



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. Park: Denali National Park and Preserve

2. Project Description:

Project Name: Install Wildlife Fence around Kennels - 2020 redesign

Prepared by: Phoebe Gilbert **Date Prepared:** 07/28/2020 **Telephone:** 907-683-9540

PEPC Project Number: 95976

Locations:

County, State: Denali Borough, AK

Describe project:

After several incidents with moose interacting aggressively with dogs in the dogyard and evolving standards of safe sled dog kennel operation it is recommended that a moose proof fence be installed around the historic kennels dogyard to keep potentially hazardous wildlife (or people) out.

Fencing the perimeter of the dogyard is the preferred solution for the following reasons:

- Ease of installation of fencing
- 4 Easy-to-move gates across pathways/ sled trails allow multiple points of ingress and egress during work hours and emergencies
- Moose can move easily around perimeter and should have no reason to enter fenced area. In rare case of entrapment, gates are wide and placed in corners so that moose will have space and visuals to exit
- Minimal vegetation inside fenced areas to tempt moose
- Dogs retain ability to socialize and play with each other on tethers as opposed to separating into all individual pens
- Visitors and staff can still interact with dogs inside fenced enclosure, staff can easily close off walkways to the public to prevent human/dog interaction
- Visitors will walk through open areas of the dogyard with no bottlenecks

Additionally, this fence configuration is in keeping with the historic character of the kennels.

To ensure the work conforms to the historic character of the kennels and meets other project needs, construction specifications include:

- Use 5"-6" wooden log vertical support posts.
- Use 6" vertical fencing on two new fenced areas, not chain link, to reduce visual impact of additional fencing on area.
- New fence height can match existing pens (~7 feet tall) to keep consistent appearance.
- Gates that meet ADA width requirements and accommodate kennels staff, dog walker, and summer crowd flow safely.

This project will also involve brushing around the kennels fence perimeter to reduce vegetation that is attractive to moose and to further improve the safety of the kennels operation. Brushing will be consistent with the Routine brushing and clearing around buildings and facilities programmatic approval described in PEPC# 73818 and the Hazardous Vegetative Fuel Treatment Plan, PEPC# 49928.

Outdoor lighting and a webcam at the kennels may be installed and upgraded concurrently with fence installation. If installed,

the exterior lighting will follow the recommendations of the Historic District CLR and will address dark night sky issues. Assessments will be made over winter 2020-2021 to determine if the two existing light poles are adequate, or if one additional pole is needed in the western end of the yard. The web cam would be small (less than 6" diameter), mounted on the new fenced area, and would be painted to match the fencing; it would be mounted in such a way as to minimize its appearance. Electrical outlets or water spigots, if moved or constructed, will follow the recommendations of the CLR.

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

see attached CR report 2020-DENA-023

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

☐ No

☒ Yes

Source or reference:

4. Potentially Affected Resource(s):

Archeological Resources Present: No

Archeological Resources Notes: The Kennels (dogyard, building, houses) are contributing features of the Mt. McKinley Headquarters Historic District and Cultural landscape

Historical Structures/Resources Present: Yes

Cultural Landscapes Present: Yes

Ethnographic Resources Present: No

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

☐ No Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure

☐ No Replace historic features/elements in kind

☐ No Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure

☒ Yes Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)

☐ Yes 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

☒ Yes 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] 106 Advisor

Name: Phoebe Gilbert

Date: 08/24/2020

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

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

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

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

2. Documentation Method:

[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. Undertaking Related to Park Specific or Another Agreement

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under another document such as a park, region or statewide agreement established in accord with 36 CFR 800.7 or 36 CFR 800.14.

[] D. Combined NEPA/NHPA Process

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

[] E. Memo to Project File

3. Consultation Information

SHPO Required: Yes
SHPO Sent: Jul 27, 2020
SHPO Received: Aug 24, 2020

THPO Required:
THPO Sent:
THPO Received:

SHPO/THPO Notes:

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

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

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

No Assessment of Effect mitigations identified.

6. Assessment of Effect Notes:

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Compliance Specialist:
NHPA Specialist

Phoebe Gilbert _____ **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

Superintendent: _____ **Date:** _____

Denice Swanke