

---

## APPENDIX: ERRATA SHEETS FOR THE FINAL YOSEMITE ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CENTER FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The following list includes clarifications or corrections to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Many of the items listed were brought forward by the public in their comments on the FEIS. The National Park Service appreciates the comments and this opportunity to correct and improve the FEIS. None of the corrections listed below significantly affect the analyses or conclusions of the effect of the FEIS.

---

Abstract (second paragraph): The following sentence was added to the FEIS abstract: "Under both action alternatives, a new education center would be owned by the NPS and operated jointly by the NPS and NatureBridge."

Abstract (third paragraph): "Environmental studies and comments received on an administrative Draft EIS prepared in 2004 led to reconsideration and formulation of a new alternative, which would locate the campus in a new area of the park to avoid sensitive resources in and around Crane Flat meadows" has been rewritten to read, "Environmental studies and comments received on an administrative Draft EIS prepared in 2003 led to reconsideration and formulation of a new alternative, which would locate the campus in a new area of the park to avoid sensitive resources in and around Crane Flat meadows."

Page iii: "Under Alternative 3, some impediments, namely water utility structures, would be removed and this parcel could become Wilderness" has been rewritten to read "Under Alternative 3, impediments, namely water utility structures, would be removed and this parcel would become Wilderness."

Page vii (second paragraph): The FEIS states [under Alternative 3], "However, restoration of the existing Crane Flat campus would result in an adverse effect to *three* historic structures, which have been determined eligible for listing on the NRHP in consensus between the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the National Park Service." This sentence has been rewritten to read, "However, restoration of the Crane Flat campus would result in an adverse effect to *four* historic structures, which have been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places."

Page 2-6: The FEIS states in the sustainability and green technology section, "Use cogeneration technology to heat water" and "Promote infiltration." The sentence has been rewritten to read, "Use *sustainable technology, such as cogeneration and geothermal, for heating*" (bullet six) and "Promote *water* filtration" (bullet eight).

Page 2-15: The FEIS states [under Alternative 1] that the number of instructors is 33. The correct number is 27 (19 in Yosemite Valley and 8 at Crane Flat).

Page 2-23: "This phase includes *demolition* of existing structures" has been rewritten to read, "This phase includes *removal* of existing structures."

Page 2-34: "Geothermal heat pumps would be located near each of the three buildings with approximately 25 boreholes spaced 20 feet apart and 300 to 400 feet deep (vertical closed loop system) in each location" has been rewritten to read, "Geothermal heat pumps would be located near each of the three buildings with approximately 174 boreholes spaced 20 feet apart and 300 to 400 feet deep (vertical closed loop system)."

Page 2-37: *tank* is misspelled as take.

Page 2-38: “The duration of construction is 12 to 18 months with the potential for phasing consolidation” has been rewritten to read, “The duration of construction is 12 to 18 months (not including downtime during winter months) with the potential for phasing consolidation.”

Page 2-30: “(page intentionally left blank) blank)” has been rewritten to read, “(page intentionally left blank).”

Page 2-37: The FEIS states [under Alternative 3] that the number of instructors is 36. The correct number is 35 (19 in Yosemite Valley and 16 at Henness Ridge).

Page 2-40: The FEIS states [under Alternative 3] that actions would include “providing interpretation of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) camp and *one historic structure (6017, Oil and Light plant) representative of the park’s CCC/Blister Rust camp history.*” This sentence has been rewritten to read that actions would include “providing interpretation of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) camp/Blister Rust camp history.”

Page 2-41: The FEIS states [under Alternative 3], “Consultation with the SHPO and the public is brought about in this document, for the proposed measures to resolve adverse effects as a result of removal of *three* historic properties (buildings 6013, 6014, and 6015).” This sentence has been rewritten to read, “Consultation with the SHPO and the public is brought about in this document, for the proposed measures to resolve adverse effects as a result of removal of *four* historic properties (buildings 6013, 6014, 6015, and 6017).”

Page 2-46: *Hodgdon* is misspelled as Hodgon.

Page 2-43: The caption, “Figure 2-11 Project *Management* Leading 2006 CBA Workshop” has been rewritten to read, “Project *Manager* Leading 2006 CBA Workshop.”

Page 2-57: “*demolished* buildings” has been rewritten to read, “*removed* buildings” (twice).

Page 2-59: The FEIS in Table 2-9 states [under Alternative 3], “Restoration of the existing Crane Flat campus would result in an adverse effect to *three* historic properties (Buildings 6013, 6014, and 6015), and a no adverse effect to historic property Building 6017.” This sentence has been rewritten to read, “Restoration of the existing Crane Flat campus would result in an adverse effect to *four* historic properties (Buildings 6013, 6014, 6015, and 6017).”

Page 2-71: The FEIS in Table 2-10 states, “Consultation with the SHPO, American Indian tribes, and the public is effectuated in this document, for the proposed measures to resolve adverse effects as a result of removal of historic properties (Buildings 6013, 6014 under Alternative 2, and 6013, 6014, and 6015 under Alternative 3) at Crane Flat.” This sentence has been rewritten to read, “Consultation with the SHPO, American Indian tribes, and the public is effectuated in this document, for the proposed measures to resolve adverse effects as a result of removal of historic properties (Buildings 6013, 6014 under Alternative 2, and 6013, 6014, 6015, and 6017 under Alternative 3) at Crane Flat.”

Page 2-71: The FEIS in Table 2-10 states, “Adverse effect of removal of two historic properties under Alternative 2 and *three* under Alternative 3 would be resolved by implementing SMMs in Section VIII of the Park’s 1999 PA, enumerated above, and retention and repair of Building 6017 according to the Secretary of Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Historic Preservation.” This sentence has been rewritten to read, “Adverse effect of removal of two historic properties under Alternative 2 and *four* historic properties under Alternative 3 would be resolved by implementing SMMs in Section VIII of the Park’s 1999 PA, enumerated above.”

Page 3-9: Under impact significance, *specific* is misspelled as specifc.

Page 3-9: Under Crane Flat Setting, *Tuolumne* is misspelled as Tuolomne.

Page 3-111: Under Environmental Consequences for the No-Action Alternative, the FEIS states, “Operation-related impacts would include non-significant impacts by visitor use or routine maintenance and repair of historic structures, and buildings.” The punctuation has been rewritten to read: “...repair of historic *structures and buildings*.”

Page 3-112: The FEIS states [under Alternative 3], “At Crane Flat, *three* historic structures (Buildings 6013, 6014, and 6015) would be removed along with all modern buildings and infrastructure, and the area would be restored to natural forest and meadow conditions.” This sentence has been rewritten to read, “At Crane Flat, *four* historic structures (Buildings 6013, 6014, 6015, and 6017) would be removed along with all modern buildings and infrastructure, and the area would be restored to natural forest and meadow conditions.”

Page 3-113: The FEIS states [under Alternative 3], “Restoration-related Impacts on Built Historic Resources and Cultural Landscapes. Demolition activities to remove buildings at the Crane Flat Campus to a natural state would result in an adverse effect under Section 106 of the NHPA to *three* historic properties (Buildings 6013, 6014, and 6015) determined eligible for listing on the National Historic Register. The adverse effect on three historic properties under Section 106 of the NHPA would be resolved in accordance with Stipulation VIII (A) of the 1999 PA, with standard mitigating measures including recordation, salvage, and documentation of the *three historic structures, and retention of one small historic structure (Building 6017)*. The *three* historic structures to be removed would first be documented according to the standards of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS). In addition, the Yosemite historical architect would conduct a documented inspection to identify architectural elements that may be reused in rehabilitating the remaining historic structure.” This section has been rewritten to read, “Restoration-related Impacts on Built Historic Resources and Cultural Landscapes. Removing buildings at the Crane Flat Campus to a natural state would result in an adverse effect under Section 106 of the NHPA to *four* historic properties (Buildings 6013, 6014, 6015, and 6017) determined eligible for listing on the National Historic Register. The adverse effect on the *four* historic properties under Section 106 of the NHPA would be resolved in accordance with Stipulation VIII (A) of the 1999 PA, with standard mitigating measures including recordation, salvage, and documentation of *the structures*. The *four* historic structures to be removed would first be documented according to the standards of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS).”

Page 3-113: The FEIS states [under Alternative 3], “*No adverse affect* would occur to the *one retained historic structure, NPS Building 6017. Methods for repairing and securing the building would follow the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for Historic Preservation standards for salvage, interpretation, and National Register re-evaluation, following policies and regulations for the preservation and use of historic properties (16 USC470h-2(a)1) and Treatment of Cultural Resources (Sec. 5.3.5, NPS 2006). NPS Building 6017 would continue to represent the contribution of the CCC/Blister Rust Camp at Crane Flat to Yosemite National Park.*” This section has been rewritten to read, “*An adverse affect* would occur to NPS Building 6017, *which would be removed.*”

Page 3-113: The FEIS states that [under Alternative 3] “Impact Significance and Determination of Effect. Restoration of the Crane Flat Campus would have an adverse effect on *three* historic properties (Buildings 6013, 6014, and 6015) that would be resolved in accordance with the 1999 PA and mitigations described herein. *There would be no adverse effect on one historic property (Building 6017).*” This section has been rewritten to read, “Impact Significance and Determination of Effect. Restoration of the Crane Flat Campus would have an adverse effect on *four* historic properties (Buildings 6013, 6014, 6015, and 6017) that would be resolved in accordance with the 1999 PA and mitigations described herein.”

Page 3-113: The FEIS states [under Alternative 3], “Conclusion. Under Alternative 3, there would be no impact or no effect to historic structures, buildings, or cultural landscapes at the proposed Henness Ridge campus location. Removal of the existing Crane Flat campus would result in an adverse effect to Buildings 6013, 6014, and 6015, which have been determined eligible for listing on the NRHP, that would be resolved in accordance with Stipulation VIII of the 1999 PA and mitigations described herein. *There*

would be no adverse effect on one historic property (Building 6017).” This section has been rewritten to read, “Conclusion. Under Alternative 3, there would be no impact or no effect to historic structures, buildings, or cultural landscapes at the proposed Henness Ridge campus location. Removal of the existing Crane Flat campus would result in an adverse effect to Buildings 6013, 6014, 6015, and 6017 which have been determined eligible for listing on the NRHP, that would be resolved in accordance with Stipulation VIII of the 1999 PA and mitigations described herein.”

Page 3-130: Under wastewater, *system* is misspelled as sytem.

Page 3-145: Under Restoration-related impacts on Land Use, *Creek* is misspelled as Crekk.

Page 3-156: Under Impacts under Alternative 3, *regional* and *compared* are misspelled as regionall and compariad.

Page 3-162: Under Happy Isles, *affected* is misspelled as affected.

Page 3-173: Under Alternative 3, *impacts* is misspelled as impac.

Page 4-1: Capitalization in *NatureBridge* should be corrected from Naturebridge.

Page 4-3: Acronym for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (*USACE*) should be corrected from USCOE.

Page 4-3: “This EIS has determined that Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 will not adversely affect waters of the United States or special aquatic sites in such a manner that would require a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USCOE)” has been rewritten to read, “This EIS has determined that Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 will not adversely affect waters of the United States or special aquatic sites.”

Page 4-3: “The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service reviewed the Draft EIS and concurred with this determination and recommended that if special-status species are encountered during project implementation, to re-initiate consultation at that time (Ann Roberts, personal communication, July 2009)” has been rewritten to read, “The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service reviewed the Draft EIS and concurred with this determination and recommended that if special-status species are encountered during project implementation, to re-initiate consultation at that time (Jeremiah Karuzas, telephone communication, July 22, 2009).”

Page 4-3: The following agency consultation has been added to the Final EIS: “Environmental Protection Agency: On July 15, 2009, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) submitted a comment letter on the Draft EIS stating that the EPA did not object to the proposed project (with a Lack of Objection rating), but requested additional information regarding applicability of Clean Air Act general conformity. The NPS addressed the EPA comment in the Final EIS.”

Page 5-3: *Megan Robertson* is misspelled as Megan Roberston.