Herbert Hoover National Historic Site Date: 08/07/2014

ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. Park: Herbert Hoover National Historic Site

2. Project Description:

Project Name: Remove Thompson Farm Hog Barn/Corn Crib (HS-86)

Prepared by: Cary Wiesner Date Prepared: 02/16/2014 Telephone: 319-643-2541

PEPC Project Number: 51301

Locations:

Describe project:

The Donald Thompson Hog Barn/Corn Crib is in an advanced state of deterioration and unfortunately needs to be removed. The structure is badly deteriorated, especially the hog barn section which has partially collapsed, and is a hazard. The structure was built probably before 1938 and was originally acquired by the park in 1974 under a life estate agreement. It came under full NPS control upon Mr. Thompson's death in 2008. As part of the life estate agreement Mr. Thompson was supposed to keep the buildings in good repair, but he failed to do so. In a 2008 discussion with Iowa SHPO representatives Doug Jones and Ralph Christian, it was agreed that the Hog Barn/Corn Crib (HS-86) was beyond repair, and that it could be removed, with salvaged lumber used to repair other Thompson Farm structures where feasible. This is what the park would like to do now with this building. Where feasable, lumber salvaged from this structure will be used as part of repairs planned in PEPC 40045, Stabilize Thompson Farm Structures. Future plans call for the Thompson Farm to be converted into the park's maintenance facility. As part of those plans HEHO will explore putting a similar-looking structure at the HS-86 site. The current structure's concrete pad will be retained, with the possibility that it will be reutilized when site is re-developed.

Area of potential effects (as defined in 36 CFR 800.16[d])

3. Has the	e area or	potentiai	effects be	en surveyea	to identify	nistoric p	roperties?
1	No						

Source or reference:

X Yes

4. Potentially Affected Resource(s):

Archeological Resources Notes: Geophysical investigations done at the Thompson Farm in 2008 did not include the hog barn/corn crib area (DeVore, Trip Report 2008). There should be no significant ground disturbance associated with this project. Concrete pad will be retained, possibly to be reutilized when farm is redeveloped as maintenance facility.

Assessment of Effect Form - Remove Thompson Farm Hog Barn/Corn Crib (HS-86) - PEPC ID: 51301

Historical Structures/Resources Notes: Project affects the Thompson Hog Barn/Corn Crib (HS-86, LCS #070103). This structure, which was probably built before 1938, was declared NR eligible in 1994, and was included as a contributing structure in the park's revised National Register nomination in 2012 (p. 11). It is currently classified Management Category B, "Should be Preserved and Maintained" in the park's List of Classified Structures (LCS). Structure has partly collapsed and is unsafe. In a 2008 discussion with Iowa SHPO representatives Doug Jones and Ralph Christian, it was agreed that the Hog Barn/Corn Crib was beyond repair, and that it could be removed, with salvaged lumber used to repair other Thompson Farm structures where feasible. This is what the park would like to do now with this building. Future plans call for the Thompson Farm to be converted into the park's mainenance facility. As part of those plans HEHO will explore putting a similar-looking structure at the HS-86 site in order to restore cluster arrangement and spatial organization of the farm site..

Cultural Landscapes Notes: Absence of structure will change historic landscape. It will affect the integrity of the Thompson Farm building cluster (CLI, 2010, p. 4).

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

Yes	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.)

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: Dawn Bringelson

Date: 02/21/2014

Comments: Area has not been inventoried for archeological resources. I assume that project will not result in ground disturbance, but am not sure. UPDATE 3/26/14: No ground disturbance is anticipated for this project. Concrete pad will be left in place, so this project should have no adverse effect on archeological resources.

Assessment of Effect Form - Remove Thompson Farm Hog Barn/Corn Crib (HS-86) - PEPC ID: 51301

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [] Assessment of Effect: No Potential to Cause Effect No Historic Properties Affected _X No Adverse Effect Adverse Effect Streamlined Review						
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:						
Doc Method: Standard 4-Step Process						
[X] Historian Name: Ron Cockrell						
Date: 02/21/2014						
Comments: The park has met with the SHPO and discussed the fate of this historic structure. Both parties agreed						
to removal. Recommend moving forward with Adverse Effect determination and ask SHPO if present						
documentation is adequate or if additional mitigation is required (through a Memorandum of Agreement).						
Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []						
Assessment of Effect: No Potential to Cause Effect No Historic Properties						
Affected No Adverse Effect _X Adverse Effect Streamlined Review Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:						
·						
Doc Method: Standard 4-Step Process						
[X] Historical Architect						
Name: Al O'Bright Date: 02/19/2014						
Comments: The subject building was documented through measured drawings 2013 (NPS dwg. no. 432/117539).						
Condition survey report dated 4/13/13 also recommends demolition of the building.						
Cheat if availant days not involve avaiged disturbance [1						
Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [] Assessment of Effect: No Potential to Cause Effect No Historic Properties						
Affected No Adverse Effect _X Adverse Effect Streamlined Review						
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:						
Doc Method: Standard 4-Step Process						
[X] Historical Landscape Architect						
Name: Marla McEnaney						
Date: 02/21/2014						
Comments: Removal of structure that contributes to a NRHP eligible farm complex.						
Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []						
Assessment of Effect: No Potential to Cause Effect No Historic Properties						
Affected No Adverse Effect _X Adverse Effect Streamlined Review						
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:						
Doc Method: Standard 4-Step Process						

No Reviews From: Curator, 106 Advisor, Other Advisor, Anthropologist

Assessment of Effect Form - Remove Thompson Farm Hog Barn/Corn Crib (HS-86) - PEPC ID: 51301

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS
1. Assessment of Effect:
No Potential to Cause Effects
No Historic Properties Affected
No Adverse Effect
XAdverse Effect
2. Documentation Method:
[$\rm X$] A. STANDARD 36 CFR PART 800 CONSULTATION Further consultation under 36 CFR Part 800 is needed.
[] 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.)
[] C. PLAN-RELATED UNDERTAKING
Consultation and review of the proposed undertaking were completed in the context of a plan review process, in accordance with the 2008 Servicewide PA and 36 CFR Part 800. Specify plan/EA/EIS:
[] D. UNDERTAKING RELATED TO ANOTHER AGREEMENT The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under another document such as a statewide agreement established in accord with 36 CFR 800.7 or counterpart regulations.
Explanation: None
[] E. COMBINED NEPA/NHPA Document Documentation is required for the preparation of an EA/FONSI or an EIS/ROD has been developed and used so as also to meet the requirements of 36 CFR 800.3 through 800.6
[] G. Memo to SHPO/THPO
[] H. Memo to ACHP
3. Additional Consulting Parties Information:

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. D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR: Compliance Specialist: NHPA Specialist Cary Wiesner Date: 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							
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. D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR: Compliance Specialist: NHPA Specialist Cary Wiesner Date: 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	4. Stipulations and Conditions:						
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. D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR: Compliance Specialist: NHPA Specialist Cary Wiesner Date: 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	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
(Remember that setting, location, and use may be relevant.) No Assessment of Effect mitigations identified. D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR: Compliance Specialist: NHPA Specialist Cary Wiesner Date: 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	5. Mitigations/Treatment Measures:						
Compliance Specialist: NHPA Specialist Cary Wiesner 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	•	• •					
Compliance Specialist: NHPA Specialist Cary Wiesner Date: 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	No Assessment of Effect mitigations identified.						
NHPA Specialist Cary Wiesner Date: 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	D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COOF	RDINATOR:					
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	Compliance Specialist:						
E. SUPERINTENDENT'S APPROVAL The proposed work conforms to the NPS <i>Management Policies</i> and <i>Cultural Resource Management Guideline</i> , and I have reviewed and approve the recommendations, stipulations, or conditions noted in Section C of this form. Signature	NHPA Specialist						
The proposed work conforms to the NPS <i>Management Policies</i> and <i>Cultural Resource Management Guideline</i> , and I have reviewed and approve the recommendations, stipulations, or conditions noted in Section C of this form. Signature	Cary Wiesner	Date:					
Management Guideline, and I have reviewed and approve the recommendations, stipulations, or conditions noted in Section C of this form. Signature	E. SUPERINTENDENT'S APPROVAL						
	• •						
Superintendent: Date:	Signature						
	Superintendent:	Date:					

Additional Consulting Parties: N_0