



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, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

**From:** Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

**Subject:** NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2012-047 Curry Village - Replace Gift Shop Floor and Doors (44209)

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, 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:

- Ensure consultation with the park's History, Architecture, and Landscape Branch staff throughout the project to guarantee the window specifications are compatible with the historic character of the district.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 44209.

//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: 12/17/2012**

## **Categorical Exclusion Form**

**Project:** 2012-047 Curry Village - Replace Gift Shop Floor and Doors

**PEPC Project Number:** 44209

**Project Description:**

This project would replace the floor including finished floor, subfloor, floor joists and other structural members, as well as the underfloor electrical conduit and wiring at the Curry Village Gift Shop. The gift shop is located at the Pavilion complex, which was constructed in 1975 and is a non-historic structure within the Camp Curry Historic District. The gift shop provides essential services to the thousands of visitors who visit Curry Village each year. The existing floor is in poor condition and requires structural intervention for continued use. The gift shop sustains heavy use and the floor has deteriorated in many areas. The electrical system in the gift shop is largely non-code compliant and needs an upgrade.

Preliminary investigation indicates that the existing concrete footings are adequate, indicating that replacement is not necessary. Therefore, there is no ground disturbance expected for this project. During the removal of the floor, inspections will be performed to determine the integrity of the existing supports, posts and joists. Deteriorated or inadequate structural members will be replaced, as necessary. It is anticipated that structural joist replacement will be significant, but cannot be determined until the flooring is removed.

In addition to replacing the floor system, it is necessary to replace the underfloor electrical conduit and wiring at the gift shop, as well as some non-code compliant wall electrical. The emergency exiting signage and emergency lighting would require an upgrade based on discussions with the park fire marshal. Devices will be hardwired as a part of this project. The existing underground electrical is currently being supported on the existing framing and will require removal when the floor is demolished. New electrical conduit and wire will be installed and properly supported on the new floor joists as part of this project.

Delaware North Companies (DNC) is planning an interior store remodel in conjunction with the floor replacement work. The remodel proposes to replace one set of exterior doors with windows that will increase natural light and improve the overall visitor flow within the store. A three foot pony wall within the space is also proposed for removal. The proposed layout, including the removal of one exterior door, has been reviewed by the park fire marshal who has determined it will provide adequate egress for visitors.

**Project Locations:**

Mariposa County, CA

**Mitigation:**

- Ensure consultation with the park's History, Architecture, and Landscape Branch staff throughout the project to guarantee the window specifications are compatible with the historic character of the district.

**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 1/3/13

*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: 12/17/2012

## ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

### DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 12/17/2012

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:** 2012-047 Curry Village - Replace Gift Shop Floor and Doors  
**PEPC Project Number:** 44209  
**Project Type:** Capital Improvement (CI)  
**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				No anticipated ground disturbance with this project.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality	No				

<b>Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural 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>
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			Some temporary construction noises are associated with this 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, 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	No				

<b>Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural 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>
species (plant or animal)					
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	No				
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources		Negligible			There will be some temporary disruption in customer service but this project will be completed during the low visitation season.
18. Archeological resources	No				The project area is within the Yosemite Valley Archeological District but no archeological resources will be affected.
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes	No				The gift shop is located within the Yosemite Valley Historic District and Camp Curry Historic District but is not a historic building.
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,	No				

<b>Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural 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>
ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.					
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				
30. Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal, paleontological 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		No		

<b>Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:</b>	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
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		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>
or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?				
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		

**D. OTHER INFORMATION**

1. Are personnel preparing this form familiar with the site? Yes
- 1.A. Did personnel conduct a site visit? No
2. Is the project in an approved plan such as a General Management Plan or an Implementation Plan with an accompanying NEPA document? No
3. Are there any interested or affected agencies or parties? No
4. Has consultation with all affected agencies or tribes been completed? No
5. 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
Woody Smeck	Deputy Superintendent
Michael Gauthier	Chief of Staff
Kathleen Morse	Chief of Planning
Randy Fong	Chief of Project Management
Teri Austin	Chief of Administration Management
Ed Walls	Chief of Facilities Management
Linda C. Mazzu	Chief of Resources Management & Science
Tara Riggs	Acting 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
Madelyn Ruffner	Acting Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
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 Kenec//</u> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kenec	<u>12/16/12</u>
<u>//Madelyn Ruffner//</u> Acting Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>12/19/12</u>
<u>//Randy Fong//</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>12/20/12</u>

**Approved:**

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Don L. Neubacher//</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>12/20/12</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: 12/17/2012

## PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: December 17, 2012

### PROJECT INFORMATION

**Park Name:** Yosemite National Park  
**Project Title:** 2012-047 Curry Village - Replace Gift Shop Floor and Doors  
**PEPC Project Number:** 44209  
**Project Type:** Capital Improvement (CI)  
**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
<b>SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST</b>				
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		
<b>NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
Entail ground disturbance?		No		
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		No		This project is within the Yosemite Valley Archeological District but no archeological resources will be affected.
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		The gift shop lies within the Yosemite Valley Historic District and the Camp Curry Historic District but is not a historic structure.

<b>ESF Addendum Questions</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
Has a National Register form been completed?			N/A	
Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?		No		
<b>WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
Fall within a wild and scenic 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			
<b>WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
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:**

**Project Name:** 2012-047 Curry Village - Replace Gift Shop Floor and Doors  
**Prepared by:** Renea Kennec  
**Date Prepared:** 12/17/2012  
**Telephone:** 209-379-1038  
**PEPC Project Number:** 44209

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

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

No  
 Yes

Source or reference: Yosemite Valley Historic District; Camp Curry Historic District; Yosemite Valley 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 Resource(s):**

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

Yes Potentially affect presently unidentified cultural resources  
Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting,  
 No landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources  
Involve a real property transaction (exchange, sale, or lease of land or  
 No 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:

---

Archeologist  
Name: Laura Kirn  
Date: 12/04/2012

*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)]

---

Historical Architect  
Name: Gabrielle Harlan  
Date: 10/17/2012

*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: This is a non-historic building located in a historic  
district. Therefore, changes to the exterior of the building must be compatible with the character of the  
historic district. DNC will continue to consult with History Architecture and Landscape Branch Staff  
throughout the project to ensure the window specifications are compatible with the historic character of  
the district.

---

Anthropologist  
Name: Jennifer Hardin  
Date: 12/06/2012

*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: Kevin McCardle  
Date: 10/15/2012

*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: Does not affect cultural landscapes.

---

**No Reviews From:** Curator, 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

//Kimball Koch//

**Date:** 12/18/12

Kimball Koch

**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:** 12/21/12

Don L. Neubacher

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