



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)

JUL 23 2014

Memorandum

To: Laura Kirn, Cultural Resources Program Manager

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2014-007 Archeological Investigations for the Emergency Services Complex Rehabilitation (51096)

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 not be any effect on historical, cultural, or archeological resources.
- There will not be serious or long-term undesirable environmental or visual effects.

The subject proposed project, therefore, is/are 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 51096.

Don L. Neubacher

Enclosure (with attachments)

cc: Statutory Compliance File

Letter of Compliance Completion - Archeological Investigations for the Emergency Services Complex Rehabilitation - PEPC ID: 51096



Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2014-007 Archeological Investigations for the Emergency Services Complex Rehabilitation

PEPC Project Number: 51096

Project Description:

Archeological investigations are necessary to support implementation of the planned rehabilitation of the structures comprising the Valley Emergency Services Complex. The Emergency Services Complex buildings exist in very close proximity to highly sensitive archeological resources and human remains. Ground disturbing activities involved in the rehabilitation include: trenching for construction of perimeter foundation footings at the main building and the garage building, new foundation for a small addition on the west side of the main building and the east side of the garage building, and utility line trenching.

The rehabilitation project has the potential to affect archeological deposits at site CA-MRP-56/H, listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing element of the Yosemite Valley Archeological District. As part of the park's obligations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) (36 CFR 800, as amended) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), park staff will assess the north central portion of MRP-56/H for the presence of intact archeological deposits and Native American human remains. Park staff is currently developing an archeological work plan that will guide efforts to identify and assess the archeological resources in the immediate project area, and a NAGPRA plan to address any discoveries of human remains. Work will begin with preliminary investigations, and may be followed by more in-depth excavations depending on the findings of the preliminary work. One outcome of this study will be to provide the archeological and tribal information necessary for a determination of effect for the undertaking as stipulated in 36 CFR 800.5, part of the Section 106 review process.

Preliminary investigations: Archeologists (accompanied by tribal cultural monitors) will excavate nine shovel test units (50 x 50 cm) and 13 six-inch diameter auger units (total excavation volume: 2.2 cubic meters). All soils will be screened using 1/8 inch mesh hardware screens, and all materials will be sorted for analysis and cataloging. Based on the findings from these initial explorations, more in-depth investigations may be necessary. If so, these investigations will consist of three to five 1 x 1 meter excavation units for a total volume of approximately 4.5 cubic meters. The quantity and location of these excavation units may be adjusted based on the findings of the preliminary investigations.

Project Location:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigation:

- 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):

E.1 Archeological surveys and permits involving only surface collection or small-scale test excavations.

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: 7/23/4
Don L. Neubacher



ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 02/03/2014

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: 2014-007 Archeological Investigations for the Emergency Services Complex Rehabilitation
PEPC Project #: 51096
Project Type: Archeological investigation (OTHER)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California **Other:** Yosemite Valley Maintenance Area
Project Leader: Laura Kirn, Cultural Resources Program Manager

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				The project is to dig 9 shovel test units (50 cm x 50 cm) and 13 six-inch diameter auger units for a total volume of 2.2 cubic meters. All soils will be screened using 1/8" screen. If further investigation is required, additional 3 to 5 excavations of 1x1 meter will be made for a total of 4.5 cubic meters.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality	No				
4. Soundscapes	No				
5. Water quality 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
quantity					
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				
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			Minor		The Emergency Services Complex buildings exist in very close proximity to highly sensitive archeological resources and human remains.
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes	No				
21. Ethnographic resources			Minor		These archeological investigations will guide efforts to identify and assess the archeological resources in the project area. The NAGPRA plan of action will lay out a process for addressing any discoveries of human remains.
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		
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		No		

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

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?
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
Michael Gauthier	Chief of Staff
Kathleen Morse	Chief of Planning
Randy Fong	Chief of Project Management
Zach Allely	Acting Chief of Administration Management
Lou Summerfield	Acting Chief of Facilities Management
Linda C. Mazzu	Chief of Resources Management & Science
Kris Kirby	Chief of Business and Revenue Management
Tom Medema	Chief of Interpretation and Education
Kevin Killian	Chief of Visitor and Resource Protection
Laura Kirn	Project Leader
Madelyn Ruffner	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  Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec  Acting Compliance Program Manager – Lisa Acree  Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	Date <u>7/17/14</u> <u>7/17/14</u>
---	--

Approved:

Superintendent  Don L. Neubacher	Date <u>7/23/14</u>
--	----------------------------



PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: July 17, 2014

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2014-007 Archeological Investigations for the Emergency Services Complex Rehabilitation
PEPC Project Number: 51096
Project Type: Archeological investigation (OTHER)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Laura Kim

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			The project is to dig 9 shovel test units (50 cm x 50 cm) and 13 six-inch diameter auger units for a total volume of 2.2 cubic meters. All soils will be screened using 1/8" screen. If further investigation is required, an additional 3 to 5 excavations of 1x1 meter will be made for a total of 4.5 cubic meters
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located	Yes			The Emergency Services Complex buildings exist in very close proximity to highly sensitive archeological

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
within the area of potential effect?				resources and human remains.
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		
Has a National Register form been completed?	Yes			The Yosemite Valley Archeological District
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		
WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST				
Within designated Wilderness?		No		
Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		No		

**ARCHEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS AT CA-MRP-56/H, YOSEMITE
VALLEY NPS MAINTENANCE AREA,
YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK, CALIFORNIA
(Project YOSE 2014 E)**

The National Park Service (NPS) at Yosemite National Park (park) is planning to rehabilitate the structures comprising the Valley Emergency Services Complex (ESC). This proposed work has the potential to affect archeological deposits at site CA-MRP-56/H, listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing element of the Yosemite Valley Archeological District. As part of the park's obligations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (36 CFR 800, as amended) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the NPS will assess the north central portion of MRP-56/H for the presence of intact archeological deposits and Native American human remains. The NPS is currently developing an archeological work plan that will guide archeological work to assess the archeological resources in the immediate project area. The NPS will consult with the California State Historic Preservation Office and traditionally associated tribes and groups regarding this work plan. One outcome of this study will be to provide for a determination of effect for the undertaking as stipulated in 36 CFR 800.5, part of the Section 106 review process.

Concurrent with the archeological work planning, the park is consulting with traditionally associated American Indian tribes and groups pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(c)(2) to evaluate the religious and cultural significance of the area, and to coordinate the review of the undertaking with requirements of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) pursuant to 36 CFR 800.3(b). A NAGPRA Plan will be incorporated into the archeological work plan in order to address any discoveries of American Indian human remains.

Prior to embarking on any archeological subsurface work, the park plans to conduct remote sensing (ground penetrating radar) in the project area as a means to discern subsurface anomalies that may indicate presence of buried archeological features or American Indian burial(s), abandoned subsurface utilities, or other disturbances. After this remote sensing, archeologists (accompanied by tribal cultural monitors) will excavate 1 x1 m Excavations Units (EU), 50 x 50 cm Shove Test Units (STU), and 6" diameter auger units (AU) (Table 1).

The archeological work is estimated to consist of the following excavation units: 3-5 EU's, 12 STUs, and 11 (AUs) that total an estimated excavation volume of 6.7 m³. All soils will be screened using 1/8" mesh hardware screens, and all materials will be sorted for analysis and cataloging. The quantity and location of excavation units may be adjusted based on the findings from remote sensing.

Table #. Preliminary Assessment of Anticipated Excavation Units Types Employed and Sediment Volumes (M³) Processed.

Area Fig. #	Project Location	Undertaking Subsurface Action	Excavation Unit Type			Volume Estimate (M ³)
			EUs - 1 x 1 m (size); - 1 m (max. depth)	STUs - 0.5 x 0.5 m (size) - 1 m (max. depth)	AUs - 6" diam. auger - 1.5 m (~max. depth)	
1	No. 530: western portion	Foundation Stabilization, Building Footprint Expansion	1 – 2	6	2	2.25 – 3.25
2	Area between No. 529 and No. 530	Accessibility Surface Contouring	--	---	3	0.08
3	No. 529 easternmost section: north, east, and south sides	Building Footprint Expansion, Grading, Propane Line	1	2	4	1.5
4	East and Southeast of No. 530	Foundation Stabilization, Water Line Trenching, Accessibility Ramps	1?	4	2	1.9
Estimated Totals			3-5	12	11	~6.7 M ³


ESC Undertaking: Ground Disturbing Scope of Work

The proposed ESC project is located within the Yosemite Village maintenance area, Yosemite National Park, and includes rehabilitation of two structures (historic Warehouse, Bldg. No. 530) and the Garage Building (Bldg. No. 529), and the removal of one small storage/office building, No. 532. Current conditions of the buildings fail to meet health and life safety standards and exist in a poor-to-serious state. To comply with life safety code requirements, two structures would be rehabilitated. Specifically, the proposed rehabilitation will address fire egresses, electrical system violations, and lack of accessibility, wood rot and other structural integrity concerns. Rehabilitation actions will involve ground disturbance with the potential to impact archeological resources within the boundary of CA-MRP-56/H, a large, complex, ethnographic, historic, and prehistoric archeological site listed as a contributing element to the Yosemite Valley

Archeological District (YVAD). Project actions identified during the project planning and design process that involve ground disturbance include:

- Construction of perimeter foundation footings along the west and east portions of Building 530; foundation footings are also planned the western portion of No. 530.
- Reconstruction (slight footprint expansion east and north) of the eastern most section of Building 529 with new foundation; involves some grading near the northeast corner of this building section.
- Structural footprint increase of Building No. 530 (200 sq. ft) with perimeter foundation; located in west central portion of this Building No. 350.
- Utility line trenching (~30 feet) for a propane and water line connections, associated with Bldgs. 529 and 530 respectively.

Location



Graphics taken from:
2012, G. Jaramillo, ESC Historic Structures Report



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

Project Name: 2014-007 Archeological Investigations for the Emergency Services Complex Rehabilitation

Prepared by: Laura Kirn

Date Prepared: 7/17/14

Telephone: 209.379.1314

PEPC Project Number: 51096

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

See attached archeological work plan. Archeological investigations will occur within the immediate vicinity of the NPS Warehouse and Garage.

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

☐ No

☒ Yes

Source or reference:

4. **Potentially Affected Resource(s):**

Archeological resources affected:

Name and number(s): Yosemite Valley Archeological District

NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

Archeological Resources Notes: Within the Yosemite Valley Archeological District, site CA-MRP-56/H is the subject of the investigations.

Ethnographic Resources Affected:

Name and numbers: Yosemite Valley Archeological District

NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

Ethnographic Resources Affected Notes: The Superintendent and park archeology staff are working closely with park American Indian Liaison Jennifer Hardin to initiate tribal consultations pursuant to NAGPRA and NHPA. A draft NAGPRA plan has been prepared for initial tribal review and collaboration. In the event human remains are discovered during archeological investigations, all work in the discovery area will cease. YOSE Law Enforcement will be notified, and if the remains

are likely of American Indian origin, tribal consultations and other actions pursuant to NAGPRA will immediately be initiated. No intentional excavations of human burials will occur as part of this archeological work.

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
- ☒ Yes Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible
- ☒ Yes 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] Anthropologist

Name: Laura Kirn

Date: 06/10/2014

Comments: On behalf of Park Cultural Anthropologist: archeological work is likely to encounter Native American human remains. A NAGPRA Plan of Action has been prepared and will be implemented.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: ☐ No Potential to Cause Effect ☐ No Historic Properties Affected ☐ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect ☐ Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: Follow NAGPRA Plan of Action. Continue consultation with tribes regarding resolution of NAGPRA issues, and continued project design and 4-step consultations under Section 106.

[X] Archeologist
Name: Laura Kirn
Date: 04/23/2014

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: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

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

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

___ No Potential to Cause Effects
___ 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.

Explanation: None

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

☐ 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:

Historic Preservation Officer:

Kimball
Koch

Date: 7/17/2014

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

Don L. Neubacher

Date: 7/23/14