



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: Garrett Chun, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2013-012 White Wolf Location Assessment for an Alternative Sewer System (46585)

The Executive Leadership Team has reviewed the proposed project 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:

- Trees should be felled in the fall to avoid impact to nesting birds and bats.
- Equipment used at the site shall be pressure cleaned and free of weeds, seed, debris, and mud to prevent the introduction and/or spread of exotic, invasive plants.
- No ethnographic resources recorded in the specific project area but it is adjacent to the archeological district (an ethnographic resource).
- If any cultural items, including prehistoric or historical archeological materials, are discovered during project implementation, halt excavation and contact Anthropology Branch.

Letter of Compliance Completion - White Wolf Location Assessment for an Alternative Sewer System -
PEPC ID: 46585

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 46585.

//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: 07/25/2013

Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2013-012 White Wolf Location Assessment for an Alternative Sewer System

PEPC Project Number: 46585

Project Description:

A geotechnical report composed by Kleinfelder in 1999 (104/D-1019) investigated a potential new septic disposal field to replace the existing sewer disposal system located between the White Wolf Lodge and the employee housing area located on the west side of the road. This project proposes the continuation of the feasibility study by making 10 piezometer holes (12' deep) and 4 percolation holes (2 to 6' deep). Holes will be 6" diameter or less.

The new piezometer holes are needed so that the groundwater levels can be monitored during the entire open season of White Wolf (the 1999 study monitored groundwater once in November). The new percolation holes are needed to ensure that the percolation rates are determined based on current codes and standards. In addition, this study will investigate the broad area between the White Wolf Lodge and employee housing area to determine if a proposed disposal system can be placed a further distance away from the Lodge visitors.

This project will not be providing a proposed design or a recommendation of improvements; the sole purpose is to allow for the collection of additional data. The existing sewer system was constructed circa 1973-1977. If a viable location for a new sewer system is found closer to the White Wolf development, the existing sewer system consisting of approximately 2.5 acres of spray field, the 1.7 acre disposal pond, 3,500 of 6" gravity pipe (most of which is above ground in steep grade), 1,600 lf of effluent force main, and the effluent pump house may no longer be needed.

Project Locations:

Tuolumne County, CA

Mitigations:

- Trees should be felled in the fall to avoid impact to nesting birds and bats.
- Equipment used at the site shall be pressure cleaned and free of weeds, seed, debris, and mud to prevent the introduction and/or spread of exotic, invasive plants.

- No ethnographic resources recorded in the specific project area but it is adjacent to the archeological district (an ethnographic resource).
- If any cultural items, including prehistoric or historical archeological materials, are discovered during project implementation, halt excavation and contact Anthropology Branch.

Describe the category used to exclude action from further NEPA analysis and indicate the number of the category (see Section 3-4 of DO-12):

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

On the basis of the environmental impact information in the statutory compliance file, with which I am familiar, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No exceptional circumstances (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:** 8/1/13
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: 07/24/2013

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: 2013-012 White Wolf Location Assessment for an Alternative Sewer System
PEPC Project Number: 46585
Project Type: Feasibility Study (FS)
Project Location:
County, State: Tuolumne, California
Project Leader: Garrett Chun

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 ten piezometer holes will be six inches in diameter and up to twelve feet deep. The four percolation holes will be six inches in diameter and up to six feet deep.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			Minimal air emissions associated with this project.
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			There will be temporary drilling noises during the installation.
5. Water quality or	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
quantity					
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				

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
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	No				
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				
18. Archeological resources		Negligible			There are archeological resources in the White Wolf area. The archeologist recommends; if prehistoric or historical archeological materials are discovered during project implementation, halt excavation and contact Anthropology Branch.
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes	No				
21. Ethnographic resources		Negligible			No ethnographic resources recorded in the specific project area but it is adjacent to the archeological district (an ethnographic resource). The park Anthropologist recommends contacting her immediately if any cultural items are found during project implementation.
22. Museum collections (objects, specimens, and archival and manuscript collections)	No				
23. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base,	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
infrastructure					
24. Minority and low income populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.	No				
25. Energy resources	No				
26. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	No				
27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability	No				
28. Urban quality, gateway communities, etc.	No				
29. Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity	No				
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		

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

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

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
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
Garrett Chun	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>7/25/13</u>
<u>//Madelyn Ruffner//</u> Acting Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>7/29/13</u>
<u>//Michael Wichmann// acting</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>7/30/13</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date

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

8/1/13

*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 25, 2013

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2013-012 White Wolf Location Assessment for an Alternative Sewer System
PEPC Project Number: 46585
Project Type: Feasibility Study (FS)
Project Location:
County, State: Tuolumne, California
Project Leader: Garrett Chun

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		Project is located within the Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog (endangered) and Yosemite Toad (threatened) proposed critical habitat.
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 ten piezometer holes will be six inches in diameter and up to twelve feet deep. The four percolation holes will be six inches in

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
				diameter and up to six feet deep.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?	Yes			
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		
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		
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST				
Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor?		No		
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	
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:**

Project Name: 2013-012 White Wolf Location Assessment for an Alternative Sewer System

Prepared by: Laura Kirn

Date Prepared: 07/09/2013

PEPC Project Number: 46585

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

APE is the location of the geotechnical borings.

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

No

Yes

Source or reference:

4. **Potentially Affected Resources:**

Archeological Resources Notes: No archeological resources documented in specific area of investigation, however work will occur in proximity to known archeological resources and within the archeological district.

Ethnographic Resources Affected Notes: Archeological district has traditional cultural significance to associated American Indian tribes and groups.

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

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 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:

Archeologist
 Name: Sonny Montague
 Date: 07/09/2013

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: If prehistoric or historical archeological materials are discovered during project implementation, halt excavation and contact Anthropology Branch.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

Anthropologist
 Name: Jennifer Hardin
 Date: 07/09/2013

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 ethnographic resources recorded in the specific project area but it is adjacent to the archeological district (an ethnographic resource). Please notify Anthropology Branch immediately if any cultural items are found during project implementation.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

Historical Landscape Architect
 Name: Kevin McCardle
 Date: 06/06/2013

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

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; if area is determined suitable for waste disposal system, tribal consultation and subsurface survey required to identify presence/absence of archeological materials prior to any design development..**

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.)**

- Assessment of Effect - Ethnography - No ethnographic resources recorded in the specific project area but it is adjacent to the archeological district (an ethnographic resource). Please notify Anthropology Branch immediately if any cultural items are found during project implementation.
- Assessment of Effect - Archeology - If prehistoric or historical archeological materials are discovered during project implementation, halt excavation and contact Anthropology Branch.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Acting Historic Preservation Officer:

Kimball

Koch //Kimball Koch// **Date:** 7/26/13

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:** 8/1/13
Don L. Neubacher

Assessment of The signed original of this document is on file at the Sewer System - PEPC ID: 46585

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