



IN REPLY REFER TO:
L7615(YOSE-PM)

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Yosemite National Park
P. O. Box 577
Yosemite, California 95389

Memorandum

To: Sean McCabe, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2010-002 El Portal Egan Residence Roof Installation (28442)

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:

- No mitigations identified.

//Luis Shram// (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
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite NP
Date: 10/23/2009

Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2010-002 El Portal Eagan Residence Roof Installation

PEPC ID: 28442

Project Description: This project entails replacing the roof at 9723 Rocky Road in Old El Portal. The existing composite shingle roof has reached its useful life and has started to leak. A contractor has determined that when the house was initially constructed the rafters were spaced too far apart and many have lost structural integrity. Due to fire concerns the resident has chosen to replace the existing roof with a standing seam metal roof which will be more fire resistant.

The scope of work includes replacing the existing composite shingle roof with a tan colored metal roof, replacing rafters, and replacing gutters and downspouts. This roof replacement will not change the existing footprint or increase capacity. All construction debris will be removed by the contractor and taken to the landfill. The contractor will comply with the 6 pm to 8 am noise ordinance.

Project Location:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

- No mitigations identified.

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.3 Routine maintenance and repairs to non-historic structures, facilities, utilities, grounds and trails.

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.

Park Acting Superintendent //Luis Shram// (acting)

Date 11/13/09

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



National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite NP
Date: 10/23/2009

ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 10/23/2009

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

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite NP
Project Title: 2010-002 El Portal Egan Residence Roof Installation
PEPC Project Number: 28442
Project Type: Residence Upgrade (OTHER)
Project Location: County, State: **Mariposa, California** District: **El Portal**
Project Leader: Sean McCabe

Preliminary drawings attached? Yes

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

B. 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.	No				
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			This project involves use of generators that emit minimal air emissions.
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			Construction noises are associated with this re-roofing project.
5. Water quality or quantity	No				
6. Streamflow characteristics	No				
7. Marine or estuarine resources	No				
8. Floodplains or wetlands	No				
9. Land use, including occupancy, income, values,	No				

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
ownership, type of use					
10. Rare or unusual vegetation – old growth timber, riparian, alpine	No				
11. Species of special concern (plant or animal; state or federal listed or proposed for listing) or their habitat	No				
12. Unique ecosystems, biosphere reserves, World Heritage Sites	No				
13. Unique or important wildlife or wildlife habitat	No				
14. Unique or important fish or fish habitat	No				
15. Introduce or promote non-native species (plant or animal)	No				
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	No				
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				
18. Archeological resources		Negligible			El Portal Archeological District; the assessment of effect is "No Historic Properties Affected."
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes	No				
21. Ethnographic resources	No				
22. Museum collections (objects, specimens, and archival and manuscript collections)	No				
23. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure	No				
24. Minority and low income populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.	No				
25. Energy resources	No				
26. Other agency or tribal land	No				

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
use plans or policies					
27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability					
28. Urban quality, gateway communities, etc.	No				
29. Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity	No				
30. Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal, paleontological resources)?	No				

C. 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?		N		
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?		N		
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?		N		
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		N		
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		N		
F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		N		

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
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?		N		
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?		N		
I. Violate a federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		N		
J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		N		
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)?		N		
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)?		N		

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.

D. OTHER INFORMATION

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

Did personnel conduct a site visit? **No**

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**

E. INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM SIGNATORIES

<u>Interdisciplinary Team</u>	<u>Field of Expertise</u>
David V. Uberuaga	Acting Superintendent
Dennis Schramm	Acting Deputy Superintendent
Kristina Rylands	Acting Chief of Planning
Mark Butler	Chief of Project Management
Katariina Tuovinen	Chief of Administration Management
Paul Laymon	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
Sean McCabe	Project Leader
Elexis Mayer	Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
Jeannette Simons	NHPA Specialist
Renea Kennec	NEPA Specialist

F. 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 Specialists	Date
<u>//Renea Kennec//</u> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	<u>10/27/09</u>
<u>//Elexis Mayer//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Elexis Mayer	<u>11/4/09</u>
<u>//Mark A. Butler//</u> Chief, Project Management – Mark Butler	<u>11/6/09</u>

Approved:

Acting Superintendent	Date
<u>//Charles Cuvelier// (acting)</u> David V. Uberuaga	<u>11/20/09</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: **October 23, 2009**

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite NP

Project Number: 28442

Project Type: Residence Upgrade (OTHER)

Project Location: County, State: Mariposa, California District, Section: El Portal,

Project Manager: Sean McCabe

Project Title: 2010-002 El Portal Egan Residence Roof Installation

PARK ESF ADDENDUM QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST				
1. Listed or proposed threatened or endangered species (Federal or State)?		X		
2. Species of special concern (Federal or State)?		X		
3. Park rare plants or vegetation?		X		
4. Potential habitat for any special-status species listed above?		X		
NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST				
5. Entail ground disturbance?		X		
6. Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		X		
7. Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		X		
8. Has a National Register form been completed?		X		
9. Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?		X		
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST				
10. Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor?	X			Merced River.
11. Fall within the bed and banks AND will affect the free-flow of the river?		X		
12. Have the possibility of affecting water quality of the area?		X		
13. Remain consistent with its river segment classification?			X	
14. Protect and enhance river ORVs?			X	
15. Fall within the River Protection Overlay?		X		
16. If Yes, remain consistent with conditions of the River Protection Overlay?			X	
17. Remain consistent with the areas Management			X	

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
Zoning?				
18. Fall on a tributary of a Wild and Scenic River?		X		
19. Will the project encroach or intrude upon the Wild and Scenic River corridor?		X		
20. Will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values?		X		
WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST				
21. Within designated Wilderness?		X		
22. Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		X		



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite **Park District:** El Portal

2. **Project Description:**

a. **Project Name:** 2010-002 El Portal Egan Residence Roof Installation

b. **Date:** October 23, 2009

c. **PEPC Project ID Number:** 28442

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

 No

 X Yes, Source or reference: El Portal Archeological District.

 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 Resources:** None

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: Renea Kennec **Date:** October 23, 2009 **Title:** Environmental Protection Specialist **Telephone:** 209-379-1038

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:

☒ Archeologist
Name: Laura Kirn
Date: 10/20/2009
Comments:

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance ☒
Assessment of Effect: ☒ No Historic Properties Affected ☐ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect ☐ Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: No Potential to Cause Effects [800.3(a)(1)]

☒ 106 Advisor
Name: Jeannette Simons
Date: 10/26/2009
Comments: A level One CLI was made in 2005; some buildings in Old El Portal are eligible for listing as an HP, this one is not; the cultural landscape as a historic district does not seem to maintain integrity as a HP. The changes are appropriate to the history of the area.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance ☐
Assessment of Effect: ☒ No Historic Properties Affected ☐ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse Effect ☐ Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

☒ Anthropologist
Name: Jeannette Simons, American Indian Liaison.
Date: 10/26/2009
Comments: The project is within the boundary of an American Indian traditional use are, but the project will not impact traditional resources.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [☐]

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

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

[☒] Historical Landscape Architect

Name: David Humphrey

Date: 10/21/2009

Comments:

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [☐]

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

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: No Potential to Cause Effects [800.3(a)(1)]

No Reviews From: Curator, Historical Architect, Historian, 106 Advisor, Other Advisor, Anthropologist

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

☒ 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. STREAMLINED REVIEW UNDER THE 2008 SERVICEWIDE PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT (PA)

The above action meets all conditions for a streamlined review under section III of the 2008 Servicewide PA for Section 106 compliance.

APPLICABLE STREAMLINED REVIEW Criteria
(Specify 1-16 of the list of streamlined review criteria.)

[☐] C. PLAN-RELATED UNDERTAKING

Consultation and review of the proposed undertaking were completed in the context of a plan review process, in accordance with the 2008 Servicewide PA and 36 CFR Part 800.

Specify plan/EA/EIS: _____

☐ D. UNDERTAKING RELATED TO ANOTHER AGREEMENT

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

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. No Potential to Cause Effects [800.3(a)(1)]

☐ G. 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: 10/27/09

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 //Luis Shram// (acting)

Date: 11/13/09

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