



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: David Engelstad, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2014-002 El Portal Sewer Rehabilitation Geotech Investigation (52186)

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 not be any effect on historical, cultural, or archeological resources.
- 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:

Recommendations for Conditions or Stipulations:

None

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 52186.

//Don 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: 08/26/2014

Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2014-002 El Portal Sewer Rehabilitation Geotech Investigation

PEPC Project Number: 52186

Project Description:

This project proposes to drill dig up to three test borings per location in eleven locations to support the design development for the El Portal sewer replacement project (Phase 1). The purpose of these borings is to develop geotechnical conclusions regarding the anticipated subsurface conditions and constructability along the proposed sewer line route, and provide geotechnical recommendations for trench backfill and utility construction. These drill locations will extend to refusal or a maximum depth of 6.5 feet along the following roads; Foresta Road, El Portal Road and Highway 140 (see attached map for specific locations). Each drill location will have up to three test borings grouped approximately within a six to eight foot diameter.

The geotechnical firm (Holladay Engineering) will coordinate with the Yosemite Park personnel to erect and maintain appropriate traffic control for the excavation of borings within the public road right-of-ways along the water line alignment.

Project Locations:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

None

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 Neubacher// **Date:** 9/4/14
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: 08/25/2014

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: 2014-002 El Portal Sewer Rehabilitation Geotech Investigation
PEPC Project Number: 52186
Project Type: Other Natural/Cultural Resource Activities (NCR)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California **District:** El Portal
Project Leader: David Engelstad

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			There are eleven geotech locations; each location will have up to three borings within a six to eight foot area. The borings will be no deeper than six and a half feet with a six inch diameter drill bit.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			The drilling will produce some temporary dust in the immediate project area.
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			The geotech investigation includes temporary noise impacts such as equipment engine noise and back up warning beepers. Increased noises will occur for up to three days from 8 am to 5 pm.
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		Negligible			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			El Portal Archeological District; no archeological construction monitoring is recommended for this geotech work.
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes	No				
21. Ethnographic resources		Negligible			Drill bore locations 1-9, shown mapped on 6-2-14 C-Alt4-A project drawings, are located in previously surveyed and historically disturbed areas at least 20 meters beyond documented archeological site boundaries. Additionally, bore locations 4-8 are shown in an area of extensive sediment fill placed after the flood of 1997. No tribal comments received. Park SME does not recommend tribal monitoring.
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				

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
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

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		No		

water 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 or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		No		
K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands		No		

by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?				
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? 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
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
Dayna Jackson	Acting Chief of Administration Management
Ron Borne	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
David Engelstad	Project Leader
Lisa Acree	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>9/2/14</u>
Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	
<u>//Lisa Acree//</u>	<u>9/2/14</u>
Acting Compliance Program Manager – Lisa Acree	
<u>//David Engelstad// for</u>	<u>9/2/14</u>
Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Don Neubacher//</u>	<u>9/4/14</u>
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 26, 2014

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2014-002 El Portal Sewer Rehabilitation Geotech Investigation
PEPC Project Number: 52186
Project Type: Other Natural/Cultural Resource Activities (NCR)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California **District:** El Portal
Project Leader: David Engelstad

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			There are eleven geotech locations; each location will have up to three borings within a six to eight foot area. The borings will be no deeper than six and a half feet with a six inch diameter drill bit.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?	Yes			El Portal Archeological District. Drill bore locations 1-9, shown mapped on 6-2-14

			C-Alt4-A project drawings, are located in previously surveyed and historically disturbed areas at least 20 meters beyond documented archeological site boundaries. Additionally, bore locations 4-8 are shown in an area of extensive sediment fill placed after the flood of 1997. No tribal comments received. Park SME does not recommend tribal monitoring.
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No	
Has a National Register form been completed?	Yes		
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?		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	
WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST			
Within designated Wilderness?		No	
Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		No	



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

Project Name: 2014-002 El Portal Sewer Rehabilitation Geotech Investigation

Prepared by: Renea Kennec

Date Prepared: 8/26/14

Telephone: 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 52186

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

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

☐ No

☐ Yes

Source or reference:

4. **Potentially Affected Resources:**

Ethnographic Resources Affected:

Name and numbers: El Portal Resources of Cultural Significance (un-evaluated)

Ethnographic Resources Affected Notes: Submitted for Tribal Review in June 2014. Drill bore locations 1-9, shown mapped on 6-2-14 C-Alt4-A project drawings, are located in previously surveyed and historically disturbed areas at least 20 meters beyond documented archeological site boundaries. Additionally, bore locations 4-8 are shown in an area of extensive sediment fill placed after the flood of 1997. No tribal comments received. Park SME does not recommend tribal monitoring.

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:

[X] Anthropologist

Name: Jennifer Hardin

Date: 08/25/2014

Comments: Submitted for Tribal Review, June 2014. Drill bore locations 1-9, shown mapped on 6-2-14 C-Alt4-A project drawings, are located in previously surveyed and historically disturbed areas at least 20 meters beyond documented archeological site boundaries. Additionally, bore locations 4-8 are shown in an area of extensive sediment fill placed after the flood of 1997.

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 tribal comments received. NPS SME does not recommend tribal monitoring.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

[X] Archeologist

Name: Sonny Montague

Date: 09/02/2014

Comments: Drill bore locations 1-9, shown mapped on 6-2-14 C-Alt4-A project drawings, are located in previously surveyed and historically disturbed areas at least 20 meters beyond documented archeological site boundaries. Additionally, bore locations 4-8 are shown in an area of extensive sediment fill placed after the flood of 1997. No archeological construction monitoring is recommended for this geotech work.

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

Assessment of Effect Form - El Portal Sewer Rehabilitation Geotech Investigation - PEPC ID: 52186

[X] Historical Landscape Architect
Name: Kevin McCardle
Date: 06/03/2014

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

No Reviews From: Curator, Archeologist, 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
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.

Explanation: None

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 - Archeological and tribal monitoring is recommended due to the sensitive resources in the project area.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Acting Historic Preservation Officer:

Kimball

Koch

//Kimball Koch//

Date: 9/2/2014

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 Neubacher//

Date: 9/4/14

Don L. Neubacher

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