



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: Russell Balch, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2012-048 Glacier Point Surface Water Treatment System Replacement (44304)

The Executive Leadership Team has reviewed the proposed project/action and completed its environmental assessment documentation, and we have determined the following:

- There will not be any effect on threatened, endangered, or rare species and/or their critical habitat.
- There will be no historic properties affected.
- There 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 44304.

//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: 04/10/2013

Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2012-048 Glacier Point Surface Water Treatment System Replacement

PEPC Project Number: 44304

Project Description:

The existing Glacier Point water system provides approximately 9,000 gallons per day for visitors and employees. It presently operates under a temporary waiver from California Department of Public Health (CDPH) to allow the use treated surface water from Pothole Meadow and Union Point. During 2010, the National Park Service attempted to drill two wells and connect to the existing water system. Both wells resulted in very low gallons per minute yields.

The only remaining viable option for potable water at Glacier Point is surface water and an associated surface water treatment system. The surface water treatment system will consist of filtration and disinfection. Park engineering and operator staff has determined that a 20 feet x 24 feet building will be sufficient to treat water at Glacier Point in the near term and will be sufficient for long term needs provided that future water consumption remains relatively consistent.

The proposed building will be inset into a previously disturbed bank. One 12 inch diameter tree, and not more than three smaller trees, will need to be removed.

The proposed building will be located for minimal visual intrusion. The existing building is not sufficient to meet CDPH requirements for surface water treatment and will be removed when the new treatment system is inaugurated. Associated work outside the building will include trenching and installation of underground pipes, trenching and installation of signal wires, and installation of an underground wastewater storage tank. The 500 gallon tank will be installed to receive wastewater from the treatment system. The wastewater will consist of small amounts of effluent from a small sink and treatment system analyzers. The only surface feature will be a manhole top and cover set six inches above grade level. Pump out frequency is expected to be about once every two months. A French drain will be installed to receive less than 200 gallons per day of raw water after testing.

Automated control will improve treatment system efficiency and reduce waste. In addition, telemetry will be installed to replace otherwise necessary maintenance trips. These 60 mile round trips are circuits including other nearby utility systems. This project will reduce each road trip by 12 miles in the near future and will make 40 mile reductions possible when similar systems are in place elsewhere. Near term and long term monthly travel reductions will be 180 and 400 miles, respectively. Each round trip is made by facilities personnel using trucks. Total disturbed area will be less than 8,000 square feet and will be completely within the 23,000 square feet previously disturbed for water treatment and storage. Within the 8,000 square feet of disturbed area there will be approximately 300 linear feet of trenching and two holes not greater than eight feet in diameter nor more than eight feet in depth.

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.18 Construction of minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas.

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.

//Don L. Neubacher//
Don L. Neubacher

5/3/13
Date

*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: 04/10/2013

ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 04/10/2013

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: 2012-048 Glacier Point Surface Water Treatment System Replacement
PEPC Project Number: 44304
Project Type: Facility Rehabilitation (FR)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa , California **District:** Glacier Point
Project Leader: Russell Balch

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			Replacing the chlorination building includes expanding the footprint from 8 feet x 12 feet to 10 feet x 18 feet. The new water treatment building will be 20 feet x 24 feet set into the cut bank. Trenching includes 3300 feet for the electric line and 1120 feet for the water line.
2. From geohazards	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
3. Air quality		Negligible			Construction of the facility includes temporary air emissions.
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			There will be temporary construction noises associated with the facility installation.
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				Project will avoid Great Grey owl nesting season.
14. Unique 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
important fish or 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			The treatment facility can minimally be seen from the trail.
18. Archeological resources		Negligible			
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,	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
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; wilderness areas; wild or scenic		No		

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
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? Yes, there were no comments received.
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 Randy Fong Teri Austin Ed Walls	Chief of Planning Chief of Project Management Chief of Administration Management Chief of Facilities Management
Linda C. Mazzu Kris Kirby Tom Medema Kevin Killian Russ Balch Madelyn Ruffner Renea Kennec	Chief of Resources Management & Science Chief of Business and Revenue Management Chief of Interpretation and Education Acting Chief of Visitor and Resource Protection Project Leader Acting Environmental Planning and Compliance Program 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
<u>//Renea Kennec//</u> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	<u>4/25/13</u>
<u>//Madelyn Ruffner//</u> Acting Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>4/29/13</u>
<u>//Randy Fong//</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>5/3/13</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Don L. Neubacher//</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>5/3/13</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: 04/10/2013

PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: April 10, 2013

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2012-048 Glacier Point Surface Water Treatment System Replacement
PEPC Project Number: 44304
Project Type: Facility Rehabilitation (FR)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa , California **District:** Glacier Point
Project Leader: Russell Balch

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)?	Yes			The Great Grey owl is on the endangered species list. This project will avoid all activities during the spring nesting season.
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			Replacing the chlorination building includes expanding the footprint from 8 feet x 12 feet to 10 feet x 18 feet. The new water treatment building will be 20 feet x 24 feet set into the cut bank. Trenching includes 3300 feet for the electric line and 1120 feet for the water line.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		No		
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
Has a National Register form been completed?			N/A	
Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?		No		
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		



National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite National Park
Date: 04/10/2013

ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

Project Name: 2012-048 Glacier Point Surface Water Treatment System Replacement

Prepared by: Renea Kennec

Date Prepared: 04/10/2013

Telephone: 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 44304

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

3. **Has the area of potential effects been surveyed to identify historic properties?**

☐ No

☒ Yes

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)

☐ 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: 12/04/2012

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []
Assessment of Effect: No Potential to Cause Effect X No Historic Properties
Affected No Adverse Effect Adverse Effect Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:
Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

[X] Historical Landscape Architect
Name: Kevin McCardle
Date: 10/15/2012
Comments: Site is within Glacier point Road Historic District. Steps have been taken to minimize or eliminate visual impacts to the district.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []
Assessment of Effect: No Potential to Cause Effect No Historic Properties
Affected X No Adverse Effect Adverse Effect Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:
Doc Method: Combined NEPA/NHPA Document

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

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

 No Potential to Cause Effects

☐ 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. Memo to SHPO/THPO

☐ G. 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: 5/2/13

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: 5/3/13

Don L. Neubacher

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