs/corms/rhizomes/ tubers - dry
cabbage - head
canola
cantaloupes
cauliflower
chinese cabbage
collards
corn for grain
corn for grain (irrigated)
corn for silage or greenchop
cotton, all
cotton, all (irrigated)

sorghum for silage or greenchop
 spinach
 squash
 strawberries
 sugarbeets for seed
 sugarbeets for seed (irrigated)
 sugarbeets for sugar
 sugarbeets for sugar (irrigated)
 sweet corn
 tomatoes
 turnip greens
 turnips
 watermelons
 wheat for grain, all
 wheat, grain, all (irrigated)

alfalfa hay
 alfalfa hay (irrigated)
 alfalfa seed
 forage - land used for all hay and all
 haylage, grass silage, and greenchop
 forage - land used for all hay and all
 haylage, grass silage, and greenchop
 (irrigated)
 seed - bermuda grass
 seed - ladino clover
 seed - red clover
 seed - sudangrass
 seed - vetch
 seed crops - other field and grass

Turf Use

Golf Course
 Sod Farms

Terrestrial Use Determination

Sources and Methods

Base mapping layers for the terrestrial analysis component were obtained from the National Land-cover Dataset (NLCD 2001) for the majority of land use types and the California GAP data (6/98) for the orchards and vineyard uses. The NLCD is a recently released national land use dataset and the GAP is from the Biogeography Lab from UCLA-Santa Barbara. These raster files were converted to vector and used in the analysis. The rights-of-way landuse layer was derived from TeleAtlas (2006) for roads and rail, and the U.S. Department of Transportation’s National Pipeline Dataset (1999). Table 2 shows the land-cover sources used.

Table 1 Land cover data sources.

Land Cover Data Sources			
Layer name	Base source	Description	non-NASS
Cultivated Crops	NLCD	Grid code 82: Areas used for the production of annual crops, such as corn, soybeans, vegetables, tobacco, and cotton, and also perennial woody crops such as orchards and vineyards. Crop vegetation accounts for greater than 20 percent of total vegetation. This class also includes all land being actively tilled.	No
Developed, High Intensity	NLCD	Grid code 24: Includes highly developed areas where people reside or work in high numbers. Examples include apartment complexes, row houses and commercial/industrial. Impervious surfaces account for 80 to 100 percent of the total cover.	Yes
Developed, Low Intensity	NLCD	Grid code 22: Includes areas with a mixture of constructed materials and vegetation. Impervious surfaces account for 20-49 percent of total cover. These areas most commonly include single-family housing units.	Yes

Land Cover Data Sources			
Layer name	Base source	Description	non-NASS
Developed, Medium Intensity	NLCD	Grid code 23: Includes areas with a mixture of constructed materials and vegetation. Impervious surfaces account for 50-79 percent of the total cover. These areas most commonly include single-family housing units.	Yes
Developed, Open Space	NLCD	Grid code 21: Includes areas with a mixture of some constructed materials, but mostly vegetation in the form of lawn grasses. Impervious surfaces account for less than 20 percent of total cover. These areas most commonly include large-lot single-family housing units, parks, golf courses, and vegetation planted in developed settings for recreation, erosion control, or aesthetic purposes.	Yes
Forest	NLCD	Grid codes 41,42,43: Deciduous, evergreen and mixed. Areas dominated by trees generally greater than 5 meters tall, and greater than 20% of total vegetation cover.	Yes
Open Water	NLCD	Grid code 11: All areas of open water, generally with less than 25% cover of vegetation or soil.	Yes
Orchards and vineyards	CA GAP	Grid codes 11210, 11211 and 11212. This is the only CA GAP reference.	No
Pasture/Hay	NLCD	Grid codes 81: Areas of grasses, legumes, or grass-legume mixtures planted for livestock grazing or the production of seed or hay crops, typically on a perennial cycle. Pasture/hay vegetation accounts for greater than 20 percent of total vegetation.	No
Wetlands	NLCD	Grid codes 90, 95: Woody wetlands and emergent herbaceous.	Yes
Rights-of-Way	US DOT; TeleAtlas	A derived class, using road, rail, and pipeline coverages.	Yes
Turf	NLCD	A derived NLCD class based on developed classes and the impervious surface layer with corrections applied.	Yes

U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Agriculture Statistics Service (NASS) census dataset, 2002 was used to determine whether a crop was grown in a particular county. This census dataset provides survey information over five years on agricultural practices and is used mainly for cultivated or agriculture crops. Chemical labeled uses were matched to NASS uses; an agriculture use match would result in a mapped area for one or more counties. For uses that are not agricultural, the use is assumed to occur in every county where that particular land-cover occurs within California (*i.e.* a 'forestry' labeled use is assumed to potentially occur in all California counties where NLCD indicates there is forest land-cover).

The 'Initial Area of Concern' represents the use type and its occurrence in the NASS or NLCD datasets. These are the areas where the pesticide has potential to be applied. The 'Action Area' represents the 'Initial Area of Concern' plus a buffer distance. There may not always be a buffer distance in which case the 'Action Area' is the same as the 'Initial Area of Concern'. The overlap of the 'Action Area' with CRLF habitat areas is named 'Overlapping Area' and is the target of spatial analysis. The ratio of Overlapping Area to CRLF habitat area is reported for each of eight Recovery Units (RU1 to RU8).

There are three types of CRLF habitat areas considered in this assessment: Critical Habitat (CH); Core Areas; and California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) occurrence sections (EPA

Region 9). Critical habitat areas were obtained from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) final designation of critical habitat for the CRLF (USFWS 2006). Core areas were obtained from USFWS's Recovery Plan for the CRLF (USFWS 2002). The occurrence sections represent an EPA-derived subset of occurrences noted in the CNDDDB. They are generalized by the Meridian Range and Township Section (MTRS) one square mile units so that individual habitat areas are obfuscated. As such, only occurrence section counts are provided and not the area potentially affected.

Spatially Determined Analysis for Terrestrial Uses

Table 2 Terrestrial spatial summary results for Captan uses (Union of Agriculture and Orchard/Vineyard) with buffer.

Measure	RU1	RU2	RU3	RU4	RU5	RU6	RU7	RU8	Total
Initial Area of Concern (no buffer)	35,988 sq km								
Action Area (Initial area of concern plus buffer)	54,173 sq km								
Established species range area (CH plus core in sq km)	3654	2742	1323	3279	3650	5306	4917	3326	28,197
Overlapping area (sq km)	39	75.7	47	137	432	616	796	298	2,442
<i>Percent area affected</i>	<i>1%</i>	<i>3%</i>	<i>4%</i>	<i>4%</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>16%</i>	<i>9%</i>	<i>9%</i>
Established occurrence sections (959 total; 30 outside recovery units)	13	3	70	324	276	120	90	33	929
# Occurrence sections affected	0	0	8	75	155	30	59	0	327

Table 3 Terrestrial spatial summary results for Captan Turf Use with buffer.

Measure	RU1	RU2	RU3	RU4	RU5	RU6	RU7	RU8	Total
Established species range area (CH plus core in sq km)	3654	2742	1323	3279	3650	5306	4917	3326	28,197
Overlapping area (sq km)	56	56	62	528	275	175	239	266	1659
<i>Percent area affected</i>	<i>2%</i>	<i>2%</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>16%</i>	<i>8%</i>	<i>3%</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>8%</i>	<i>6%</i>
Established occurrence sections (959 total; 30 outside recovery units)	13	3	70	324	276	120	90	33	929
# Occurrence sections affected	1	0	15	86	78	14	37	1	232

Spatially Determined Analysis for Waterbodies

The aquatic analysis uses a downstream dilution model to determine the downstream extent of exposure in streams and rivers. The downstream component, combined with the initial area of concern, define the aquatic action area. The downstream extent includes the area where the EEC could potentially be above levels that would exceed the most sensitive LOC. The model calculates two values, the dilution factor (DF) and the threshold Percent Cropped Area (PCA). The dilution factor (DF) is the maximum RQ/LOC, and the threshold PCA is the inverse value represented as a percent.

The dilution model uses the NHDPlus data set (<http://www.horizon-systems.com/nhdplus/>) as the framework for the downstream analysis. The NHDPlus includes several pieces of information that can be used to analyze downstream effects. For each stream reach in the hydrography network, the data provide a tally of the total area in each NLCD land cover class for the upstream cumulative area contributing to the given stream reach. Using the cumulative land cover data provided by the NHDPlus, an aggregated use class is created based on the classes listed in Table 4. A cumulative PCA is calculated for each stream reach based on the aggregate use class (divided by the total upstream contribution area).

The dilution model traverses downstream from each stream segment within the initial area of concern. At each downstream node, the threshold PCA is compared to the aggregate cumulative PCA. If the cumulative PCA exceeds the threshold then the stream segment is included in the downstream extent. The model continues traversing downstream until the cumulative PCA no longer exceeds the threshold. The additional stream length by the downstream analysis is presented in Table 5.

Table 4 Aquatic spatial summary results for agricultural land use (including ornamentals)

Measure	Total
Total California stream kilometers	332,962
Total stream kilometers in initial area of concern	57,087
Total stream kilometers added downstream	3,580
Total stream kilometers in final action area	60,667

Table 5 Aquatic spatial summary results for orchard/vineyard

Measure	Total
Total California stream kilometers	332,962
Total stream kilometers in initial area of concern	11,946
Total stream kilometers added downstream	1,477
Total stream kilometers in final action area	13,423

Table 6 Aquatic spatial summary results for Turf

Measure	Total
Total California stream kilometers	332,962
Total stream kilometers in initial area of concern	19,939
Total stream kilometers added downstream	765
Total stream kilometers in final action area	20,704


A Note on Limitations and Constraints of Tabular and Geospatial Sources

The geographic data sets used in this analysis are limited with respect to their accuracy and timeliness. The NASS Census of Agriculture (NASS 2002) contains adjusted survey data collected prior to 2002. Small use sites, and minor uses (e.g., specialty crops) tend to be underrepresented in this dataset. The National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD 2001) represents the best comprehensive collection of national land use and land cover information for the United States representing a range of years from 1994 – 1998. Because the NLCD does not explicitly include a class to represent orchard and vineyard landcover, California Gap Analysis Project data (CaGAP 1998) were overlaid with the NCLD and used to identify these areas.

Hydrographic data are from the NHDPlus dataset (<http://www.horizon-systems.com/nhdplus/>). NHDPlus contains the most current and accurate nationwide representation of hydrologic data. In some isolated instances, there are, however, errors in the data including missing or disconnected stream segments and incorrect assignment of flow direction. Spatial data describing the recovery zones and core areas are from the US Fish and Wildlife Service. The data depicting survey sections in which the species has been found in past surveys is from the California Natural Diversity Database (<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/bdb/html/cnddb.html>).

The relatively coarse spatial scale of these datasets precludes use of the data for highly localized studies, therefore, tabular information presented here is limited to the scale of individual Recovery Units. Additionally, some labeled uses are not possible to map precisely due to the lack of appropriate spatial data in NLCD on the location of these areas. To account for these uncertainties, the spatial analysis presented here is conservative, and may overestimate the areal extent of actual pesticide use in California.


CRLF Recovery Units and Habitat Areas



Compiled from California County boundaries (ESRI, 2002),
 USDA National Agriculture Statistical Service (NASS, 2002)
 Gap Analysis Program Orchard/Vineyard Landcover (GAP)
 National Land Cover Database (NLCD) (MRLC, 2001)

Map created by US Environmental Protection Agency, Office
 of Pesticides Programs, Environmental Fate and Effects Division.
 June, 2007. Projection: Albers Equal Area Conic USGS, North
 American Datum of 1983 (NAD 1983)


Captan Use Map



Compiled from California County boundaries (ESRI, 2002),
USDA National Agriculture Statistical Service (NASS, 2002)
Gap Analysis Program Orchard/Vineyard Landcover (GAP)
National Land Cover Database (NLCD) (MRLC, 2001)

Map created by US Environmental Protection Agency, Office
of Pesticides Programs, Environmental Fate and Effects Division,
September, 2007. Projection: Albers Equal Area Conic USGS,
North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 1983)


Captan - Initial Area of Concern



Compiled from California County boundaries (ESRI, 2002),
USDA National Agriculture Statistical Service (NASS, 2002)
Gap Analysis Program Orchard/Vineyard Landcover (GAP)
National Land Cover Database (NLCD) (MRLC, 2001)

Map created by US Environmental Protection Agency, Office
of Pesticides Programs, Environmental Fate and Effects Division,
September, 2007. Projection: Albers Equal Area Conic USGS,
North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 1983)


Captan - Action Area



Compiled from California County boundaries (ESRI, 2002),
USDA National Agriculture Statistical Service (NASS, 2002)
Gap Analysis Program Orchard/Vineyard Landcover (GAP)
National Land Cover Database (NLCD) (MRLC, 2001)

Map created by US Environmental Protection Agency, Office
of Pesticides Programs, Environmental Fate and Effects Division,
September, 2007. Projection: Albers Equal Area Conic USGS,
North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 1983)


Captan - Action Area and CRLF Habitat



Compiled from California County boundaries (ESRI, 2002),
USDA National Agriculture Statistical Service (NASS, 2002)
Gap Analysis Program Orchard/ Vineyard Landcover (GAP)
National Land Cover Database (NLCD) (MRLC, 2001)

Map created by US Environmental Protection Agency, Office
of Pesticides Programs, Environmental Fate and Effects Division,
September, 2007. Projection: Albers Equal Area Conic USGS,
North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 1983)


Captan Action Area (AA) and CRLF Habitat Overlap-1



Compiled from California County boundaries (ESRI, 2002),
USDA National Agriculture Statistical Service (NASS, 2002)
Gap Analysis Program Orchard/Vineyard Landcover (GAP)
National Land Cover Database (NLCD) (MRLC, 2001)

Map created by US Environmental Protection Agency, Office
of Pesticides Programs, Environmental Fate and Effects Division,
September, 2007. Projection: Albers Equal Area Conic USGS,
North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 1983)


Captan Action Area (AA) and CRLF Habitat Overlap-2



Compiled from California County boundaries (ESRI, 2002),
USDA National Agriculture Statistical Service (NASS, 2002)
Gap Analysis Program Orchard/Vineyard Landcover (GAP)
National Land Cover Database (NLCD) (MRLC, 2001)

Map created by US Environmental Protection Agency, Office
of Pesticides Programs, Environmental Fate and Effects Division,
September, 2007. Projection: Albers Equal Area Conic USGS,
North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 1983)


Captan Action Area (AA) and CRLF Habitat Overlap-3



Compiled from California County boundaries (ESRI, 2002),
 USDA National Agriculture Statistical Service (NASS, 2002)
 Gap Analysis Program Orchard/Vineyard Landcover (GAP)
 National Land Cover Database (NLCD) (MRLC, 2001)

Map created by US Environmental Protection Agency, Office
 of Pesticides Programs, Environmental Fate and Effects Division,
 September, 2007. Projection: Albers Equal Area Conic USGS,
 North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 1983)


Captan Action Area (AA) and CRLF Habitat Overlap-4



Compiled from California County boundaries (ESRI, 2002),
USDA National Agriculture Statistical Service (NASS, 2002)
Gap Analysis Program Orchard/Vineyard Landcover (GAP)
National Land Cover Database (NLCD) (MRLC, 2001)

Map created by US Environmental Protection Agency, Office
of Pesticides Programs, Environmental Fate and Effects Division,
September, 2007. Projection: Albers Equal Area Conic USGS,
North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 1983)


Captan Action Area (AA) and CRLF Habitat Overlap-5



Compiled from California County boundaries (ESRI, 2002),
USDA National Agriculture Statistical Service (NASS, 2002)
Gap Analysis Program Orchard/Vineyard Landcover (GAP)
National Land Cover Database (NLCD) (MRLC, 2001)

Map created by US Environmental Protection Agency, Office
of Pesticides Programs, Environmental Fate and Effects Division,
September, 2007. Projection: Albers Equal Area Conic USGS,
North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 1983)

Captan Action Area (AA) and CRLF Habitat Overlap-6



Compiled from California County boundaries (ESRI, 2002),
USDA National Agriculture Statistical Service (NASS, 2002)
Gap Analysis Program Orchard/Vineyard Landcover (GAP)
National Land Cover Database (NLCD) (MRLC, 2001)

Map created by US Environmental Protection Agency, Office
of Pesticides Programs, Environmental Fate and Effects Division,
September, 2007. Projection: Albers Equal Area Conic USGS,
North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 1983)

References for GIS Maps

Crop Maps

ESRI, 2002. Detailed Counties, ESRI data and maps. (1:24,000) www.esri.com

GAP. Gap Analysis. National Biological Information Infrastructure. www.nbi.gov

NASS, 2002. USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service. www.nass.usda.gov

MRLC, 2001. Multiresolution Land Characteristics (MRLC) www.mrlc.gov

Habitat Maps

US FWS 2002 California red-legged frog General Recovery Zones

US FWS 2002 California red-legged frog Core Areas

US FWS 2005 Final Critical Habitat for California red-legged frog

CNDDDB Occurrence Sections – California Natural Diversity Database
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/bdb/html/cnddb.html>

ESRI, 2002. Detailed Counties, ESRI data and maps. (1:24,000) www.esri.com

Information References

Altig, R. and R.W. McDiarmid. 1999. Body Plan: Development and Morphology. In R.W. McDiarmid and R. Altig (Eds.), Tadpoles: The Biology of Anuran Larvae. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. pp. 24-51.

Alvarez, J. 2000. Letter to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service providing comments on the Draft California Red-legged Frog Recovery Plan.

Crawshaw, G.J. 2000. Diseases and Pathology of Amphibians and Reptiles *in*: Ecotoxicology of Amphibians and Reptiles; ed: Sparling, D.W., G. Linder, and C.A. Bishop. SETAC Publication Series, Columbia, MO.

Fellers, G. M., et al. 2001. Overwintering tadpoles in the California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*). Herpetological Review, 32(3): 156-157.

- Fellers, G.M, L.L. McConnell, D. Pratt, S. Datta. 2004. Pesticides in Mountain Yellow-Legged Frogs (*Rana Mucosa*) from the Sierra Nevada Mountains of California, USA. *Environmental Toxicology & Chemistry* 23 (9):2170-2177.
- Fellers, Gary M. 2005a. *Rana draytonii* Baird and Girard 1852. California Red-legged Frog. Pages 552-554. *In*: M. Lannoo (ed.) *Amphibian Declines: The Conservation Status of United States Species, Vol. 2: Species Accounts*. University of California Press, Berkeley, California. xxi+1094 pp.
(<http://www.werc.usgs.gov/pt-reyes/pdfs/Rana%20draytonii.PDF>)
- Fellers, Gary M. 2005b. California red-legged frog, *Rana draytonii* Baird and Girard. Pages 198-201. *In*: L.L.C. Jones, et al (eds.) *Amphibians of the Pacific Northwest*. xxi+227.
- Hayes, M.P. and M.M. Miyamoto. 1984. Biochemical, behavioral and body size differences between *Rana aurora aurora* and *R. a. draytonii*. *Copeia* 1984(4): 1018-22.
- Hayes and Tennant. 1985. Diet and feeding behavior of the California red-legged frog. *The Southwestern Naturalist* 30(4): 601-605.
- Jennings, M.R. and M.P. Hayes. 1985. Pre-1900 overharvest of California red-legged frogs (*Rana aurora draytonii*): The inducement for bullfrog (*Rana catesbeiana*) introduction. *Herpetological Review* 31(1): 94-103.
- Jennings, Mark R. 1988. Natural history and decline of native ranids in California. Pp. 61-72. *In* *Proceedings of the conference on California herpetology*. H.F. DeLisle, P.R. Brown, B. Kaufman, and H.M. McGurty (eds). *Southwestern Herpetologists Society Special Publication* (4): 1-143.
- Jennings, M.R. and M.P. Hayes. 1994. Amphibian and reptile species of special concern in California. Report prepared for the California Department of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Division, Rancho Cordova, California. 255 pp.
- Jennings, M.R., S. Townsend, and R.R. Duke. 1997. Santa Clara Valley Water District California red-legged frog distribution and status – 1997. Final Report prepared by H.T. Harvey & Associates, Alviso, California. 22 pp.
- Kupferberg, S. 1997. Facilitation of periphyton production by tadpole grazing: Functional differences between species. *Freshwater Biology* 37:427-439.
- Kupferberg, S.J., J.C. Marks and M.E. Power. 1994. Effects of variation in natural algal and detrital diets on larval anuran (*Hyla regilla*) life-history traits. *Copeia* 1994:446-457.

- LeNoir, J.S., L.L. McConnell, G.M. Fellers, T.M. Cahill, J.N. Seiber. 1999. Summertime Transport of Current-use pesticides from California's Central Valley to the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range, USA. *Environmental Toxicology & Chemistry* 18(12): 2715-2722.
- McConnell, L.L., J.S. LeNoir, S. Datta, J.N. Seiber. 1998. Wet deposition of current-use pesticides in the Sierra Nevada mountain range, California, USA. *Environmental Toxicology & Chemistry* 17(10):1908-1916.
- Rathburn, G.B. 1998. *Rana aurora draytonii* egg predation. *Herpetological Review*, 29(3): 165.
- Reis, D.K. 1999. Habitat characteristics of California red-legged frogs (*Rana aurora draytonii*): Ecological differences between eggs, tadpoles, and adults in a coastal brackish and freshwater system. M.S. Thesis. San Jose State University. 58 pp.
- Seale, D.B. and N. Beckvar. 1980. The comparative ability of anuran larvae (genera: *Hyla*, *Bufo* and *Rana*) to ingest suspended blue-green algae. *Copeia* 1980:495-503.
- D.W. Sparling, G.M. Fellers, L.L. McConnell. 2001. Pesticides and amphibian population declines in California, USA. *Environmental Toxicology & Chemistry* 20(7): 1591-1595.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 1998. Guidance for Ecological Risk Assessment. Risk Assessment Forum. EPA/630/R-95/002F, April 1998.
- U.S. EPA. 2004. Overview of the Ecological Risk Assessment Process in the Office of Pesticide Programs. Office of Prevention, Pesticides, and Toxic Substances. Office of Pesticide Programs. Washington, D.C. January 23, 2004.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1996. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: determination of threatened status for the California red-legged frog. *Federal Register* 61(101):25813-25833.
- USFWS. 2002. Recovery Plan for the California Red-legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*). Region 1, USFWS, Portland, Oregon.
(http://ecos.fws.gov/doc/recovery_plans/2002/020528.pdf)
- USFWS. 2006. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: determination of critical habitat for the California red-legged frog. 71 FR 19244-19346.
- USFWS. Website accessed: 30 December 2006.
http://www.fws.gov/endangered/features/rl_frog/rlfrog.html#where

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 1998. Endangered Species Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Final Draft. March 1998.

USFWS/NMFS. 2004. 50 CFR Part 402. Joint Counterpart Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation Regulations; Final Rule. FR 47732-47762.

Wassersug, R. 1984. Why tadpoles love fast food. Natural History 4/84.