ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

Updated Sept 2015 per NPS NEPA Handbook

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Accelerating Succession of Native Coastal Rain Forest
PEPC Project Number: 105765
PMIS Number:
Project Type: Resource Management (RM)
Project Location:
County, State: Clatsop, Oregon **District, Section:** 01,
Project Leader: Carla Cole

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project will accelerate the succession of shore pine plantations on the Oregon Coast into native coastal Sitka spruce and western hemlock forests through a combination of girdling and falling mature shore pine to release native trees and removing young shore pine seedlings. Work will be accomplished through contract crews and youth hires. Twenty acres of artificial plantation will be set on a trajectory to develop into a native Sitka spruce coastal temperate rainforest. Extent of project area is outlined in yellow on the attached map.

C. RESOURCE IMPACTS TO CONSIDER:

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Air Air Quality	None	
Biological Nonnative or Exotic Species *exotic species*		Issue: introduction of propagules through unclean equipment Impact: introducing new infestations to the site. this will be mitigated through requiring all equipment to be cleaned prior to bringing to site.
Biological Species of Special Concern or Their Habitat	None	
Biological Vegetation *coastal forest plant community*	Potential	Issue: planted shorepine have produced an unnatural stand of low diversity Impact: will improve diversity
Biological Wildlife and/or Wildlife Habitat including terrestrial and aquatic		Issue: limited foraging and nesting opportunities Impact: this project will improve habitat

species *songbird habitat*		
Cultural Archeological Resources	None	
Cultural Cultural Landscapes	None	
Cultural Ethnographic Resources	None	
Cultural Museum Collections	None	
Cultural Prehistoric/historic structures	None	
Geological Geologic Features		
Geological Geologic Features	None	
Geological Geologic Processes	None	
Lightscapes Lightscapes	None	
Other Human Health and Safety	None	
Paleontological Paleontological Resources		
Socioeconomic Land Use	None	
Socioeconomic Minority and low-income populations, size, migration patterns, etc.	None	
Socioeconomic Socioeconomic	None	
Soundscapes Soundscapes	None	
Viewsheds Viewsheds	None	
Visitor Use and Experience Recreation Resources	None	
Visitor Use and Experience Visitor Use and Experience	None	

Water Floodplains	None	
Water Marine or Estuarine Resources	None	
Water Water Quality or Quantity	None	
Water Wetlands	None	

D. ESF ADDENDUM QUESTIONS:

Question	Answer	Notes

ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. Park: Lewis and Clark National Historic Park

2. Project Description:

Project Name: Accelerating Succession of Native Coastal Rain Forest
Prepared by: Rachel Stokeld **Date Prepared:** 12/13/2021 **Telephone:** (503) 861-4440
PEPC Project Number: 105765
Locations:
County, State: Clatsop, OR **District, Section:** 01,
Describe project:
This project will accelerate the succession of shore pine plantations on the Oregon Coast into native coastal Sitka spruce and western hemlock forests through a combination of girdling and falling mature shore pine to release native trees and removing young shore pine seedlings. Work will be accomplished through contract crews and youth hires. Twenty acres of artificial plantation will be set on a trajectory to develop into a native Sitka spruce coastal temperate rainforest. Extent of project area is outlined in yellow on the attached map.

Area of potential effects (as defined in 36 CFR 800.16[d])
Foredunes, Sunset Beach/Yeon Unit, LEWI
Section 16, Township 7 North, Range 10 West, Willamette Meridian
USGS map reference: Gearhart, OR

3. Has the area of potential effects been surveyed to identify historic properties?

___ **No**
X **Yes**

Source or reference: 2017. DOUGLAS C. WILSON, PH.D. AND LESLIE L. O'ROURKE, M.A., R.P.A. PEDESTRIAN AND SUBSURFACE SURVEY OF THE YEON PROPERTY, LEWIS AND CLARK NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK.
2018. STOKELD, RACHEL. CULTURAL RESOURCES MONITORING REPORT, YEON UNIT SOIL TESTING, LEWIS AND CLARK NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, CLATSOP COUNTY, OREGON.

4. Potentially Affected Resource(s):

Archeological Resources Present: No

Archeological Resources Notes: 2011 archaeological pedestrian and shovel probe survey did not locate archaeological resources within the project area.

In 2011, cultural remains were identified rom 89-108 cm below surface approximately 80 m (262 ft.) east of the project area boundary. The excavator found 8 calcined bone fragments, 10 fire cracked rock pieces, and 9

fragments of charcoal during screening in the 1/8 in mesh. Crews recorded the cultural remains as an isolate. Site #: 35CLT133, Yeon South Site.

Historical Structures/Resources Present: No

Cultural Landscapes Present: No

Ethnographic Resources Present: No

Ethnographic Resources Notes: Previous consultations for other work at the property have not identified any ethnographic resources.

5. The proposed action will: (check as many as apply)

No Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure
No Replace historic features/elements in kind
No Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure
No Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)
No Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape
No Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible
No Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible>
No Potentially affect presently unidentified cultural resources
No Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting, landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources
No Involve a real property transaction (exchange, sale, or lease of land or structures)
___ Other (please specify): _____

6. Supporting Study Data:
(Attach if feasible; if action is in a plan, EA or EIS, give name and project or page number.)

Response received from Grand Ronde 4/21/22. No comments.

B. REVIEWS BY CULTURAL RESOURCE SPECIALISTS

The park 106 coordinator requested review by the park's cultural resource specialist/advisors as indicated by check-off boxes or as follows:

[X] Archeologist
Name: Rachel Stokeld
Date: 12/15/2021
Comments: 2011 arch survey did not identified cultural resources within project area. Project does not involve ground disturbance.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance **[X]**
Assessment of Effect: __No Potential to Cause Effect __X__No Historic Properties Affected __No Adverse Effect __Adverse Effect __X__Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: Report any potential cultural resources encountered to cultural resource specialist @ LEWI.

Doc Method: Streamlined Review (PA)

Streamlined Activity:
5. Routine Grounds Maintenance

No Reviews From: Curator, Historical Architect, Historian, 106 Advisor, Other Advisor, Anthropologist, Historical Landscape Architect

---

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

_____	No Potential to Cause Effects
X	No Historic Properties Affected
_____	No Adverse Effect
_____	Adverse Effect

2. Documentation Method:

[ ] A. Standard 36 CFR Part 800 Consultation
Further consultation under 36 CFR Part 800 is needed.

[X] B. Streamlined Review Under the 2008 Servicewide Programmatic Agreement (PA)
The above action meets all conditions for a streamlined review under section III of the 2008 Servicewide PA for Section 106 compliance.

Applicable Streamlined Review Criteria
(Specify 1-16 of the list of streamlined review criteria.)

5. Routine Grounds Maintenance.

[ ] C. Undertaking Related to Park Specific or Another Agreement
The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under another document such as a park, region or statewide agreement established in accord with 36 CFR 800.7 or 36 CFR 800.14.

[ ] D. Combined NEPA/NHPA Process
Process and documentation required for the preparation of an EA/FONSI or an EIS/ROD to comply with Section 106 is in accord with 36 CFR 800.8.c.

[ ] E. Memo to Project File

3. Consultation Information

SHPO Required: No
SHPO Sent:
SHPO Received:

THPO Required: Yes
THPO Sent: 3/18/22
THPO Received: 4/21/22

SHPO/THPO Notes:

Advisory Council Participating: No
Advisory Council Notes:
Additional Consulting Parties: No

4. Stipulations and Conditions: Following are listed any stipulations or conditions necessary to ensure that the assessment of effect above is consistent with 36 CFR Part 800 criteria of effect or to avoid or reduce potential adverse effects.

5. Mitigations/Treatment Measures: Measures to prevent or minimize loss or impairment of historic/prehistoric properties: (Remember that setting, location, and use may be relevant.)

No Assessment of Effect mitigations identified.

6. Assessment of Effect Notes:

Published research concerning the age of the dune ridges in the area indicates that the dunes in the project area were accreted since ca. 1858.Clatsop Community College provided an estimate of the 1858 ocean line which is about 325 m east of the current shoreline. See Wilson and O'Rourke, 2017 p. 8.
The material culture remains documented in 2011 occurred at a significant depth (over 80 cm BS) and, therefore, the project is not likely to impact archaeological resources.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Compliance Specialist:
NHPA Specialist
Rachel Stokeld Rachel Stokeld **Date:** 4/21/22

E. SUPERINTENDENT'S APPROVAL

The proposed work conforms to the NPS *Management Policies* and *Cultural Resource Management Guideline*, and I have reviewed and approve the recommendations, stipulations, or conditions noted in Section C of this form.

Signature

Superintendent: _____ **Date:** 4/25/2022

Categorical Exclusion Documentation Form (CE Form)

Project: Accelerating Succession of Native Coastal Rain Forest
PEPC Project Number: 105765
Description of Action (Project Description):

This project will accelerate the succession of shore pine plantations on the Oregon Coast into native coastal Sitka spruce and western hemlock forests through a combination of girdling and falling mature shore pine to release native trees and removing young shore pine seedlings. Work will be accomplished through contract crews and youth hires. Twenty acres of artificial plantation will be set on a trajectory to develop into a native Sitka spruce coastal temperate rainforest. Extent of project area is outlined in yellow on the attached map.

Project Locations:

Location

County:	Clatsop	**State:**	OR
District:	01	**Section:**	

There are no required mitigations identified.

CE Citation: 3.3.E.2 Restoration of noncontroversial native species into suitable habitats within their historic range and elimination of exotic species.

CE Justification:

Thinning of planted shore pine to release the growth of native Sitka spruce and hemlock fall under this CE: "Restoration of noncontroversial native species into suitable habitats within their historic range and elimination of exotic species."

Decision: I find that the action fits within the categorical exclusion above. Therefore, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No extraordinary circumstances apply.

Signature

Superintendent: _____ **Date:** _____

Extraordinary Circumstances:

If implemented, would the proposal...	Yes/No	Explanation
A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?	No	
B. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas?	No	
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?	No	
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?	No	
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?	No	
G. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office?	No	
H. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?	No	
I. Violate a federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?	No	
J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EO 12898)?	No	
K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 130007)?	No	
L. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?	No	