



# 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:** Linda Mazzu, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

**From:** Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

**Subject:** NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2016-023 Parkwide Plague Mitigation - Programmatic (2016-2020) (66521)

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 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:

- As locations are identified, measures will be identified to avoid impacts to ethnographic sites.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 66521.

// 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.*



## Categorical Exclusion Form

**Project:** 2016-023 Parkwide Plague Mitigation – Programmatic (2016-2020)

**PEPC Project Number:** 66521

**Description of Action (Project Description):**

Plague is a disease spread by fleas to humans. It is found, in most cases, on rodents such as ground squirrels. Because Yosemite would like to be prepared if treatments for plague are needed, Delta Dust Insecticide will be approved through the NPS pesticide use system through this 5-year programmatic categorical exclusion to treat rodent burrows for fleas as needed.

Applications of Delta Dust will be limited to rodent burrows in areas identified by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) as needing treatment. All application amounts, methods, and safety measures will closely adhere to the Delta Dust label (attached). Delta Dust is applied by inserting an applicator down each burrow. It does not require digging. Delta Dust is in the form of a powder that rodents pick up as they move through the burrow. It does not impact the rodent, it impacts the fleas.

Visitor exposure to Delta Dust will be mitigated and reduced through closures during treatment. Length of closures after treatment will be directed by the label. Exposure to employees will be mitigated by following all safety procedures on the label, and by ensuring trained pesticide applicators are supervising application.

**Project Locations:**

Mariposa County, CA  
Tuolumne County, CA

**Mitigation(s):**

- As locations are identified, measures will be identified to avoid impacts to ethnographic sites.

**CE Citation:** E.3 Removal of park resident individuals of non-threatened/endangered species which pose a danger to visitors, threaten park resources or become a nuisance in areas surrounding a park, when such removal is included in an approved resource management plan.

**Explanation:**

**Decision:** I find that the action fits within the categorical exclusion above. Therefore, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No extraordinary circumstances apply.

**Superintendent:** // Don L. Neubacher //

Don L. Neubacher

**Date:** 8/26/2016

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

**Extraordinary Circumstances:**

If implemented, would the proposal...	Yes/No	Notes
<b>A.</b> Have significant impacts on public health or safety?	No	
<b>B.</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	
<b>C.</b> Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?	No	
<b>D.</b> Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?	No	
<b>E.</b> Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?	No	
<b>F.</b> Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?	No	
<b>G.</b> 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	
<b>H.</b> 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	
<b>I.</b> Violate a federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?	No	
<b>J.</b> Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EO 12898)?	No	
<b>K.</b> Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 130007)?	No	
<b>L.</b> 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	



## ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

Updated Sept 2015 per NPS NEPA Handbook

### A. PROJECT INFORMATION

**Project Title:** 2016-023 Parkwide Plague Mitigation – Programmatic (2016-2020)

**PEPC Project Number:** 66521

**Project Type:**  
Integrated Pest Management (IPM)

**Project Location:**

**County, State:**  
Mariposa, California

**County, State:**  
Tuolumne, California

**Project Leader:**  
Linda Mazzu

### B. RESOURCE IMPACTS TO CONSIDER:

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
<b>Air</b> Air Quality	None	
<b>Biological</b> Nonnative or Exotic Species	None	
<b>Biological</b> Species of Special Concern or Their Habitat	None	
<b>Biological</b> Vegetation	None	
<b>Biological</b> Wildlife and/or Wildlife Habitat including terrestrial and aquatic species	None	
<b>Cultural</b> Archeological Resources	None	
<b>Cultural</b> Cultural Landscapes	None	
<b>Cultural</b>	Potential	As locations are identified measures will be identified to avoid impacts to

<b>Resource</b>	<b>Potential for Impact</b>	<b>Potential Issues &amp; Impacts</b>
Ethnographic Resources		ethnographic sites.
<b>Cultural</b> Museum Collections	None	
<b>Cultural</b> Prehistoric/historic structures	None	
<b>Geological</b> Geologic Features	None	
<b>Geological</b> Geologic Processes	None	
<b>Lightscares</b> Lightscares	None	
<b>Other</b> Human Health and Safety <i>Visitor or Employee Safety</i>	Potential	Exposure to visitors will be mitigated through closures during treatment. Length of closures after treatment will be directed by the label. Exposure to employees will be mitigated by following all safety procedures on the label, and by ensuring trained pesticide applicators are supervising application.
<b>Other</b> Operational <i>Campground or other visitor use area operations</i>	Potential	Temporary closures will be placed in accordance with the label. CDPH and park staff will work to determine timing in order to mitigate impact to operations as much as possible.
<b>Socioeconomic</b> Land Use	None	
<b>Socioeconomic</b> Minority and low-income populations, size, migration patterns, etc.	None	
<b>Socioeconomic</b> Socioeconomic	None	
<b>Soundscapes</b> Soundscapes	None	
<b>Viewsheds</b> Viewsheds	None	
<b>Visitor Use and Experience</b> Recreation Resources	None	
<b>Visitor Use and Experience</b> Visitor Use and Experience	Potential	CDPH and park staff will work to determine timing in order to mitigate impact to operations as much as possible.
<b>Water</b> Floodplains	None	

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
<b>Water</b> Marine or Estuarine Resources	None	
<b>Water</b> Water Quality or Quantity	None	
<b>Water</b> Wetlands	None	
<b>Water</b> Wild and Scenic River	None	
<b>Wilderness</b> Wilderness	None	

**Recommended:**

Compliance Specialists	Date
<u>// Kristin Anderson //</u> Compliance Specialist – Kristin Anderson	<u>8/26/2016</u>
<u>// Madelyn Ruffner //</u> Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>8/26/2016</u>
<u>// Randy Fong //</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>8/26/2016</u>

**Approved:**

Superintendent	Date
<u>// Don L. Neubacher //</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>8/26/2016</u>

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



# ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

## A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

**Project Name:** 2016-023 Parkwide Plague Mitigation - Programmatic (2016-2020)

**Prepared by:** Kristin Anderson    **Date Prepared:** 08/04/2016    **Telephone:** 209-379-1219

**PEPC Project Number:** 66521

**Locations:**

**County, State:** Mariposa, CA

**County, State:** Tuolumne, CA

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

The area of potential effect would be rodent burrows in areas of high public concentration.

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)  
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
- ☐ No    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:

---

☒ 106 Advisor

Name: Kimball Koch

Date: 08/09/2016

*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:

---

☒ Anthropologist

Name: Eirik Thorsgard

Date: 08/09/2016

*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: As locations are identified measures will be identified to avoid impacts to ethnographic sites.

---

☒ Archeologist

Name: Sara Dolan

Date: 08/08/2016

*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:

---

☒ Historian

Name: Sara Dolan

Date: 08/09/2016

Comments: Acting for Scott Carpenter

*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:

---

☒ Historical Architect

Name: Sara Dolan

Date: 08/09/2016

Comments: Acting for Scott Carpenter

*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:



---

☒ Historical Landscape Architect  
Name: Kimball Koch  
Date: 08/09/2016

*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:

---

No Reviews From: Curator, Other Advisor

---

## 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.

### 1999 Programmatic Agreement as amended in 2016

☐ 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:**

N/A

**4. Stipulations and Conditions:**

N/A

**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.)

- Assessment of Effect - Ethnography - As locations are identified measures will be identified to avoid impacts to ethnographic sites.

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

*Historic Preservation Officer*

Kimball Koch    // Kimball Koch //    **Date:** 8/26/2016

**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:** 8/26/2016  
Don L. Neubacher