



# 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:** Rod Kennec, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

**From:** Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

**Subject:** NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2013-014 Ostrander Ski Hut and Woodshed Improvements (46797)

The Executive Leadership Team has reviewed the proposed project/action and completed its environmental assessment documentation, and we have determined the following:

- There will not be any effect on threatened, endangered, or rare species and/or their critical habitat.
- There will be no historical properties affected.
- There 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:

- If previously unknown historical features (e.g., dumps, privies) are identified during excavation for the woodshed footing, halt excavation activities in the area of discovery, protect the feature, and contact the Archeology Office for assistance in further treatment.
- Stipulation of described work is that the new concrete slab at the non-contributing woodshed be kept structurally isolated from the National Register eligible Ostrander Ski Hut. This will be accomplished by adding a sheet of 6 mil visqueen at the juncture of the new slab with the building. Should this approach change, further consultation with HAL will be required.

//Don L. Neubacher//  
Don L. Neubacher

Enclosure (with attachments)

cc: Statutory Compliance File

Letter of *The signed original of this document is on file at the Environmental Planning and Compliance Office in Yosemite National Park.* vements - PEPC ID: 46797



National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite National Park  
Date: 07/01/2013

## Categorical Exclusion Form

**Project:** 2013-014 Ostrander Ski Hut and Woodshed Improvements

**PEPC Project Number:** 46797

**Project Description:**

Environmental Health Surveys conducted on the Ostrander Ski Hut in 2008 and 2011 by the National Park Service in cooperation with the California Department of Public Health, Vector-Borne Disease Section identified areas of concern that could have an effect on the visitors and keepers of the Ostrander Ski Hut. This project will correct these interior and exterior deficiencies to contribute to a safe and healthy environment for the visiting public and administrative staff.

The Ostrander Ski Hut has been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places by Yosemite's Branch of History, Architecture and Landscapes and the California State Historic Preservation Officer. The non-historic woodshed addition that will be modified as part of this project does not contribute to the Ostrander Ski Hut's overall eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. All work will be performed in accordance with "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties".

Project actions include:

- Place a concrete slab with raised (12 inch high) stem walls under the attached wood storage shed on the north end of the hut. The total area of the wood shed is 108 square feet. The concrete slab and stem wall will be isolated from the exterior stone wall of the hut with 6ml plastic sheeting to prevent the concrete from bonding with the stone.
- Repair the roof and roof structure of the wood shed.
- Repair the wall framing of the wood shed.
- Repair and replace the damaged wood siding of the wood shed to prevent rodent intrusion and firewood theft.
- Prevent rodent intrusion between wood shed walls and the stone exterior of the hut.
- Improve the wood shed door.
- Strip and refinish both kitchen countertops.
- Repair the bathroom compartment wall damage.
- Replace the stove cap on top of the chimney.
- Replace the 42 gallon hot water tank in the hut keeper's kitchen.
- Replace the 200 gallon water tank in the upstairs hut keeper's quarters.

Categorical Exclusion Form - Ostrander Ski Hut and Woodshed Improvements - PEPC ID: 46797

- Continued rodent exclusion work on the hut.
- Selective pointing of failed mortar in the walls of the hut.
- Preservation treatments of the exterior log components of the hut.

**Project Locations:**

Mariposa County, CA

**Mitigations:**

- If previously unknown historical features (e.g., dumps, privies) are identified during excavation for the woodshed footing, halt excavation activities in the area of discovery, protect the feature, and contact the Archeology Office for assistance in further treatment.
- Stipulation of described work is that the new concrete slab at the non-contributing woodshed be kept structurally isolated from the National Register eligible Ostrander Ski Hut. This will be accomplished by adding a sheet of 6 mil visqueen at the juncture of the new slab with the building. Should this approach change, further consultation with HAL will be required.

**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.4 Routine maintenance and repairs to cultural resource sites, structures, utilities and grounds under an approved Historic Structures Preservation Guide or Cyclic Maintenance Guide; or if the action would not adversely affect the cultural resource.

**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.**

//Don L. Neubacher//  
Don L. Neubacher

7/12/13  
Date

*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: 07/01/2013

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:** 2013-014 Ostrander Ski Hut and Woodshed Improvements  
**PEPC Project Number:** 46797  
**Project Type:** Facility Maintenance (FM)  
**Project Location:**  
**County, State:** Mariposa County, California

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			Soil disturbance includes 30 lineal feet by 8 inches deep by 12 inches wide.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality	No				
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			Temporary construction noises during the shed improvement work.
5. Water quality or quantity	No				
6. Streamflow characteristics	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>
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, etc.	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>
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				
18. Archeological resources	No				
19. Prehistoric/historic structure		Negligible			Ostrander Lake Ski Hut
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 potential,	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
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		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>
102(2)(E))?				
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		



<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>
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><b>Interdisciplinary Team</b></u>	<u><b>Field of Expertise</b></u>
Don L. Neubacher	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
Kris Kirby	Chief of Business and Revenue Management
Tom Medema	Chief of Interpretation and Education
Kevin Killian	Acting Chief of Visitor and Resource Protection
Rod Kennec	Project Leader
Madelyn Ruffner	Acting Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
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>7/1/13</u>
<u>//Madelyn Ruffner//</u> Acting Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>7/8/13</u>
<u>//Randy fong//</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>7/10/13</u>

### Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Don L. Neubacher//</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>7/12/13</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: 07/01/2013

## PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: July 1, 2013

### PROJECT INFORMATION

**Park Name:** Yosemite National Park  
**Project Title:** 2013-014 Ostrander Ski Hut and Woodshed Improvements  
**PEPC Project Number:** 46797  
**Project Type:** Facility Maintenance (FM)  
**Project Location:**  
**County, State:** Mariposa County, California  
**Project Leader:** Rod Kennec

### 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?	Yes			Soil disturbance includes 30 lineal feet by 8 inches deep by 12 inches wide.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		No		
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		
Has a National Register form been completed?	Yes			Ostrander Lake Ski Hut
Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?	Yes			#055760
<b>WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor?		No		

<b>ESF Addendum Questions</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
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?			N/A	
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?			N/A	
<b>WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
Within designated Wilderness?	Yes			Minimum Requirement Analysis attached.
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:** 2013-014 Ostrander Ski Hut and Woodshed Improvements

**Prepared by:** Renea Kennec

**Date Prepared:** 07/01/2013

**Telephone:** 209-379-1038

**PEPC Project Number:** 46797

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

Ostrander Lake Ski Hut

3. **Has the area of potential effects been surveyed to identify historic properties?**

       No

  X   Yes

Source or reference:

4. **Potentially Affected Resource(s):**

**Historical Structures/Resources Affected:**

**Name and numbers:** Ostrander Ski Hut    LCS 055760

8 - Within a Register-eligible district

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

  Yes   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

       Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment

  No   (inc. terrain)

       Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric)

  No   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:

---

[ X ] Archeologist  
 Name: Sonny Montague  
 Date: 06/12/2013

*Check if project does not involve ground disturbance* [ ]

Assessment of Effect:    No Potential to Cause Effect   X   No Historic Properties

Affected    No Adverse Effect    Adverse Effect    Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: If previously unknown historical features (e.g., dumps, privies) are identified during excavation for the woodshed footing, halt excavation activities in the area of discovery, protect the feature, and contact the Archeology Office for assistance in further treatment.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

---

[ X ] Historical Architect  
 Name: Gabrielle Harlan  
 Date: 07/02/2013

*Check if project does not involve ground disturbance* [ ]

Assessment of Effect:    No Potential to Cause Effect    No Historic Properties

Affected   X   No Adverse Effect    Adverse Effect    Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: Stipulation of described work is that the new concrete slab at the non-contributing woodshed be kept structurally isolated from the National Register eligible Ostrander Ski Hut. It is our understanding that this will be accomplished by adding a sheet of 6 mil visqueen at the juncture of the new slab with the building, and this is an acceptable strategy. Should this approach change, further consultation with HAL will be required.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

---

[ X ] Anthropologist  
 Name: Jennifer Hardin  
 Date: 06/26/2013

*Check if project does not involve ground disturbance* ☐

Assessment of Effect: ☐ No Potential to Cause 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: 04/16/2013

*Check if project does not involve ground disturbance* ☐

Assessment of Effect: ☐ No Potential to Cause 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 Potential to Cause Effects

☐ 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

☐ 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

//Kimball Koch//

**Date:** 7/2/13

**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:** 7/12/13

Don L. Neubacher

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

Assessment

PEPC ID: 46797









Ostrander Ski Hut