

**National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior**



**Harry S Truman National Historic Site – Truman Farm
Missouri**

HARRY S TRUMAN NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE TRUMAN FARM CULTURAL LANDSCAPE REPORT HISTORIC STRUCTURE REPORT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

BACKGROUND

The Harry S Truman National Historic Site (NHS or park) was authorized by an act of Congress on May 23, 1983 (Public Law 98-32). The Truman Farm is located in the Grandview Unit of the Harry S Truman National Historic Site and was authorized for acquisition by Congress on December 14, 1993. The Truman Farm is significant because of its association with Harry S Truman, President of the United States from 1945 to 1953. The NHS is administered and maintained by the National Park Service (NPS).

The NPS has completed the combined Harry S Truman National Historic Site Truman Farm Cultural Landscape Report, Historic Structure Report, and Environmental Assessment (CLR/HSR/EA), one purpose of which is to document the condition and development of the Truman Farm including its building, structures, and landscape, and to provide guidance on preserving those qualities that best convey the historical significance and association with President Truman. This includes developing a series of treatment (action and no action) Treatment Alternatives that provide guidance on integrating visitor, administrative, and maintenance facilities within the cultural landscape to provide a comprehensive and authentic experience.

The CLR/HSR/EA is needed to address deficiencies in the condition of the building, structures, and grounds of the Truman Farm; preserve the historically significant farmhouse, structures, and landscape features that convey its agrarian sense of place; and improve interpretation of the site to maximize the visitor experience.

The Harry S Truman National Historic Site General Management Plan (GMP) directed a limited restoration treatment for the Truman Farm, and the Long Range Interpretive Plan (LRIP) provides a vision for media and programs best suited for meeting visitor needs, achieving management goals, and telling the story of the Truman Farm. The CLR/HSR/EA

builds on the GMP and LRIP and provides recommendations on the repair, protection, and stewardship of the Truman Farm and its contributing features, including evaluating the physical opportunities and constraints of each Treatment Alternative. The CLR/HSR/EA includes a no-action Treatment Alternative and four action Treatment Alternatives: Treatment Alternative 1 – The Family Farm; Treatment Alternative 2 – Farm, City, Nation (selected Treatment Alternative); Treatment Alternative 3A – Restoration to 1917; and Treatment Alternative 3B – Restoration to 1957.

This finding of no significant impact (FONSI) and the CLR/HSR/EA constitute the record of the environmental impact analysis and decision-making process associated with selecting and implementing the selected Treatment Alternative, which defines treatment for the Truman Farm cultural landscape and historic buildings as well as provides recommendations for connectivity with future planned visitor and management facilities. The selected Treatment Alternative includes measures to protect cultural resources, improve visitor enjoyment, and provide long-term conditions necessary to sustain natural and cultural resources. The selected Treatment Alternative was selected after careful review of resource and visitor impacts and public comment.

This document records 1) a FONSI as required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), and 2) a determination of no impairment as required by the NPS Organic Act of 1916.

TREATMENT ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

No Action Treatment Alternative

The no action Treatment Alternative provides a basis for comparison with the action Treatment Alternatives, including the selected Treatment Alternative, and with the respective environmental consequences.

Under the no action Treatment Alternative, the present level of use, management, interpretation, operations, and maintenance would continue. As identified in the 1999 Revised GMP, the no action Treatment Alternative would include removing nonhistoric features and developing the recently acquired building and land of Tract 3, a parcel that was part of the original Truman Farm lands.

As noted in the park's GMP, the building on Tract 3 would be converted for use for visitor facilities including restrooms and drinking fountains, and a sales area. Parking for visitors and park staff would be accommodated in an improved parking area on this site, and the existing drive and parking lot at the Truman Farm would be eliminated.

The Farmhouse would continue to accommodate the visitor program at its current level, including visitor orientation and sales. For the short term, the site would also continue to accommodate the administrative and maintenance program by continuing to use the

Farmhouse for administration, and the nonhistoric shed for storage and maintenance functions.

Administrative and maintenance facilities would continue to expand as needed. Stabilization and preservation of the Farmhouse, Garage, and Poultry House buildings would continue as part of the no action Treatment Alternative.

Action Treatment Alternatives

The action Treatment Alternatives have common goals and objectives and some common basic treatment recommendations. Because these aspects of the Treatment Alternatives do not differentiate between the Treatment Alternatives, the discussion of the action Treatment Alternatives is focused on general recommendations unique to each Treatment Alternative.

Treatment Alternative 1 – The Family Farm

Treatment Alternative 1 would convey the introspective story of the evolution of the Truman family farm from Solomon Young's original homestead through the time the Truman family lived, managed, or otherwise had a direct connection with the farm. A treatment approach of rehabilitation is proposed under this Treatment Alternative, and would focus on repairing extant contributing features and reestablishing the farm's historic character through acceptable preservation practices.

As a rehabilitation approach, Treatment Alternative 1 includes preservation of all extant contributing features (within the period of significance of 1906 to 1965), and the addition of new compatible features. With so many missing features and just a few additions, Treatment Alternative 1 provides an authentic experience, but does not fully convey vibrancy of farm life. In addition to repair of extant features, more interpretive media would be used to convey the full story.

Treatment Alternative 1 is compatible with the LRIP in that it conveys Primary Theme 1 as it conveys events of Harry S Truman's presidency, and Primary Theme 8 as reflective of President Truman's character learned from his time on the farm.

Treatment Alternative 2 – Farm, City, Nation (Selected Treatment Alternative)

Treatment Alternative 2 is the selected Treatment Alternative and recommended treatment for the Truman Farm. This Treatment Alternative follows a rehabilitation approach for the historic buildings and cultural landscape that will allow for compatible use and provide for restoration, repair, alteration, and additions to the Truman Farm while also preserving those features that convey the historical and cultural values of the historic site. This Treatment Alternative was selected as the selected Treatment Alternative during the Value Analysis/Choosing by Advantages process in July 2012.

In general, the selected Treatment Alternative recommends rehabilitation of the Truman Farm to provide a holistic visitor experience where extant contributing features are repaired, missing features are restored, and new compatible features are added. The rehabilitation approach is well suited to preserving the Truman Farm and its contributing features while ensuring the site offers the contemporary visitor a multitude of tactile, sensory, and kinetic experiences.

The selected Treatment Alternative is compatible with the period of significance of 1906 to 1967 as it recommends conveying the broad story of Harry S Truman—his character and the influence he had on agriculture, commerce, and politics—from his early years through his presidency and after he left office. The selected Treatment Alternative recommends telling this story through the rehabilitation of his family farm and through interpretation of the farm's immediate setting and broader surroundings as a place that was heavily influenced by President Truman's actions and decisions.

The selected Treatment Alternative is compatible with the 1999 Revised GMP. It is also compatible with the park's LRIP as it conveys Primary Theme 1 as being a product of the events of Harry S Truman's presidency, Primary Theme 7, and Primary Theme 8 as revealing President Truman's Character Learned from His Time on the Farm.

Treatment Alternative 3A – Restoration to 1917

Treatment Alternative 3A proposes to restore the Truman Farm to the appearance of the farm between the years of 1906 and 1917 when Harry S Truman lived on the farm and managed day-to-day operations.

A treatment approach of restoration is proposed with this Treatment Alternative, and would focus on restoring contributing features and the historic setting to reflect a date near the end of the time President Truman lived on the farm. As a restoration approach, Treatment Alternative 3A would preserve those features that contribute to the period from 1906 to 1917, including buildings and structures, and the restoration of missing features from this period. This approach would also include the removal of noncontributing features (outside of this period, including some that date to other times within the period of significance).

Historical documentation for the period from 1906 to 1917 is available to a certain extent through historic photographs; however, additional information would be required to authentically restore the Truman Farm to this period, including archeological investigations. Treatment Alternative 3A proposes to tell the story of life on the farm as it would have been when President Truman lived on the farm.

This Treatment Alternative is compatible with the LRIP in that it conveys Primary Theme 8 – Truman's Character Learned from His Time on the Farm.

Treatment Alternative 3B – Restoration to 1957

Treatment Alternative 3B proposes to restore the Truman Farm to resemble the family farm as it would have looked during President Truman's lifetime. A treatment approach of restoration is proposed with this Treatment Alternative and would focus on restoring contributing features and the historic setting to reflect a date near the end of the period of significance. Restoration to this date would convey the appearance of the farm as President Truman would have known it.

The site has the most contributing features and available historical documentation for 1957 and the farm retains the most integrity for 1957. As a restoration approach, Treatment Alternative 3B proposes preservation and restoration of all extant contributing features, and restoration of contributing features and historic setting to reflect a date near the end of the period of significance. This would include the original sugar maple grove (now modified) and the Solomon Young barn, both in existence in 1957. This approach would also include the removal of noncontributing features (outside of this period, including some that date to other times within the period of significance).

Treatment Alternative 3B is compatible with the LRIP in that it conveys Primary Theme 8 – Truman's Character Learned from His Time on the Farm, and Primary Theme 8 – Truman's Character Learned From His Time on the Farm.

ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERABLE TREATMENT ALTERNATIVE

The NPS determined that the selected Treatment Alternative is also the environmentally preferable Treatment Alternative because the selected Treatment Alternative surpasses the no action Treatment Alternative and action Treatment Alternatives 1, 3A, and 3B by realizing the full range of national environmental policy goals as stated in section 101 of NEPA. The goals are to:

- (1) Fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;
- (2) Assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;
- (3) Attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;
- (4) Preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice;
- (5) Achieve a balance between population and resource use, which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and

- (6) Enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

Treatment Alternative 2, the selected Treatment Alternative, is similar to Treatment Alternative 1 but would include rehabilitating more structures and landscape features and would better improve visitor access, use, and understanding (goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5). Treatment Alternative 2 would meet many of the NEPA section 101 goals and would better protect, preserve, and enhance historic resources than the no action Treatment Alternative or other treatment Alternatives. Treatment Alternative 2 meets the provisions of NEPA section 101 goals for the reasons described below.

WHY THE SELECTED TREATMENT ALTERNATIVE WOULD NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

The intensity or severity of impacts resulting from implementing the selected Treatment Alternative is evaluated using the 10 criteria listed in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1508.27. Key areas in which impacts were evaluated include historic structures and cultural landscapes, archeological resources, vegetation, visitor experience, park operations, and visual resources. As defined in 40 CFR § 1508.27, significance is determined by examining the following criteria.

Impacts that May be Both Beneficial and Adverse; a Significant Effect May Exist Even if the Park Service Believes that on Balance the Effect Would be Beneficial

The selected Treatment Alternative will result in both beneficial and adverse impacts. In general, the project provides long-term beneficial effects on historic structures and cultural landscapes, visitor experience, and park operations. The benefits to historic structures and cultural landscapes will result from rehabilitating the NHS buildings and associated landscape features. The benefits to visitor experience and park operations will result from conversion of the building on Tract 3 into new visitor and maintenance facilities that will increase interpretive opportunities, meet current building codes, and provide a safe environment for visitors and park staff.

Adverse impacts on archeological resources, cultural landscapes, vegetation, and visual resources will be short-term and minor and will result from the construction activities within the Truman Farm. Mitigation measures, as listed in table 1, will minimize adverse effects. A summary of resource effects is found in table 4 of the CLR/HSR/EA.

Degree of Effect on Public Health or Safety

Public health and safety will benefit from the construction of new visitor facilities by meeting current fire and electrical safety and building codes and complying with Occupational Safety and Health Administration workplace safety standards. The new visitor facility will meet

Americans with Disabilities Act standards for universal accessibility. The new visitor and maintenance facilities also will provide an improved work environment for park staff and is expected to have a positive effect on employee morale. In addition, a number of safety measures will be implemented during construction to protect visitors, park staff, and construction workers. Orange barricade fencing will be used to limit visitor access to construction areas. Staging and access areas will be located to avoid creating conflicts with ongoing park operations and visitor access. Maintaining a safe environment for park staff, contractors, and visitors during and after construction will be a primary objective.

Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area such as Proximity to Historic or Cultural Resources, Monument Lands, Prime Farmlands, Wetlands, Wild and Scenic Rivers, or Ecologically Critical Areas

As described in the CLR/HSR/EA, the selected Treatment Alternative will not affect prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. There may be minor adverse effects on archeological resources during activities associated with rehabilitating structures and landscape, which may expose previously unknown archeological resources. Monitoring for subsurface artifacts will be conducted during ground-disturbing activities in the park. The selected Treatment Alternative will also have short-term minor adverse effects on cultural landscapes during implementation of recommended treatments, and long-term minor adverse effects on vegetation from ground-disturbing activities and tree removal. The selected Treatment Alternative will have beneficial effects on historic structures, cultural landscapes, and visual resources.

Degree to Which Effects on the Quality of the Human Environment are Likely to be Highly Controversial

The selected Treatment Alternative is not highly controversial. No issues arose during the preparation of the CLR/HSR/EA from park staff and no issues were brought to the park's attention during the public review period that indicated a dispute with either the methods or results of the analysis of topics.

Degree to Which the Possible Effects on the Quality of the Human Environment are Highly Uncertain or Involve Unique or Unknown Risks

No highly uncertain, unique, or unknown risks were identified during the preparation of the CLR/HSR/EA or the public review period.

Degree to Which the Action may Establish a Precedent for Future Actions with Significant Effects or Represents a Decision in Principle about a Future Consideration

The selected Treatment Alternative will not have a significant effect and does not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects. Furthermore, the level of development at

this site proposed by the selected Treatment Alternative is within the guidelines set by the GMP.

Whether the Action is Related to Other Actions with Individually Insignificant but Cumulatively Significant Impacts

The CLR/HSR/EA concluded that past, present, and future activities, when coupled with the selected Treatment Alternative, will have local long-term minor to major beneficial cumulative effects and local long-term minor to moderate adverse cumulative effects. No significant adverse cumulative effects were identified. Likely future actions taken individually or collectively under the GMP as currently written will result in no more than local moderate adverse cumulative impacts on the human or natural environment.

Degree to Which the Action may Adversely Affect Districts, Sites, Highways, Structures, or Objects Listed on the National Register of Historic Places; or May Cause Loss or Destruction of Significant Scientific, Cultural, or Historical Resources

The selected Treatment Alternative will have a moderate beneficial effect on historic structures and cultural landscapes resulting from implementing the treatment recommendations and will not diminish the overall integrity of the cultural landscape. The Park Service initiated consultation with the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on September 4, 2012, with submittal of a letter notifying the SHPO that the Park Service was initiating the CLR/HSR/EA process. The SHPO was also notified of the availability of the completed CLR/HSR/EA for comment. On March 25, 2013, the SHPO concurred with the NPS determination that the project will not adversely affect any historic properties.

Degree to Which the Action May Adversely Affect an Endangered or Threatened Species or its Critical Habitat

No federally listed plant or animal species are known within the park boundaries. Park staff sent a section 7 coordination letter to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on September 4, 2012, notifying the Fish and Wildlife Service that the Park Service had determined that no threatened or endangered species habitat is present at Truman Farm and requesting information on species from the Fish and Wildlife Service. The Fish and Wildlife Service responded in an October 16, 2013 letter to the Park Service that Fish and Wildlife Service should be contacted for further consultation if forested areas cannot be cleared during the hibernation period of Indiana bats (November 1 to March 31) or more than 10 acres of trees will be cleared. Because the Park Service will perform any needed tree and shrub removal between November 1 and March 31 and less than 10 acres of trees will be cleared, further consultation with Fish and Wildlife Service is not necessary.

Whether the Action Threatens a Violation of Federal, State, or Local Environmental Protection Law

The selected Treatment Alternative violates no federal, state, or local environmental protection law.

MITIGATION MEASURES

A number of mitigation measures and best management practices (BMPs) will be incorporated into the project design for the selected Treatment Alternative to minimize the degree and/or severity of adverse environmental impacts (table 1).

Table 1. Mitigation Measures

Resource Area	Mitigation
<p>General Considerations</p>	<p>Where necessary for resource or visitor protection, work areas will be identified with construction fence, silt fence, or some similar material prior to any activity. The fencing will define the work zone and confine activity to the minimum area required. All protection measures will be clearly stated in the construction specifications, and workers will be instructed to avoid conducting activities beyond the work zone. Disturbances will be limited to areas inside the designated construction limits. No machinery or equipment will access areas outside the work limits.</p> <p>Construction equipment staging will occur within previously disturbed areas as much as possible. All staging and stockpiling areas will be returned to preconstruction conditions following construction.</p> <p>Contractors will be required to properly maintain construction equipment (i.e., mufflers and brakes) to minimize noise.</p> <p>All tools, equipment, barricades, signs, surplus materials, and rubbish will be removed from the project work limits upon project completion.</p>
<p>Vegetation and Wildlife</p>	<p>All disturbed ground will be reclaimed using appropriate BMPs including planting native plants.</p> <p>Until the soil is stable and vegetation is established, erosion-control measures will be implemented to minimize erosion and prevent sediment from leaving the site.</p> <p>Temporary barriers will be provided to protect existing trees and shrubs that are not identified for removal.</p> <p>To comply with the Endangered Species Act and Migratory Bird Treaty Act, trees and shrubs will be removed during the Indiana bat hibernation and bird nonnesting season (generally between August 15 and March 31). If trees and shrubs will be removed at other times, the Park Service will coordinate with the Fish and Wildlife Service prior to removal to ensure the removal has no adverse effects on Indiana bats or migratory birds.</p>

Resource Area	Mitigation
Cultural Resources	<p>All activities will comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation (48 Federal Register 44716, revised).</p> <p>Known archeological resources in the vicinity of project activities will be identified and delineated for avoidance prior to project work.</p> <p>The park will continue to coordinate with the SHPO throughout the course of the project to protect and mitigate cultural resources affected by the selected Treatment Alternative.</p> <p>Should any archeological resources be uncovered during construction, as appropriate, work will be halted in the area and the park archeologist, SHPO, and appropriate Native American tribes (if applicable) will be contacted for further consultation.</p> <p>Park cultural resource staff will be available during construction to advise or take appropriate actions should any archeological resources be uncovered during construction. 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.</p> <p>The Park Service will ensure that all contractors and subcontractors are informed of the penalties for illegally collecting artifacts or intentionally damaging archeological sites or historic properties. Contractors and subcontractors also will be instructed on procedures to follow in case previously unknown archeological resources are uncovered during construction.</p> <p>Equipment and material staging areas will avoid known archeological resources.</p>
Visitor Experience and Park Operations	<p>Visitors will be informed in advance of construction activities via the park website and visitor center.</p>

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

During preparation of the CLR/HSR/EA, the Park Service made efforts to involve the public in the planning process, including soliciting information and data from regulatory agencies. The CLR/HSR/EA was made available on the NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment website for public review and comment between January 23, 2013 and February 23, 2013. The park did not receive any comments from the public that resulted in changes to the CLR/HSR/EA.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Based on my review of the facts and analysis contained in the CLR/HSR/EA, which is incorporated herein, I conclude that the selected Treatment Alternative for the CLR/HSR/EA at the Truman Farm in the Grandview Unit of the Harry S Truman National Historic Site will not have a significant impact either by itself or in consideration of cumulative impacts. Accordingly, the requirements of NEPA, regulations promulgated by the President's Council on Environmental Quality, and provisions of NPS Director's Order-12 and Handbook (Conservation Planning and Environmental Impact Analysis and Decision-Making) have been fulfilled. Furthermore, the selected Treatment Alternative will not impair park resources or

values and will not violate the NPS Organic Act. The selected Treatment Alternative supports the enabling legislation establishing Harry S Truman National Historic Site under the NPS Organic Act with the intended purpose of preserving the scientific and public interests for future generations. An environmental impact statement is not required and will not be prepared for implementation of the selected Treatment Alternative.

Recommended:

Larry Villalva
Larry Villalva, Superintendent

05-03-13

Date

Approved:

Michael T. Reynolds
Michael T. Reynolds, Regional Director

5.24.13

Date

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The following contains responses to substantive comments received on the CLR/HSR /EA. No changes in the text of the CLR/HSR/EA were made as a result of these comments.

Comment (PEPC)

RE: Truman Farm Shopping Center – More appropriate siding on South side such as rough cedar for a more “farm like” look and/or row(s) of evergreens to hide.

RE: Truman Comers Shopping Center – Remove old Wards sign; plant shrubs on East Farm Home property line to be just high enough to hide current shopping center rooftops; Poplar trees (fast growing) on backside (West side) of the current Aarons store.

Longer Range Possible (sic) Proposals

RE: Truman Farm Shopping Center – Monitor occupancy for possible partial acquisition to enhance Farm Home site.

RE: Truman Comers Shopping Center – Should replacement of any current buildings be proposed, pursue design to leave the official “grand view” clear, or at least porpose (sic) low rooftops and signs unable to be seen from the Farm Home.

Response: Thank you for the comments, but the Truman Farm Shopping Center is not included in the CLR/HRS/EA.

Comment (PEPC)

REGARDING the FARM HOME SITE:

POULTRY HOUSE: (Educational Project sponsored by 4-H/University of MO Extension)
Baby chicks in the spring, raised to butcher on-site for “Chicken Fry” fund raiser.

ORCHARD/GARDEN: (Extension & local clubs) for “fruit pie”/”fresh vegetable” fund raisers. Or even pie baking contests!

FARMYARD/BARN YARD: at least (during warm months) drafthorse(s) to pull the plow and hay rake for demonstrations. Possibly a contest to plow the straightest furrow during “Harry’s Hay Days!”

OTHER:

Urge more involvement with the MO Dept. of Tourism.

Tours: Round Trip Grandview-Blue Ridge-Independence (and reverse) including sites along the way, lunch, etc.

(Van, Trolley, eventually Train?)

Create Post cards similar to Butler, MO.

Urge “Tourism” sales space in local businesses (restaurants, drug stores, etc.)
Park-like informational trail from Home to shopping area.

Official (sic) historic landmark designation to the “Truman Comers” site sign.

Promote Postmaster Truman at current Post Office &/or original site with portrait, monument, etc.

Response: Thank you for the comments. Developing specific interpretive programming elements and outreach strategies are not part of the CLR/HSR/EA, but the comments are on record and may be considered during future relevant planning efforts.

Comment (PEPC)

This project appears fiscally and environmentally sound, well reasoned, and timely. The mission and goals are achievable and success will benefit the site and public appropriately. The proposed process steps should be approved and implemented.

Response: Thank you for the comment.

Comment (PEPC)

As a native of southern Jackson County, Missouri, and someone who is familiar with the Truman story and the National Park Service at HSTR, I am very pleased to see this Truman Farm Cultural Landscape Report, Historic Structures Report and Environmental Assessment moving toward completion. I fully support the preferred Treatment Alternative. As a historian, I value placing the Truman farm in the widest context that is possible, and thus am gratified that the report expands the period of significance to include the Truman family’s use and sale of the farm for suburbanization purposes into the 1960s. I am hopeful that park management in its interpretive programs will include an even more expansive period to include the pre-Truman era as well as the history of the area after Harry Truman’s involvement ended, for in microcosm the story of the Truman farm links to many, many themes in American history that are significant in their own right and that will allow the park to tell the wider Truman story in Jackson and Cass counties and forge partnerships with other sites and agencies in the area. Finally, I am particularly excited to see the report recommend restoration of landscape and vegetation features that will provide visitors with a much better idea of the site as the core of a functioning Missouri farmstead in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, one that was not only focused on the practical aspects of farming but also recognized that rural folk appreciated and participated in ideas about beauty (rose arbors), the taming of nature; and the separation of human space from wild space.

Well done, everyone.

Response: Thank you for the comment.

APPENDIX A

HARRY S TRUMAN NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE TRUMAN FARM CULTURAL LANDSCAPE REPORT, HISTORIC STRUCTURE REPORT, AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT IMPAIRMENT DETERMINATION

In addition to determining the environmental consequences of Treatment Alternatives to proposed actions, National Park Service (NPS) *Management Policies 2006* and Director's Order (DO)-12 require an analysis of potential effects to determine if actions will impair park resources. Impairment is an impact that would, in the professional judgment of the responsible NPS manager, harm the integrity of park resources or values, including opportunities that will otherwise be present for the enjoyment of those resources or values. A determination of impairment is made for particular resource impact topics carried forward and analyzed in the environmental assessment for the preferred Treatment Alternative. The preferred Treatment Alternative for meeting the objectives established in the Harry S Truman National Historic Site (NHS or park) Truman Farm Cultural Landscape Report, Historic Structure Report, and Environmental Assessment (CLR/HSR/EA) is described in Chapter 4 of the CLR/HSR/EA. The CLR/HSR/EA also includes detailed information on existing conditions of resources (CLR/HSR/EA Chapter 5) and the effects the preferred Treatment Alternative will have on those resources (CLR/HSR/EA Chapter 5). Existing conditions and effects are briefly summarized in this impairment determination.

The description of park significance in Chapter 1 of the CLR/HSR/EA was used as a basis for determining if a resource is:

- Necessary to fulfill specific purposes identified in the establishing legislation or proclamation of the park, or
- key to the natural or cultural integrity of the park, or to opportunities for enjoyment of the park, or
- identified in the park's general management plan or other relevant NPS planning documents as being of significance.

Impairment determinations are not necessary for some impact topics such as visitor experience, socioeconomics, public health and safety, environmental justice, land use, and park operations because impairment findings relate back to park resources and values. These impact areas are not generally considered park resources or values according to the Organic Act and cannot be impaired the same way that an action can impair park resources and values. The impact topics relevant to this impairment determination are historic structures and cultural landscapes, archeological resources, vegetation, and visual resources.

This impairment determination is based on current NPS guidance on determining impairment of park resources and values. The impairment determination for each resource and value includes:

APPENDIX A

- a brief description of the condition of the resource;
- whether the resource is necessary to fulfill the purposes for which the park was established;
- whether the resource is key to the natural or cultural integrity of the park or to the opportunity for enjoyment of the park;
- whether the resource is identified as a significant resource in the park's planning documents; and
- a statement as to why the action will or will not result in impairment of the resource, including a discussion of the context, severity, duration, and timing of any impacts, and any mitigation measures, if applicable.

Based on the aforementioned guidelines and basis for determining impairment of park resources and values, a determination of impairment is made for each of the resource impact topics carried forward and analyzed in the environmental assessment for the preferred Treatment Alternative.

HISTORIC STRUCTURES AND CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

The Truman Farm has integrity in location and setting as it remains in its original location, and its contributing features remain in their original locations. The setting reflects the original characteristics of the farm as reflected in the extant historic residential area, farmyards, and agricultural fields. The residential area and farmyards are approximately 5 acres, and comprise the listing in the National Register of Historic Places district and National Historic Landmark. Contributing features including the Farmhouse, garage, sugar maple grove, barnyard, and foundations of the Solomon Young barn and granary; and small-scale features such as the stone posts remain in their original location and relationship to one another. However, the loss of historic structures such as the Solomon Young barn, granary, and other outbuildings, and fencing of farm spaces such as barnyard and garden has diminished the feeling of the farm as it is difficult to discern the three-dimensional qualities of the farm and its spaces. The removal and deposition of several stone posts has obscured the relationship between the original Farmhouse and adjacent agricultural lands (Vivian's Farm). Most contributing features retain original historic fabric and materials, and reflect the workmanship of the historic construction. The brick and stone Farmhouse foundation, and the stone foundation of the garage retain their original materials. The stone posts and stone threshold remain and are of original construction of native local stone often used in the area during the period of significance. The poultry house, concrete pad, and fence remain with their original materials, and reflect the workmanship of the period.

The park's historic structures and cultural landscapes are necessary to fulfill the purpose of the park, are key to the cultural integrity of the park, and are considered significant park resources.

The emphasis of the preferred Treatment Alternative is to repair, maintain, and interpret the three historic buildings within the NHS. The central south porch at the Farmhouse would be altered to be Architectural Barriers Act Accessibility Standard compatible. The visitor

orientation and sales would be relocated from the Truman Farm home to the new Truman center at the former paint store. Parking would also be moved to the former paint store. The Truman Farm home garage would be rehabilitated and opened to visitors. A new maintenance and administrative building would be constructed behind the visitor center. Rehabilitation of the farm would focus on reestablishing the historical arrangement of the farm as originally designed by the family. These activities would improve the historic structures and cultural landscape of the farm.

The proposed activities under the preferred Treatment Alternative will have a local long-term moderate beneficial effect on historic structures and cultural landscapes and will not impair the resource.

ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Several known archeological features exist within the Truman Farm. These are primarily located to the east of the Farmhouse in areas historically used as barnyards. The archeological features that are evident in the landscape today and nonvisible remains include the Solomon Young barn, the small barn, and the original farmhouse. The original house foundation was found west of the current Farmhouse. A root cellar was identified south of the home, which could have belonged to either house. A buried stone foundation of a small barn exists 18 feet east of the Farmhouse. The foundation of the Solomon Young barn is in the northeast corner of the site and two unknown structures are present in the park. It is possible that prehistoric archeological artifacts are also present in the Truman Farm parcel. Extensive disturbance and cultivation of the farm makes it likely that any artifacts present would be isolated and not part of a historic property.

These known archeological resources are necessary to fulfill the purpose of the park, are key to the cultural integrity of the park, and are considered significant park resources.

Excavation will be required for removal of the parking lot and grading activities between Tracts 1 and 2, which may expose previously unknown archeological resources (most likely artifacts associated with the NHS). No known archeological sites will be disturbed by the preferred Treatment Alternative. The proposed pavilion around the granary could have a long-term minor beneficial effect on the structure by protecting it from disturbance.

To minimize potential adverse impacts, surveys for visible archeological resources will be conducted prior to ground-disturbing activities. Testing and monitoring for subsurface artifacts will be conducted during ground-disturbing activities at the site. In the event archeological resources are encountered, work will be stopped immediately and the park cultural resource specialist will be contacted. If necessary, the State Historic Preservation Office will be consulted on potential adverse impacts and additional mitigation measures.

The preferred Treatment Alternative will have local long-term minor adverse impacts on archeological resources. Because the effects will be local, long-term, and minor, the preferred Treatment Alternative will not impair archeological resources.

VEGETATION

Vegetation at the Truman Farm is typical of properties that have been continuously modified by human disturbance. Little, if any, of the vegetation is reflective of conditions present before agricultural use of the site. The vegetation surrounding the Farmhouse and parking lot consists of upland turfgrass dominated by fescue (*Festuca* sp.), Bermudagrass (*Cynodon dactylon*), bluegrass (*Poa* sp.), and foxtail (*Setaria glauca*). A large sugar maple grove is located between the west facade of the Farmhouse and Blue Ridge Boulevard. A thick row of trees marks the fence line to the east and south of the Farmhouse. The southern and eastern parcels past the fence lines are dominated by smooth brome (*Bromopsis inermis*), switchgrass (*Panicum virgatum*), fescue, and dropseed (*Sporobolus* sp.). A small clump of trees and shrubs is present in the southeast corner of the property. No sensitive or unusual vegetation communities or species are present in either the farm parcel or the recently acquired parcel to the south.

The existing vegetation patterns that contribute to the Truman Farm's historic character are necessary to fulfill the park's purpose of preserving and interpreting the Truman Farm and agrarian landscape, are key to the cultural integrity of the park, and are considered significant park resources.

The vegetation patterns that contribute to the Truman Farm's historic character will be preserved under the preferred Treatment Alternative. Many of the trees around the Farmhouse, including the maple grove, will be maintained and vegetation patterns will be reestablished that reinforce the historic special organization of the farm. Vegetation buffers will be established along the perimeter of the property to screen the adjacent commercial and residential development. Some vegetation will be removed to strengthen the historical vegetation patterns and eradicate invasive species, including all of the trees along the southern fence line. Construction activities will be confined to the smallest area necessary to complete the work, and all areas of temporarily disturbed vegetation will be restored with native or appropriate introduced/historic vegetation following construction. The preferred Treatment Alternative will result in local long-term minor adverse effects on vegetation; however, these effects will not impair the resource.

VISUAL RESOURCES

The Farmhouse is the most dominant feature of the Truman Farm. Views of the Farmhouse are apparent from Blue Ridge Boulevard, the entrance drive, and from many locations across the farm. Views from the Truman Farm include those from the Farmhouse, the eastern field, and across the property. Views to the site include those seen from Blue Ridge Boulevard and the entrance drive. The view of the Farmhouse from Blue Ridge Boulevard is somewhat obscured by the adjacent commercial properties north and south, and only when located directly west of the Farmhouse can it be clearly seen from the road. From the entrance drive, the Farmhouse dominates the view.

From the Farmhouse, views exist to the west, east, and south to the Farmhouse yard and lawn beyond. The west side of the Farmhouse offers views to the sugar maple grove, and the original entrance to the farm with its two stone posts on Grandview Road. The barnyard's open space provides views to the adjacent commercial development on the north, while views to the east and south end at the tree rows.

Visual resources are necessary to fulfill the park's purpose of preserving and interpreting the Truman Farm, are key to the cultural integrity of the park, and are part of the significant "Farm experience" of the Truman Farm.

The visual quality of the town will be improved under the preferred Treatment Alternative by removing nonhistoric landscape features from the park. This includes adding vegetation to screen views of the adjacent development from the Truman Farm home and other areas of the site and by removing trees to open the view in the Farmhouse. The removal of the trees between Tracts 1 and 2 will also open up internal views of the site between the Farmhouse and the open field to the south. The preferred Treatment Alternative will result in local long-term moderate beneficial effects on visual resources, with no impairment to the resource.