



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: Kevin McCardle, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2013-019 Yosemite Valley Cemetery Stabilization (47174)

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 adverse effect to historical properties.
- 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:

- Tribal consultation about this project is ongoing. NPS will attempt to contact descendants to receive feedback on proposed actions. Contact the park Archeology office immediately if ground disturbance is required during headstone repairs/replacement or other project activities.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 47174.

//Edward J. Walls// acting
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.*

Letter of Compliance

PEPC ID: 47174



Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2013-019 Yosemite Valley Cemetery Stabilization

PEPC Project Number: 47174

Project Description:

The Yosemite Valley Cemetery is the final resting place for many of Yosemite's stewards including Galen Clark, James Hutchings, Lucy Brown and many American Indians. The site remains our only tangible link to these iconic figures, early park staff, and their predecessors in this great landscape. After many decades of neglect, the cemetery is in a state of disrepair. Gravestones are damaged and split, metal fences are broken, and weathering and vegetation stains obscure the names and details of our past.

This project will stabilize and repair monuments and clean up the site. The existing conditions of the monuments, stone wall, wood fencing, vegetation, and other features have been surveyed documented and assessed this past winter. Volunteers this fall will remove seedlings, clean debris from graves and walls, dismantle the wood fence within the cemetery and repurpose it to better delineate walking paths and protect the landscape. The park historic preservation crew will clean gravestones, replace split wood monuments, and repair damaged metal fences following conservation best practices.

Of the 26 wood markers, up to 15 will need to be removed, repaired or replaced, and reinstalled. All will be cleaned, stained and preservative applied. The bench and 17 marble and granite monuments will have vegetation and staining cleaned from the carved faces. The Lamon monument and associated chain fence and pillars will be repaired and leveled. Two metal fences surrounding graves will be repaired.

Project Locations:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

- Tribal consultation about this project is ongoing. NPS will attempt to contact descendants to receive feedback on proposed actions. Contact the park Archeology office immediately if ground disturbance is required during headstone repairs/replacement or other project activities.

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.

Superintendent: //Edward J. Walls// acting

Date: 8/15/13

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: 08/08/2013

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: 2013-019 Yosemite Valley Cemetery Stabilization
PEPC Project Number: 47174
Project Type: Historic Preservation (HP)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Kevin McCardle

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			This project includes filling rodent holes.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality	No				
4. Soundscapes	No				
5. Water quality or quantity	No				
6. Streamflow characteristics	No				
7. Marine or estuarine resources	No				
8. Floodplains 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
wetlands					
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				
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources		Negligible			The visitor experience will be enhanced by the improved appearance of the cemetery.
18. Archeological resources		Negligible			Yosemite Valley Archeological District
19. Prehistoric/historic		Negligible			The cemetery's gravestones will

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
structure					be repaired and stabilized.
20. Cultural landscapes		Negligible			Yosemite Valley Historic District; Yosemite Village Historic District
21. Ethnographic resources		Negligible			Yosemite Valley Archeological District
22. Museum collections (objects, specimens, and archival and manuscript collections)	No				
23. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure	No				
24. Minority and low income populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.	No				
25. Energy resources	No				
26. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	No				
27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability	No				
28. Urban quality, gateway communities, etc.					
29. Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity	No				
30. Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal,	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
paleontological resources)?					

C. MANDATORY CRITERIA

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?		No		
B. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		No		
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?		No		
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		No		
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant 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? Yes
- 3.A. Did you make a diligent effort to contact them? Yes
4. Has consultation with all affected agencies or tribes been completed? Yes, on-going consultation.
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	Chief of Visitor and Resource Protection
Kevin McCardle	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>	<u>8/9/13</u>
Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	
<u>//Madelyn Ruffner//</u>	<u>8/13/13</u>
Acting Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	
<u>//Randy Fong//</u>	<u>8/15/13</u>
Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Edward J. Walls// acting</u>	<u>8/15/13</u>
Don L. Neubacher	

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



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

Project Name: 2013-019 Yosemite Valley Cemetery Stabilization

Prepared by: Renea Kennec

Date Prepared: 08/08/2013

Telephone: 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 47174

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

Yosemite Valley Cemetery

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

 No

 X Yes

Source or reference:

4. **Potentially Affected Resources:**

Archeological resources affected:

Name and numbers: **Yosemite Valley Archeological District**

NR status: **1 - Listed in Register and documented**

Historical Structures/Resources Affected:

Name and numbers: **Yosemite Valley Historic District**

NR status: **1 - Listed in Register and documented**

Cultural Landscapes Affected:

Name and numbers: **Yosemite Village Historic District**

NR status: **1 - Listed in Register and documented**

Ethnographic Resources Affected:

Name and number(s): **Resources of Cultural Significance (un-evaluated)**

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

 No Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure

<u>Yes</u>	Replace historic features/elements in kind
<u>No</u>	Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure
<u>No</u>	Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)
<u>No</u>	Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape
<u>No</u>	Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible
<u>No</u>	Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible
<u>Yes</u>	Potentially affect presently unidentified cultural resources
<u>No</u>	Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting, landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources
<u>No</u>	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: Sonny Montague
 Date: 06/12/2013

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: Contact RMS Archeology Office if plans change and ground disturbance is necessary to replace cemetery markers.
 Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

[X] Historical Architect
 Name: Gabrielle Harlan
 Date: 07/30/2013

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:
 Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

☒ Anthropologist
Name: Jennifer Hardin
Date: 07/30/2013

Comments: The proposed project includes actions that will occur within culturally significant areas with ethnographic resources (including archeological resources) valued by traditionally associated tribal groups.

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: Tribal consultation about this project is ongoing. NPS will attempt to contact descendants to receive feedback on proposed actions. Contact YOSE Archeology immediately if ground disturbance is required during headstone repairs/replacement or other project activities.

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, 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.)**

- Assessment of Effect - Ethnography - Tribal consultation about this project is ongoing. NPS will attempt to contact descendants to receive feedback on proposed actions. Contact the park Archeology office immediately if ground disturbance is required during headstone repairs/replacement or other project activities.
- Assessment of Effect - Archeology - Contact RMS Archeology Office if plans change and ground disturbance is necessary to replace cemetery markers.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Acting Historic Preservation Officer:

Kimball Koch //Kimball Koch// **Date:** 8/9/13

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: //Edward J. Walls// acting **Date:** 8/15/13
Don L. Neubacher

*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: August 8, 2013

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2013-019 Yosemite Valley Cemetery Stabilization
PEPC Project Number: 47174
Project Type: Historic Preservation (HP)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Kevin McCardle

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)?				
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			Minimal ground disturbance; filling rodent holes.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?	Yes			Yosemite Valley Archeological District
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?	Yes			The cemetery's features will all be removed, repaired or replaced, and reinstalled.
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		

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
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?			N/A	
Will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values?			N/A	
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		



YOSEMITE VALLEY CEMETERY EXISTING CONDITIONS

APRIL 24, 2013



Yosemite Valley Cemetery Stabilization – April 2013



James Lamon Grave early 20th century and 2013



Replace and repair damaged monuments; clean stone monuments; repair fences; and remove saplings over graves