



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: Marea Ortiz, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2009-099 Wawona Visitor Center Sign Installation (27464)

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. Ueberuaga

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.*



---

## Categorical Exclusion Form

**Project:** 2009-099 Wawona Visitor Center Sign Installation

**PEPC Project Number:** 27464

**Project Description:** The goal of this project is to create and place new signs that would easily direct visitors to Wawona's Visitor Center at Hill's Studio. Currently, there are two small road signs that read "Visitor Information" and vaguely direct visitors to the center, and there are no signs to indicate that Hill's Studio is a visitor center. Any new sign installations would be buried in a hole that measures one foot in diameter by two feet deep.

The two road signs would be upgraded and changed to read "Visitor Center" and would incorporate the "?" international symbol.

Three wood-routed signs would be created and hung on the front of the building to read: Visitor Center, Wilderness Permits, and Open/Closed. In addition, a large split-rail constructed sign would be placed at the base of the stairs near the Wawona Store parking area restrooms. It would read: Visitor Center, Hill's Studio, and Wilderness Permits.

An existing way-finding post is located at the top of the stairs directing visitors to Hill's studio. A similar wood-routed sign to read "Shuttle" would be added to the post. This sign would route visitors between the lower Wawona Store and the upper Wawona Hotel parking lots, while also directing them to the visitor center and the shuttle.

It is recommended that a few Incense Cedar trees on the Hill's Studio grounds be trimmed and/or removed, if necessary, to allow visitors to see the signs on the building.

The proposed signs would be designed by the Branch of History, Architecture, and Landscapes in coordination with the Division of Interpretation and Education. The signs would be produced at the Yosemite Sign Shop.

**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.5 Installation of signs, displays, kiosks, etc.

On the basis of the environmental impact information in the statutory compliance file, with which I am familiar, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No exceptional circumstances or conditions in Section 3-6 apply, and the action is fully described in Section 3-4 of DO-12.

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

Date 1/8/10

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



## ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

### DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: **11/18/2009**

Updated May 2007 - per 2004 Departmental Manual revisions and proposed Director's Order 12 changes

### A. PROJECT INFORMATION

**Park Name:** Yosemite National Park  
**Project Title:** 2009-099 Wawona Visitor Center Sign Installation  
**PEPC Project Number:** 27464  
**Project Type:** Sign installation (OTHER)  
**Project Location:** County, State: Mariposa, California  
**Project Leader:** Marea Ortiz

**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 or natural resources	No Effect	Negligible Effects	Minor Effects	Exceeds Minor Effects	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
1. Geologic resources – soils, bedrock, streambeds, etc.		Negligible			The sign installation includes holes to be dug two feet deep by one foot in diameter.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality	No				
4. Soundscapes	No				
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, ownership, type of use	No				
10. Rare or unusual vegetation – old growth timber, riparian, alpine	No				

<b>Identify potential effects to the following physical or natural resources</b>	<b>No Effect</b>	<b>Negligible Effects</b>	<b>Minor Effects</b>	<b>Exceeds Minor Effects</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
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				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	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.		Negligible			Visitor experience will be enhanced by clear signage directing them to the visitor center.
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				
18. Museum collections (objects, specimens, and archival and manuscript collections)	No				
19. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure	No				
20. Minority and low income populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.	No				
21. Energy resources	No				
22. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	No				
23. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability	No				
24. Urban quality, gateway communities, etc.	No				
25. Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity	No				

<b>Identify potential effects to the following physical or natural resources</b>	<b>No Effect</b>	<b>Negligible Effects</b>	<b>Minor Effects</b>	<b>Exceeds Minor Effects</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
26. Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal, paleontological resources)?	No				
<b>Identify potential effects to the following cultural resources</b>	<b>No Historic Properties Affect</b>	<b>No Adverse Effect</b>	<b>Adverse Effect</b>		<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
1. Archeological resources		No			
2. Prehistoric/historic structure		No			
3. Cultural landscapes		No			Wawona Historic District.
4. Ethnographic resources		No			

### C. MANDATORY CRITERIA

<b>Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Comment or Data Needed to Determine</b>
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		

<b>Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Comment or Data Needed to Determine</b>
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		
I. Violate a federal law, or a 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 (Executive Order 12898)?		No		
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)?		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		

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?** Yes, History, Architecture, and Landscapes staff members.

**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	Acting 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
Marea Ortiz	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>1/5/10</u>
<u>//Elexis Mayer//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Elexis Mayer	<u>1/5/10</u>
<u>//Mark A. Butler//</u> Chief, Project Management – Mark Butler	<u>1/6/10</u>

Approved:

Acting Superintendent	Date
<u>//Luis Shram// (acting)</u> David V. Uberuaga	<u>1/8/10</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: November 18, 2009

### PROJECT INFORMATION

**Park Name:** Yosemite National Park  
**Project Title:** 2009-099 Wawona Visitor Center Sign Installation  
**PEPC Project Number:** 27464  
**Project Type:** Sign installation (OTHER)  
**Project Location:** County, State: Mariposa, California  
**Project Leader:** Marea Ortiz

### PARK ESF ADDENDUM QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
<b>SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST</b>				
1. Listed or proposed threatened or endangered species (Federal or State)?		No		
2. Species of special concern (Federal or State)?		No		
3. Park rare plants or vegetation?		No		
4. Potential habitat for any special-status species listed above?		No		
<b>NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
5. Entail ground disturbance?	Yes			The sign installation includes holes to be dug two feet deep by one foot in diameter. The assessment of effect is "No Adverse Effect."
6. Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?	Yes			
7. Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?	Yes			This project entails adding a sign to the porch of the visitor center; the assessment of effect is "No Adverse Effect."
8. Has a National Register form been completed?		No		

<b>ESF Addendum Questions</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
9. Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?	Yes			Thomas Hill Studio, #100241.
<b>WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
10. Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor? (Name the river corridor)	Yes			South Fork of Merced River.
11. Fall within the bed and banks AND will affect the free-flow of the river?		No		
12. Have the possibility of affecting water quality of the area?		No		
13. Remain consistent with its river segment classification?	Yes			The Wawona segment is classified as "Recreational."
14. Protect and enhance river ORVs?	Yes			
15. Fall on a tributary of a Wild and Scenic River?		No		
16. Will the project encroach or intrude upon the Wild and Scenic River corridor?		No		
17. Will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values?		No		
18. Consistent with the provisions in the Merced River Plan Settlement Agreement?	Yes			
<b>WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
19. Within designated Wilderness?		No		
20. Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		No		



EXISTING CONDITION



DETAIL VIEW WITH CLOSED SIGN

**MAIN SIGN COMPOSITION**

MATERIALS: PAINTED 3/4"  
PLYWOOD, WITH 6" DIE  
CUT WOOD LETTERS  
ATTACHED TO SURFACE.  
BRONZE EDGE FINISH

SIZE: ~9" X 60"

INSTALLATION: HEAVY  
DUTY CHAIN ATTACHED  
TO BEAM WITH EYE  
HOOKS ON SIGN

**VIEW WITH OPEN SIGN**



ENTRY HANGING SIGN PROPOSAL ON VERANDA  
09/30/09

WAWONA VISITOR CENTER AT HILL'S STUDIO  
SIGN DESIGN AND INSTALLATION  
RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND SCIENCE



EXISTING CONDITION



EXISTING WAYFINDING SIGN TO REMAIN

**MAIN SIGN COMPOSITION**

MATERIALS: PAINTED  
SIGN ON SURFACE OF  
BEADBOARD BASE

SIZE: ~3' X 6'

**VIEW LOOKING SOUTHEAST TOWARDS WEST FACADE**



APPROACH SIGNAGE  
09/30/09

WAWONA VISITOR CENTER AT HILL'S STUDIO  
SIGN DESIGN AND INSTALLATION  
RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND SCIENCE



EXISTING CONDITION



COMPOSITE RENDERING WITH NEW SIGN

**MAIN SIGN COMPOSITION**

MATERIALS: ROUGH  
PAINTED CEDAR 6" X 8"  
RAILS, STAINED WITH  
ROUTED PAINTED  
LETTERING

SIZE: ~3' X 6'

INSTALLATION: SIMILAR  
FORMAT TO EXISTING  
SPLIT RAIL FENCING; LAG  
BOLTS TO SUPPORT  
PLANKS

DETAIL RENDERING OF SPLIT RAIL SIGN



MAIN DIRECTIONAL SIGN AT NORTH PARKING LOT  
09/30/09

WAWONA VISITOR CENTER AT HILL'S STUDIO  
SIGN DESIGN AND INSTALLATION  
RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND SCIENCE



---

## ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

### A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park    **Park District:** Wawona

#### 2. Project Description:

a. **Project Name:** 2009-099 Wawona Visitor Center Sign Installation

b. **Date:** November 18, 2009

c. **PEPC Project ID Number:** 27464

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

No

Yes, Source or reference: **Wawona Historic District; Wawona Archeological District; Wawona Hotel National Historic Landmark; Thomas Hill Studio.**

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:

Archeological resources affected?

Name and number(s): Wawona Archeological District

NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

Historical structures/resources affected?

Name and number(s): Thomas Hill Studio    LCS 100241

NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

Name and number(s): Wawona Hotel National Historic Landmark

NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

Cultural landscapes affected?

Name and number(s): Wawona Historic District (CLI/DOE in prep)    Location:

Wawona

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

- No** Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure
- Yes** Replace historic features/elements in kind
- Yes** 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
- 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:** November 18, 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: Sonny Montague  
Date: 11/19/2009  
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: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

---

Historical Architect

Name: Sueann Brown

Date: 11/17/2009

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: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

---

Historical Landscape Architect

Name: David Humphrey

Date: 11/10/2009

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: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

---

No Reviews From: Curator, Archeologist, 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: 12/1/09

**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: 1/8/10

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