



# 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: Joseph Llewellyn, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2017-029 El Portal Harrell Residence Shed Demo and Room Addition (74822)

The Superintendent and park interdisciplinary team have reviewed the proposed project and completed an impact analysis and documentation, and 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/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.

### Recommendations for Conditions or Stipulations: None

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 74822.

//Sula Jacobs// for  
Palmer L. Jenkins (Acting Superintendent)

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:** 2017-029 El Portal Harrell Residence Shed Demo and Room Addition

**PEPC Project Number:** 74822

**Project Description:**

The residence at 5692 Foresta Road has a small laundry and storage room on the northerly side of the structure that is in a state of serious decay and disrepair due to dry rot, water damage and poor construction. After inspection it was determined that the best option would be to demolish and reconstruct a new room that will be safer and more functional.

According to the Mariposa County Assessor's Office, the existing square footage of the home is 998 square feet. The demolished area is approximately 78 square feet and the new room will measure 11 feet by 13 feet (143 square feet). The total increase in living area is 65 square feet.

The demolition phase will entail removal of the shed roof, walls, floor, and stone foundation. The existing attic and kitchen vents will need to be relocated. The overhead electrical supply line will need to be temporarily relocated during construction. The new foundation will require some minor ground disturbance. The perimeter footing will measure 12 inch deep by 12 inch wide. Some additional minor excavation may be required to satisfy the code requirement of 18 inches of clear space below the floor joist.

The exterior finishes, including the roof covering, siding, trim, etc. will be constructed to match and blend with the existing structure as much as possible. Existing mechanical ducts and water piping will be extended through the crawl space to serve the new room. Some minor landscaping and relocation of sidewalks and planters will also be performed. All work shall comply with the current codes.

**Project Locations:**

Mariposa County, CA

**Mitigations:**

- No mitigations identified.

**CE Citation:** C.8 Replacement in kind of minor structures and facilities with little or no change in location, capacity or appearance.

**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:** //Sula Jacobs// for  
Palmer L. Jenkins

**Date:** 11/20/17

*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:** 2017-029 El Portal Harrell Residence Shed Demo and Room Addition  
**PEPC Project Number:** 74822  
**Project Type:** Other Plan (PLAN)  
**Project Location:**  
**County, State:** Mariposa, California  
**Project Leader:** Joseph Llewellyn

### B. RESOURCE IMPACTS TO CONSIDER:

| Resource  | Potential for Impact | Potential Issues & Impacts   |
|---|----------------------|--|
| <b>Air</b><br>Air Quality   | Potential            | Temporary air emissions during the construction.                               |
| <b>Biological</b><br>Nonnative or Exotic Species  | None                 |  |
| <b>Biological</b><br>Species of Special Concern or Their Habitat                                | None                 |  |
| <b>Biological</b><br>Vegetation   | None                 |  |
| <b>Biological</b><br>Wildlife and/or Wildlife Habitat including terrestrial and aquatic species | None                 |  |
| <b>Cultural</b><br>Archeological Resources  | None                 |  |
| <b>Cultural</b><br>Cultural Landscapes  | None                 |  |
| <b>Cultural</b><br>Ethnographic Resources   | Potential            | This project was on the October 2017 Tribal Spreadsheet. No comments received. |
| <b>Cultural</b>   | None                 |  |

| <b>Resource</b>   | <b>Potential for Impact</b> | <b>Potential Issues &amp; Impacts</b>  |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Museum Collections  |                             |  |
| <b>Cultural</b><br>Prehistoric/historic structures  | None                        |  |
| <b>Geological</b><br>Geologic Features  | None                        |  |
| <b>Geological</b><br>Geologic Processes   | None                        |  |
| <b>Lightscares</b><br>Lightscares   | None                        |  |
| <b>Other</b><br>Human Health and Safety   | None                        |  |
| <b>Other</b><br>Operational   | None                        |  |
| <b>Socioeconomic</b><br>Land Use  | None                        |  |
| <b>Socioeconomic</b><br>Minority and low-income populations, size, migration patterns, etc. | None                        |  |
| <b>Socioeconomic</b><br>Socioeconomic   | None                        |  |
| <b>Soundscares</b><br>Soundscares   | Potential                   | There are temporary construction noises during the demolition and rebuilding phases of this project. |
| <b>Viewsheds</b><br>Viewsheds   | None                        |  |
| <b>Visitor Use and Experience</b><br>Recreation Resources                                   | None                        |  |
| <b>Visitor Use and Experience</b><br>Visitor Use and Experience                             | None                        |  |
| <b>Water</b><br>Floodplains   | None                        |  |
| <b>Water</b><br>Marine or Estuarine Resources   | None                        |  |

Environmental Screening Form (ESF) – 2017-029 El Portal Harrell Residence Shed Demo and Room Addition - PEPC ID: 74822

| Resource                                  | Potential for Impact | Potential Issues & Impacts |
|---|----------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Water</b><br>Water Quality or Quantity | None                 |                            |
| <b>Water</b><br>Wetlands                  | None                 |                            |
| <b>Water</b><br>Wild and Scenic River     | None                 |                            |
| <b>Wilderness</b><br>Wilderness           | None                 |                            |

**Recommended:**

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| Compliance Specialists   | Date           |
| <u>//Renea Kennec//</u><br>Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec            | <u>11/6/17</u> |
| <u>//Madelyn Ruffner//</u><br>Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner | <u>11/6/17</u> |
| <u>//Ron Gaunt//</u><br>Chief, Project Management – Ron Gaunt              | <u>11/8/17</u> |

**Approved:**

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| Acting Superintendent                           | Date            |
| <u>//Sula Jacobs// for</u><br>Palmer L. Jenkins | <u>11/20/17</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:** 2017-029 El Portal Harrell Residence Shed Demo and Room Addition

**Prepared by:** Renea Kennec    **Date Prepared:** 09/12/2017    **Telephone:** 209-379-1038

**PEPC Project Number:** 74822

#### **Locations:**

**County, State:** Mariposa, CA

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

El Portal lots 51, 52 and 53

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

☐ No

☒ Yes

**Source or reference:**

### 4. **Potentially Affected Resources:**

#### **Archeological Resources Affected:**

**Name and numbers:** El Portal Archeological District    LCS

**Archeological Resources Notes:** The project is not within the boundaries of any known archeological site but is within the El Portal Archeological District.

**Historical Structures/Resources Affected:** None

**Cultural Landscapes Affected:** None

**Ethnographic Resources Affected:** None

### 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  
No 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  
\_\_\_\_ Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting,  
No landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources  
\_\_\_\_ Involve a real property transaction (exchange, sale, or lease of land or  
No 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 ] 106 Advisor

Name: Kimball Koch

Date: 10/25/2017

Comments: SHPO consultation not required because no historic properties affected.

*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: Standard 4-Step Process

---

##### [ X ] Anthropologist

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 10/25/2017

*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: Standard 4-Step Process

---

##### [ X ] Archeologist

Name: Sara Dolan

Date: 10/24/2017



**Comments:** There are no known archeological sites within the project area. There are no archeological concerns and monitoring is not required.

*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:**

---

[ X ] **Historian**

**Name:** Scott Carpenter

**Date:** 10/24/2017

**Comments:** No review by historical architect because property was determined ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

*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:**

---

[ X ] **Historical Landscape Architect**

**Name:** Kimball Koch

**Date:** 09/25/2017

*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:**

**Doc Method:** Standard 4-Step Process

---

**No Reviews From:** Curator, Historical Architect, 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:**

[X] 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.

---

☐ E. Combined NEPA/NHPA Process

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.)**

**No Assessment of Effect mitigations identified.**

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

**Section 106 Coordinator:**

Kimball

Koch

//Kimball Koch//

**Date:** 10/31/17

**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:** //Sula Jacobs// for

**Date:** 11/21/17

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