



# United States Department of the Interior

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

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

IN REPLY REFER TO:  
L7615(YOSE-PM)

### Memorandum

**To:** Garrett Chun, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

**From:** Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

**Subject:** NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2015-019 Wawona Soil Investigation for Suitable Effluent Disposal Field (55190)

The Executive Leadership Team has reviewed the proposed project 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 adverse 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 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:

- Archaeological monitoring is necessary in Areas 1 & 2 due to their location to nearby sensitive archaeological resources. No monitoring is necessary in the remaining four areas (Areas 3-6). If inadvertent discoveries are made during the soil testing, please stop work and contact Compliance Archaeologist.
- Use protective mats if equipment needs to be brought in by vehicle.

### Recommendations for Conditions or Stipulations:

None

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 55190.

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

Enclosure (with attachments)

cc: Statutory Compliance File

Letter of Compliance Completion - Wawona Soil Investigation for Suitable Effluent Disposal Field - PEPC ID: 55190

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



---

## Categorical Exclusion Form

**Project:** 2015-019 Wawona Soil Investigation for Suitable Effluent Disposal Field

**PEPC Project Number:** 55190

**Project Description:**

In 2013, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board initiated a renewal review of the Wawona discharge permit, and issued a Time Schedule Order which established new effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane when discharging into the South Fork of the Merced River. Chlorination is part of the Wawona Wastewater Treatment Plant tertiary treatment process and dichlorobromomethane is a byproduct of chlorination.

Park staff is strongly considering abandoning the secondary discharge option of discharge into the South Fork of the Merced River to remove any possibility of dichlorobromomethane from entering the river. Preliminary estimates indicate that the cost of additional treatment to remove dichlorobromomethane will be cost prohibitive. As an alternative, park engineers and operators are considering removing all discharge into the South Fork by investigating the feasibility of constructing a land-based disposal system that would act as a new secondary discharge; all discharge into the South Fork would then cease.

The area around the Wawona Wastewater Treatment Plant has been assessed to have potential for a new land-based effluent disposal field. Soil condition assessments will validate and confirm the viability of four areas around the Wawona Wastewater Treatment Plant (see attached maps). Eight 6-inch piezometer borings will be made 12 ft below ground and eight 6-inch percolation borings will be made 5 ft below ground for each of the locations.

**Project Locations:**

Mariposa County, CA

**Mitigations:**

- Archaeological monitoring is necessary in Areas 1 & 2 due to their location to nearby sensitive archaeological resources. No monitoring is necessary in the remaining four areas (Areas 3-6). If inadvertent discoveries are made during the soil testing, please stop work and contact Compliance Archaeologist.
- Use protective mats if equipment needs to be brought in by vehicle.

**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.5 Nondestructive data collection, inventory (including field, aerial, and satellite surveying and mapping), study, research, and monitoring activities.

**Project:** 2015-019 Wawona Soil Investigation for Suitable Effluent Disposal Field

**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:**           9/1/2015            
Don L. Neubacher

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



## ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

### DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 08/25/2015

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:** 2015-019 Wawona Soil Investigation for Suitable Effluent Disposal Field  
**PEPC Project Number:** 55190  
**Project Type:** Repair/Rehabilitation (REHAB)  
**Project Location:**  
**County, State:** Mariposa, California  
**Project Leader:** Garrett Chun

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			16 proposed holes. 8 holes, 6 inches in diameter 12 feet deep. 8 holes, 6 inches in diameter, 5 feet deep.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			Minor emissions and dust from drill rig or auger device.
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			Minor noise from drill rig or auger device.
5. Water quality or quantity	No				
6. Streamflow characteristics	No				

<b>Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources</b>	<b>No Effect</b>	<b>Negligible Effects</b>	<b>Minor Effects</b>	<b>Exceeds Minor Effects</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
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				
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	No				

<b>Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources</b>	<b>No Effect</b>	<b>Negligible Effects</b>	<b>Minor Effects</b>	<b>Exceeds Minor Effects</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				
18. Archeological resources		Negligible			Archaeological monitoring is necessary in Areas 1 & 2 due to their location to nearby sensitive archaeological resources.
19. Prehistoric/historic structure		Negligible			Archeological monitor will be on-site during test borings to determine if previously unknown subsurface historic material is located in project area.
20. Cultural landscapes	No				
21. Ethnographic resources	No				
22. Museum collections (objects, specimens, and archival and manuscript collections)	No				
23. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure	No				
24. Minority and low income populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.	No				
25. Energy resources	No				
26. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	No				
27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential,	No				

<b>Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources</b>	<b>No Effect</b>	<b>Negligible Effects</b>	<b>Minor Effects</b>	<b>Exceeds Minor Effects</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
sustainability					
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**

<b>Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Comment or Data Needed to Determine</b>
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 effects?		No		
G. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office?		No		
H. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		No		
I. Violate a federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		No		
J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		No		
K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (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		

**For the purpose of interpreting these procedures within the NPS, any action that has the potential to violate the NPS Organic Act by impairing park resources or values would constitute an action that triggers the DOI exception for actions that threaten to violate a federal law for protection of the environment.**

#### **D. OTHER INFORMATION**

1. Are personnel preparing this form familiar with the site? Yes
- 1.A. Did personnel conduct a site visit? No



2. Is the project in an approved plan such as a General Management Plan or an Implementation Plan with an accompanying NEPA document? No
3. Are there any interested or affected agencies or parties? No
4. Has consultation with all affected agencies or tribes been completed? N/A
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*) N/A

#### E. INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM SIGNATORIES

<u>Interdisciplinary Team</u>	<u>Field of Expertise</u>
Don L. Neubacher	Superintendent
Kathleen Morse	Chief of Planning
Randy Fong	Chief of Project Management
Jeff Hilliard	Chief of Administration Management
Ron Borne	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
Chad Thomas	Project Leader
Madelyn Ruffner	Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
Kyle Meakins	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>// Kyle Meakins //</u>	<u>8/26/2015</u>
Compliance Specialist – Kyle Meakins	
<u>// Madelyn Ruffner //</u>	<u>8/26/2015</u>
Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	
<u>// Randy Fong //</u>	<u>8/28/2015</u>
Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	

##### Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>// Don L. Neubacher //</u>	<u>9/1/2015</u>
Don L. Neubacher	



## PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: August 26, 2015

*(This form should be attached to ESF document sent to the regional director's office for signature. While you may modify this form to fit your needs, you must ensure that the form includes information detailed below and must have your modifications reviewed and approved by the regional environmental coordinator.)*

### PROJECT INFORMATION

**Park Name:** Yosemite National Park  
**Project Title:** 2015-019 Wawona Soil Investigation for Suitable Effluent Disposal Field  
**PEPC Project Number:** 55190  
**Project Type:** Repair/Rehabilitation (REHAB)  
**Project Location:**  
**County, State:** Mariposa, California **District, Section:** Wawona,  
**Project Leader:** Garrett Chun

### PARK ESF ADDENDUM QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
<b>SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST</b>				
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		
<b>NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
Entail ground disturbance?	Yes			16 proposed holes. 8 holes, 6 inches in diameter 12 feet deep. 8 holes, 6 inches in diameter, 5 feet deep.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		No		Two of the proposed testing areas (1 & 2) lie in close proximity to a previously recorded archaeological site.
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		

2015-019 Wawona Soil Investigation for Suitable Effluent Disposal Field - PEPC ID: 55190

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
Has a National Register form been completed?		No		
Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?		No		
<b>WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor? (Name the 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		
<b>WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
Within designated Wilderness?		No		
Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		No		





## ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

### A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

**Project Name:** 2015-019 Wawona Soil Investigation for Suitable Effluent Disposal Field  
**Prepared by:** Kyle Meakins **Date Prepared:** 08/25/2015 **Telephone:** 209-379-1226  
**PEPC Project Number:** 55190

**Area of potential effects (as defined in 36 CFR 800.16[d])**  
Wawona archeological district.

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

☐ No  
☒ Yes

Source or reference:

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

**Ethnographic Resources Affected Notes:** No known ethnographic resources.

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)  
Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting
- ☐ No 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  
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:** Scott Carpenter

**Date:** 08/13/2015

**Comments:** No known cultural sites or locations of ethnographic or spiritual nature located within project area.

*Check if project does not involve ground disturbance* [ ]

**Assessment of Effect:**  X  No Potential to Cause Effect    \_\_\_ No Historic Properties Affected    \_\_\_ No

**Adverse Effect**    \_\_\_ Adverse Effect    \_\_\_ Streamlined Review

**Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:**

---

#### [ X ] Archeologist

**Name:** Sara Dolan

**Date:** 08/10/2015

**Comments:** On July 22-23, 2015 a YOSE archaeologist and FM Engineer selected six potential testing areas. Two of the proposed testing areas (1 & 2) lie in close proximity to a previously recorded archaeological site. As part of the project planning, the YOSE archaeologist also conducted a reconnaissance-level survey to determine if there were any unrecorded cultural resources within the project area.

*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:** Archaeological monitoring is necessary in Areas 1 & 2 due to their location to nearby sensitive archaeological resources. No monitoring is necessary in the remaining four areas (Areas 3-6). However, if inadvertent discoveries are made during the soil testing, please stop work and contact Compliance Archaeologist Sara Dolan.

**Doc Method:** Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

---

#### [ X ] Historian

**Name:** Scott Carpenter

**Date:** 08/13/2015

**Comments:** Survey for historic period resources conducted, no known resources located within project area.

*Check if project does not involve ground disturbance* [ ]

**Assessment of Effect:**  X  No Potential to Cause Effect    \_\_\_ No Historic Properties Affected    \_\_\_ No

**Adverse Effect**    \_\_\_ Adverse Effect    \_\_\_ Streamlined Review

**Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:** Archeological monitor will be on-site during test borings to determine if previously unknown subsurface historic material is located in project area.

---

**[ X ] Historical Architect**

**Name:** Scott Carpenter

**Date:** 08/13/2015

**Comments:** No historic buildings/structures located within project arez.

*Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [ ]*

**Assessment of Effect:**  X  No Potential to Cause Effect   No Historic Properties Affected   No

**Adverse Effect**   Adverse Effect   Streamlined Review

**Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:**

---

**[ X ] Historical Landscape Architect**

**Name:** Scott Carpenter

**Date:** 08/13/2015

**Comments:** No issues related to historic landscapes.

*Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [ ]*

**Assessment of Effect:**  X  No Potential to Cause Effect   No Historic Properties Affected   No

**Adverse Effect**   Adverse Effect   Streamlined Review

**Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:**

---

**No Reviews From:** Curator, 106 Advisor, Other Advisor

---

**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:

☒ 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.

**1999 Programmatic Agreement as amended in 2014.**

☐ 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

SHPO/THPO Notes:

**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.)

- Archaeological monitoring is necessary in Areas 1 & 2 due to their location to nearby sensitive archaeological resources. No monitoring is necessary in the remaining four areas (Areas 3-6). If inadvertent discoveries are made during the soil testing, please stop work and contact Compliance Archaeologist.
- Use protective mats if equipment needs to be brought in by vehicle.

**D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:**

**Historic Preservation Officer:**

Kimball Koch // Kimball Koch // Date 8/26/2015



## 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: 9/1/2015  
Don L. Neubacher