United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

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

IN REPLY REFER TO:
L7615(YOSE-PM)

Memorandum

To: Bill Rust, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2012-039 Ansel Adams Gallery Investigative Testing (43501)

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 43501.

//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: 2012-039 Ansel Adams Gallery Investigative Testing
PEPC Project Number: 43501
Project Description:

The uncovering of concealed conditions during design allows for appropriate design solutions to be developed before construction begins, which makes for a more well-designed and cost-effective project. The following destructive testing is needed in order to inform the design and construction planning process for the Ansel Adams Gallery Rehabilitation project. Testing will reveal concealed conditions within certain buildings associated with The Ansel Adams Gallery and all work will be completed by the park's Historic Preservation Team.

Testing includes temporary removal of:

- A limited area of decking, no greater than 3 square feet, at 900A Gallery porch to see concealed condition of deck framing.
- Debris and soil from the base of a wood pole at west elevation of 900A Gallery to determine extent of rotted wood.
- Limited area of wall finish, 1 square foot, on exterior wall of 900A or to the extent necessary or find alternative non-destructive means to confirm presence of insulation.
- Limited flooring and substrate, no greater than 3 square feet, to view floor framing at lower and upper level of the Gallery (Building 900A), preferably up against perimeter areas where existing floor joists may have contact with soil.
- Flooring and floor substrate, no greater than 3 square feet, in 3 to 4 areas near perimeter walls of 900A, 900B, 902 and 904 to view conditions at foundation.
- Select areas, no greater than 1.5 lineal feet, of wood skirting at all buildings (where present) to reveal existing foundation conditions.
- The ceiling finish attachment to roof rafters sufficiently at the west side of deck at 900A to view and document framing details. This is necessary for preparing new detail to attach new canopy for ADA ramp; this is not necessary if canopy alternative is not selected.
- A louver at west gable end of 900A for access to attic framing.

Project Locations:
Mariposa 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.4 Routine maintenance and repairs to cultural resource sites, structures, utilities and grounds under an approved Historic Structures Preservation Guide or Cyclic Maintenance Guide; or if the action would not adversely affect the cultural resource.

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//*___

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

Date_11/19/12_____

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite National Park
Date: 11/01/2012

ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 10/30/2012

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: 2012-039 Ansel Adams Gallery Investigative Testing
PEPC Project Number: 43501
Project Type: Feasibility Study (FS)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California **District:** Yosemite Valley
Project Leader: Bill Rust

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				Minimal ground disturbance around rotted wood structures.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality	No				
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			There will be temporary, minimal construction noises associated with the investigative testing.
5. Water quality or quantity	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
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				
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand,	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**
visitation, activities, etc.					
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				
18. Archeological resources	No				
19. Prehistoric/historic structure		Negligible			In order to develop appropriate design solutions, concealed conditions need to be revealed. The assessment of effect is “No Adverse Effect.”
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 or policies	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
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
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		No		

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (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		No		

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
(Executive Order 13007)?				
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? No

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? No

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

Interdisciplinary Team	**Field of Expertise**
Don L. Neubacher	Superintendent
Woody Smeck	Deputy Superintendent
Michael Gauthier	Chief of Staff
Kathleen Morse	Chief of Planning
Randy Fong	Chief of Project Management
Teri Austin	Chief of Administration Management
Ed Walls	Chief of Facilities Management
Linda C. Mazzu	Chief of Resources Management & Science
Tara Riggs	Acting Chief of Business and Revenue Management
Tom Medema	Chief of Interpretation and Education
Charles Cuvelier	Chief of Visitor and Resource Protection
Bill Rust	Project Leader
Madelyn Ruffner	Acting Environmental Planning and Compliance Program

Renea Kennec	Manager 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
_//Renea Kennec//_____ Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	__11/14/12_____
_*//Madelyn Ruffner//*_____ Acting Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	_11/14/12_____
_*//Randy Fong//*_____ Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	_11/15/12_____

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
_*//Don L. Neubacher//*_____ Don L. Neubacher	_11/19/12_____

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: November 1, 2012

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2012-039 Ansel Adams Gallery Investigative Testing
PEPC Project Number: 43501
Project Type: Feasibility Study (FS)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California **District:** Yosemite Valley
Project Leader: Bill Rust

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?	Yes			Minimal ground disturbance around rotted wood structures.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		No		
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?	Yes			All testing areas and materials will be replaced in kind.
Has a National Register form been completed?	Yes			Yosemite Valley

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
				Historic District, Yosemite Village Historic District, and Yosemite Valley Archeological District.
Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?	Yes			Ansel Adams Darkroom (#55937) Ansel Adams Residence (#55938) Ansel Adams Duplex Residence (#55940)
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST				
Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor?		No		
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?			N/A	
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		

ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. Park: Yosemite National Park

2. Project Description:

Project Name: 2012-039 Ansel Adams Gallery Investigative Testing
Prepared by: Renea Kennec
Date Prepared: 11/01/2012
Telephone: 209-379-1038
PEPC Project Number: 43501

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

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

___ No

X Yes

Source or reference: **Yosemite Valley Archeological District; Yosemite Valley Historic District; Yosemite Village Historic District.**

X 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:

Historical Structures/Resources Affected:

Name and number(s): Ansel Adams #900 **LCS** 55936
Location: Yosemite Village
NR status: 8 - Within a Register-eligible district

Name and number(s): Ansel Adams Residence #902 **LCS** 55938
Location: Yosemite Village
NR status: 8 - Within a Register-eligible district

Name and number(s): Ansel Adams #904 **LCS** 55940
Location: Yosemite Village
NR status: 8 - Within a Register-eligible district

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

Yes	Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure
Yes	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
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] Archeologist
Name: Laura Kirn
Date: 10/21/2012

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 Architect
Name: Gabrielle Harlan
Date: 11/05/2012

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, Anthropologist, Historical Landscape Architect

---

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:

[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 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 SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Acting Historic Preservation Officer

//Kimball Koch// Date: 11/14/12

Kimball Koch

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.

Superintendent: *//Don L. Neubacher//* Date: 11/19/12

Don L. Neubacher

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