



A PDF text file of the project's approved environmental compliance package containing the letter of compliance completion, categorical exclusion form, environmental screening form, and any other associated environmental clearance forms, as applicable (e.g., Wilderness Minimum Requirement Analysis, Wild and Scenic River Section 7 Analysis). The signed originals of the package are on file in the Environmental Planning and Compliance Office at Yosemite National Park.

Letter of Compliance Completion

To: Sarah Stock, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Cicely Muldoon, Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2020-104 Cathedral Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep Augmentations (PEPC: 93296)

The Superintendent and park interdisciplinary team have reviewed the proposed project and completed an impact analysis and documentation, and have determined the following:

- The project will augment the Cathedral Herd Unit of the endangered Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep. There will not be any effect on other threatened, endangered, or rare species and/or their critical habitat.
- There will be no potential to cause effects 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 project implementation can commence.

Required Mitigations - For the proposed project actions to be within compliance requirements during construction and/or project implementation, the following mitigations must be adhered to:

- The Park must be notified 3 weeks in advance and also the day before the flight operation. Must contact the Park Aviation Manager (or acting) a week before the flight to assure all potential emergency responding units are aware of the flight operations. Park dispatch must be notified the day of the flight to give an ETA of when the flight will be in park (ECC 209.379.1998). All helicopters used during project work must report identification number, color, and ownership information prior to airflight over park.
- Prior to entering the backcountry, all workers shall check boots, backpacks, and tools for weed seeds, mud that could harbor weed seeds, and plant parts to prevent the spread and introduction of non-native plants. Equipment brought into backcountry by helicopter should be checked and cleaned for mud, seeds, and plant parts.
- Prior to entering the backcountry, all workers shall check boots, backpacks, and tools for weed seeds, mud that could harbor weed seeds, and plant parts to prevent the spread and introduction of non-native plants. Equipment brought into backcountry by helicopter should be checked and cleaned for mud, seeds, and plant parts.

- Mountain Lion predation on bighorn sheep may trigger killing that lion if it threatens bighorns. The decision to kill a lion would be guided by the following decision tree outlined in the CA Department of Fish and Wildlife document "A Strategy for Managing Predation on Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep" (2019). This document provides a thorough analysis and convincing argument that, in the Sierra, killing mountain lions to protect the remaining bighorn herds is necessary if done with the due consideration and restraint outlined within.
- Compliance with food-storage and garbage disposal requirements must be achieved at all times
- The project crew would follow "Leave-No-Trace" principles while working in wilderness. All provisions outlined in the project Minimum Requirements Analysis (MRA) will be followed.
- The park would implement the Recovery Plan for the Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep (USFWS 2007) in close collaboration with the CDFW, who hold the 10(a)1(A) permit, and follow all stipulations contained in the permit. Bighorn sheep augmentations would be completed using the same methods as used in the 2015 reintroductions and in subsequent augmentations. Monitoring methods/protocols will be consistent with those identified in the Recovery Plan for the SNBS (2007). The NPS will coordinate with the CDFW to ensure actions carried out in the park under CDFW's 10(a)1(A) permit are included in reportings to the USFWS. The CDFW would continue to meet their reporting and consultation requirements of their Recovery Permit regarding the proposed actions, engaging the USFWS when necessary.

There are no NHPA Recommendations for Conditions or Stipulations identified.

Acting Superintendent: Cicely Muldoon Date: September 15, 2020
Cicely Muldoon

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



Categorical Exclusion Documentation Form (CE Form)

Project: Cathedral Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep Augmentations

PEPC Project Number: 93296

Description of Action (Project Description):

The National Park Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) will reintroduce a herd comprising up to 25 Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep (hereafter bighorn or sheep) into the Cathedral Range of Yosemite National Park starting in March 2015. Up to 20 of these animals will wear Global Positioning System (GPS) and Very High Frequency (VHF) collars at any given time in order to monitor their movements throughout the range. In addition to collars, field surveys will be conducted by NPS and CDFW personnel to monitor the herd.

From 2015-2019, NPS and CDFW conducted three separate bighorn releases in the Cathedral Range. The first release occurred from March 26 - April 3, 2015 and consisted of 13 bighorns (10 ewes and 3 rams). The second release occurred on November 2, 2016 and consisted of five rams. The third release occurred on October 24, 2017 and consisted of two rams. During the 3 releases, 8 total helicopter landings took place: 5 in the Washburn Lake area in 2015; 1 on the SW side of Mt. Lyell and 1 on the Parson's Plateau in 2016; and 1 on the Parson's Plateau in 2017.

The most recent surveys conducted in 2019 concluded that four bighorns currently occupy the Cathedral Range. Three of the bighorns are adult ewes and one is a yearling. At this time, there are no functional collars in the Cathedral herd, which limits monitoring efforts to ground-based surveys. Three of the four existing ewes were born in the Cathedral herd and they have not been collared. The one ewe that was transported and released into the Cathedral Range carries a collar, but the collar no longer functions.

Population declines in the Cathedral Range are attributed mostly to severe winter conditions in 2017 and 2019. High snowpack levels hinder foraging and can cause malnutrition and death; while increased avalanche activity can cause direct mortality. Members of the Science Advisory Team are currently engaged in discussions about how to strategically conduct future augmentations/releases to continue growing and monitoring the herd.

Additional population augmentations will occur 2020 to 2024. Each of those years, up to 5 ewes or rams will be translocated to the Cathedral Herd. The source herd will likely be Mt. Langley, but could be from other herds if necessary. The maximum number of sheep reintroduced into the Cathedral Herd will not exceed a herd size of 25 animals (up to 15 ewes and up to 10 rams).

Augmentations will be completed using the same methods as past efforts. The crews use net-guns operated from a helicopter. Net-gunning involves deploying a net on an individual sheep, tying their feet together and covering the bighorn's eyes with a mask. Research has shown net-gunning to be the safest alternative for bighorn captures with 2-3% accidental mortality. After a bighorn is immobilized, it is harnessed and flown out of the capture site to a processing site on the east side of the Sierra Nevada. During processing, veterinarians and biologists perform health assessments on each individual, take blood and hair samples for genetic analysis, and affix GPS and VHF collars for monitoring purposes. The sheep are then loaded into large boxes and transported by truck north to a location close to the release site. Once there, biologists transport all boxes of sheep to release locations in

Yosemite's Cathedral Range via helicopter. Biologists release the sheep and are flown out of the backcountry. Alternatively, sheep are harnessed and flown directly to the release site where they are released by the helicopter crew, negating the need for the biologist, boxes, or vehicular transport.

Helicopter flights will generally be short in duration (10 minutes or less) and as short as possible when transporting sheep and crew members. Over the next five-year duration of the project (through 2024), a maximum of 24 landings over 7 days will be required for augmentations in the Cathedral Range.

The release sites are located near Parsons Plateau in the Cathedral Range. The sheep have selected the Parson's Plateau as their main wintering area since the initial reintroduction in 2015. Summer range includes extensive habitat throughout the Cathedral Range and in the headwaters of the Merced River. There is potential for rams from the Cathedral herd to migrate and breed with the existing Mt. Gibbs herd farther northeast and vice-versa.

Monitoring methods and protocols will be consistent with those identified in the Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep Recovery Plan. Field crews will conduct surveys throughout each summer and fall to monitor the sheep and assess movement and mortality. Twice yearly surveys will continue for at least 15 years. The GPS collars will send out location fixes once per day and can last up to 3 years. Once the collar battery dies or nears depletion, collars may be replaced depending on monitoring needs for the herd. GPS collaring of multiple bighorns will continue for at least 15 years due to Endangered Species Act delisting requirements. VHF collars send out a short-range radio signal that help crews and air support locate the sheep. Batteries on the VHF collars have a much longer life and generally last throughout the lifetime of a sheep. Due to herd movements and dynamics, we will attempt to collar all rams and multiple, but not all, ewes.

Because of the wet winters of 2017 and 2019, the Yosemite bighorn populations are precarious. The previous MRA did not allow for any predator control actions. For 2020-2024, mountain lion predation on bighorn sheep may trigger killing that lion if it threatens sheep. A single kill by a lion does not necessarily trigger killing that lion. A single lion may have a devastating effect on a small sheep population, and a decision to kill the lion would have to occur quickly to prevent such a loss. If a mountain lion is discovered to be preying on bighorn sheep, that lion may be killed according to the guidance and limitations discussed in "A Strategy for Managing Predation on Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep", Gammons et al. (2019). This document provides a thorough analysis and convincing argument that, in the Sierra, killing mountain lions to protect the remaining bighorn herds is justified if done with the due consideration and restraint outlined within.

Mitigation(s):

See Letter of Compliance Completion Form for mitigations.

CE Citation: E.2 Restoration of noncontroversial native species into suitable habitats within their historic range and elimination of exotic species.

CE Justification:

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.

Acting Superintendent: Cicely Muldoon **Date:** September 15, 2020
Cicely Muldoon

*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
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	Project implements Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep Recovery Plan; USFWS 10(a)1(A) Recovery Permit is held by California Department of Fish and Wildlife, who are collaborators on this work.
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	



ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

Updated Sept 2015 per NPS NEPA Handbook

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Cathedral Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep Augmentations
PEPC Project Number: 93296
PMIS Numbers: 308111,213105
Project Type: Resource Management (RMS)
Project Location:
 County, State: Madera, California **Other:** Cathedral Range
 County, State: Mariposa, California **Other:** Cathedral Range
 County, State: Tuolumne, California **Other:** Cathedral Range
Project Leader: Sarah Stock

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

See Categorical Exclusion Form for project description.

C. 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 <i>Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep (federally endangered)</i>	Potential	Issue: Project augments a herd of bighorn that currently has low population numbers and allows for a predator removal decision framework. The project implements the species' recovery plan. Impact: Project benefits endangered species and their recovery in Yosemite.
Biological Vegetation	None	
Biological Wildlife and/or	None	

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Wildlife Habitat including terrestrial and aquatic species		
Cultural Archeological Resources	None	
Cultural Cultural Landscapes <i>Cultural Resources</i>	Potential	Issue: Park wildlife may hold cultural value to traditionally associated American Indian tribes. Impact: The park has consulted the tribes on this project; no comments or concerns with the project have been expressed by the tribes.
Cultural Ethnographic Resources	None	
Cultural Museum Collections	None	
Cultural Prehistoric/historic structures	None	
Geological Geologic Features	None	
Geological Geologic Processes	None	
Lightsapes Lightsapes	None	
Other Human Health and Safety <i>Helicopter Operations</i>	Potential	Issue: The project involves helicopter operations and extensive backcountry hiking/backpacking. Impact: The Project Manager will coordinate closely with park aviation staff on helicopter operations and will follow existing park procedures related to backcountry travel and safety.
Other Operational	None	
Other Other	None	
Socioeconomic Land Use	None	
Socioeconomic Minority and low-income populations,	None	

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
size, migration patterns, etc.		
Socioeconomic Socioeconomic	None	
Soundscapes Soundscapes	None	
Viewsheds Viewsheds	None	
Visitor Use and Experience Recreation Resources	None	
Visitor Use and Experience Visitor Use and Experience <i>Visitor Experience</i>	Potential	<p>Issue: Visitors enjoy seeing native wildlife. Visitors in the wilderness may be impacted by short term helicopter operations.</p> <p>Impact: The project will enhance visitor experience in the long-term by restoring charismatic native wildlife to the Yosemite landscape. The project will result in short term impacts to some visitors in wilderness due to helicopter operations.</p>
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 <i>Wilderness Character</i>	Potential	<p>Issue: The project involves helicopter landings, augmentations of wildlife, and using radio-collars to track wildlife.</p> <p>Impact: Project manager will follow stipulations outlined in Minimum Requirements Analysis. The project will have short-term impacts to wilderness character that will result in long-term benefits to wilderness character.</p>



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

Project Name: Cathedral Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep Augmentations

Prepared by: Ninette Daniele **Date Prepared:** 03/06/2020 **Telephone:** (209) 379-1457

PEPC Project Number: 93296

Locations:

County, State: Madera, CA

Other: Cathedral Range

County, State: Mariposa, CA

Other: Cathedral Range

County, State: Tuolumne, CA

Other: Cathedral Range

Describe project:

See Categorical Exclusion form for Project Description.

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

Yosemite National Park backcountry/wilderness, Cathedral Range.

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

☐ No

☒ Yes

Source or reference:

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

Archeological Resources Present: Yes

Archeological Resources Notes: Archeological resources are scattered throughout Yosemite's backcountry, however the project involves no ground disturbance and will not have impacts to archeological resources.

Historical Structures/Resources Present: Yes

Historical Structures/Resources Notes: Historic structures/resources are scattered throughout Yosemite's backcountry, however the project will not have impacts to historic structures/resources.

Cultural Landscapes Present: No

Ethnographic Resources Present: Yes

Ethnographic Resources Notes: The project was presented to traditionally associated American Indian tribes for their review on the February 2020 tribal spreadsheet; no comments or concerns were received.

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

[X] 106 Advisor

Name: Madelyn Ruffner

Date: 09/04/2020

Comments: No historian, HA, or HLA review needed as project has no potential to cause effects. Project continues work that was approved under previous compliance.

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] Anthropologist

Name: Liz Williams

Date: 09/02/2020

Comments: please see archeologist comments

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: Park Specific or Other Programmatic Agreement

☒ **Archeologist**

Name: Wesley Wills

Date: 09/01/2020

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: Park Specific or Other Programmatic Agreement

No Reviews From: Curator, Historical Architect, Historian, Other Advisor, Historical Landscape Architect

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. Undertaking Related to Park Specific or Another Agreement**

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under another document such as a park, region or statewide agreement established in accord with 36 CFR 800.7 or 36 CFR 800.14.

☐ **D. Combined NEPA/NHPA Process**

Process and documentation required for the preparation of an EA/FONSI or an EIS/ROD to comply with Section 106 is in accord with 36 CFR 800.8.c.

☒ **E. Memo to Project File**

3. Consultation Information

SHPO Required: No

SHPO Sent:

SHPO Received:

THPO Required: Yes

THPO Sent: 2/3/2020

THPO Received: No comments received after 30 days

SHPO/THPO Notes:

Advisory Council Participating: No

Advisory Council Notes:

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.)

Required Mitigations - For the proposed project actions to be within compliance requirements during construction and/or project implementation, the following mitigations must be adhered to:

No NHPA mitigations recommended

6. Assessment of Effect Notes:

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

NHPA Specialist

Madelyn Ruffner Madelyn Ruffner **Date:** September 8, 2020

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.

Acting Superintendent: Cicely Muldoon **Date:** September 15, 2020
Cicely Muldoon

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



Other Compliance/Consultations Form

Park Name: Yosemite National Park

PEPC Project Number: 93296

Project Title: Cathedral Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep Augmentations

Project Type: Resource Management

Project Location:

County, State: Madera, CA Other: Cathedral Range

County, State: Mariposa, CA Other: Cathedral Range

County, State: Tuolumne, CA Other: Cathedral Range

Project Leader: Sarah Stock

ESA

Any Federal Species in the project Area? Yes

If species in area:

Was Biological Assessment prepared? No

If Biological Assessment prepared, concurred?

Formal Consultation required? No

Formal Consultation Notes:

The park would continue implementation of the Recovery Plan for the Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep (SNBS) (USFWS 2007) in close collaboration with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), who hold the 10(a)1(A) permit. The CDFW and the park propose to release up to 5-8 bighorn each year from 2020-2024 in the Cathedral Range, to establish 25 sheep in the herd unit. Source herds would likely include Mt. Baxter, Mt. Langley, Sawmill Canyon, and Wheeler Ridge, but could include others. Augmentations would be completed using the same methods as used in the 2015 reintroductions and in subsequent augmentations. Monitoring methods/protocols will be consistent with those identified in the Recovery Plan for the SNBS. The CDFW would continue to meet their reporting and consultation requirements of their Recovery Permit regarding the proposed actions, engaging the USFWS when necessary. The park has coordinated with CDFW to ensure the proposed 2020-2024 introductions and monitoring would be carried out fully under the existing provisions of their 10(a)1(A) permit.

Following the previous guidance that the park received from the USFWS (see background below) for the 2014-2019 work, the park's understanding is that the proposed 2020-2024 work is completely encompassed by the CDFW 10(a)1(A) permit and that the work can continue to be implemented from 2020-2024 without the park needing to engage in consultation to seek USFWS section 7 or 10 permits for Yosemite National Park specifically. The park intends to continue bighorn augmentations and monitoring in Spring of 2020 under CDFW's 10(a)1(A) permit.

Formal Consultation Concluded:

Any State listed Species in the Project Area? N

Consultation Information:

General Notes: Background: The 2015-2019 introductions and monitoring were implemented under a CE, including a Minimum Requirements Analysis to satisfy Wilderness Act responsibilities, issued by Yosemite

National Park. The CDFW held the 10(a)1(A) permit covering the work. At that time, the park was not required to open official consultation with the USFWS to seek section 7 permits and was advised by the service that it was not necessary to be added as a permittee to the CDFW 10(a)1(A) permit. The park sent correspondence dated December 23, 2014 to your office stating the park and CDFW's plans to introduce 25 sheep into the Cathedral Range in Yosemite from 2015-2019 and monitor them using GPS collars. The CDFW sent a letter to your office dated February 27, 2015 outlining the plans to reintroduce Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep into the Cathedral Range in Yosemite and requested a letter of support for the project. In response, your office sent correspondence dated March 17, 2015 to Yosemite National Park stating that potential adverse effects associated with the proposed reintroduction and monitoring had already been analyzed through prior section 7(a)(2) consultation as part of the recovery permit issued to CDFW, and that no additional consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under section 7 of the act was required. At that time, your office also issued a letter of support for the project to the CDFW. From 2015-2019, the CDFW and the park performed three bighorn releases in the Cathedral Range, releasing a total of 20 sheep (2015: 10 ewes, 3 rams; 2016: 5 rams; 2017: 2 rams). Recent surveys concluded that only four sheep currently comprise the herd (3 adult ewes, 1 yearling). At this time, there are no functional collars in the herd, which limits monitoring efforts to ground-based surveys. Population declines in the herd have mostly been attributed to severe winter conditions in 2017 and 2019. Due to the current small population size of the Cathedral Herd Unit, additional time, augmentations, and monitoring are required to meet the Recovery Plan's goal of establishing a self-sustaining herd of at least 25 sheep in the Cathedral Range.

Data Entered By: _____ **Date:** _____

ESA Mitigations

Mitigation ID	Text
99148	The park would implement the Recovery Plan for the Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep (USFWS 2007) in close collaboration with the CDFW, who hold the 10(a)1(A) permit, and follow all stipulations contained in the permit. Bighorn sheep augmentations would be completed using the same methods as used in the 2015 reintroductions and in subsequent augmentations. Monitoring methods/protocols will be consistent with those identified in the Recovery Plan for the SNBS (2007). The NPS will coordinate with the CDFW to ensure actions carried out in the park under CDFW's 10(a)1(A) permit are included in reportings to the USFWS. The CDFW would continue to meet their reporting and consultation requirements of their Recovery Permit regarding the proposed actions, engaging the USFWS when necessary.

Floodplains/Wetlands/§404 Permits

Question	Yes	No	Details
A.1. Is project in 100- or 500-year floodplain or flash flood hazard area?		No	Not in floodplain or flash flood hazard area.
A.2. Is Project in wetlands as defined by NPS/DOI?		No	Not in wetland as defined by NPS/DOI.
B. COE Section 404 permit needed?		No	No placement of fill in waters of the United States.
C. State 401 certification?		No	
D. State Section 401 Permit?		No	Issue Date: Expiration Date:
E. Tribal Water Quality Permit?		No	

F. CZM Consistency determination needed?			N/A
G. Erosion & Sediment Control Plan Required?		No	
H. Any other permits required?		No	Permit Information:
Other Information:			

Data Entered By: Ninette Daniele

Date: Mar 6, 2020

Floodplains & Wetlands Mitigations

No Floodplains & Wetlands mitigations are associated with this project.

Wilderness

Question	Yes	No	
A. Does this project occur in or adjacent to Designated, Recommended, Proposed, Study, Eligible, or Potential Wilderness?	Yes		
B. Is the only place to conduct this project in wilderness?	Yes		
C. Is the project necessary for the administration of the area as wilderness?	Yes		
D. Would the project or any of its alternatives adversely affect (directly or indirectly) Designated, Recommended, Proposed, Study, Eligible, or Potential Wilderness? (If Yes, Minimum Requirements Analysis required)	Yes		
E. Does the project or any of its alternatives involve the use of any of the Wilderness Act Section 4(c) prohibited uses: commercial enterprise, permanent road, temporary road, motor vehicles, motorized equipment, motorboats, landing of aircraft, mechanical transport, structure, or installation? (If Yes, Minimum Requirements Analysis required)	Yes		
If the answer to D or E above is "Yes" then a Minimum Requirements Analysis is required. Describe the status of this analysis in the column to the right.			Initiation Date: Feb 5, 2020 Completed Date: Feb 11, 2020 Approved Date: Feb 19, 2020
Other Information:			

Data Entered By: Ninette Daniele

Date: _____

Other Permits/Laws *Questions A & B are no longer used.*

Question	Yes	No
----------	-----	----

C. Wild and scenic river concerns exist?		No
D. National Trails concerns exist?		No
E. Air Quality consult with State needed?		No
F. Consistent with Architectural Barriers, Rehabilitation, and Americans with Disabilities Acts or not Applicable? (If N/A check Yes)		No
G. Other:		

Other Information:

Data Entered By: Ninette Daniele **Date:** Mar 6, 2020