



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: Tony Paladino, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2017-023 Majestic Yosemite Hotel Redecoration of 95 Rooms (2017 YH) (74924)

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 to historic properties.
- 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:

- The SHPO and regional historical architect recommended that the park direct the concessioner to avoid the use of wall-mount brackets for the installation of televisions in the guest rooms and continue to have televisions placed on top of the furniture. While use of wall-mounting brackets would be reversible, avoiding this action would reduce the effects to this National Historic Landmark building by limiting penetrations of the historic plastered walls. For the smaller rooms, placing the televisions on the furniture would not meet project objectives to achieve hospitality industry standards for hotel room furnishings. An attempt was made to construct brackets that would raise the televisions above the furniture but required additional wall penetrations to stabilize the furniture made top-heavy by the television and brackets. This also did not meet the industry standards for furnishings. In the following ten (10) rooms: 319, 419, 232, 332, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, and 607 televisions will be placed on flat screen stands on furniture in lieu of wall mounts.

Recommendations for Conditions or Stipulations: None

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 74924.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Letter of Compliance Completion – 2017-023 Majestic Yosemite Hotel Redecoration of 95 Rooms (2017 YH) - PEPC ID: 74924

//Michael T. Reynolds//
Michael T. Reynolds, 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: 2017-023 Majestic Yosemite Hotel Redecoration of 95 Rooms (2017 YH)

PEPC Project Number: 74924

Project Description:

The guest rooms at the Majestic Yosemite Hotel are typically refurbished when updates are needed to meet guest needs or address code requirements. The last time the guest rooms were updated was in 2008. The concessioner, Yosemite Hospitality, is proposing to update 95 guest rooms in the hotel. Refurbishment would be consistent with the two rooms that were previously redecorated as a result of accessibility improvements that were part of the Ahwahnee Comprehensive Rehabilitation implementation completed in 2016. All work is consistent with the treatment recommendations in the Ahwahnee Historic Furnishings Report (ARG 2011) and the Ahwahnee Historic Structure Report (ARG 2011).

Refurbishment would consist of the following:

- Replace carpet
- Paint the rooms (historic stencils would be protected)
- Replace non-historic ceiling lights
- Replace non-historic wallpaper in bathrooms
- Mount new wall sconces adjacent to the beds (will include wall penetrations for mounting and electricity)
- Mount the flat screened televisions onto the walls (will include wall penetrations for mounting, electricity and cable access) as noted in the memorandum and in the mitigations
- Replace non-historic draperies
- Hang new ceiling-mount valance
- Replace wall art (in same locations)
- Suite Rooms (230, 232/234, 330, 332/ 334, 601, 602/604, 603/607) will be repainted, recarpeted, and draperies replaced. These will be different from the model rooms but are consistent with recommendations from the Historic Structure Report and Historic Furnishings Report.
- Window valances will be installed to cover past damage to the stencils above the windows; the stencils would not be restored as part of this project.

Colors, patterns, and textures of carpet and draperies would be consistent with the period of significance.

Project Locations:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

- The SHPO and regional historical architect recommended that the park direct the concessioner to avoid the use of wall-mount brackets for the installation of televisions in the guest rooms and continue to have televisions placed on top of the furniture. While use of wall-mounting brackets would be reversible, avoiding this action would reduce the effects to this National Historic Landmark building by limiting penetrations of the historic plastered walls. For the smaller rooms, placing the televisions on the furniture would not meet project objectives to achieve hospitality industry standards for hotel room furnishings. An attempt was made to construct brackets that would raise the televisions above the furniture but required additional wall penetrations to stabilize the furniture made top-heavy by the television and brackets. This also did not meet the industry standards for furnishings. In the following ten (10) rooms: 319, 419, 232, 332, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, and 607 televisions will be placed on flat screen stands on furniture in lieu of wall mounts.

CE Citation: C.4 Routine maintenance and repairs to cultural resource sites, structures, utilities and grounds under an approved Historic Structures Preservation Guide or Cyclic Maintenance Guide; or if the action would not adversely affect the cultural resource.

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: //Michael T. Reynolds// **Date:** 3/30/18
Michael T. Reynolds

Extraordinary Circumstances:

If implemented, would the proposal...	Yes/No	Notes
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, 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 (EO 12898)?	No	
K. 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	
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	

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

Updated Sept 2015 per NPS NEPA Handbook

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: 2017-023 Majestic Yosemite Hotel Redecoration of 95 Rooms (2017 YH)
PEPC Project Number: 74924
Project Type: Routine Maintenance (ROU)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Tony Paladino

B. RESOURCE IMPACTS TO CONSIDER:

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Air Air Quality	None	
Biological Nonnative or Exotic Species	None	
Biological Species of Special Concern or Their Habitat	None	
Biological Vegetation	None	
Biological Wildlife and/or Wildlife Habitat including terrestrial and aquatic species	None	
Cultural Archeological Resources	None	
Cultural Cultural Landscapes	None	
Cultural Ethnographic Resources	None	

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Cultural Museum Collections	None	
Cultural Prehistoric/historic structures	Potential	Both the PWR historical architect and the SHPO recommend that the park "reconsider the proposal to mount televisions on the walls of the guest rooms. While mounting the televisions would be reversible, avoiding this action would reduce the effects to contributing historic fabric in this National Historic Landmark building by limiting penetrations of the wall and plaster."
Geological Geologic Features	None	
Geological Geologic Processes	None	
Lightscapes Lightscapes	None	
Other Human Health and Safety	None	
Other Operational	None	
Socioeconomic Land Use	None	
Socioeconomic Minority and low-income populations, size, migration patterns, etc.	None	
Socioeconomic Socioeconomic	None	
Soundscapes Soundscapes	None	
Viewsheds Viewsheds	None	
Visitor Use and Experience Recreation Resources	None	
Visitor Use and Experience	None	

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Visitor Use and Experience		
Water Floodplains	None	
Water Marine or Estuarine Resources	None	
Water Water Quality or Quantity	None	
Water Wetlands	None	
Water Wild and Scenic River	None	
Wilderness Wilderness	None	



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

Project Name: 2017-023 Majestic Yosemite Hotel Redecoration of 95 Rooms (2017 YH)

Prepared by: Renea Kennec **Date Prepared:** 08/24/2017 **Telephone:** 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 74924

Locations:

County, State: Mariposa, CA

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

Ahwahnee Hotel Main Building

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

 No

 X Yes

Source or reference: Ahwahnee Historic Structures Report

4. **Potentially Affected Resources:**

Archeological Resources Affected: None

Historical Structures/Resources Affected:

Name and numbers: Ahwahnee Hotel National Historical Landmark

Historical Structures/Resources Notes: Both the PWR historical architect and the SHPO recommend that the park "reconsider the proposal to mount televisions on the walls of the guest rooms. While mounting the televisions would be reversible, avoiding this action would reduce the effects to contributing historic fabric in this National Historic Landmark building by limiting penetrations of the wall and plaster."

Cultural Landscapes Affected: None

Ethnographic Resources Affected: None

5. **The proposed action will: (check as many as apply)**

 Yes Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure

 Yes Replace historic features/elements in kind

Yes Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure
 Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc.
No 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
No 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: 11/06/2017

Comments: After consultation with the Pacific West Regional Office Section 106 team, the park has been able to craft the project so that it does not adversely effect the hotel.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: ___No Potential to Cause Effect ___No Historic Properties Affected XNo

Adverse Effect ___Adverse Effect ___Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: Standard 4-Step Process

[X] Anthropologist

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 09/19/2017

Comments: All project work is interior to the building. No ground disturbance will occur. No properties of religious or cultural significance are located within the project.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [X]

Assessment of Effect: ___No Potential to Cause Effect XNo Historic Properties Affected ___No

Adverse Effect ___Adverse Effect ___Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

[X] Archeologist

Name: Sara Dolan

Date: 09/13/2017

Comments: The work is for the interior of the Majestic Yosemite Hotel. There are no concerns.

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: Elaine Jackson-Retondo

Date: 10/27/2017

Comments: Quote HA comments "The designers should be given a copy of the Historic Furnishings Report and encouraged to follow the recommendations. Curtains, bedding and carpets should be simplified patterns rather than the bold floral patterns proposed and should be compatible with, rather than over powering, the historic stenciling in the rooms. Light fixtures should also be a simple design selected to be compatible with the historic character of the hotel. Modern expectations would not support replicating the original rooms but it is possible to design modern luxurious rooms with an elegant simplicity compatible with the character of the Ahwahnee and that should be the goal. One of the reasons guests choose the Ahwahnee is it's historic character and the room design should embrace that character.

The proposed changes will have only minor impact on historic materials, resulting in a determination of no adverse effect. The changes will diminish the historic character of the rooms but will not affect more significant public areas. The changes are temporary, generally redone on a cycle of less than every ten years.

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: See HA recommendations

Doc Method: Standard 4-Step Process

[X] Historian

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 09/19/2017

Comments: Project occurs within the interior of the Yosemite Majestic (Ahwahnee) Hotel. No historic fabric will be irreversibly altered.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [X]

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 Architect

Name: Sueann Brown

Date: 10/18/2017

Comments: The designers should be given a copy of the Historic Furnishings Report and encouraged to follow the

recommendations. Curtains, bedding and carpets should be simplified patterns rather than the bold floral patterns proposed and should be compatible with, rather than over powering, the historic stenciling in the rooms. Light fixtures should also be a simple design selected to be compatible with the historic character of the hotel. Modern expectations would not support replicating the original rooms but it is possible to design modern luxurious rooms with an elegant simplicity compatible with the character of the Ahwahnee and that should be the goal. One of the reasons guests choose the Ahwahnee is it's historic character and the room design should embrace that character.

The proposed changes will have only minor impact on historic materials, resulting in a determination of no adverse effect. The changes will diminish the historic character of the rooms but will not affect more significant public areas. The changes are temporary, generally redone on a cycle of less than every ten years.

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: While the proposed changes will result in no adverse effect, they will diminish the historic character of the rooms and consequently diminish the guest experience. Redesign as noted in the comments section is highly recommended.

Doc Method: Standard 4-Step Process

[X] Historical Landscape Architect

Name: Kimball Koch

Date: 09/12/2017

Comments: Work is interior so historic landscape would not be affected

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:

[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: 3/28/18

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: //Michael T. Reynolds//

Date: 3/30/18

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