INTERMOUNTAIN REGION
GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK
ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM

NEPA COMPLIANCE # **12-038** **(ASSIGNED BY PLANNER)**

*This form is required for any project that involves surface or subsurface disturbance to water, soils, vegetation, wetlands; or any construction or modification of facilities within Grand Teton NP or John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Memorial Parkway that could affect natural or cultural resources or require design review. Sections **A** and **B** should be filled out by the project initiator (may be coupled with other park project initiation forms). Sections **C - J** are to be completed by the interdisciplinary team members. This form must be attached to any document that will require the Regional Director's signature.*

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Date (ESF was filled out): **11/29/2012**

Project Title: Newbold Diversion Dam Removal

Project Number: _____

Project Type: (*Circle/Highlight):* Cyclic, Cultural Cyclic, Repair/Rehab, ONPS, NRPP, CRPP, FLHP, Line Item, Fee Demo, Concession Reimbursable, Other (specify) Removal of failing diversion dam structure to improve fish passage.

Project Location: Gros Ventre River at Kelly, Wyoming Dimensions of Disturbance: **~ 2 acres**

Proposed Start Date: **March 2013** Estimated Completion Date: **March 2013**

Project Lead/Orgn: **Sue Consolo Murphy, GTNP** **Phone #: 307-739-3481**

Contract#/Contractor Name: **To be determined**

Administrative Record Location: Planning Office Files Contact: Carol Cunningham, Planning (307)739-3467

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION/LOCATION [*Attach maps, photos of site, agency consultation, site visit notes, relevant data or reports. Use DCP maps or aerials for developed areas and/or USGS maps or other maps for all other areas. Plot project location.*]

Is the project in a previously disturbed area?	☒ Yes	☐ No
Is it flagged or stacked?	☐ Yes	☒ No
Is the project within recommended or proposed wilderness? If yes, initiate a Minimum Requirement Decision (MRD) procedure by completing Minimum Requirement Decision Guide (MRDG) worksheets.	☐ Yes	☒ No
Is the project within a wellhead protection zone?	☐ Yes	☒ No
Is a new access route required? (If so, describe below and show on map)	☐ Yes	☒ No
Is the work performed routinely? (As in road maintenance or building repair)	☐ Yes	☒ No
Does the action require the removal of any trees?	☐ Yes	☒ No
Is the proposed work generated from a Development Concept Plan (DCP) or other planning document? If so, Name and Date: _____	☐ Yes	☒ No
Has the work been covered under a previous work clearance request? If so, what is the previous compliance number? _____	☐ Yes	☒ No
Is this project below ordinary high water mark (OHWM) for lake or river? Above & below	☒ Yes	☒ No
Preliminary drawings and/or background information attached?	☒ Yes	☐ No
Is the project a hot topic or sensitive issue? *(If so, describe circumstances on next page)*	☐ Yes	☒ No

Problem or Opportunity to be Addressed: *(What is the purpose or objective addressed by the action? What is the need for action or the existing condition?* Attach supporting information or use additional sheets as necessary.)

The Newbold diversion dam, a low-head, log and rock structure located in the Gros Ventre River at Kelly, Wyoming, is showing signs of failing to the point that there is concern that the dam could fail in the next 1-3 years, possibly during Spring 2013, the next period of high water. Dam failure could affect the structural integrity of a bridge about 650 feet upstream of the diversion structure. Consultants recommend planned dam removal, which they believe would be preferable to dam failure for both resource and cost reasons.

The north river bank marks the boundary between GTNP and the NER, managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. GTNP acquired the diversion structure, associated headgates and irrigation ditches, and all associated water rights in 1949, but has not used these assets in recent memory. The structure is not performing its original function of diverting water from the river to other areas. In addition, the NPS, Trout Unlimited (TU), and Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) have identified the dam as an impediment to natural movements of native cutthroat trout and non-game fish, particularly bluehead sucker, a state-listed sensitive species. Both fish species have declined in distribution and abundance across their range. The dam is the only barrier to upstream migration between the Snake River approximately 8 miles downstream and numerous miles of upstream habitat which is generally in good condition. Recent radio telemetry movement studies indicate that some adult trout are able to pass the low-head dam, but others, along with smaller trout, native suckers, and small non-game fish, are unable to pass.

Leaving the failing structure in place could also pose a safety hazard to people fishing near the structure due to debris flowing downstream or a sudden surge of water.

Problem Solution or Proposed Action: *(What action is being proposed to address the problem/need or take advantage of the opportunity? Be specific about the "what, when, and how" of the proposal.* Attach maps, concept drawings, or other supporting information about the proposal and use additional sheets as necessary.)

Grand Teton National Park (GTNP), the National Elk Refuge (NER) and Trout Unlimited (TU) propose to work together as partners to remove the Newbold diversion dam. Because the structure impedes native fish passage and fearing that it will fail within the next few years with a heavy runoff season and potentially affect the integrity of an upstream bridge, TU's Western Water Project proposes to provide funds and contract removal of the structures in partnership with the park during low water in early March 2013.

The park received recommendations from hydrologists and a water rights specialist from the NPS Water Resources Division (WRD) who visited GRTE in May 2012. These experts believed that removal is unlikely to cause appreciable impacts to river conditions. The park is currently seeking engineering information about the upstream Highlands Loop Drive Bridge, particularly the substrate beneath its central pier, and requested a topographic survey and a scour analysis to assess potential impacts. WRD experts did not recommend the use of sediment- retaining weirs.

In a November 19, 2012 memo presenting scour analysis results (see attached), WRD experts did recommend being prepared to place rip-rap to protect the bridge pier if needed. The pier is directly in the river flowfield and subject to scour at frequent flows. Scour analysis modeling indicates that scour may increase somewhat due to higher flow velocities from a slightly steeper channel streambed. Stored sediment above (upstream of) the diversion dam is expected to be released as the river is able to erode it but experts were unable to predict how quickly this would occur. Sediment release would not be expected to impact river water quality conditions because the Gros Ventre River is already very sediment-rich and the amount and amount of time for the release would likely be relatively short. Because the impoundment is essentially the same width as the channel, riparian restoration would be limited to some bank restoration, including re-contouring the existing access and only a short upper portion of the Newbold ditch. Revegetation would also be performed in these areas.

Quadrant Consulting, Inc. (QCI), out of Boise, Idaho, was contracted by Trout Unlimited's Wyoming Water Project to plan a controlled removal strategy to:

- protect the central pier of the upstream bridge with rock riprap;
- block the Newbold ditch at the diversion dam headgates to prevent river flow into the ditch, which would change existing river flow and exacerbate erosion;
- grade the streambed to produce a more gradual drop in water surface than currently exists and prevent
- remove depositional material upstream of the diversion and use to fill streambed scour hole downstream of the diversion, use for blocking the irrigation ditch entrance and for backfill over rootwad structures installed to protect the river bank;
- enhance fish passage;
- restore and revegetate with live willow and cottonwood cuttings the disturbed river bank and access areas; and
- install a "dry hydrant" (a non-pressurized drafting pipe) to provide a water source for fire management as mitigation for the loss of the diversion structure and the ability to divert water into the Newbold Ditch.

See the attached Quadrant Consulting, Inc. design drawings dated 11/15/2012 for additional details and the Mack McFarland email d. 01.08.2013 providing dry hydrant information.

The improved fish passage and ecological connectivity for native fisheries would effectively restore native Snake River cutthroat trout and native non-game fish access to heretofore inaccessible aquatic habitat. Other goals would be to reduce safety concerns related to public access to the existing structure and the potential for debris to be driven down river, and to mitigate the potential effects of dam removal or natural failure to the upstream Highlands Loop Drive Bridge and the capacity for fire fighting.

The contractor shall develop a water management plan to complete as much work as practical outside of actively flowing water. This plan shall be presented to owner and engineer for approval prior to beginning work. Work shall take place at low stream flow conditions to minimize in-stream turbidity and construction impacts. During in-stream construction activities, daily turbidity monitoring shall be performed upstream and downstream of the project. Monitoring data shall be recorded and provided to owner and engineer on a weekly basis. The contractor shall minimize disturbance to existing vegetation to the greatest extent practical. Staging of 200 cubic yards of rock (approximately 50-60 feet long, 25 feet wide, and 4 feet high) will be on-site between Third Street and the river.

Issues and Alternatives: ***(What issues, if any, would you expect to arise from this proposal? What alternatives have you considered to address the issues? Would the action be controversial?)***

A "No Action" alternative is not considered reasonable due to resource and safety concerns. It is possible that a natural failure at high spring flows would not have appreciable consequences but hydrological experts advise anticipating potential effects and mitigating them with a pre-emptive planned removal. TU contractors have prepared a conceptual design for removing the dam, including placing rock rip-rap at the central pier of the upstream bridge and grading the streambed to fill scour holes and produce a more gradual drop in water surface than currently provided by the diversion structure.

The primary issues to be resolved are 1) determining and mitigating any potential effects of downstream dam removal on the upstream bridge, the condition of which is unknown, and 2) completing evaluation of the dam and associated ditches as eligibility as historic resources and, if historic, achieving cultural resource compliance with the State Historic Preservation Office.

Mitigation and/or Rehabilitation: *(Describe what mitigation measures or stipulations will be necessary from this proposal? What alternatives have you considered to address the issues? Would the action be controversial?)*

- Katherine Longfield Wonson, Cultural Resource Specialist, 739-3671), has been working with the regional archeologist to determine whether the Newbold Diversion Dam and/or Newbold Ditch are eligible to be listed as historic and with SHPO to complete additional compliance if more is needed. Any necessary cultural compliance must be complete prior to beginning work.

- A water management plan will be completed to allow as much work as practical to be conducted outside of actively flowing water. Work will take place at low stream flow conditions to minimize in-stream turbidity and construction impacts.

- During in-stream construction activities, daily turbidity monitoring will be performed upstream and downstream of the project. Monitoring data will be recorded and provided to owner and engineer on a weekly basis.

- All employees working in the field must follow park food storage regulations (*36 CFR 2.10*). Any food, garbage, toiletry, or other bear attractants must not be left unattended for ANY length of time. Contractors must receive Bear Awareness Education prior to work. Contact Kate Wilmot (739-3673) to arrange a meeting.

- No night work is authorized. Work is authorized only between sunrise and sunset.

- Prior to breaking ground, the park project contact must communicate with SRM Vegetation Management (Jason Brengle, 739-3684, or Ken Stella, 739-3486) and work closely with park vegetation specialists regarding exotic plant control, revegetation with appropriate plant species, use of park-approved seed, and monitoring of revegetation efforts.

- Power wash equipment and/or vehicles before use to prevent the introduction and transportation of exotic plants. The park is willing to provide a portable power washer for post-project washing.

- Limit ground disturbance to the smallest area possible.

- To minimize the amount of ground disturbance, locate staging and stockpiling areas in previously disturbed/paved sites to the extent possible. Return all staging and stockpiling areas to pre-construction conditions following construction.

- Conserve topsoil during construction activities. Topsoil should be collected as trenching is done, using planks or tarps, and prevented from mixing with subsoil. Soil and cobble should be placed in the trench in the proper order, cobble lowest, then subsoil, then topsoil. Use a trench box if one is needed to reduce disturbance.

- Maintain a safe construction zone. Fence around open holes and staging area when personnel are not present.

- To minimize air and sound pollution associated with construction activities, limit warm up, cool down, and idling of construction equipment to the minimum durations recommended in the equipment owner's manual, taking into consideration ambient temperatures and other factors.

- Ensure that construction equipment uses the best available technology for sound dampening muffler and exhaust systems.

- Keep in mind the value of natural soundscapes and attempt to reduce noise production and impacts.

- Should construction unearth previously undiscovered archaeological resources, work will be stopped in the area of any discovery, and the park will consult with the park archaeologist, state historic preservation officer/tribal historic preservation officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, as necessary, according to §36 CFR Part 800.13, Post Review Discoveries. In the unlikely event that human remains are discovered during construction, provisions outlined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990) will be followed.

- Work with Jackie Skaggs (739-3393) and TU regarding public notification regarding removal and post-removal bank restoration activities.

- Educational signage and/or fliers for visitors about revegetation activities are recommended. Place barriers to prevent people from walking on these areas.

- CWA §404 and §401 permitting –A letter verifying that *Nationwide Permit 27: Stream and Wetland Restoration Activities* applies must be sent to the Army Corps of Engineers and their approval received before construction commences. The ACOE requests 401 permits from the State of Wyoming as part of the overall permit. All restrictions within these permits must be strictly adhered to.

- Construction contract must include a clause requiring cleanup of all generated wastes and erosion materials before the completion of the project.

- It is anticipated that the removal of the existing diversion structure will lead to a small increase in channel velocity through the project reach, including the area in the vicinity of the Highlands Loop Drive Bridge pier. Inspection of the project area following high water events is highly recommended, particularly for the first five years following construction, to verify the presence or absence of increased channel downcuttng or lateral channel movement.

- A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan must be developed and kept on site during work activities. Contact TU regarding whether the contractor or other entity will complete the plan.

Project Cost and Funding: ***(Are funds available for this project, or are there funds that may be allocated to it?*** **If there is no current funding allocation, enter an estimated cost, the account code and the responsible division.)**

No funds have been allocated. Project is being funded through NGO partner, Trout Unlimited.

Project Submitter:	/S/Sue Consolo Murphy Signature	1/29/13 Date
Responsible Division Chief:	/S/Sue Consolo Murphy Signature	1/29/13 Date
Receipt Acknowledgement:	/S/Carol Cunningham Signature (Planner)	1/29/13 Date

Division Chief Comments (*if necessary*):

C. OTHER INFORMATION

1) Personnel preparing form familiar with the site? ☒ Yes ☐ No Site visit conducted? ☒ Yes ☐ No
(*Attach meeting notes or additional pages noting when site visit took place, staff attending, etc.*)

2) Is the project in an approved plan with accompanying environmental document? ☒ Yes ☐ No
If so, plan name _____ FONSI/ROD *(Circle one)* Date approved: _____
Is the project still consistent with the approved plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No *(If no, prepare plan/EA-EIS)*
Is the environmental document accurate and up-to-date? ☐ Yes ☐ No *(If no, prepare plan/EA-EIS)*

3) Are there any interested or affected agencies, parties or tribes? __ If so, have they been consulted? _____

4) Has consultation with all affected agencies or tribes been completed? ☐ Yes ☒ No
(*If so, attach documentation detailing the consultation, including name, dates, summary of comments*)

5) Are there any connected, cumulative, or similar actions as part of the proposed action? ☒ Yes ☐ No
(*If so, attach documentation detailing the other actions*) See project description section above for connectivity to other plans/proposals.

D. RESOURCE EFFECTS TO CONSIDER *(Any measurable impacts possible on the following resources?)*

Use the process described in DO-12, §2.9 and §2.10; §3.5; §4.5(G) to (G)(5) and §5.4(F) to help determine the context, duration and intensity of effects on resources..[A=ADVERSE, B=BENEFICIAL, N-NEGLIGIBLE, MI=MINOR, MO=MODERATE, MA=MAJOR]

Are any impacts possible on the following physical, natural or cultural resources?	Y/N	Level of Effect	Data Needed
1. Geological resources – soils, bedrock, streambeds, etc.	Y	ST MI A	
2. From geohazards	N		
3. Air quality (from vehicles or equipment)	N		
4. Soundscapes	Y	ST MI A	
5. Water quality or quantity	Y	ST MI A	
6. Streamflow characteristics	Y	LT MI B	
7. Marine or estuarine resources	N		
8. Floodplains or wetlands (No affect to floodplain, potential N-MI adverse to artificial wetland/artificial riparian area along Newbold Ditch)	Y	LT N-MI A	
9. Land use, including occupancy, income, values, ownership, type of use	N		
10. Rare or unusual vegetation – old growth timber, riparian, alpine	N		
11. Species of special concern (plant or animal; state or federal listed or proposed) or their habitat	N		
12. Unique ecosystems, biosphere reserves, World Heritage Sites	N		
13. Unique or important wildlife or wildlife habitat	N		
14. Unique, essential or important fish or fish habitat	Y	LT MI B	
15. Introduce or promote non-native species (plant or animal)	N		
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	N		
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	N		
18. Prehistoric/historic structures	N		
19. Cultural landscapes	N		
20. Ethnographic resources	N		
21. Museum collections (objects, specimens, and archival and manuscript collections)	N		
22. Socioeconomics (employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure, concessions	N		
23. Minority and low income populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.	N		
24. Energy resources	N		
25. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	N		
26. Resource, including energy, conservation potential	N		
27. Urban quality, gateway communities, etc.	N		
28. Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity	N		
29. Pollution prevention (greening the parks)	N		
30. Wilderness – suitability, recommended, potential, designated	N		
31. Park operations	Y	LT MI B	
32. Other important environmental resources (geothermal, paleontological resources, night skies)?	N		

E. MANDATORY CRITERIA

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	Data Needed	Comments
A. Have material adverse effects on public health or safety?		X		
B. Have adverse effects on such unique 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; floodplains; or ecologically significant or critical areas, including those listed on the National Register of Natural Landmarks?		X		
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects?		X		
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		X		
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		X		
F. Be directly related to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		X		
G. Have adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places?		X		
H. Have adverse effects on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species or have adverse effects on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		X		
I. Require compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act?		X		
J. Threaten to violate a federal, state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		X		
K. Involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA sec. 102(2)(E)?		X		
L. Have a disproportionate, significant adverse effect on low-income or minority populations (EO 12898)?		X		
M. Restrict access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 130007)?		X		
N. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of federally listed noxious weeds (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act)?		X		
O. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of non-native invasive species or actions that may promote the introduction, growth or expansion of the range of non-native invasive species (EO 13112)?		X		
P. Require a permit from a federal, state, or local agency to proceed, unless the agency from which the permit is required agrees that a CE is appropriate?		X		
Q. Have the potential for significant impact as indicated by a federal, state, or local agency or Indian tribe?		X		
R. Have the potential to be controversial because of disagreement over possible environmental effects?		X		
S. Have the potential to violate the NPS Organic Act by impairing park resources or values?		X		

F. INSTRUCTIONS FOR DETERMINING APPROPRIATE NEPA PATHWAY

First, always check DO-12, § 3.2, "Process to Follow" in determining whether the action is categorically excluded from additional NEPA analyses. Other sections within DO-12, including §2.9 and 2.10; §3.5; §4.5(G)(4) and (G)(5), and §5.4(F), should also be consulted in determining the appropriate NEPA pathway. Complete the following tasks: conduct a site visit or ensure that staff is familiar with the site's specifics; consult with affected agencies, and/or tribes; and interested public and complete this environmental screening form.

If your action is described in DO-12 section 3.3, "CE's for Which No Formal Documentation is Necessary," follow the instructions indicated in that section. If your action is not described in DO-12, section 3.3, and IS described in section 3.4, AND you checked yes or identified "data needed to determine" impacts in any block in section D (Mandatory Criteria), this is an indication that there is potential for significant impacts to the human environment, therefore, you must prepare an EA or EIS or supply missing information to determine context, duration and intensity of impacts.

If your action is described in section 3.4 and NO is checked for all boxes in section D (Mandatory Criteria), BUT you have initially checked "yes" in section C (Resource Effects to Consider) during internal scoping, this means that the team should do additional analyses to determine the context, duration and intensity of effects. If the magnitude of effects is then determined to be at the negligible or minor level, then usually there is no potential for significant impacts, then an EA or EIS is not required. If, however, during internal scoping and further investigation, resource effects still remain unknown, or are at the minor to moderate level of intensity, and the potential for significant impacts may be likely, an EA or EIS is required.

In all cases, data collected to determine the appropriate NEPA pathway must be included in the administrative record.

G. ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE PROJECT REVIEW

This section may be filled out either as the project progresses or when environmental documentation is complete.

National Environmental Policy Act

Data entered by: CC

(*Choose one and fill in blanks*)

☒ CE *Complete sections A-F before checking this box.* _E(4). Removal of non-historic materials and structures in order to restore natural conditions._____ CE Citation (from 3-4 of DO-12)

☐ EA Public scoping date _____ IMR Review date _____
EA release to public _____ FONSI date _____

☐ EIS NOI in FR _____ NOA for DEIS _____
NOA for FEIS _____ ROD date _____

Will the EA/EIS be used as the §106 compliance document? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, you must notify *in advance* the SHPO/THPO and ACHP of your intent to do so. Date notified _____

National Historic Preservation Act

Data entered by: KL

Has the area been surveyed and NRHP resources identified? ..... ☐ Yes ☒ No

Ground disturbance involved?	☒ Yes	☐ No	Historic structures affected?	☐ Yes	☒ No
Archeological resources affected?*	☐ Yes	☐ No	Cultural landscapes affected?	☐ Yes	☒ No
Museum Collections affected?	☐ Yes	☒ No			
Ethnographic resources affected?*	☐ Yes	☐ No	If yes, interested parties contacted?	☐ Yes	☐ No

☐ *No Historic Properties Affected* Date to SHPO/THPO: _Jan. 25, 2013_☐ Data Needed, What? _____

☒ *No Adverse Effect* ☐ Programmatic Excl. # _____

If using combined EA/AEF/ESF, date of letter of intention to SHPO/THPO to use combined doc.: _____
Date AEF/ESF or EA/AEF to SHPO/THPO _____
Date response from SHPO/THPO _____
Date mitigation completed _____
Date mitigation completed _____

☐ *Adverse Effect*

If using combined EA/AEF/ESF, date of letter of intention to SHPO/THPO to use combined doc.: _____
Date AEF/ESF or EA/AEF to SHPO/THPO _____
Date to ACHP, if required _____
MOA Date _____
Date mitigation completed _____

*None known.

The park recently completed the *2012 Class III Cultural Resource Inventory Report of the Kelly Diversion Dam and Newbold Canal.* Three sites were recorded as a result of this inventory; these include the Kelly Diversion Dam (48TE1877), the associated Newbold Canal (48TE1879), and one historic trash scatter. Only the Newbold Canal (48TE1879) was determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The national register eligible canal will not be adversely impacted by this project as the project will not "alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association" (36CFR800.5). The park has determined that the proposed action will have no adverse impacts to cultural resources, and is, therefore, a "no adverse effect" action. The report and request for concurrence with the NPS determination were sent to SHPO on 1/25/2013, starting a 30-day consultation period. The park must complete cultural compliance and receive SHPO concurrence of no adverse effect before work can commence.

Endangered Species Act

Data entered by: CC

Any threatened/endangered species in area? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If species in area ☒ No effect ☐ Not Likely to Adversely Affect ☐ Likely to Adversely Affect

(If checked, consider EIS)

Is proposed action within the Grizzly Bear Conservation Area (GBCA)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Date to FWS _____ Date FWS response _____

Floodplains/Wetlands/§404 Permits			Data entered by: CC
Is project in 100- or 500-year floodplain, flash flood hazard area, or wetlands?	☒ Yes	☐ No	*If yes, statement of findings approval date* Not required
Is a 404 permit needed?	☒ Yes	☐ No	Date PCN sent 2/1/13
State 401 certification? *Note: If 404 permit needed, so is 401 permit*	☒ Yes	☐ No	Date _____
State Water Quality permit? Turbidity Waiver	☒ Yes	☐ No	Date Application sent 2/1/13
Tribal Water Quality permit?	☐ Yes	☒ No	Date _____

Other Permits/Laws				Data entered by: CC
Consistent with Wilderness Act	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Date _____
Wilderness minimum requirement (tool) decision needed?	☐ Yes	☒ No		Date _____
Wild and scenic river concerns? Section 7 evaluation	☒ Yes	☐ No		Date 1/31/13; cc to ACOE 2/1/13
National Trails concerns?	☐ Yes	☒ No		Date _____
Air Quality consult w/State?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Date _____
Consistent w/Architectural Barriers, Rehabilitation, and Americans with Disabilities Acts?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A	Date _____
Other _____	☐ Yes	☒ No		Date _____

H. MITIGATING MEASURES AND/OR STIPULATIONS TO BE INCLUDED IN PROJECT:

(Specify conditions of approval or stipulations for project or attach appropriate pages from the EA, EIS, FONSI, MOA, or ROD)

The following stipulation is in addition to those listed on pages 4-5 of this document and on the Clean Water Act permits.

- Ensure the dry hydrant intake is appropriately screened.

I. SIGNATORY (*All ID Team Members Need To Sign*)

By signing this form, you affirm the following: you have either completed a site visit or are familiar with the specifics of the site; you have consulted with affected agencies and tribes; and you, to the best of your knowledge, have answered the questions posed in the checklist correctly.

Resource Council Members	Field of Expertise	Date Signed
/S/Carol Cunnngham	**NEPA Compliance Specialist**	1/28/2013
/S/Katherine (Longfield) Wonson	**Cultural Resources Specialists**	1/28/2013
/S/Mike Nicklas, Mack McFarland	**Visitor Resources/Protection Specialists**	1/31/2013, 1/30/2013

/S/Sue Consolo Murphy, Steve Cain, Jason Brengle	**Natural Resources Specialist**	1/30/2013
/S/Rusty Mizelle	**Facilities Management**	1/30/2013
/S/Dave Rhinehart	**Business Resources Specialist**	1/28/2013

Resource Council Meeting Date and Attendees: Individual consultation during late January 2013.

J. *Based on the environmental impact information contained in the statutory compliance file and in this environmental screening form, environmental documentation for the subject project is complete. If the project involves hot topics or sensitive issues, I have briefed the deputy or regional director.*

Recommended: Carol Cunningham — Park NEPA Compliance Specialist — 1/31/2013 — Date

Approved: — Deputy Superintendent — 1/31/13 — Date