

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE Yosemite National Park P.O. Box 577 Yosemite, California 95389

IN REPLY REFER TO: L7617 (YOSE-PM)

Memorandum

- To: Maurice West, Project Manager, Project Management, Yosemite National Park Chris Wicks, Project Manager, DNC Parks and Resorts at Yosemite
- From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park
- Subject: Notice to Proceed, 2007-045 Yosemtie Village Tecoya Dorm Boiler #2 Replacement (18038)

Your proposed project is an action that has been determined to result in no measurable environmental effects. It is therefore categorically excluded from further National Environmental Policy Act analysis under Categorical Exclusion: DO12 3.4 *C* (*3*) - *Routine maintenance and repairs to non-historic structures, facilities, utilities, grounds, and trails.*

Necessary compliance coordination has been completed regarding the National Historic Preservation Act, the Wilderness Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Endangered Species Act, as applicable. This project clearance is valid providing that you adhere to any conditions that may be stipulated in the enclosed *Categorical Exclusion Form* and associated documents when implementing this project.

//R. Kevin Cann// Michael J. Tollefson <u>4/11/07</u> Date

Enclosure (with attachments)

cc: Statutory Compliance File

Categorical Exclusion

(Version: OCT06)

Compliance Tracking Number: 2007-045 PEPC Project Number: 18038

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: Yosemite Village Tecoya Dorm Boiler #2 Replacement Location: Yosemite Village, Mariposa County, California Project Manager: Maurice West, Project Management, Yosemite National Park Project Manager: Chris Wicks, DNC Parks and Resorts at Yosemite

B. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

This project is an action that has been determined to result in no measurable environmental effects. It is therefore categorically excluded from further National Environmental Policy Act analysis under Categorical Exclusion: DO12 3.4 C(3) - Routine maintenance and repairs to non-historic structures, facilities, utilities, grounds, and trails.

Necessary compliance coordination has been completed regarding the National Historic Preservation Act, the Wilderness Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Endangered Species Act, as applicable. Environmental impacts will be negligible or less when the project is implemented with the conditions stipulated under **Project Mitigations and Conditions** in **Section I** at the end of the attached *Environmental Screening Form*.

Additional supporting information for this determination and the stipulated conditions can be found in the following attachments (when checked):

Environmental Screening Form

Preservation Assessment Form (YOSE-XXX)

Wilderness Minimum Requirement Analysis

Wild and Scenic River Section 7 Determination

Other:

C. DECISION

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 or conditions in DO12 3.5 or 3.6 apply and the action is fully described in DO12, Section 3.4.

//R. Kevin Cann//

Michael J. Tollefson, Superintendent

Original: Statutory Compliance File cc: Project Proponent

Attachments (2)

4/11/07 Date

Environmental Screening Form

(Version: NOV06)

Compliance Tracking Number: 2007-045 PEPC Project Number: 18038

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: Yosemite Village Tecoya Dorm Boiler #2 Replacement
Location: Yosemite Village, Mariposa County, California
Project Manager: Maurice West, Project Management, Yosemite National Park
Project Manager: Chris Wicks, DNC Parks and Resorts at Yosemite

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

This project will involve the design and replacement of boiler #2 at the Tecoya Dorm residential housing area. There are two boilers within the same structure that supply heat to Tecoya Dorms, apartments, and some private residences. The project scope includes adding valves necessary for operational cutover of one boiler at a time. Design will also bring the boiler room to code compliance. The construction effort will provide a new boiler with a higher level of performance and efficiency. Construction will also include incidental rehabilitation of the boiler room in the Tecoya Dorm, including but not limited to, repair/replacement of boiler room valving, piping and appurtenances necessary for code compliance.

Boiler #2 in Tecoya Dorm has far exceeded its useful life. It is over 50 years old. Boiler #2 can no longer be operated safely. Only temporary repairs can be made to use it over the winter, and even then it is subject to failure. A number of system distribution valves need replacement and the piping has served its design life with only five to ten years of remaining life estimated. Boiler #1 in the Tecoya Dorm was replaced during 2000, but without consideration for system efficiency, or the integrity of valving, piping, and appurtenances within the boiler room. The current boiler room ventilation does not supply sufficient air for simultaneous operation of both boilers. This project will result in a substantial savings in energy and maintenance costs.

Table B1 – Background Information

| | | Yes | No | N/A | Explanation/Notes |
|-----|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| 1. | Did NPS staff conduct a site visit? If yes, list attendees. If no, explain. | \boxtimes | | | Project Management staff. |
| 2a. | Is the project providing compliance for an action associated with but not covered by an approved plan? (Identify the plan and provide a section or page citation.); OR | | | | |
| 2b. | Is the project in an approved plan? (Identify the plan and provide a section or page citation. | | \square | | |
| 2c. | Is the project consistent with that plan? | | | \boxtimes | |
| 2d. | Is the Plan's CE, FONSI, or ROD current? | | | \boxtimes | |
| 3a. | Are there any interested or affected parties? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 3b. | Has a diligent effort been made to communicate with them? | | | | |
| 4a. | Are there any affected agencies or tribes? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 4b. | Has consultation been completed? | | | | |

Table B2 – Environmental Screening Form Attachments (provide Attachment letter—A, B, etc.)

| | | Yes | No | N/A | Explanation/Notes |
|----|--|-------------|-------------|-----|---|
| 1 | Manay 2 manimad (visinity man & site man) | \boxtimes | | | Vicinity and location map; see |
| 1. | Maps: 2 required (vicinity map & site map) | | | | Attachment A. |
| 2. | Drawings (e.g., design, construction) | | \boxtimes | | |
| 3. | Site Plans | \boxtimes | | | Site plan; see Attachment B. |
| 4. | Photographs | \square | | | Photo of failed tube; see Attachment C. |
| 5. | Non-NEPA/NHPA Approvals (Explain) | | \boxtimes | | |
| 6. | Other (Explain) | | \boxtimes | | |

C. ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL RESOURCE EFFECTS

| | e any impacts possible on the following ources? | Yes | No | N/A | Data Needed to Determine/Notes |
|-----|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| 1. | Geologic resources: soils, bedrock, streambeds, etc | | \boxtimes | | |
| 2. | From geohazards | | \boxtimes | | |
| 3. | Air quality | \boxtimes | | | Negligible: temporary during boiler replacement. |
| 4. | Soundscapes | \boxtimes | | | Negligible: temporary during boiler replacement. |
| 5. | Water quality or quantity | | \boxtimes | | |
| 6. | Stream flow characteristics | | \boxtimes | | |
| 7. | Marine or estuarine resources | | | \boxtimes | |
| 8. | Floodplains or wetlands | | \boxtimes | | |
| 9. | Land use, including occupancy, income, values, ownership, type of use | | \boxtimes | | |
| | Rare or unusual vegetation – old growth timber, riparian, alpine | | \square | | |
| 11. | Species of special concern (plant or animal; state or federal listed or proposed for listing) or their habitat | | \boxtimes | | |
| 12. | Unique ecosystems, biosphere reserves, World Heritage Sites | | | | Yosemite National Park is a World Heritage site; no historic properties would be adversely affected by implementing this project; see Section F, National Historic Preservation Act Checklist, below. |
| 13. | Unique or important wildlife or wildlife habitat | | \boxtimes | | |
| | Unique or important fish or fish habitat | | \boxtimes | | |
| | Introduce or promote non-native species (plant or animal) | \boxtimes | | | See Section D. Condition 2, Mandatory Criteria, below. |
| | Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc. | | \boxtimes | | |
| 17. | Visitor experience, aesthetic resources | | \boxtimes | | |
| 18. | Cultural resources including cultural landscapes, ethnographic resources | | | | No historic properties would be adversely affected by implementing this project; see Section F, National Historic Preservation Act Checklist, below. |
| 19. | Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure | | | | |
| 20. | Minority and low income populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc. | | \boxtimes | | |
| 21. | Energy resources | | \boxtimes | | |
| 22. | Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies | | \boxtimes | | |
| 23. | Resource, including energy, conservation potential | | \boxtimes | | |
| 24. | Urban quality, gateway communities, etc. | | \boxtimes | | |
| 25. | Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity | | \boxtimes | | |
| 26 | Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal, paleontological resources)? | | \boxtimes | | |
| Cor | nments, Mitigations and Conditions: | | | | |
| 1. | None | | | | |

D. MANDATORY CRITERIA

| If | implemented, would the proposed action: | Yes | No | N/A | Data Needed to Determine/Notes |
|-----|--|-----|-------------|-----|--|
| 1. | Have material adverse effects on public health or safety? | | \boxtimes | | Mitigated; see condition 1, below. |
| 2. | Have adverse effects on such unique 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; floodplains; or ecologically significant or critical areas, including those listed on the National Register of Natural Landmarks? | | | | Mitigated: see Section F, Historic Preservation Act Checklist, below. |
| 3. | Have highly controversial environmental effects? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 4. | Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 5. | Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 6. | Be directly related to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects? | | | | |
| 7. | Have adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 8. | Have adverse effects on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species or have adverse effects on designated Critical Habitat for these species? | | | | |
| 9. | Require compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act? | | | | |
| 10. | Threaten to violate a federal, state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? | | | | |
| 11. | Involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA sec. 102(2)(E)? | | \bowtie | | |
| 12. | Have a disproportionate, significant adverse effect on low-income or minority populations (EO 12898)? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 13. | Restrict access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 130007)? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 14. | Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of federally listed noxious weeds (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act)? | | | | See Section D. Mandatory Criteria, below. |
| 15. | Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of non-native invasive species or actions that may promote the introduction, growth or expansion of the range of non-native invasive species (EO 13112)? | | | | See Section D. Mandatory Criteria, below. |
| 16. | Require a permit from a federal, state, or local agency to proceed, unless the agency from which the permit is required agrees that a CE is appropriate? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 17. | Have the potential for significant impact as indicated by a federal, state, or local agency or Indian tribe? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 18. | Have the potential to be controversial because of disagreement over possible environmental effects? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 10 | Have the potential to violate the NPS Organic Act by | | \boxtimes | | |

1. Develop and submit an Accident Prevention Plan to the park Safety Office (379-1079) for review and approval before proceeding with this work. (Safety Office)

Ensure that all equipment and materials brought into the park are free of non-native, invasive plants and animals, and 2. noxious weeds. All staff working on site shall be informed of and follow best management practices for preventing the introduction and spread of non-native, invasive species as described in Division 1 Specifications, Section 1355.

E. SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST

| Within the area of potential effect, are there: | Yes | No | N/A | Data Needed to Determine/Notes | | |
|--|-----|-------------|-----|--------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. Listed or proposed threatened or endangered species (Federal or State)? | | \boxtimes | | | | |
| 2. Species of special concern (Federal or State)? | | \boxtimes | | | | |
| 3. Park rare plants or vegetation? | | \boxtimes | | | | |
| 4. Potential habitat for any special-status species listed above? | | \square | | | | |
| If "yes" to any of the above questions, a Special-Status Species Checklist must be completed and attached. | | | | | | |
| Comments, Mitigations and Conditions: | | | | | | |

1. None

F. NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST

| Wi | thin the area of potential effect: | Yes | No | N/A | Data Needed to Determine/Notes |
|------|---|---------|-------------|-------|--|
| 1. | Will there be ground disturbance? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 2. | Are there any archeological sites? | | | | Yosemite Valley Archeological District; the assessment of effect is "No Effect;" see the attached XXX. |
| 3. | Are there any Native American Indian traditional cultural resources? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 4. | Is there a historic property (a building, structure, feature, or all or any part of an archeological district or site, or a historic district or site, or any associated landscape element) that is listed or eligible for listing on the <i>National Register</i> ? | | | | Yosemite Valley Historic District; the assessment of effect is "No Effect;" see the attached XXX. |
| 5. | Is there a National Historic Landmark? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 6. | Is there a structure(s) on the park's <i>List of Classified Structures</i> ? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 7. | Is there any cultural resource requiring an evaluation of eligibility as a historic property under NHPA, Section 106, before an affect determination can be made? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 8 | Would there be alteration of any historic property or associated landscape element covered by 2-7, above? | | \square | | |
| If ' | 'yes" to any of the above, then an Assessment | of Effe | cts fo | rm (Y | OSE-XXX) must be completed and attached. |
| Mi | tigations and Conditions: | | | | |
| 1. | None | | | | |

G. WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST

| Is the proposed project: | | No | N/A | Data Needed to Determine/Notes | | |
|--|--|-------------|-----|--------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. Within designated Wilderness? | | \boxtimes | | | | |
| 2. Within a Potential Wilderness Addition? | | \boxtimes | | | | |
| If "yes" to either of the above, then a Wilderness Minimum Requirements Analysis must be completed and attached. | | | | | | |
| Mitigations and Conditions: | | | | | | |
| 1. None | | | | | | |

H. WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST

| Does the proposed project: | Yes | No | N/A | Data Needed to Determine/Notes | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1. Fall within a wild and scenic rive If 'yes'', name the river(s) | er corridor? | | | Merced River | | | |
| 2. Fall within the bed and banks Al the free-flow of the river? | ND affect | \square | | | | | |
| 3. Potentially affect water quality of | f the area? | \boxtimes | | | | | |
| Diminish or other wise change th for which the river was designate Wild and Scenic River? If "yes" | ed as a | | | | | | |
| 5a. Fall on a tributary of a Wild and River? | Scenic | \boxtimes | | | | | |
| 5b. If 5a is "yes", will the project aff Wild and Scenic River corridor? | ect the | | \boxtimes | | | | |
| 5c. If 5a is "yes", will the project un diminish scenic, recreational, or wildlife values? | · _ | | \boxtimes | | | | |
| If "yes" to questions 2, 5b, or 5c, then a WSRA Section 7 determination must be completed and attached. | | | | | | | |
| Mitigations and Conditions: | | | | | | | |
| 1. None | | | | | | | |

I. NEPA Analysis and Approval Conditions

When implemented as detailed in the project description and following all Project Mitigations and Conditions listed below, this project meets the terms and conditions of a categorical exclusion to NEPA.

Applicable Categorical Exclusion:

DO12 3.4 *C*(3) - Routine maintenance and repairs to non-historic structures, facilities, utilities, grounds, and trails.

Project Mitigations and Conditions:


- **1.** Develop and submit an Accident Prevention Plan to the park Safety Office (379-1079) for review and approval before proceeding with this work. (Safety Office)
- 2. Ensure that all equipment and materials brought into the park are free of non-native, invasive plants and animals, and noxious weeds. All staff working on site shall be informed of and follow best management practices for preventing the introduction and spread of non-native, invasive species as described in Division 1 Specifications, Section 1355. (Planning and Compliance)
- 3. Ensure that a backflow prevention system is in place and meets code requirements. (Facilities Management)

This project has been reviewed in accordance with the above criteria and it has been determined that the project will result in no or minimal environmental effects. Therefore, it is categorically excluded from further environmental review required under the National Environmental Policy Act. Additionally, the necessary compliance coordination has been completed with regard to the National Historic Preservation Act, the Wilderness Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Endangered Species Act.


| //Elexis Mayer// | 4/04/07 |
|----------------------------|---------|
| Compliance Specialist | Date |
| | |
| //Mark A Butler// | 4/05/07 |
| Compliance Program Manager | Date |
| | |
| //Bill Delaney// | 4/09/07 |
| Chief, Project Management | Date |
| Chief, Project Management | Date |

Attachment A


VICINITY MAP PROJECT TITLE: CIF 4701, YOSEMITE VILLAGE, REPLACE TECOYA BOILER #2



DNCPR AT YOSEMITE 2007



Attachment B



Attachment C



Location of Failed Tube

Preservation Assessment Form (YOSE XXX)

(Version: AUG06)

Compliance Tracking Number: 2007-045 PEPC Project Number: 18038

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

Title: Yosemite Village Tecoya Dorm Boiler #2 Replacement

Project Location and Area of Potential Effect:

Yosemite Valley, Mariposa County, California

Tecoya Dorm

Project Manager: Maurice West, Project Management, Yosemite National Park

Project Manager: Chris Wicks, DNC Parks and Resorts at Yosemite,

Project Description: This project will involve the design and replacement of boiler #2 at the Tecoya Dorm residential housing area. There are two boilers within the same structure that supply heat to Tecoya Dorms, apartments, and some private residences. The project scope includes adding valves necessary for operational cutover of one boiler at a time. Design will also bring the boiler room to code compliance. The construction effort will provide a new boiler with a higher level of performance and efficiency. Construction will also include incidental rehabilitation of the boiler room in Tecoya Dorm, including but not limited to, repair/replacement of boiler room valving, piping and appurtenances necessary for code compliance.

Boiler #2 in Tecoya Dorm has far exceeded its useful life. It is over 50 years old. Boiler #2 can no longer be operated safely. Only temporary repairs can be made to use it over the winter, and even then it is subject to failure. A number of system distribution valves need replacement and the piping has served its design life with only five to ten years of remaining life estimated. Boiler #1 was replaced during 2000, but without consideration for system efficiency, or the integrity of valving, piping, and appurtenances within the boiler room. The current boiler room ventilation does not supply sufficient air for simultaneous operation of both boilers. This project will result in a substantial savings in energy and maintenance costs.

| 1. Atta | ached Sensitive Information** | Yes | No | Explanation/Source/Notes |
|---------|-------------------------------|-----|-------------|--------------------------|
| a. | Maps | | \boxtimes | |
| b. | Drawings | | \boxtimes | |
| с. | Site Plans | | \boxtimes | |
| d. | Photographs | | \boxtimes | |
| e. | Sample | | \boxtimes | |
| f. | List of Materials | | \boxtimes | |
| g. | Other (Explain) | | \boxtimes | |

** Sensitive documents not for duplication or distribution beyond park management, subject matter experts, and the project statutory compliance file.

B. DESCRIPTION OF EFFECTS

| | | Yes | No | N/A | Explanation/Notes |
|----|--|-------------|-------------|------|--|
| 1. | Has the Area of Potential Effect been | _ | _ | _ | Yosemite Valley Historic District |
| | surveyed to identify historic properties? | \boxtimes | | | Yosemite Valley Archeological District |
| | If Yes, provide reference for the Survey (s). a. Would the proposed action affect a | | | | The dorms are contributing features to the |
| | known historic property? | \boxtimes | | | historic district. |
| | | | | | |
| 2. | List all Historic Properties in the Area of | Affec | ted? | | Explanation (Noted |
| | Potential Effect: | Yes | No | | Explanation/Notes |
| _ | a. Structure B127 | \square | | Repa | irs will occur in the structure. |
| | b. | Н | H | | |
| | с. | | | | |
| 3. | List resources in the Area of Potential | Affec | ted? | | |
| | Effect to which American Indians attach | Yes | | | Explanation/Notes |
| | cultural and religious significance: | res | No | | |
| | a. None | Ц | Ц | | |
| | b. | H | Н | | |
| | с. | | | | |
| 4. | The proposed action will: | Yes | No | N/A | Explanation/Note |
| | • Destroy, remove, or alter features or | | \boxtimes | | K |
| | elements from a historic structure | | | | |
| | • Replace historic features/elements in kind | | \square | | |
| | Add nonhistoric features/elements to a historic structure | \boxtimes | | | Replacement elements are not contributing features to the historic district. |
| | Alter or remove features/elements of a | | | | foundes to the historic district. |
| | historic setting or environment (including | | \boxtimes | | |
| | terrain) | | | | |
| | • Add nonhistoric features/elements | | \boxtimes | | |
| | (including visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape | | | | |
| | • Disturb, destroy, or make archeological | | | | |
| | resources inaccessible, or alter associated | | \boxtimes | | |
| | terrain | | | | |
| | • Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible, or alter associated | | \boxtimes | | |
| | terrain | | | | |
| | • Begin or contribute to the deterioration of | | | | |
| | historic fabric, terrain, setting, landscape | | \boxtimes | | Excavations are restricted to a previously |
| | elements, or archeological or | | | | disturbed area. |
| | ethnographic resourcesInvolve a real property transaction | | | | |
| | affecting historic cultural properties (i.e., | _ | | | |
| | the exchange, sale, or lease of land or | | \boxtimes | | |
| | structures) | | | | |
| | • Potentially affect presently unidentified | | \boxtimes | | |
| | historic resourcesOther | | | | |
| | • Ould | | \square | | |

5. Describe any measures that are incorporated as part of this project that will be taken to prevent or minimize loss or impairment of prehistoric or historic fabric, setting, integrity, or data:

Checklist prepared by: Jeannette Simons Title: Historic Preservation Officer Date: 03/08/07

C. SPECIALIST SECTION

Specialists: Your comments here (or attached) show that you have reviewed this proposal for conformity with requirements of *National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106*; with the 1995 *Servicewide Programmatic Agreement* (if applicable); with applicable parts of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation*; with the NPS *Management Policies* and *Cultural Resource Management Guideline*; and have given your best professional advice about this project and the issues relevant to the Section 106 process, including identification and evaluation of historic properties and further consultation needs.

| Archeologist Comments: | Name: Laura Kirn | Date: 3/14/07 | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Ground Disturbance Involved Assessment of Effect: No Effect Recommended Conditions: | Yes: 🖾 No: 🗌 | | | | | | |
| Signature of Archeologist: //Laura | <u>Kirn//</u> | | | | | | |
| Cultural Anthropologist Comments: | Name: Sonny Montague | Date: | | | | | |
| Assessment of Effect: | | | | | | | |
| Recommended Conditions: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Signature of Cultural Anthropologist: | | | | | | | |
| Curator Comments: | Name: Jonathan Bayless | Date: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Assessment of Effect: | | | | | | | |
| Recommended Conditions: | | | | | | | |

Signature of Curator: _____

| Historian Comments: | Name: Charles Palmer | Date: | |
|---|-----------------------|---------------|--|
| Assessment of Effect: | | | |
| Recommended Conditions: | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Signature of Historian: | | | |
| | | | |
| Historic Architect | Name: Sueann Brown | Date: 3/19/07 | |
| Comments: | | | |
| Assessment of Effect: No Effect | | | |
| Recommended Conditions: | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Signature of Historic Architect: //Jeannette Simons// | | | |
| | | | |
| Historical Landscape Architec | t Name: Dave Humphrey | Date: 3/14/07 | |
| Comments: | | | |
| Assessment of Effect: No Effect | | | |
| Recommended Conditions: | | | |

Signature of Historical Landscape Architect: //David T. Humphrey//

| Preservation Specialist Comments: | Name: Rod Kennec | Date: 3/14/07 | | |
|--|----------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Assessment of Effect: No Adverse Effect | | | | |
| Recommended Conditions: Recommended Conditions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Signature of Preservation Specialis | t: <u>//Rod B Kennec//</u> | | | |
| | | | | |
| Native American Liaison | Name: Jeannette Simons | Date: 3/19/07 | | |
| Comments: | | | | |
| Assessment of Effect: No Effect | | | | |
| Recommended Conditions: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Signature of Native American Liaison: //Jeannette Simons// | | | | |
| | | | | |
| <enter specialist="" title=""></enter> | Name: | Date: | | |
| Comments: | | | | |
| Assessment of Effect: | | | | |
| Recommended Conditions: | | | | |
| Recommended Conditions. | | | | |
| | | | | |

Signature of <Enter Specialist's Title>: _____

D. RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND SCIENCE DIVISION AND PARK 106 COORDINATOR REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Review by specialists: The appropriate subject-matter experts have reviewed the project and entered their comments and recommendations in Section C, above.

The foregoing assessment is adequate: the proposed action is consistent with all applicable NPS management policies, standards, guidelines, or US DOI standards and guidelines, Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings, or others, and incorporates measures to avoid Adverse Effects.

Reviewed and Accepted by:

| Signature: | //Niki Stephanie Nicholas// | Date: <u>3/16/07</u> |
|------------|--|----------------------|
| - | Chief of Resources Management & Science Division | |

2. Compliance Requirements: The following is the park's assessment of Section 106 process needs and requirements for this undertaking.

Standard 36 CFR Part 800 Consultation

Consultation under 36 CFR is needed subsequent to the preparation of this form and its review by appropriate historic resource management advisors.

Undertaking related to the 1995 NPS Programmatic Agreement

The above action meets all conditions for a programmatic exclusion under Stipulation IV. A of the 1995 NPS programmatic agreement, and is listed in Stipulation IV. B, as:

1. Preservation Maintenance (housekeeping, routine and cyclic maintenance, and stabilization as defined in NPS-28.)

Plan-Related Undertaking

Consultation and review of the proposed undertaking were completed in the context of a plan review process, in accordance with the 1995 NPS programmatic agreement and 36 CFR Part 800.

Undertaking Related to Another Agreement

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under a document such as a statewide agreement written in accordance with 37 CFR Part 800.7 or counterpart regulations.

Agreement: <Enter Agreement Information>

□ Flood-Recovery Related Undertaking

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under the letter-based agreement between the NPS, the State Historic Preservation Office, and the Council for Historic Preservation for "Highwater 97" flood repair and recovery

Undertaking Related to the 1999 Yosemite Programmatic Agreement

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under the park's 1999 programmatic agreement for planning, design, construction, operations and maintenance; the undertaking meets the stipulations identified in Article VII.C.2.

3. Assessment of Effects: No Effect

4. Project Stipulations and Conditions

Following are listed any stipulations or conditions necessary to ensure that the assessment of effects above is consistent with 36 CFR 800 criteria of effect or to mitigate potential adverse effects:

a. None

Recommended by Park Section 106 Coordinator:

Name: Jeannette Simons

Title: Historic Preservation Officer

Signature: //Jeannette Simons// Date: 3/19/07

E. SUPERINTENDENT'S APPROVAL

The proposed work conforms to NPS Management Policies and NPS-28 and I approve the recommendations, stipulations, and conditions noted in Section B of this form.

Signature of Superintendent: //R. Kevin Cann//

Michael J. Tollefson

Date: <u>4/11/07</u>