



National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yellowstone National Park  
Date: 04/10/2013

---

## ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

### DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 08/06/2012

Updated May 2007 - per 2004 Departmental Manual revisions and proposed Director's Order 12 changes

#### A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yellowstone National Park  
Project Title: Lake Cell Tower  
PEPC Project Number: 43426  
PMIS Number:  
Project Type: Rights-of-Way (ROW)  
Project Location:  
County, State: Teton, Wyoming  
Project Leader: Bret DeYoung  
Administrative Record Location: Telecommunications Office, YELL  
Administrative Record Contact: Bret DeYoung  
Notes:

#### B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This CE is being prepared to address a minor change to the 2008 Wireless Communications Services Plan (WCSP) and to amend the 2009 FONSI that indicated the park would issue a notice in the Federal Register. Environmental Assessments and Federal Register notices for telecommunications right-of-way permits are required for projects where an agency did not previously analyze the alternatives, evaluate the potential impacts, and identify mitigation measures. Because alternatives, impacts, and mitigation measures were analyzed in the 2008 WCSP/EA and subsequent FONSI, no Federal Register notice is required by NPS policy and therefore will not be prepared. The Lake cell tower was the only cell tower approved in the FONSI for the 2008 WCSP/EA, therefore no future Federal Register notices on this topic are anticipated. This project would construct a cellular telephone site in the Lake/Fishing Bridge area consistent with the decision made in the April, 2009 FONSI for the YELL WCSP/EA. The cell site would provide cell service to the Lake and Fishing Bridge developed areas. The proposal received from Verizon Wireless to construct a site was reviewed to determine if the scope of the project, affected resources, and impact analysis are the same as described in the original documents. The park's I.D. team determined that there are minor differences in the project proposal, but the effects of these changes are less than measurable.

Changes to the plan include an additional 10' of tower height, which would put the finished tower approximately 30' above the tree canopy. Approx. 0.45 miles of trenching within the existing admin. development would also be required and was not addressed in the plan. Current standard engineering practices support 15' of separation between tenants on a tower to avoid RF interference. Four tenants; two cellular companies, one NPS land mobile radio, and

one NPS LAN, are expected to reside on the tower. Standard practices would support a tower with 60' extending above the canopy to avoid interference and signal blocking. The NPS is requiring all tenants to manage with the minimum separation of 10' to preserve aesthetic resources and facilitate collocation, equating to a final tower 30' above the existing tree canopy.

This project entails the construction of a cell site adjacent to the buried water tank site located on the hill above the Lake govt./admin. area. The site adjacent to the water tank site was selected because of its proximity, access to utilities, road access, ability to be screened. The site would have minor visual impact and keep spillover coverage into the backcountry at a minimum. The project would include construction of a 100' tall metal lattice tower, an equipment bldg., installation of a backup electric generator, and installation of an underground cable from an existing CenturyLink junction box to the proposed tower location. The cable would be installed beneath or directly adjacent to existing dirt and paved road in the admin. area.

The NPS flew weather balloons and raised a crane to 100' at the proposed site to evaluate the potential visual impacts from the tower. These efforts demonstrated that a 100' tower would not be visible from the three historic districts in close proximity. The tower would be partially visible from one location along the historic Grand Loop road, although it would be one half mile from the road at that location and visible only through a break in the trees. The existing CenturyLink microwave tower near the junction was rejected due to lack of structural integrity, adequate height, and excessive spillover in the backcountry.

As design progressed and more detail emerged on the project specifics, additional consultation with the WYSHPO was initiated. This consultation included the construction of the equipment bldg., the communications trenching, and the increased 10' of tower height. The WYSHPO & ACHP concurred that no historic properties would be adversely affected.

**Target compliance completion date:**

**Projected advertisement/Day labor start:**

**Construction start date:**

**Is project a hot topic (controversial or sensitive issues that should be brought to attention of Regional Director)?** No

#### **C. RESOURCE EFFECTS TO CONSIDER:**

<b>Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources</b>	<b>No Effect</b>	<b>Negligible Effects</b>	<b>Minor Effects</b>	<b>Exceeds Minor Effects</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
<b>1. Geologic resources – soils, bedrock, streambeds, etc.</b>			Minor		impacts from trenching, foundation for tower, foundation for equipment building
<b>2. From geohazards</b>	No				
<b>3. Air quality</b>		Negligible			dust and exhaust fumes from equipment during construction only
<b>4. Soundscapes</b>		Negligible			noise from construction equipment during construction only. Noise is



					distant from visitors and would have no effect on visitor experience
5. Water quality or quantity	No				
6. Streamflow characteristics	No				
7. Marine or estuarine resources	No				
8. Floodplains or wetlands	No				trenching in area of wetland would remain on road prism and not within any wetland
9. Land use, including occupancy, income, values, ownership, type of use	No				
10. Rare or unusual vegetation – old growth timber, riparian, alpine	No				
11. Species of special concern (plant or animal; state or federal listed or proposed for listing) or their habitat		Negligible			noise impacts from construction and access from employees would have negligible impacts, T&E species are currently hazed out of developed areas
12. Unique ecosystems, biosphere reserves, World Heritage Sites	No				
13. Unique or important wildlife or wildlife habitat	No				
14. Unique or important fish or fish habitat	No				
15. Introduce or promote non-native species (plant or animal)		Negligible			Negligible disturbance, area will be monitored and treated if weeds are found
16. Recreation resources, including	No				

supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.					
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources			Minor		Social issues of cell phone use in the park was assessed in the Wireless Communications Plan/EA
18. Archeological resources	No				Any archeological sites would be avoided
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				No historic properties would be adversely affected
20. Cultural landscapes	No				
21. Ethnographic resources	No				
22. Museum collections (objects, specimens, and archival and manuscript collections)	No				
23. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure	No				
24. Minority and low income populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.	No				
25. Energy resources	No				
26. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	No				
27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability	No				
28. Urban quality,	No				

gateway communities, etc.					
29. Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity	No				
30. Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal, paleontological resources)?	No				

#### D. MANDATORY CRITERIA

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?		N		
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?		N		
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?		N		
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		N		
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		N		



F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		N		
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?		N		
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?		N		
I. Violate a federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		N		
J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		N		
K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		N		
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)?		N		

For the purpose of interpreting these procedures within the NPS, any action that has the potential to violate the NPS Organic Act by impairing park resources or values would constitute an action that triggers the DOI exception for actions that threaten to violate a federal law for protection of the environment.

#### E. OTHER INFORMATION

1. Are personnel preparing this form familiar with the site? Yes
  - 1.A. Did personnel conduct a site visit? Yes
2. Is the project in an approved plan such as a General Management Plan or an

Implementation Plan with an accompanying NEPA document? Yes

2.A. If so, plan name: Wireless Communications Services Plan

Plan Project ID:

2.B. Is the project still consistent with the approved plan? Yes

2.C. Is the environmental document accurate and up-to-date? Yes

FONSI: Yes ROD: No Date approved: 04/07/2009

3. Are there any interested or affected agencies or parties? N/A

4. Has consultation with all affected agencies or tribes been completed? Yes

5. Are there any connected, cumulative, or similar actions as part of the proposed action?  
(e.g., other development projects in area or identified in GMP, adequate/available utilities  
to accomplish project) No

#### F. INSTRUCTIONS FOR DETERMINING APPROPRIATE NEPA PATHWAY

First, always check DO-12, section 3.2, "Process to Follow" in determining whether the action is categorically excluded from additional NEPA analyses. Other sections within DO-12, including sections 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, "CEs 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), AND there are either no effects or all of the potential effects identified in section C (Resource Effects to Consider) are no more than minor intensity, usually there is no potential for significant impacts and 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. INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM SIGNATORIES

*All interdisciplinary team members sign as directed or deemed necessary by the Superintendent. 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.*

## H. SUPERVISORY SIGNATORY

### Field of Expertise

Project Leader

Bret DeYoung

### Field of Expertise

NEPA Specialist

### Technical Specialist

Doug Madsen

NHPA Specialist

Tobin Roop

*Based on the environmental impact information contained in the statutory compliance file and in this environmental screening form, environmental documentation for this stage of the subject project is complete.*

### Recommended:

### Compliance Specialist:

#### NEPA

Doug Madsen

Date:

4-10-13

#### NHPA

Tobin Roop

Date:

4-11-13

### Approved:

Superintendent:

Date:

4/24/2013

for Dan Wenk