



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: Garrett Chun
From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park
Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: Hodgdon Meadow Wastewater Improvements (37537)

The Executive Leadership Team has reviewed the proposed project/action 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 and/or project implementation can commence.

For the proposed project actions to be within compliance requirements during construction and/or project implementation, the following mitigations must be adhered to:

- No mitigations identified.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 37537.

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: 2011-033 Hodgdon Meadow Wastewater Improvements

PEPC Project Number: 37537

Project Description:

This project will replace the 6,000 gallon septic tank and leach field that serves the winter wastewater disposal needs of Hodgdon Meadow with a new septic tank, dosing chamber, and leach field and will accommodate both the summer and winter needs of Hodgdon Meadow proper. A new duplex pump station will be constructed to convey raw sewage to a new force main under Tuolumne Grove Road and Carlon Road to a new septic tank located at the shoulder of Carlon Road. The effluent leaving the new septic tank will then gravity flow to a new leach field placed in trenches parallel with the ground contours within a boundary defined as 100' offset from the existing spray field.

The leach field is projected to utilize approximately 40% of the existing spray field area. The remaining 60% of the existing spray field may be designated as a restoration site for native vegetative species after it is determined that the constructed leach field is properly addressing effluent disposal needs. Construction completion must occur before November 1, 2011 to provide an operational winter wastewater system. Failure to provide a winter wastewater system may result in the relocation of permanent residents and shutdown of the campground.

After construction completion of the new septic tank and leach field, the existing spray field pipes and spray heads will be removed. The existing 6,000 gallon septic tank and leach line will be abandoned in place.

Project Location:

Tuolumne County, CA

Mitigations:

- 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.3 Routine maintenance and repairs to non-historic structures, facilities, utilities, grounds and trails.

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: 7/7/11

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



National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite National Park
Date: 07/07/2011

ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 07/07/2011

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: 2011-033 Hodgdon Meadow Wastewater Improvements
PEPC Project Number: 37537
Project Type: Facility Rehabilitation (FR)
Project Location:
County, State: Tuolumne, California
Project Leader: Garrett Chun

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. | | | Minor | | Leach field and force main - three feet wide and five feet deep trenches; a total of 22,000 square feet. Force main has a total of 4,200 square feet. Pump station building is ten feet by ten feet by 25 feet deep. |
| 2. From geohazards | No | | | | |
| 3. Air quality | | Negligible | | | Temporary construction air emissions. |
| 4. Soundscapes | | Negligible | | | The wastewater improvements will create temporary construction noises. |

| 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 |
|---|------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 5. Water quality or quantity | No | | | | |
| 6. Streamflow characteristics | No | | | | |
| 7. Marine or estuarine resources | No | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |

| 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 |
|---|------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 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 | | | | |
| 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 | 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 |
|---|-----------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---|
| or policies | | | | | |
| 27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability | | | Minor | | Use of existing improvements to operation of waste water system |
| 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 |
|--|-----|----|-----|-------------------------------------|
| 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 | | No | | |

| Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal: | Yes | No | N/A | Comment or Data Needed to Determine |
|---|------------|-----------|------------|--|
| (NEPA section 102(2)(E))? | | | | |
| 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 | | |
| 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
- 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? No
3. Are there any interested or affected agencies or parties? No
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

E. 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.

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.

| <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 |
| Dale St. Vincent | 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 |
| Garrett Chun | Project Leader |
| Elaxis Mayer | Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager |
| Elaxis Mayer | Acting Historic Preservation Officer |
| Renea Kennec | NEPA Specialist |

Recommended:

| Compliance Specialists | Date |
|--|---------------|
| <u>//Elexis J. Mayer// acting</u> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec | <u>7/8/11</u> |
| <u>//Elexis J. Mayer// acting</u> Compliance Program Manager – Elexis Mayer | <u>7/8/11</u> |
| <u>//Elexis J. Mayer//</u> Acting Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong | <u>7/8/11</u> |

Approved:

| Superintendent | Date |
|---|---------------|
| <u>//Don L. Neubacher//</u> Don L. Neubacher | <u>7/8/11</u> |

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



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. Project Description:

a) **Project Name:** 2011-033 Hodgdon Meadow Wastewater Improvements

b) **Date Prepared:** 07/07/2011

c) **PEPC Project Number:** 37537

d) **Locations:** Tuolumne County, CA

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

 No

 X Yes

Source or reference:

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

 X extensive as to preclude intact cultural deposits.

4. Potentially Affected Resource(s):

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

 No 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
 No 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

 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): _____

6. Supporting Study Data:

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: Laura Kirn

Date: 07/07/2011

Comments: The area has been inventoried and no archeological resources have been located.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: X 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] Anthropologist

Name: Jennifer Hardin

Date: 07/07/2011

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: X 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: 07/07/2011

Comments: None.

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: None.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

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

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'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:

☒ 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:

☐ 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 SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

NHPA Specialist

Elexis Mayer //Elexis J. Mayer// Date: 7/7/11

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: 7/7/11
Don Neubacher

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