



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: Eric Gabriel

From: Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2008-055 Hetch Hetchy Entrance Office Trailer Installation (22011)

The Management Team has reviewed the proposed project/action and completed its environmental assessment documentation, and we have determined that there:

- Will not be any effect on threatened, endangered, or rare species and/or their critical habitat.
- Will not be any effect on historical, cultural, or archeological resources.
- 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:

- Ensure that the sanitary sewer alignment is reviewed by the Resources Management and Science Liaison Carol Knipper, 379-1097, in advance of project implementation.
- Ensure that all signs, printed publications and maps address this change.
- Ensure that all stock use information is corrected.
- 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 1335.

//Larry Harris// acting
David V. Uberuaga

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.*



National Park Service

Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2008-055 Hetch Hetchy Entrance Office Trailer Installation

PIN: 22011

Date: February 18, 2009

Project Description: An interim modular office building would be situated in the Canyon Ranch Subdistrict of the Mather District. Pursuant to an agreement between the National Park Service and the City of San Francisco, the former office space, located in the historic building (Residence #2000) near the Hetch Hetchy entrance station, has been returned to residential use excepting a single room that will continue to be utilized by the Fee Management operation. Interim office space for the ranger staff is essential for continued security and ranger operations in the Mather District while plans are developed in collaboration with the City of San Francisco for adequate permanent facilities.

PROPOSED AREA: The proposed area is approximately a 25' x 40' interim module office located entirely within the current horse camp site and road cul-du-sac within backpacker's campground. This location would provide access to visitors needing to interact with ranger staff without visual disturbance, due to natural visual shielding of vegetation that borders the loop and the bend in the access road. A trail leads from the northeast end of the loop approximately 600' to the roadway near the Main Street comfort station in the day-use area. A water trough, hitching rail, three bear boxes, two picnic tables and a garbage can comprise the remainder of the amenities in the horse camp and loop area. There is a wellhead located a short distance from the site with water already plumbed into the site. Electricity and telephone are immediately available from a power pole about 200' away on the other side of the campground comfort station.

PLACEMENT: The proposed site for the interim module office would be completely shielded by trees and vegetation from the rest of the campground, road, parking areas. Connections to utilities would be on the existing system, with water coming from an existing well. Sewer would be attached to the campground comfort station system and O'Shaughnessy area sewer system via trenched piping in the existing road prism and comfort station parking lot. The approximate distance is 100' entirely within the horse camp loop access and campground comfort station parking lot.

MITIGATIONS TO MINIMIZE IMPACTS: In consultation with the Chief of Resource Management and Science, Niki Nicholas, it was suggested that the horse camp site be vetted to determine if it would better serve as the location for the interim module office. Continuing consultation with RMS is occurring on site mitigations and impacts. The horse camp that anecdotally has seen only governmental use in the past five years will be relocated within the existing backpacker's camp which never fills to capacity. Another impact to be mitigated is a need to provide an alternative location for stock loading and unloading by the primary stock concessionaire, Mather Pack Station, and government stock operations. Due to the fact that goose neck trailers do not fit down at the Dam this site has become the adhoc location. In consultation with the park corral foreman, Johanna Wheeler, she stated that loading and unloading activities could be safely and easily accommodated between the campground comfort station and backpackers overflow parking. Moreover, the interim module office would be painted park service brown to further minimize impact to the cultural landscape. See the Project Effects Questionnaire for subject matter expert's consultation and additional information.

Project Locations:
Tuolumne County, CA

Mitigations:

- Ensure that the sanitary sewer alignment is reviewed by the Resources Management and Science liaison Carol Knipper, 379-1097, in advance of project implementation.
- Ensure that all signs, printed publications and maps address this change.
- Ensure that all stock use information is corrected.
- 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 1335.

Describe the category used to exclude action from further NEPA analysis and indicate the number of the category (see Section 3-4 of DO-12):

C.11. Installation of wells, comfort stations, and pit or vault toilets in areas of existing use and in developed areas.

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 (e.g. all boxes in the ESF are marked "no") or conditions in Section 3-6 apply, and the action is fully described in Section 3-4 of DO-12.

//Larry Harris// acting
Acting Park Superintendent

1/30/09
Date

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



National Park Service

ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF) DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Updated May 2007 - per 2004 DM revisions and proposed DO-12 changes

Today's Date: **January 21, 2009**

Date Form Initiated: **01/20/2009**

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: **Yosemite NP**

Project Title: **2008-055 Hetch Hetchy Entrance Office Trailer Installation**

PEPC Project Number: **22011**

Project Type: **Facility**

Project Location: County, State: **Tuolumne, California** District, Section: **Mather, Hetch Hetchy**

Project Leader: **Eric Gabriel**

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

An interim modular office building would be situated in the Canyon Ranch Subdistrict of the Mather District. Pursuant to an agreement between the National Park Service and the City of San Francisco, the former office space, located in the historic building (Residence #2000) near the Hetch Hetchy entrance station, has been returned to residential use excepting a single room that will continue to be utilized by the Fee Management operation. Interim office space for the ranger staff is essential for continued security and ranger operations in the Mather District while plans are developed in collaboration with the City of San Francisco for adequate permanent facilities.

PROPOSED AREA: The proposed area is approximately a 25' x 40' interim module office located entirely within the current horse camp site and road cul-du-sac within backpacker's campground. This location would provide access to visitors needing to interact with ranger staff without visual disturbance, due to natural visual shielding of vegetation that borders the loop and the bend in the access road. A trail leads from the northeast end of the loop approximately 600' to the roadway near the Main Street comfort station in the day-use area. A water trough, hitching rail, three bear boxes, two picnic tables and a garbage can comprise the remainder of the amenities in the horse camp and loop area. There is a wellhead located a short distance from the site with water already plumbed into the site. Electricity and telephone are immediately available from a power pole about 200' away on the other side of the campground comfort station.

PLACEMENT: The proposed site for the interim module office would be completely shielded by trees and vegetation from the rest of the campground, road, parking areas. Connections to utilities would be on the existing system, with water coming from an existing well. Sewer would be attached to the campground comfort station system and O'Shaughnessy area sewer system via trenched piping in the existing road prism and comfort station parking lot. The approximate distance is 100' entirely within the horse camp loop access and campground comfort station parking lot.

MITIGATIONS TO MINIMIZE IMPACTS: In consultation with the Chief of Resource Management and

Science, Niki Nicholas, it was suggested that the horse camp site be vetted to determine if it would better serve as the location for the interim module office. Continuing consultation with RMS is occurring on site mitigations and impacts. The horse camp that anecdotally has seen only governmental use in the past five years will be relocated within the existing backpacker's camp which never fills to capacity. Another impact to be mitigated is a need to provide an alternative location for stock loading and unloading by the primary stock concessionaire, Mather Pack Station, and government stock operations. Due to the fact that goose neck trailers do not fit down at the Dam this site has become the adhoc location. In consultation with the park corral foreman, Johanna Wheeler, she stated that loading and unloading activities could be safely and easily accommodated between the campground comfort station and backpackers overflow parking. Moreover, the interim module office would be painted park service brown to further minimize impact to the cultural landscape. See the Project Effects Questionnaire for subject matter expert's consultation and additional information.

Preliminary drawings attached? **Yes**

Is project a hot topic (controversial or sensitive issues that should be brought to attention of Regional Director)? **No**

C. RESOURCE EFFECTS TO CONSIDER:

Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources	No Effect	Negligible Effects	Minor Effects	Exceeds Minor Effects	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
1. Geologic resources – soils, bedrock, streambeds, etc.		X			Trenches will be 24" deep x 12" wide. The sanitary sewer will be 100' and the electrical will be 150'.
2. From geohazards	X				
3. Air quality		X			Trailer installation includes temporary air emissions during set-up.
4. Soundscapes		X			Trailer installation will include equipment noises during set-up.
5. Water quality or quantity	X				
6. Streamflow characteristics	X				
7. Marine or estuarine resources	X				
8. Floodplains or wetlands	X				
9. Land use, including occupancy, income, values, ownership, type of use	X				
10. Rare or unusual vegetation – old growth	X				

timber, riparian, alpine					
11. Species of special concern (plant or animal; state or federal listed or proposed for listing) or their habitat	X				
12. Unique ecosystems, biosphere reserves, World Heritage Sites	X				Yosemite National Park is a World Heritage site; no historic properties would be adversely affected by implementing this project.
13. Unique or important wildlife or wildlife habitat	X				
14. Unique or important fish or fish habitat	X				
15. Introduce or promote non-native species (plant or animal)		X			See comment 1, below.
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	X				
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	X				
18. Archeological resources	X				No historic properties affected.
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	X				
20. Cultural landscapes	X				
21. Ethnographic resources	X				
22. Museum collections (objects, specimens, and archival and manuscript collections)	X				
23. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure	X				
24. Minority and low income populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.	X				
25. Energy resources	X				
26. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	X				
27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability	X				

28. Urban quality, gateway communities, etc.	X				
29. Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity	X				
30. Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal, paleontological resources)?	X				

Comments:

1. 1. 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.

D. MANDATORY CRITERIA

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?		X		
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?		X		
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?		X		
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		X		
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		X		

F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		X		
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?		X		
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?		X		
I. Violate a federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		X		
J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		X		
K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		X		
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)?		X		See Comment 1. under Section A.

For the purpose of interpreting these procedures within the NPS, any action that has the potential to violate the NPS Organic Act by impairing park resources or values would constitute an action that triggers the DOI exception for actions that threaten to violate a federal law for protection of the environment.

E. OTHER INFORMATION

Are personnel preparing this form familiar with the site? **Yes**

Did personnel conduct a site visit? **Yes, Resources Management and Science and Facilities Management.**

Is the project in an approved plan such as a General Management Plan or an Implementation Plan with an accompanying NEPA document? **No**

Are there any interested or affected agencies or parties? **No**

Has consultation with all affected agencies or tribes been completed? **No**

Are there any connected, cumulative, or similar actions as part of the proposed action? (e.g., other development projects in area or identified in GMP, adequate/available utilities to accomplish project)? **No**

F. INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM SIGNATORIES

Interdisciplinary Team	Field of Expertise
David Uberuaga	Acting Superintendent
Larry Harris	Acting Deputy Superintendent
Linda Dahl	Chief of Planning
Bill Delaney	Chief of Project Management
Lorene Schafer	Chief of Administration Management
Dennis Mattiuzzi	Chief of Facilities Management
Niki Nicholas	Chief of Resources Management & Science
Marty Nielson	Chief of Business and Revenue Management
Tom Medema	Acting Chief of Interpretation and Education
Steve Shackelton	Chief Ranger
Dave Thorpe	Project Leader
Mark Butler	Environmental Planning and Compliance
	Program Manager
Jeannette Simons	NHPA Specialist
Renea Kennec	NEPA Specialist

G. SUPERVISORY SIGNATORY

Based on the environmental impact information contained in the statutory compliance file and in this environmental screening form, environmental documentation for this stage of the subject project is complete.

Recommended:

Compliance Specialist	Date
<u>//Renea Kennec//</u> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	<u>1/27/09</u>
<u>//Mark Butler//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Mark Butler	<u>1/27/09</u>
<u>//Bill Delaney//</u> Chief, Project Management – Bill Delaney	<u>1/28/09</u>

Approved:

Acting Superintendent	Date
<u>//Larry Harris// acting</u> David V. Uberuaga	<u>1/30/09</u>

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

PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: **January 21, 2009**

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite NP

Project Number: 22011

Project Type: Trailer Installation (OTHER)

Project Location: County, State: Tuolumne, California District, Section: Mather, Hetch Hetchy

Project Manager: Eric Gabriel

Project Title: 2008-055 Hetch Hetchy Entrance Office Trailer Installation

PARK ESF ADDENDUM QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
1.SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST				
2. Listed or proposed threatened or endangered species (Federal or State)?		X		
3. Species of special concern (Federal or State)?		X		
4. Park rare plants or vegetation?		X		
5. Potential habitat for any special-status species listed above?		X		
6.NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST				
7. Entail ground disturbance?	X			Trenches will be 24" deep x 12" wide. The sanitary sewer will be 100' and the electrical will be 150'.
8. Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		X		
9. Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		X		
10. Has a National Register form been completed?		X		
11. Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?		X		
12.WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST				
13. Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor? (Name the river corridor)		X		
14. Fall within the bed and banks AND will affect the free-flow of the river?		X		
15. Have the possibility of affecting water quality of the		X		

area?				
16. Remain consistent with its river segment classification?			X	
17. Protect and enhance river ORVs?			X	
18. Fall within the River Protection Overlay?		X		
19. If Yes, remain consistent with conditions of the River Protection Overlay?			X	
20. Remain consistent with the areas Management Zoning?			X	
21. Fall on a tributary of a Wild and Scenic River?		X		
22. Will the project encroach or intrude upon the Wild and Scenic River corridor?		X		
23. Will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values?		X		
100.WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST				
101. Within designated Wilderness?		X		
102. Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		X		



Area Map



Proposed Ranger Office



Utility Map



Entrance to Proposed Ranger Office



Hetch Hetchy O'Shaugnessy Trailer Installation Location



National Park Service

ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. Park: Yosemite NP Park District: Mather

2. **Project Description:**

a. Project Name: 2008-055 Hetch Hetchy Entrance Office Trailer Installation Date: January 20, 2009 Park Project Number: 22011

b. Describe project and area of potential effects (as defined in 36 CFR 800.2[c]).

An interim modular office building would be situated in the Canyon Ranch Subdistrict of the Mather District. Pursuant to an agreement between the National Park Service and the City of San Francisco, the former office space, located in the historic building (Residence #2000) near the Hetch Hetchy entrance station, has been returned to residential use excepting a single room that will continue to be utilized by the Fee Management operation. Interim office space for the ranger staff is essential for continued security and ranger operations in the Mather District while plans are developed in collaboration with the City of San Francisco for adequate permanent facilities.

PROPOSED AREA: The proposed area is approximately a 25' x 40' interim module office located entirely within the current horse camp site and road cul-du-sac within backpacker's campground. This location would provide access to visitors needing to interact with ranger staff without visual disturbance, due to natural visual shielding of vegetation that borders the loop and the bend in the access road. A trail leads from the northeast end of the loop approximately 600' to the roadway near the Main Street comfort station in the day-use area. A water trough, hitching rail, three bear boxes, two picnic tables and a garbage can comprise the remainder of the amenities in the horse camp and loop area. There is a wellhead located a short distance from the site with water already plumbed into the site. Electricity and telephone are immediately available from a power pole about 200' away on the other side of the campground comfort station.

PLACEMENT: The proposed site for the interim module office would be completely shielded by trees and vegetation from the rest of the campground, road, parking areas. Connections to utilities would be on the existing system, with water coming from an existing well. Sewer would be attached to the campground comfort station system and O'Shaughnessy area sewer system via trenched piping in the existing road prism and comfort station parking lot. The approximate distance is 100' entirely within the horse camp loop access and campground comfort station parking lot.

MITIGATIONS TO MINIMIZE IMPACTS: In consultation with the Chief of Resource Management and Science, Niki Nicholas, it was suggested that the horse camp site be vetted to determine if it would better serve as the location for the interim module office. Continuing consultation with RMS is occurring on site mitigations and impacts. The horse camp that anecdotally has seen only governmental use in the past five years will be relocated within the existing backpacker's camp which

never fills to capacity. Another impact to be mitigated is a need to provide an alternative location for stock loading and unloading by the primary stock concessionaire, Mather Pack Station, and government stock operations. Due to the fact that goose neck trailers do not fit down at the Dam this site has become the adhoc location. In consultation with the park corral foreman, Johanna Wheeler, she stated that loading and unloading activities could be safely and easily accommodated between the campground comfort station and backpackers overflow parking. Moreover, the interim module office would be painted park service brown to further minimize impact to the cultural landscape. See the Project Effects Questionnaire for subject matter experts consultation and additional information.

3. Has the area of potential effects been surveyed to identify cultural resources?

 No

 X Yes Source or reference Hetch Hetchy Cultural Landscape Inventory; YOSE 1998.

 X Check here if no known cultural resources will be affected. (If this is because area has been disturbed, please explain or attach additional information to show the disturbance was so extensive as to preclude intact cultural deposits.)

4. Potentially Affected Resource(s):

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

 No Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure

 No Replace historic features/elements in kind

 No Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure

 No Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)

 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

 No Potentially affect presently unidentified cultural resources

 No Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting, landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources

 No Involve a real property transaction (exchange, sale, or lease of land or structures)

 Other (please specify)

6. 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.

7. Supporting Study Data:

(Attach if feasible; if action is in a plan, EA or EIS, give name and project or page number.)

8. Attachments: [☐] Maps [☐] Archeological survey, if applicable [☐] Drawings [☐] Specifications
[☐] Photographs [☐] Scope of Work [☐] Site plan [☐] List of Materials [☐] Samples
[☐] Other _____

Prepared by: Jeannette Simons **Date:** 1/20/09

Title: Historic Preservation Officer **Telephone:** 209-379-1372

B. REVIEWS BY CULTURAL RESOURCE SPECIALISTS

The park 106 coordinator requested review by the park's cultural resource specialist/advisers as indicated by check-off boxes or as follows:

[X] ARCHEOLOGIST

Name: Laura Kirn

Date: 01/16/2009

Comments: YOSE 1999 PA Stipulation VII.C.2

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance ☐

Assessment of Effect: ☒ No Historic Properties Affected ☐ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect
☐ Programmatic Exclusion

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

[] CURATOR

Name:

Date:

Comments:

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance ☐ Assessment of Effect: ☐ No Historic
Properties Affected ☐ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect ☐ Programmatic
Exclusion

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

[] ANTHROPOLOGIST

Name:

Date:

Comments:

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance ☐ Assessment of Effect: ☐ No Historic
Properties Affected ☐ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect ☐ Programmatic
Exclusion

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

[X] HISTORIAN

Name: Patrick Chapin

Date: 01/16/2009

Comments: None

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance ☐

Assessment of Effect: ☐ No Historic Properties Affected ☒ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect
☐ Programmatic Exclusion

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: None

[] HISTORICAL ARCHITECT

Name:

Date:

Comments:

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [] Assessment of Effect: _____ No Historic Properties Affected _____ No Adverse Effect _____ Adverse Effect _____ Programmatic Exclusion

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

[X] HISTORICAL LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

Name: David Humphrey

Date: 01/16/2009

Comments: None.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []
Assessment of Effect: x No Historic Properties Affected ___ No Adverse Effect ___ Adverse Effect ___ Programmatic Exclusion

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

None.

[] 106 Advisor

Name:

Date:

Comments:

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [] Assessment of Effect: _____ No Historic Properties Affected _____ No Adverse Effect _____ Adverse Effect _____ Programmatic Exclusion

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

X No Historic Properties Affected _____ No Adverse Effect _____ Adverse Effect

2. Compliance requirements:

[] A. STANDARD 36 CFR PART 800 CONSULTATION

Further consultation under 36 CFR Part 800 is needed.

[] B. PROGRAMMATIC EXCLUSION UNDER THE 1995 SERVICEWIDE PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT (PA)

The above action meets all conditions for a programmatic exclusion under Stipulation IV of the 1995 Servicewide PA for Section 106 compliance.

APPLICABLE EXCLUSION: Exclusion IV. B
(Specify 1-13 or IV.C addition to the list of exclusions.)

☐ 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 1995 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.
Specify: _____

☐ E. COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED BY USE OF NEPA

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

☐ F. STIPULATIONS/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.

Recommended by Park Section 106 coordinator:

Signature of Historic Preservation Officer //Jeannette Simons//

Date 1/27/09

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

D. 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.

Signature of Acting Superintendent //Larry Harris// acting

Date 1/30/09