



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: Ron Gaunt
From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park
Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2011-022 Yosemite Lodge and Yosemite Village ADA Upgrades (37337)

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

For the proposed project actions to be within compliance requirements during project implementation, the following mitigations must be adhered to:

- 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 signage is reviewed by the park Interpretation and Education, David Restivo, 372-0645.
- Provide design drawings to the Cultural Anthropologist when available. Native American monitoring might be necessary based on review of design drawings.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

//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.*



Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2011-022 Yosemite Lodge and Yosemite Village ADA Upgrades

PEPC Project Number: 37337

Project Description:

This project proposes to construct various accessibility upgrades to the Yosemite Lodge and Yosemite Village areas located in Yosemite Valley. A design architect has inventoried and identified specific areas that need accessibility deficiencies corrected. Specific areas are:

1. Yosemite Village: The Path of Travel (POT) from ADA parking to the public entrance at the concessionaire Garage.
2. Yosemite Village: The POT from Degnan's Deli to the Village Store.
3. Yosemite Lodge: -
 - Design and construct multiple accessible paths of travel routes from parking to rooms and public services within Yosemite Lodge.
 - Design clear, logical signage.
 - This project may alter roadways to identify or locate accessible parking, repair or install curb ramps, modify walkways to conform to rise and slopes and configure surface materials to ensure the elimination of surface obstructions.
 - Concurrently with this project, an engineering firm will design parking lot re-surfacing.
4. Yosemite Lodge:
 - Alter the physical layout of the shuttle bus stop to make accessible.
 - Alter roadway striping to identify or locate the accessible stop.
 - Install curb ramps.
 - Modify walkways to conform to rise and slopes.
 - Configure surface materials to ensure the elimination of surface obstructions.
5. Yosemite Lodge:
 - Alter the physical layout of the amphitheatre and stage to make the seating arrangement, type and location accessible.
 - Install curb ramps.
 - Modify walkways to conform to rise and slopes.
 - Configure surface materials to ensure the elimination of surface obstructions.
6. Yosemite Lodge:
 - Alter the physical layout of the public restrooms in the Food Court and the Registration Lobby to be fully accessible including entry doors, accessible routes, toilet rooms, fixtures, stall doors, signage, hardware, fire alarms, and electrical controls.

7. Yosemite Lodge:

- Alter the physical layout of five rooms to increase the available number of accessible rooms including alterations to entry doors, signage, hardware, window controls, patio configurations, fire alarms, and electrical controls.

Schematic designs are currently being developed for each location listed above. Design will continue to 100% Construction Documents with internal reviews at the Schematic Design, Design Drawing, and Construction Document level by various park staff, including the accessibility coordinator, Resources Management and Science, Anthropology branch staff and History, Architecture and Landscapes branch staff.

Project Locations:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

- 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 signage is reviewed by the park Interpretation and Education, Mary Kline, 372-0645.
- Provide design drawings to the Cultural Anthropologist when available. Native American monitoring might be necessary based on review of design drawings.

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.

Superintendent: //Don L. Neubacher//

Date: 12/7/11

Don L. Neubacher

*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: 07/26/2011

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: 2011-022 Yosemite Lodge and Yosemite Village ADA Upgrades
PEPC Project Number: 37337
Project Type: Facility Rehabilitation (FR)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Ron Gaunt

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				Minimal grading might be required to meet desired slopes; up to four to six inches under existing pavement.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality	No				
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			The accessibility upgrades will produce some temporary construction noises.
5. Water quality or quantity	No				
6. Streamflow	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
characteristics					
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		Negligible			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				
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	No				
17. Visitor	No				Visitor experience will be

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
experience, aesthetic resources					enhanced by compliant paths of travel.
18. Archeological resources		Negligible			Yosemite Valley Archeological District.
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes		Negligible			Yosemite Valley Historic District and Yosemite Village Historic District.
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 use plans or policies	No				
27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability	No				
28. Urban quality,	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
gateway communities, etc.					
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?		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		No		

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
environmental effects?				
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		
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		Mitigated; vehicles will be inspected for noxious weeds or non-native invasive species prior to entering the park.

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

1. Are personnel preparing this form familiar with the site? Yes
2. Did personnel conduct a site visit? No

3. Is the project in an approved plan such as a General Management Plan or an Implementation Plan with an accompanying NEPA document? No
4. Are there any interested or affected agencies or parties? No
5. Has consultation with all affected agencies or tribes been completed? N/A
6. 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>
Don L. Neubacher	Superintendent
Michael Gauthier	Chief of Staff
Kathleen Morse	Chief of Planning
Randy Fong	Chief of Project Management
Dale St. Vincent	Acting Chief of Administration Management
Ed Walls	Chief of Facilities Management
Joe Meyer	Acting 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
Ron Gaunt	Project Leader
Elexis Mayer	Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
Elexis Mayer	Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Renea Kenec	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>11/22/11</u>
<u>//Elexis J. Mayer//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Elexis Mayer	<u>11/29/11</u>
<u>//Randy Fong//</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>12/1/11</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Don L. Neubacher//</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>12/7/11</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: July 28, 2011

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2011-022 Yosemite Lodge and Yosemite Village ADA Upgrades
PEPC Project Number: 37337
Project Type: Facility Rehabilitation (FR)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Ron Gaunt

PARK ESF ADDENDUM QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST				
Listed or proposed threatened or endangered species (Federal or State)?		No		
Species of special concern (Federal or State)?		No		
Park rare plants or vegetation?		No		
Potential habitat for any special-status species listed above?		No		
NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST				
Entail ground disturbance?	Yes			Up to four - six inches of ground disturbance.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?	Yes			Yosemite Valley Archeological District; the assessment of effect is "No Adverse Effect."
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		
Has a National Register form been completed?		No		

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
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				
Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor? (Name the river corridor)	Yes			Merced River.
Fall within the bed and banks AND will affect the free-flow of the river?		No		
Have the possibility of affecting water quality of the area?		No		
Remain consistent with its river segment classification?	Yes			
Fall on a tributary of a Wild and Scenic River?		No		
Will the project encroach or intrude upon the Wild and Scenic River corridor?		No		
Will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values?		No		
Consistent with the provisions in the Merced River Plan Settlement Agreement?	Yes			
WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST				
Within designated Wilderness		No		
Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		No		



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

- a) **Project Name:** 2011-022 Yosemite Lodge and Yosemite Village ADA Upgrades
- b) **Date Prepared:** 07/26/2011
- c) **PEPC Project Number:** 37337
- d) **Locations:** Mariposa, CA

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

No
 Yes

Source or reference: Yosemite Valley Archeological District; Yosemite Valley Historic District; Yosemite Village Historic 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 Resource(s):**

Archeological resources affected?

Name and number(s): Yosemite Valley Archeological District
NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

Cultural landscapes affected?

Name and number(s): Yosemite Valley Historic District
NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

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

Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure
 Replace historic features/elements in kind
 Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure

- No Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)
 Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting
No 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
 Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting, landscape elements,
No or archeological or ethnographic resources
- No Involve a real property transaction (exchange, sale, or lease of land or structures)
- 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] Archeologist

Name: Laura Kirn

Date: 07/03/2011

Comments: Provide design drawings to archeologist when available.

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: Archeological monitoring where necessary, based on review of design drawings.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

[X] Anthropologist

Name: Jennifer Hardin

Date: 11/18/2011

Comments: Provide design drawings to Cultural Anthropologist when available.

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: Native American monitoring where necessary, based on review of design drawings.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

Historical Landscape Architect
Name: David Humphrey
Date: 07/15/2011

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, Historical Architect, Historian, 106 Advisor, Other Advisor

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

No Historic Properties Affected 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. 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. COMBINED NEPA/NHPA Document

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. Memo to SHPO/THPO

H. Memo to ACHP

3. Additional Consulting Parties Information:

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 Assessment of Effect mitigations identified.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Acting Historic Preservation Officer //Elexis J. Mayer// Date 11/27/11
Elexis Mayer

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: //Don L. Neubacher// Date: 12/7/11
Don L. Neubacher

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