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: Jesse McGahey, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2011-027 Yosemite Facelift Special Projects 2011 (37820)

The Executive Leadership 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:

- An appropriate American Indian consultation strategy will be developed through the Park American Indian Liaison to identify and address any American Indian concerns prior to project implementation.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 37820.

//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: 2011-027 Yosemite Facelift Special Projects 2011
PEPC Project Number: 37820
Project Description:

Starting in 2011 Yosemite Facelift volunteer event compliance will be broken up into two separate compliance packages:

This document will cover the following 2011 Special Projects:

1. Mist Trail: Old dilapidated sign removal 200 feet South of Happy Isles.
2. Foresta: Assorted metal junk on NPS lands near private lots in Foresta Community, park archeological staff will be on site.
3. Pat & Jack Pinnacle and Reed's Pinnacle climbing areas: stabilizing eroding trails restoring eroded slopes eliminating additional trail.
4. Tioga Pass: Removal of rotting shed and water-tank from old ground-fed water system.

"Special Projects" involve coordinated efforts to clean or restore previously identified areas or sites. The special projects will have assigned NPS personnel supervising activities and will require more intensive coordination. The special projects will be covered by a separate compliance package every year to reflect the distinct concerns of each separate proposed special project. However, compliance will not be redundant. If a project already has been approved through the NEPA process than the Facelift can provide the labor and oversight to complete the project.

Project Locations:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

- An appropriate American Indian consultation strategy will be developed through the Park American Indian Liaison to identify and address any American Indian concerns prior to project implementation.

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):

E.4 Removal of non-historic materials and structures in order to restore natural conditions.

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 9/22/11

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: 09/09/2011

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: 2011-027 Yosemite Facelift Special Projects 2011
PEPC Project Number: 37820
Project Type: Volunteer Event (OTHER)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Jesse McGahey

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 trail restoration projects will have some ground disturbance in order to stabilize and restore eroded trail surfaces.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			Minimal air emissions are associated with the facelift projects.
4. Soundscapes	No				
5. Water quality or quantity	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**
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				
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities,	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**
etc.					
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				Visitor experience will be enhanced by the restoration of the trails and less debris in the park.
18. Archeological resources		Negligible			Project leaders are working with the park Archeology Office to minimize or eliminate impacts.
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 use plans or policies	No				
27. Resource, including energy, conservation	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
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?		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		No		

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

1. Are personnel preparing this form familiar with the site? Yes

1.A. Did personnel conduct a site visit? Yes

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? Yes, an appropriate American Indian consultation strategy will be developed through the Park American Indian Liaison to identify and address any American Indian concerns prior to project implementation.

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

Interdisciplinary Team	**Field of Expertise**
Don L. Neubacher	Superintendent
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
Jesse McGahey	Project Leader
Elexis Mayer	Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
Elexis Mayer	Historic Preservation Officer
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
_*//Renea Kennec//*_____ Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	_9/19/11_____
_*//Elexis Mayer//*_____ Compliance Program Manager – Elexis Mayer	_9/20/11_____
_*//Randy Fong//*_____ Acting Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	_9/20/11_____

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
_*//Don L. Neubacher//*_____ Don L. Neubacher	_9/20/11_____

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: September 9, 2011

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2011-027 Yosemite Facelift Special Projects 2011
PEPC Project Number: 37820
Project Type: Volunteer Event (OTHER)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Jesse McGahey

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			The trail restoration projects will have some ground disturbance in order to stabilize and restore eroded trail surfaces.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?	Yes			Project leader is consulting with the park Archeology office to mitigate impacts to park archeological resources.
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
Has a National Register form been completed?		No		
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?	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?	Yes			Various tributaries throughout the park.
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		

Special Project Photos and Descriptions:

Tioga Pass – Old Water Tank and Shed Removal

Roughly 1/4 mile up the Gaylor Lakes Trail and slightly off to the right are the remnants of an old surface-fed water system that was installed in early the 1970s. The site consists of a water tank and a small wooden shed that contains several oxygen-like tanks. We are uncertain as to the purpose of the tanks or their relevance to the water system or whether they can be removed safely. Nonetheless, the wooden shed is rotting away and ought to be removed, along with the tanks.

Research has been done by Jeff Pappas (BRM-Tioga Pass) and he found a citation for the water system in a Superintendent's Report dated either 1972 or 1973, the year in which it was installed.

Mist Trail: Old Sign Removal. It is on the Mist Trail, just beyond the junction with the JMT but before reaching the Vernal Fall steps; on the river side of the trail near Lady Franklin rock (the large flat rock jutting out into the river).

Pat and Jack and Reed's – Climber Use Trail Maintenance/Restoration

Foresta – Trash Removal on NPS lands adjacent to private lots.

ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. Park: Yosemite National Park

2. Project Description:

Project Name: 2011-027 Yosemite Facelift Special Projects 2011
Prepared by: Renea Kennec
Date Prepared: September 9, 2011
Telephone: 209-379-1038
PEPC Project Number: 37820

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

___ No
X Yes

Source or reference: All the Facelift project areas have identified the cultural resources.

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
X 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
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. 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: 09/19/2011

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: YOSE 1999 PA, Stipulation VII.C.2.h.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

[X] Anthropologist
Name: Jennifer Hardin
Date: 07/28/2011
Comments: An appropriate American Indian consultation strategy will be developed through the Park American Indian Liaison to identify and address any American Indian concerns prior to project implementation.

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:

[X] Historical Landscape Architect
Name: David Humphrey
Date: 09/06/2011
Comments: It is important that an appropriate American Indian consultation strategy be developed through the Park American Indian Liaison to identify & address any American Indian concerns prior to project implementation.

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:

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** X **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:

[X] 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:

Signature

Acting Historic Preservation Officer *//Elexis Mayer//* Date: 9/20/11

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.

Signature

Superintendent: *//Don L. Neubacher//* Date: 9/20/11

Don L. Neubacher

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