



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: Michael Pieper, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2012-046 Tunnel Preservation Project (43825)

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:

- Ensure continuous involvement of park History, Architecture, and Landscape (HAL) staff in details and methods proposed for concrete interior finishes. Power washing has the potential to remove and damage the historic finish and materials and it is recommended to use a low pressure washing. Please consult HAL staff to determine an appropriate level.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 43825.

//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: 12/18/2012

Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2012-046 Tunnel Preservation Project

PEPC Project Number: 43825

Project Description:

The work includes repairing the existing Wawona Tunnel and the three Big Oak Flat Tunnels in an effort to mitigate the spalling of the tunnel linings, correct drainage problems, and fix other minor features of the structures. The detailed work includes:

- power wash all existing concrete tunnel linings,
- repair concrete cracks and spalling problems,
- replace the existing failed interior floor drains by cutting new drains into the concrete road surface,
- replace the trenches at the large tunnel entrances with new drop inlets and cross drains,
- replace adjoining pavement,
- repair and patch concrete floors,
- replace wall drains in existing locations unless missing,
- remove all graffiti,
- clean exterior drains at tunnel entrances
- resurface Wawona tunnel by grinding the top 1/4 inch of the road,
- remove four trees at the end of Wawona Tunnel, three cedars and one fir.

Project Locations:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

- Ensure continuous involvement of park History, Architecture, and Landscape (HAL) staff in details and methods proposed for concrete interior finishes. Power washing has the potential to remove and damage the historic finish and materials and it is recommended to use a low pressure washing. Please consult HAL staff to determine an appropriate level.

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//

Date 1/10/13

*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: 12/18/2012

ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 12/17/2012

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: 2012-046 Tunnel Preservation Project
PEPC Project Number: 43825
Project Type: Facility Maintenance (FM)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Michael Pieper

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.		Negligible			Floor and trench drains will be replaced which entails only excavating down to the existing base material. Repairs will not include cutting rock or excavating any native soils.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			Some concrete dust will be generated during the preservation work but it will be minimized with water and control of the emissions.

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
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			Temporary construction noises will occur during this project; the majority of the noises will be contained within the tunnels.
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	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
fish habitat					
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		Negligible			Short term traffic delays are anticipated with this project. Projected construction schedule is designed to avoid peak visitation times.
18. Archeological resources	No				
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				Wawona Tunnel has been determined eligible for the National Register for Historic Places.
20. Cultural landscapes	No				New Big Oak Flat Road has been determined eligible for the National Register for Historic Places.
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	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
populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.					
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
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;		No		

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

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

<u>Interdisciplinary Team</u>	<u>Field of Expertise</u>
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
Sheri Ogden	Acting Chief of Business and Revenue Management
Tom Medema	Chief of Interpretation and Education
Charles Cuvelier	Chief of Visitor and Resource Protection
Michael Pieper	Project Leader
Madelyn Ruffner	Acting Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
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>12/18/12</u>
<u>//Madelyn Ruffner//</u> Acting Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>12/19/12</u>
<u>//Randy Fong//</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>12/20/12</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date

<u>//Don L. Neubacher//</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>12/20/12</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: 12/18/2012

PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: December 18, 2012

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2012-046 Tunnel Preservation Project
PEPC Project Number: 43825
Project Type: Facility Maintenance (FM)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Michael Pieper

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			Floor and trench drains will be replaced which entails only excavating down to the existing base material. Repairs will not include cutting rock or excavating any native soils.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		No		

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		
Has a National Register form been completed?		No		New Big Oak Flat Road and Wawona Tunnel have been determined eligible.
Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?	Yes			New Big Oak Flat Road Tunnel #1, #56033; Tunnel #2, #56034; Tunnel #3, #56035. Wawona Tunnel, #5839.
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?	Yes			
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: 12/18/2012

ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

Project Name: 2012-046 Tunnel Preservation Project

Prepared by: Renea Kennec

Date Prepared: 12/17/2012

Telephone: 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 43825

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

Yes

Source or reference: New Big Oak Flat Road and Wawona Tunnel
(determined eligible)

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 Resource(s):**

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

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

- 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:

Archeologist
 Name: Laura Kirn
 Date: 10/21/2012

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: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

Historical Architect
 Name: Gabrielle Harlan
 Date: 12/18/2012

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: Please continue to involve HAL staff in details and methods proposed for concrete interior finishes. Power washing has the potential to remove and damage the historic finish and materials and it is recommended to use a technique involving a low pressure, as measured in pounds per square inch. Please consult HAL staff to determine an appropriate pressure level for the effort to clean the concrete surfaces.

Doc Method: Stipulations/Conditions

Anthropologist
 Name: Jennifer Hardin
 Date: 12/04/2012

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: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

Historical Landscape Architect

Name: Kevin McCardle

Date: 11/19/2012

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: Please continue to involve HAL staff in details and methods proposed for concrete interior finishes. Power washing has the potential to remove and damage the historic finish and materials and it is recommended to use a low pressure washing. Please consult HAL staff to determine an appropriate level.

Doc Method: Stipulations/Conditions

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 **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.)

- Ensure continuous involvement of park History, Architecture, and Landscape (HAL) staff in details and methods proposed for concrete interior finishes. Power washing has the potential to remove and damage the historic finish and materials and it is recommended to use a low pressure washing. Please consult HAL staff to determine an appropriate level.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Acting Historic
Preservation Officer

//Kimball Koch//

Kimball Koch

Date: 12/18/12

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: 12/20/12

Don L. Neubacher

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