



IN REPLY REFER TO:
L7615(YOSE-PM)

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Yosemite National Park
P. O. Box 577
Yosemite, California 95389

Memorandum

To: Sally Sprouse, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2011-005 Tuolumne Meadows Tent Cabin Improvement (34538)

The Executive Leadership Team has reviewed the proposed project and completed its environmental assessment documentation, and we have determined that there:

- Will not be any effect on threatened, endangered, or rare species and/or their critical habitat.
- Will not be any effect on historical, cultural, or archeological resources.
- Will not be serious or long-term undesirable environmental or visual effects.

The subject proposed project, therefore, is now cleared for all NEPA and NHPA compliance requirements as presented above. Project plans and specifications are approved and construction can commence.

For the proposed project actions to be within compliance requirements during construction the following mitigations must be adhered to:

- No mitigations identified.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

//Don L. Neubacher//
Don L. Neubacher

Enclosure (with attachments)

cc: Statutory Compliance File

*The signed original of this document is on file at the
Environmental Planning and Compliance Office in
Yosemite National Park.*



Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2011-005 Tuolumne Meadows Tent Cabin Improvement

PEPC Project Number: 34538

Project Description:

This project will upgrade six hardsided tent cabins in Tuolumne Meadows; units 3306, 3056, 3066, 3067 and 3089 at Bug Camp and unit 3305 at Ranger Camp.

Additional roof supports will be constructed and a metal roof will be installed. Side walls will be insulated to reduce heat loss. These upgrades will preclude the need to put up and take down these cabins each year.

Project Locations:

Tuolumne County, CA

Mitigation(s):

- No mitigations identified.

Describe the category used to exclude action from further NEPA analysis and indicate the number of the category (see Section 3-4 of DO-12):

C.18 Construction of minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas.

On the basis of the environmental impact information in the statutory compliance file, with which I am familiar, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No exceptional circumstances (e.g. all boxes in the ESF are marked "no") or conditions in Section 3-6 apply, and the action is fully described in Section 3-4 of DO-12.

Superintendent //Don L. Neubacher//

Date 5/18/11

*The signed original of this document is on file at the
Environmental Planning and Compliance Office in
Yosemite National Park.*



ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 04/11/2011

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

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2011-005 Tuolumne Meadows Tent Cabin Improvement
PEPC Project Number: 34538
Project Type: Housing Improvement (OTHER)
Project Location: Tuolumne, California
Project Leader: Sally Sprouse

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

B. RESOURCE EFFECTS TO CONSIDER:

| Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources | No Effect | Negligible Effects | Minor Effects | Exceeds Minor Effects | Data Needed to Determine/Notes |
|--|-----------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------------|--|
| 1. Geologic resources – soils, bedrock, streambeds, etc. | No | | | | |
| 2. From geohazards | No | | | | |
| 3. Air quality | No | | | | |
| 4. Soundscapes | | Negligible | | | Construction noises would occur temporarily during the renovation. |
| 5. Water quality or quantity | No | | | | |
| 6. Streamflow characteristics | No | | | | |
| 7. Marine or estuarine resources | No | | | | |

| Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources | No Effect | Negligible Effects | Minor Effects | Exceeds Minor Effects | Data Needed to Determine/Notes |
|--|------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 8. Floodplains or wetlands | No | | | | |
| 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 | No | | | | |
| 12. Unique ecosystems, biosphere reserves, World Heritage Sites | No | | | | Yosemite National Park is a World Heritage Site. |
| 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) | No | | | | |
| 16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc. | No | | | | |
| 17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources | No | | | | |
| 18. Archeological resources | No | | | | |
| 19. Prehistoric/historic structure | No | | | | |
| 20. Cultural landscapes | No | | | | All units are non-historic |

| Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources | No Effect | Negligible Effects | Minor Effects | Exceeds Minor Effects | Data Needed to Determine/Notes |
|--|------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 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, gateway communities, etc. | No | | | | |
| 29. Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity | No | | | | |
| 30. Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal, paleontological resources)? | No | | | | |

C. MANDATORY CRITERIA

| Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal: | Yes | No | N/A | Comment or Data Needed to Determine |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|--|
|--|------------|-----------|------------|--|

| 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? | | No | | |
| 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? | | No | | |
| C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))? | | No | | |
| D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? | | No | | |
| E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? | | No | | |
| F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects? | | No | | |
| 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? | | No | | |
| 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? | | No | | |
| I. Violate a federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? | | No | | |

| Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal: | Yes | No | N/A | Comment or Data Needed to Determine |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|--|
| J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)? | | No | | |
| 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)? | | No | | |
| 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)? | | No | | |

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.

D. OTHER INFORMATION

1. Are personnel preparing this form familiar with the site? Yes
2. Did personnel conduct a site visit? No
3. Is the project in an approved plan such as a General Management Plan or an Implementation Plan with an accompanying NEPA document? No
4. Are there any interested or affected agencies or parties? No
5. Has consultation with all affected agencies or tribes been completed? N/A
6. Are there any connected, cumulative, or similar actions as part of the proposed action? Yes

E. INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM SIGNATORIES

| <u>Interdisciplinary Team</u> | <u>Field of Expertise</u> |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Don L. Neubacher | Superintendent |
| Kathleen Morse | Chief of Planning |
| Randy Fong | Acting Chief of Project Management |
| Lena McDowall | Acting Chief of Administration Management |
| Ed Walls | Chief of Facilities Management |
| Joe Meyer | Acting Chief of Resources Management & Science |
| Marty Nielson | Chief of Business and Revenue Management |
| Tom Medema | Chief of Interpretation and Education |
| Charles Cuvelier | Chief of Visitor and Resource Protection |
| Sally Sprouse | Project Leader |
| Elexis Mayer | Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager |
| Barbara Wyatt | Historic Preservation Officer |
| Renea Kennece | NEPA Specialist |

F. SUPERVISORY SIGNATORY

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 Specialists | Date |
|---|----------------|
| <u>//Renea Kennece//</u> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennece | <u>5/5/11</u> |
| <u>//Elexis J. Mayer//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Elexis Mayer | <u>5/12/11</u> |
| <u>//Randy Fong//</u> Acting Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong | <u>5/17/11</u> |

Approved:

| Superintendent | Date |
|---|----------------|
| <u>//Don L. Neubacher//</u> Don L. Neubacher | <u>5/18/11</u> |

The signed original of this document is on file at the Environmental Planning and Compliance Office in Yosemite National Park.



PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: April 13, 2011

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2011-005 Tuolumne Meadows Tent Cabin Improvement
PEPC Project Number: 34538
Project Type: Housing Improvement (OTHER)
Project Location: Tuolumne, California
Project Leader: Sally Sprouse

PARK ESF ADDENDUM QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

| ESF Addendum Questions | Yes | No | N/A | Data Needed to Determine/Notes |
|--|-----|----|-----|--|
| SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST | | | | |
| Listed or proposed threatened or endangered species (Federal or State)? | | No | | |
| Species of special concern (Federal or State)? | | No | | |
| Park rare plants or vegetation? | | No | | |
| Potential habitat for any special-status species listed above? | | No | | |
| NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST | | | | |
| Entail ground disturbance? | | No | | |
| Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect? | | No | | |
| Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape? | | No | | All cabins are non-historic and non-contributing |
| Has a National Register form been completed? | | No | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|----|--|--|
| Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect? | | No | | |
|---|--|----|--|--|

WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST

| | | | | |
|---|-----|----|-----|-----------------|
| Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor? (Name the river corridor) | Yes | | | Tuolumne River. |
| Fall within the bed and banks AND will affect the free-flow of the river? | | No | | |
| Have the possibility of affecting water quality of the area? | | No | | |
| Remain consistent with its river segment classification? | Yes | | | |
| Fall on a tributary of a Wild and Scenic River? | | No | | |
| Will the project encroach or intrude upon the Wild and Scenic River corridor? | | No | | |
| Will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values? | | No | | |
| Consistent with the provisions in the Merced River Plan Settlement Agreement? | | | N/A | |

WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST

| | | | | |
|---|--|----|--|--|
| Within designated Wilderness | | No | | |
| Within a Potential Wilderness Addition? | | No | | |



Current interior condition



Current Exterior Condition



Current Exterior Condition



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

- a) **Project Name:** 2011-005 Tuolumne Meadows Tent Cabin Improvement
- b) **Date Prepared:** 04/11/2011
- c) **PEPC Project Number:** 34538
- d) **Locations:** Mariposa County, CA

3. **Has the area of potential effects been surveyed to identify cultural resources?**

- No
 Yes

Source or reference: Tuolumne Meadows Historic District.

Check here if no known cultural resources will be affected. (If this is because area has been disturbed, please explain or attach additional information to show the disturbance was so

- extensive as to preclude intact cultural deposits.)

4. **Potentially Affected Resources:**

Cultural landscapes affected?

Name and number(s): Tuolumne Meadows Historic District
Location: Tuolumne Meadows

5. **The proposed action will:**

- Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure
- Replace historic features/elements in kind
- Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure
- Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)
Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting
- or cultural landscape
- Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible
- Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible

No Potentially affect presently unidentified cultural resources
Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting, landscape elements,
 No or archeological or ethnographic resources
 No Involve a real property transaction (exchange, sale, or lease of land or structures)
 Other (please specify): _____

B. REVIEWS BY CULTURAL RESOURCE SPECIALISTS

The park Historic Preservation Officer requested review by the park's cultural resource specialist/advisors as indicated by check-off boxes or as follows:

Archeologist
Name: Laura Kirn
Date: 03/04/2011

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance
Assessment of Effect: No Historic Properties Affected No Adverse Effect Adverse Effect
 Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:
Doc Method: No Potential to Cause Effects [800.3(a)(1)]

Historical Architect
Name: Shawn Lingo
Date: 04/12/2011

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance
Assessment of Effect: No Historic Properties Affected No Adverse Effect Adverse Effect
 Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:
Doc Method: No Potential to Cause Effects [800.3(a)(1)]

Anthropologist
Name: Jennifer Hardin
Date: 04/26/2011

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance
Assessment of Effect: No Historic Properties Affected No Adverse Effect Adverse Effect
 Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:
Doc Method: No Potential to Cause Effects [800.3(a)(1)]

[X] Historical Landscape Architect

Name: David Humphrey

Date: 04/12/2011

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: ___ No Historic Properties Affected X No Adverse Effect ___ Adverse Effect
___ Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

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

C. PARK HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

_____ No Historic Properties Affected X No Adverse Effect _____ Adverse Effect

2. Documentation Method:

[] 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:

[X] 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.

Specify: 1999 Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

[] 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

F. No Potential to Cause Effects [800.3(a)(1)]

G. Memo to SHPO/THPO

H. Memo to ACHP

3. Additional Consulting Parties Information:

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.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK ACTING HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER:

Signature

Acting
Historic
Preservation
Officer

//Barbara Wyatt//

Date: 5/9/11

Barbara Wyatt

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: //Don L. Neubacher//

Date: 5/18/11

Don L. Neubacher

*The signed original of this document is on file at the
Environmental Planning and Compliance Office in
Yosemite National Park.*