



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: Ron Gaunt, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2011-031 Yosemite Valley DNC Guest and Residential Facilities Fire Safety Upgrade (37732)

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:

- Portions of this project will occur in archeological site areas. Where this is the case, archeological monitoring is required to avoid adverse effects per the Yosemite 1999 PA, Stipulation VII.C.2.h. Recommendations: Archeological monitoring is required during ground disturbance at Lost Arrow, Tecoya 9000 A&B, and Stoneman House.
- Portions of this project will occur in culturally significant archeological site areas. Where this is the case, American Indian cultural monitoring is required to avoid adverse effects to resources with traditional cultural or religious significance. Recommendations: American Indian Cultural Monitoring will be required at select locations

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 37732.

//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.*



National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite National Park
Date: 11/18/2011

Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2011-031 Yosemite Valley DNC Guest and Residential Facilities Fire Safety Upgrade

PEPC Project Number: 37732

Project Description:

The purpose of this project is to design and install fire and smoke detection and alarm systems, fire sprinkler systems and backflow prevention connections at various facilities located in in Yosemite National Park. Many residential units in the park are currently protected by battery operated fire and smoke alarms. These units will be replaced with hard wired, fire and smoke detectors and alarms with battery backup that will be connected to the National Park Service fire command and the Delaware North Corporation control panel. Facilities that receive this fire safety upgrade include:

Tecoya Dorms A, B, C, D, E, F, and Y Apartments Indian Creek Apartments, Medic Row Six-plex Apartments, Lost Arrow Dorm, and Stoneman Lodge at Curry Village

Recent changes to the National Fire Protection Association and California Building codes have added inclusion of sprinklers into construction of housing units of six units or larger. This project will bring housing units of this size within the park up to code.

Three concessioner buildings in Yosemite currently have fire sprinkler systems but do not have appropriate backflow prevention connections. This project will size those backflow prevention connections.

Many of these buildings are historic and contributing to the Yosemite Valley and Yosemite Village Historic District. The design team includes a Historical Architect and all design work has been done in close consultation with park History, Architecture, and Landscapes branch. All design will meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The connections to the underground utility will include ground disturbance in previously disturbed areas.

Project Locations:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

- Portions of this project will occur in archeological site areas. Where this is the case, archeological monitoring is required to avoid adverse effects per the Yosemite 1999 PA, Stipulation VII.C.2.h. Recommendations: Archeological monitoring is required during ground disturbance at Lost Arrow, Tecoya 9000 A&B, and Stoneman House.
- Portions of this project will occur in culturally significant archeological site areas. Where this is the case, American Indian cultural monitoring is required to avoid adverse effects to resources

with traditional cultural or religious significance. Recommendations: American Indian Cultural Monitoring will be required at select locations

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//

Don L. Neubacher

Date: 12/5/11

*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: 11/18/2011

ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 11/18/2011

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: 2011-031 Yosemite Valley DNC Guest and Residential Facilities Fire Safety Upgrade
PEPC Project Number: 37732
Project Type: Capital Improvement (CI)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Ron Gaunt

Is project a hot topic (controversial or sensitive issues that should be brought to attention of Regional Director)?

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.		Negligible			Trenching involves 36 inches deep and 24 inches wide of soil disturbance.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality	No				
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			Temporary construction noises will occur during the project work.
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, visitation, activities, etc.	No				
17. Visitor experience,	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
aesthetic resources					
18. Archeological resources		Negligible			Yosemite Valley Archeological District.
19. Prehistoric/historic structure		Negligible			Many of these structures are historic and contributing resources to the historic district.
20. Cultural landscapes		Negligible			Yosemite Valley Historic District and Yosemite Village Historic District.
21. Ethnographic resources		Negligible			Yosemite Valley American Indian Traditional Cultural Property.
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				

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
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 (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		No		

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

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? 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

<u>Interdisciplinary Team</u>	<u>Field of Expertise</u>
Don L. Neubacher	Superintendent
Michael Gauthier	Chief of Staff
Kathleen Morse	Chief of Planning
Randy Fong	Chief of Project Management
Terri Austin	Chief of Administration Management
Ed Walls	Chief of Facilities Management
Linda C. Mazzu	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
Geoffrey Lane	Project Leader
Elexis Mayer	Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
Elexis Mayer	Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Renea Kennec	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 Kennec//</u> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	<u>11/22/11</u>
<u>//Elexis J. Mayer//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Elexis Mayer	<u>11/29/11</u>
<u>//Randy Fong//</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>12/1/11</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Don L. Neubacher//</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>12/5/11</u>

*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: 11/18/2011

PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: November 18, 2011

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2011-031 Yosemite Valley DNC Guest and Residential Facilities Fire Safety Upgrade
PEPC Project Number: 37732
Project Type: Capital Improvement (CI)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Ron Gaunt

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			
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?	Yes			Trenching involves 36 inches deep and 24 inches wide of soil disturbance.
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		
Has a National Register form been completed?		No		
Are there any structures on the park's	Yes			Some structures are listed.

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?				
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST				
Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor?	Yes			Merced 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?		No		
WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST				
Within designated Wilderness?		No		
Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		No		



National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite National Park
Date: 11/18/2011

ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. Park: Yosemite National Park

2. Project Description:

Project Name: 2011-031 Yosemite Valley DNC Guest and Residential Facilities Fire Safety Upgrade

Prepared by: Renea Kennec

Date Prepared: 11/18/2011

Telephone: 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 37732

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

☐ No
☒ Yes

Source or reference: Yosemite Valley Historic District; Yosemite Valley Archeological District; Yosemite Village Historic District; Yosemite Valley American Indian Traditional Cultural Property.

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:

Archeological resources affected?

Name and numbers: Yosemite Creek Archeological District

Cultural landscapes affected?

Name and numbers: Yosemite Village Historic District

NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

Name and numbers: Yosemite Valley Historic District

NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

Ethnographic resources affected?

Name and numbers: Yosemite Valley American Indian Traditional Cultural Property

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
- ☐ 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)
- ☐ 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] Archeologist

Name: Laura Kirn

Date: 07/21/2011

Comments: Portions of this project will occur in archeological site areas. Where this is the case, archeological monitoring is required to avoid adverse effects per the Yosemite 1999 PA, Stipulation VII.C.2.h.

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: Archeological monitoring is required during ground disturbance at Lost Arrow, Tecoya 9000 A&B, and Stoneman House.

[X] Anthropologist
Name: Jennifer Hardin
Date: 07/28/2011

Comments: Portions of this project will occur in culturally significant archeological site areas. Where this is the case, American Indian cultural monitoring is required to avoid adverse effects to resources with traditional cultural or religious significance.

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: American Indian Cultural Monitoring will be required at select locations.

[X] Historical Landscape Architect
Name: David Humphrey
Date: 09/09/2011

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: Project will comply with YOSE 1999 PA, Stipulation VII.C.2.h).

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: 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.)**

- **Portions of this project will occur in archeological site areas. Where this is the case, archeological monitoring is required to avoid adverse effects per the Yosemite 1999 PA, Stipulation VII.C.2.h. Recommendations: Archeological monitoring is required during ground disturbance at Lost Arrow, Tecoya 9000 A&B, and Stoneman House.**
- **Portions of this project will occur in culturally significant archeological site areas. Where this is the case, American Indian cultural monitoring is required to avoid adverse effects to resources with traditional cultural or religious significance. Recommendations: American Indian Cultural Monitoring will be required at select locations**

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Acting Historic Preservation Officer //Elexis Mayer// Date 11/29/12
Elexis Mayer

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: 12/5/12
Don L. Neubacher

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