



Letter of Compliance Completion

To: Jim Donovan, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Cicely Muldoon, Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: Improve Shuttle and Transit Bus Stops in Yosemite Village and Curry Village (PEPC 99242) U:\EP Project Managment\00 - PROJECT FILES\8 - TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS\Bus Stops Project Phase 4 FY2020 (Donovan)\2. Compliance

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

- There will not be any effect on threatened, endangered, or rare species and/or their critical habitat.
- There will be no adverse effect to historic properties.
- There will not be serious or long-term undesirable environmental or visual effects.

The subject proposed project, therefore, is now cleared for all NEPA and NHPA compliance requirements as presented above. Project plans and specifications are approved and construction and/or project implementation can commence.

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:

Wildlife

- Workers will be made aware that California Red Legged Frogs (CRLF) occupy Yosemite Valley (please see attached educational handout) and will be given an educational briefing on protection measures and identification.
- Trenches or holes will be backfilled at the end of every day. Any trenches that cannot be backfilled at the end of the day must have wildlife escape ramps installed.
- Project actions at stops 18/19 will preferably occur during dry months of the year (May to September), during times when precipitation is not forecast. 4) Project workers will obey park speed limits and exercise extra vigilance while driving during worm/wet conditions to avoid vehicle strikes of frogs and toads.
- If a CRLF is found in the project area, all work must cease within 500 feet of the observation and the Aquatic Ecologist must be immediately contacted (Rob_Grasso@nps.gov; 209-379-1438). Work at the site can resume at the discretion of the Aquatic Ecologist. Nobody except the park Aquatic Ecologist or Wildlife Biologist may move or handle a CRLF.
- If tree removal is planned May 1 - July 31 trees must be surveyed for nesting migratory birds prior to removal. Once surveyed, the project has 1 week to remove trees. If work is not completed within 1 week, trees must be resurveyed. If nesting migratory birds are discovered, tree removal will be delayed until after nesting is complete.
- Compliance with food-storage and garbage disposal requirements must be achieved at all times.

Vegetation

- Measures shall be taken to prevent the introduction of exotic species in the project area and staging areas. All earth moving equipment must enter the Park free of dirt, dust, mud, seeds, or other potential contaminant. Examples of equipment that require inspection are excavators, skid steers, or boring equipment. Passenger vehicles do not need inspection but should be clean prior to entry in the park. Equipment exhibiting any dirt or other material attached to frame, tires, wheels, or other parts shall be thoroughly cleaned by the Contractor before entering the Park. Areas inspected shall include, but not be limited to, tracks, track guard/housings, belly pans/under covers, buckets, rippers, and other attachments. Equipment that does not pass inspection will be turned around to the nearest cleaning facility outside the park. The Contractor shall notify the Construction manager at least two work days (not including weekends) prior to bringing any equipment into the Park. Equipment found to have entered the Park with potential contaminants will be removed from the Park at the direction of the Contracting Officer at Contractor's sole expense. 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.
- Use barriers, fencing, or other means to maintain tight work limits and protect adjacent soils and vegetation from disturbance.

Superintendent Signature: Ephriam Dickson for Cicely Muldoon **Date:** July 15, 2022



Categorical Exclusion Documentation Form (CE Form)

Project: Improve Shuttle and Transit Bus Stops in Yosemite Village and Curry Village

PEPC Project Number: 99242

Description of Action (Project Description):

The purpose of this project is to improve the existing Yosemite Village Loop Drive and Curry Village shuttle and transit bus system. Improvements will support daily operation, pedestrian access and safety. The Yosemite Valley Shuttle Bus System provides service to lodging facilities and attraction sites throughout Yosemite Valley.

The scope of the current project includes the following actions:

Curry Village Shuttle and Regional Transportation Stops

- Remove the signs at former Stops 13a and 21 at the Curry Village Recreation Area.
- Abandon shuttle bus service at Stop 13b; retain improvements for regional transportation service.
- Improve Shuttle Stop 14 Curry Village (eastbound) and Shuttle Stop 20 Curry Village (westbound) at Curry Orchard Parking. The scope requires saw cutting existing asphalt; salvaging and re-using boulders; constructing two (2) wooden shelters; constructing accessible pathways; removing certain trees and stumps; installing split-rail and post-and-rope fencing; installing benches, trash receptacles, and signage; asphalt and concrete paving, granite curbing and gutters; and crosswalk striping.

Campground Shuttle Stops 15 and 19 on the Happy Isles Loop

- At Upper Pines and Lower Pines Stops (15 and 19) saw cut existing asphalt; remove cedar trees and stumps at Upper Pines, and remove pine and cedar trees at North Pines; remove asphalt and concrete paving; install trash and recycling cans, boulders barriers, benches, and signage. No new shelters will be constructed.

Yosemite Village Shuttle Stops and Regional Transportation Stop

- At the Yosemite Village Welcome Center/Store, Stop 2, saw cut existing asphalt; salvage and re-use boulders; remove pine trees, stumps and saplings; construct two (2) shelters; construct low stone dry-laid retaining walls; install pierced-post fencing and rails; replace asphalt and concrete paving, granite curbing and gutters; improve crosswalk; install benches, trash receptacles, and signage.
- Decommission Stop 10 by removing signs.
- At Degnan's Kitchen, Stop 4, saw cut existing asphalt and curb; realign split-rail fencing; salvage and re-use of boulders; asphalt, concrete, and granite inlay paving; improve crosswalk; and install trash and recycling cans, boulders, benches, bike rack, and signage.
- At the existing Visitor Center, Stop 5, create space for regional transportation buses; saw cut the existing asphalt; add asphalt and concrete paving for bus pads and pedestrian access; construct granite curbing and a low stone dry-laid retaining structure along the back edge of the pedestrian waiting area.

- Decommission Stop 9 (eastbound) by removing existing signs.

Mitigation(s): See Letter of Compliance Completion Form

CE Citation: 3.3.C.18 Construction of minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas.

Decision: I find that the action fits within the categorical exclusion above. Therefore, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No extraordinary circumstances apply.

Superintendent Signature: Ephriam Dickson for Cicely Muldoon **Date:** July 15, 2022

Extraordinary Circumstances:

If implemented, would the proposal...	Yes/No	Explanation
A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?	No	The project will improve safety by providing better access to bus stops, designated waiting areas or shelters and pedestrian crosswalks.
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	Work will be done in the previously disturbed road prism the potential to impact resources has been evaluated and determined that it will not have a significant impact to resources.
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?	No	The project sites are currently used for transit stops. Resource allocation in the area will remain the same. Identified environmental effects are not controversial.
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?	No	The project is within existing park roads and bus stops located in developed areas with high visitor use, therefore, no uncertain or significant environmental effects or risks are expected to occur from the proposed action
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?	No	The project will not have significant environmental effects. Therefore, it will not establish a precedent for future actions.
F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?	No	The project does not have a relationship to other actions that have individually or cumulatively significant environmental effects.
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	There are no properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic places in the project area.
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	The project was evaluated and determined to be Not Likely to Adversely Affect 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.
I. Violate a federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?	No	The proposed actions do not violate any environmental laws.
J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EO 12898)?	No	There are no low income or minority populations in the project area.

If implemented, would the proposal...	Yes/No	Explanation
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	The project areas are not currently used by any local Tribes for day-to-day or ceremonial uses, nor do they include any sacred sites. The proposed actions would not adversely affect the integrity of important Tribal areas.
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	No known invasive species are within the project areas. Measures shall be taken to prevent the introduction of exotic species in the project areas and staging areas.



ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

Updated Sept 2015 per NPS NEPA Handbook

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Improve Shuttle and Transit Bus Stops in Yosemite Village and Curry Village
PEPC Project Number: 99242
Project Type: Construction Permit (CONP)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California **District, Section:** Yosemite Valley,
Project Leader: Jim Donovan

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Categorical Exclusion

C. RESOURCE IMPACTS TO CONSIDER:

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Air Air Quality	None	None
Biological Nonnative or Exotic Species <i>Invasive Species</i>	Potential	Issue: There are invasive plant species in the project areas. Impact: No impacts are anticipated if mitigation measures are followed.
Biological Species of Special Concern or Their Habitat <i>California Red Legged Frog</i>	Potential	Issue: California Red Legged Frog (listed as threatened) may be present in the project area. Impact: No negative impacts are anticipated if mitigation measures are followed.
Biological Vegetation	Potential	Issue: Mature trees and sensitive vegetation exist in the project area. Impact: No impacts are anticipated if crews use barriers, fencing, or other means to maintain tight work limits and protect adjacent soils and vegetation from disturbance.

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Biological Wildlife and/or Wildlife Habitat including terrestrial and aquatic species <i>Nesting migratory birds</i>	Potential	Issue: Nesting migratory birds may be present in the project area. Impact: No impacts are anticipated if mitigation measures are followed. If tree removal is planned May 1 - July 31 trees must be surveyed for nesting migratory birds prior to removal. Once surveyed, the project has 1 week to remove trees. If work is not completed within 1 week, trees must be resurveyed. If nesting migratory birds are discovered, tree removal will be delayed until after nesting is complete.
Cultural Archeological Resources	None	None
Cultural Cultural Landscapes	None	None
Cultural Ethnographic Resources	None	None
Cultural Museum Collections	None	None
Cultural Prehistoric/historic structures	None	None
Geological Geologic Features	None	None
Geological Geologic Processes	None	None
Lightscares	None	None
Other Human Health and Safety <i>Visitor Safety</i>	Potential	Issue: Visitors congregate in areas that are not well marked and cross the road in an unsafe manner to access the bus. Impact: Positive impacts anticipated include an increase in visitors' safety because designated areas will be provided for waiting and crossing the road.
Other Operational	None	None
Other	None	None
Paleontological Paleontological Resources	None	None

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Socioeconomic Land Use	None	None
Socioeconomic Minority and low-income populations, size, migration patterns, etc.	None	None
Socioeconomic	None	None
Soundscapes	None	None
Viewsheds	None	None
Visitor Use and Experience Recreation Resources	None	None
Visitor Use and Experience Visitor Use and Experience	None	None
Water Floodplains	None	None
Water Marine or Estuarine Resources	None	None
Water Water Quality or Quantity	None	None
Water Wetlands	None	None
Water Wild and Scenic River	None	None
Wilderness	None	None



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. Park: Yosemite National Park

2. Project Description:

Project Name: Improve Shuttle and Transit Bus Stops in Yosemite Village and Curry Village

Prepared by: Erin Davenport **Date Prepared:** **Telephone:** (209) 379-1067

PEPC Project Number: 99242

Locations:

County, State: Mariposa, CA **District:** Yosemite Valley

Describe project: See Categorical Exclusion

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

The APE for this project includes individual project location areas connected by the Yosemite Valley Loop Road. The subsurface APE is 3-feet below grade, and the above-ground APE is the height of the shelters, 15-feet. The Curry Village project area includes the Curry Orchard Parking Area as well as Curry Village Drive. Regional Transportation Stop 13 in the registration area, Shuttle Stops 14 and 20 in the Curry Orchard Parking Area. The Regional Transportation Stop 13 at the registration area is bounded to the north by Curry Village Drive, to the east by the forested edge, to the south by the Curry Village Registration Building, and to the west by the forested edge. The project area for Shuttle Stops 14 and 20 is bounded to the north by the Happy Isles Loop Road, to the east by the Curry Orchard Parking Area, to the south by the Curry Pavilion complex, and to the west by Stoneman Meadow. The Campgrounds project area includes the Happy Isles Road and the Mission 66 campground areas. Shuttle Stop 15 at Upper Pines Campground is at the intersection of Southside Drive and Happy Isles Loop Road; it is bounded to the north by Southside Drive, to the east and south by the forested edge, and to the west by Boystown and the campground office. Shuttle Stop 19 is located at the entrance to Lower Pines Campground and the project area is surrounded by dense forest with Clark's Bridge to the east. Stop 2 and 10 (Village Store/Welcome Center), Stop 4 (Degnan's), and Stop 5 (YARTS transit) are located in the heavily-visited pedestrian area known in previous times as New Village or Government Center. This area was once used as the primary parking area for the Yosemite Museum and Visitor Center, with a capacity of 250 parking spaces.

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

4. Potentially Affected Resource(s):

Archeological Resources Present: Yes

Property Name: Yosemite Valley Archeological District **LCS:**

Historical Structures/Resources Present: Yes

Property Name: Yosemite Valley Historic District **LCS:**

Property Name: Camp Curry Historic District **LCS:**

Property Name: Yosemite Village Historic District **LCS:**

Cultural Landscapes Present: Yes

Ethnographic Resources Present: No

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

Yes/No	The proposed action will...
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)
Yes	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)
No	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: Hope Schear

Date: 05/09/2022

Comments: Compliance complete. SHPO concurrence received 5/9/2022. No comments, concerns, or objections received through tribal consultation.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: ___No Potential to Cause Effect ___No Historic Properties Affected X No

Adverse Effect ___Adverse Effect ___Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: Please follow all specialist's recommendations.

Doc Method: Standard 4-Step Process

[X] Anthropologist

Name: Liz Williams

Date: 05/02/2022

Comments: Project submitted for tribal consultation in May 2021 Tribal Spreadsheet emailed to tribes for 30 day review on May.27.21. No tribal comments received within 30 day review period. However, most tribes have stated that they would like to have a tribal monitor present during all ground disturbance. Tribal monitor is highly recommended.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: ☐ No Potential to Cause Effect ☐ No Historic Properties Affected ☐ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect ☐ Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

[X] Archeologist

Name: Matthew Flynn

Date: 07/13/2021

Comments: Reviewed project Design Development document and compared planned locations to known site boundaries and conducted an internal literature review. Excluding stop 2 and stop 10, proposed work in Yosemite Village as displayed on page G1.2 fall inside [REDACTED] which listed in the California register and determined eligible for the National Register by the keeper. All stops displayed on page G1.2 fall within the Mundy 1987 survey of Yosemite Village, which took place over the course of 9 days in July of 1987.

Curry Village and Campgrounds Key Plan on page G1.3 has plans adjacent to [REDACTED] (See page C1.4 stops 13A and 21, and Curry Village walkway page C1.6 and C2.5) which were surveyed during the 2004 Hicks et al review of the area in preparation for building new housing. Sites 1979H and 1980H are unevaluated, site 0827/H appears eligible for NR as a contributor to a NR eligible district through survey evaluation.

Plans on page C1.11 and C2.11 are adjacent to [REDACTED] which is listed in the California register and is considered eligible for inclusion by the keeper. Site 0045 was last surveyed for the 1986 Valley survey conducted by Kathleen Hull (YOSE 1986F, PA15)

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: Since this work will be done in the previously disturbed road prism the potential to impact resources is low, however many of the work sites are listed in the CR and eligible for the NR. Due to the archeological and ethnographic sensitivity of the valley work that occurs in or adjacent to archeological resources should be monitored by an archeologist and tribal monitor. If there are opportunities to reduce surface disturbance within archeological site boundaries, those should be explored. Sites [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] should be officially evaluated before work takes place adjacent to them in order to determine if monitoring is necessary. Work outside of known archeological boundaries does not require monitoring, but construction crews should be aware of the potential for inadvertent finds and should be briefed before the initiation of construction as Yosemite valley is broadly an archeologically sensitive region.

Doc Method: Standard 4-Step Process

[X] Historical Architect

Name: Donald Faxon

Date: 08/04/2021

Comments: Reviewed project development plans and designs for shelters. Project appears compatible with existing historic features and resources in Historic District(s), yet is identifiable as new construction so as not to be confused as historic structures.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance ☐

Assessment of Effect: ☐ No Potential to Cause Effect ☐ No Historic Properties Affected ☒ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect ☐ Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: Standard 4-Step Process

☒ **Historical Landscape Architect**

Name: Richard Freitas

Date: 09/21/2021

Comments: No adverse effect, based on the recent change (2/10/2021, see attached materials from Jim Donovan) to pull back the proposed pedestrian walkway behind (west) of Shuttle Stop 14 to avoid infringing upon the footprint of the historic traffic aisle.

Overall, the project proposal's treatment and materials are compatible with the cultural landscape. The proposed site furnishings are in a style that is consistent with the design guidelines.

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: The plum tree impacted by shuttle stop 20 was not part of the Olmsted orchard plan and was not considered by the draft Orchard Management Plan or draft Fruit Trees DOE. The tree may be removed but the park should follow up with the core sample it took to confirm whether it was planted after 1910.

Doc Method: Standard 4-Step Process

No Reviews From: Curator, Historian, Other Advisor

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

Select with X	Assessment of Effect
	No Potential to Cause Effects
	No Historic Properties Affected
X	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: Yes

SHPO Sent: Mar 30, 2022

SHPO Received: May 9, 2022

THPO Required: Yes

THPO Sent: May 27, 2022

THPO Received:

SHPO/THPO Notes:

Advisory Council Participating: No

Advisory Council Notes:

Additional Consulting Parties: No

4. Stipulations and Conditions: Following are listed any stipulations or conditions necessary to ensure that the assessment of effect above is consistent with 36 CFR Part 800 criteria of effect or to avoid or reduce potential adverse effects.

5. Mitigations/Treatment Measures: Measures to prevent or minimize loss or impairment of historic/prehistoric properties: (Remember that setting, location, and use may be relevant.) No mitigation measures required.

6. Assessment of Effect Notes:

There were concerns by the historic landscape architect that the following actions would result in an adverse effect:

1. Removal of a plumb tree
2. Development of Shuttle Stops 14 and 20 which would impact historic circulation patterns, namely the western-most drive aisle of the orchard parking area

The plumb tree was determined through core sample analysis and background research to not be associated with the historic orchard. The westernmost drive aisle in the historic plans for the orchard parking area is non-extant. The current project would not further affect historic circulation patterns of the orchard parking area.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Section 106 Coordinator Hope Schear **Date:** March 14, 2022
Signature: _____

E. SUPERINTENDENT'S APPROVAL

The proposed work conforms to the NPS *Management Policies* and *Cultural Resource Management Guideline*, and I have reviewed and approve the recommendations, stipulations, or conditions noted in Section C of this form.

Superintendent Signature: Ephriam Dickson for Cicely Muldoon **Date:** July 15, 2022



Other Compliance/Consultations Form

Park Name: Yosemite National Park

PEPC Project Number: 99242

Project Title: Improve Shuttle and Transit Bus Stops in Yosemite Village and Curry Village

Project Type: Construction Permit

Project Location:

County, State: Mariposa, CA **District, Section:** Yosemite Valley

Project Leader: Jim Donovan

ESA

Any Federal Species in the project Area? Yes

If species in area: Not Likely to Adversely Affect

Was Biological Assessment prepared? Yes

Sent to FWS:

FWS Response: Dec 8, 2018

Sent to NMFS:

NMFS Response:

If Biological Assessment prepared, concurred? Yes

Formal Consultation required? Yes

Formal Consultation Notes:

Fisher are not known to occur in the project area. Project actions are covered by the fisher BO and will be a no effect as long as mitigations are followed.

Project area in the vicinity [REDACTED] are in close proximity to aquatic habitat that may be occupied by California red-legged frogs ('CRLF'; listed as 'threatened'). The project activities are limited to the roadway bus stops and are unlikely to impact aquatic habitat. Due to the limited duration and scope of activities, as well as the protective measures that will be implemented, the project "may affect, but is unlikely to adversely affect" the California red-legged frog. The project is being placed under the 2018 Biological Opinion issued by the USFWS (attached). The following resource protections will be enacted:

- 1) Workers will be made aware that CRLF occupy Yosemite Valley (please see attached educational handout) and will be given an educational briefing on protection measures and identification.
- 2) Trenches or holes will be backfilled at the end of every day. Any trenches that cannot be backfilled at the end of the day must have wildlife escape ramps installed.
- 3) Project actions [REDACTED] will preferably occur during dry months of the year (May to September), during times when precipitation is not forecast.
- 4) Project workers will obey park speed limits and exercise extra vigilance while driving during worm/wet conditions to avoid vehicle strikes of frogs and toads.
- 5) If a CRLF is found in the project area, all work must cease within 500 feet of the observation and the Aquatic Ecologist must be immediately contacted (Rob_Grasso@nps.gov; 209-379-1438). Work at the

site can resume at the discretion of the Aquatic Ecologist. Nobody except the park Aquatic Ecologist or Wildlife Biologist may move or handle a CRLF.

Formal Consultation Concluded: Dec 8, 2018

Any State listed Species in the Project Area?

Consultation Information:

General Notes:

Data Entered By: Heather Mackey

Date: Mar 21, 2022

ESA Mitigations

Mitigation ID	Text
128550	1) Workers will be made aware that California Red Legged Frogs (CRLF) occupy Yosemite Valley (please see attached educational handout) and will be given an educational briefing on protection measures and identification. 2) Trenches or holes will be backfilled at the end of every day. Any trenches that cannot be backfilled at the end of the day must have wildlife escape ramps installed. 3) Project actions [REDACTED] will preferably occur during dry months of the year (May to September), during times when precipitation is not forecast. 4) Project workers will obey park speed limits and exercise extra vigilance while driving during worm/wet conditions to avoid vehicle strikes of frogs and toads. 5) If a CRLF is found in the project area, all work must cease within 500 feet of the observation and the Aquatic Ecologist must be immediately contacted (Rob_Grasso@nps.gov; 209-379-1438). Work at the site can resume at the discretion of the Aquatic Ecologist. Nobody except the park Aquatic Ecologist or Wildlife Biologist may move or handle a CRLF.

Floodplains/Wetlands/§404 Permits

Question	Yes/No	Details
A.1. Is project in 100- or 500-year floodplain or flash flood hazard area?		None
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	None
D. State Section 401 Permit?	No	Issue Date: Expiration Date:
E. Tribal Water Quality Permit?	No	None
F. CZM Consistency determination needed?		N/A
G. Erosion & Sediment Control Plan Required?	No	None
H. Any other permits required?	No	Permit Information:
Other Information:		

Data Entered By: Laura Stevens

Date: Mar 18, 2022

Floodplains & Wetlands Mitigations

No Floodplains & Wetlands mitigations are associated with this project.

Wilderness

Question	Yes/No	Details
A. Does this project occur in or adjacent to Designated, Recommended, Proposed, Study, Eligible, or Potential Wilderness?	No	None
B. Is the only place to conduct this project in wilderness?	No	None
C. Is the project necessary for the administration of the area as wilderness?	No	None
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)	No	None
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)	No	None
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.	N/A	Initiation Date: Completed Date: Approved Date:
Other Information:	No	None

Data Entered By: Laura Stevens

Date: Mar 18, 2022

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)	Yes
G. Other:	No

Other Information:

Data Entered By: Laura Stevens

Date: Mar 18, 2022