



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: Russ Balch, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2009-044 Glacier Point Area Well Drilling (25201)

The Leadership Team has reviewed the proposed project 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/are 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 drilling only occurs from August 15th to March 15th to avoid disturbing great gray owl habitat.
- 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.
- Ensure that all staging is in previously disturbed areas.

\\ Don L. Neubacher \\

Don L. Neubacher

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 National Park

Date: 09/20/2010

Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2009-044 Glacier Point Area Well Drilling and Water System Improvements

PEPC Project Number: 25201

Project Description: This project would replace the existing surface water supply for the Glacier Point developed area with a new well. The existing Glacier Point water system provides approximately 9,000 gallons per day. The current surface water collection system draws water from two surface water collection systems. Pothole Meadow and Union Point are subject to seasonal fluctuations in the water supply. Pending discovery of an adequate water supply (at least three gallons a minute) at the new well site the existing nine foot by six foot water treatment chlorination and filtration building will be replaced with a new ten foot by 18 foot water treatment building containing chlorination equipment and a backup generator. The existing 300,000 gallon, 48 foot diameter water storage tank will remain in use.

The target location of the new well will be located on a former alignment of the Glacier Point Road near the Sentinel Dome Road. An architectural screen wall with a footprint of approximately 90 square feet and will serve to protect the well site. Water and electric lines will be installed to the new well site. These new lines will be buried and placed within previously disturbed utility and road alignments. Total length of the new electric line will be 3,330 feet. A new water line will be within the same utility corridor for 1,120 feet. All trenching will involve removing topsoil by hand and returning the topsoil to its original location to preserve the native seed bank. No construction will take place in designated wilderness.

All work will be performed by park staff, local, county, state and federal regulations. Any private contractors will be properly licensed for the work they will perform.

Project Location:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

- Ensure drilling only occurs from August 15th to March 15th to avoid disturbing great gray owl habitat.
- 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.

- Ensure that all staging is in previously disturbed areas.

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.15 Installation of underground utilities in previously disturbed areas having stable soils, or in an existing utility right-of-way.

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 Superintendent \\ Don L. Neubacher \\

Date 10/20/10

*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 National Park
Date: 09/20/2010

ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 07/26/2010

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: 2009-044 Glacier Point Area Well Drilling
PEPC Project Number: 25201
Project Type: Facility Rehabilitation (FR)
Project Location: County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Russ Balch

Background information 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.		Negligible			The existing nine foot by six foot building will be replaced by a ten foot by 18 foot building. Total area affected will be 12 feet by 20 feet.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			Temporary air emissions from generators will occur throughout the project.
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			Construction noises are associated with the drilling.

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
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				
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.
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				This project includes mitigation measures to avoid non-native species from entering the park.
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	No				
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources		Negligible			The well drilling would have temporary effect on visitor experience.
18. Archeological resources	No				
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes		Negligible			The Glacier Point Road Historic District.
21. Ethnographic resources	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
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 use plans or policies	No				
27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability	No				
28. Urban quality, gateway communities, etc.	No				
29. Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity	No				This project would improve the public drinking water quality by replacing a surface water system with a ground water system.
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?		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		No		

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
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?				
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?		No		
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		No		
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		No		
F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		No		
G. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office?		No		
H. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		No		
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		

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

Interdisciplinary Team	Field of Expertise
Don L. Neubacher	Superintendent
Kathleen Morse	Chief of Planning
Mark Butler	Chief of Project Management
Katariina Tuovinen	Chief of Administration Management
Ed Walls	Chief of Facilities Management
Niki Nicholas	Chief of Resources Management & Science
Marty Nielson	Chief of Business and Revenue Management
Tom Medema	Chief of Interpretation and Education
Charles Cuvelier	Chief of Visitor and Resource Protection
Russ Balch	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>10/15/10</u>
<u>// Elexis Mayer //</u> Compliance Program Manager – Elexis Mayer	<u>10/19/10</u>
<u>// Mark A Butler //</u> Chief, Project Management – Mark Butler	<u>10/19/10</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Don L. Neubacher //</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>10/20/10</u>

*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 National Park
Date: 07/28/2010

PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: July 28, 2010

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2009-044 Glacier Point Area Well Drilling
PEPC Project Number: 25201
Project Type: Facility Rehabilitation (FR)
Project Location: County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Russ Balch

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)?		No		
2. Species of special concern (Federal or State)?	Yes			Great Grey Owl; mitigation measures in place to protect habitat.
3. Park rare plants or vegetation?		No		
4. Potential habitat for any special-status species listed above?		No		
NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST				
5. Entail ground disturbance?	Yes			The existing nine foot by six foot building will be replaced by a ten foot by 12 foot building. Total area affected will be 12 feet by 14 feet.
6. Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		No		The assessment of effect is "No Historic Properties Affected."
7. Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		
8. Has a National Register form been completed?		No		
9. Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?		No		
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST				
10. Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor?		No		

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?			N/A	
14. Fall on a tributary of a Wild and Scenic River?		No		
15. Will the project encroach or intrude upon the Wild and Scenic River corridor?		No		
16. Will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values?		No		
17. Consistent with the provisions in the Merced River Plan Settlement Agreement?			Yes	
WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST				
18. Within designated Wilderness?		No		
19. Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		No		



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. Park: Yosemite National Park **Park district:** Glacier Point

2. Project Description:

a. Project Name: 2009-044 Glacier Point Area Well Drilling

b. Date: September 21, 2010

c. PEPC Project ID Number: 25201

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

 No

 X Yes, Source or reference: Glacier Point Road Historic District.

 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):

Cultural landscapes affected?

Name and number(s): Glacier Point Road Historic District

NR status: 5 - Found eligible for 106 purposes through consultation with the SHPO

Notes:

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)

 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)

 Other (please specify)

6. Measures to prevent or minimize loss or impairment of historic/prehistoric properties:

No Assessment of Effect mitigations identified

7. Supporting Study Data:

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: September 21, 2010 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: 08/17/2009

Comments:

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance ☐

Assessment of Effect: X 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)]

☒ Historical Architect

Name: Sueann Brown

Date: 07/19/2010

Comments:

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance ☐

Assessment of Effect: No Historic Properties Affected X 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: 07/19/2010

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, 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: 1999 Programmatic Agreement

☐ 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 Historic Preservation Officer:

Signature of Historic Preservation Officer: \\ Jeanette Simmons \\

Date: 9/21/10

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 Superintendent: \\ Don L. Neubacher \\

Date: 10/20/10

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