



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: Catherine Carlisle-McMullen, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2014-028 Programmatic Wedding Special Use Permit  
2015-2019 (53266)

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 historic, 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:

- The wedding permit coordinator will ensure that the parameters and specific criteria the permittees must adhere to ensure the protection of historic properties and other cultural resources.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 53266.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

//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.*

Letter of Compliance Completion - Programmatic CE-Wedding Special Use Permit - PEPC ID: 53266



National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite National Park  
Date: 10/03/2014

## Categorical Exclusion Form

**Project:** 2014-028 Programmatic CE-Wedding Special Use Permit 2015-2019

**PEPC Project Number:** 53266

**Project Description:**

This documents the issuance of special use permits for wedding activities in Yosemite National Park and the El Portal Administrative Site. Specific locations have been designated for these programmatic activities. Alternate locations will be reviewed by park resources and compliance staff before a permit is issued. Wedding parties that consist of ten people or less have the option of alternative locations. Dependent on group size, park employees monitor wedding activities to ensure protection of resources, compliance with permit conditions, and to address activities that have the potential to conflict with visitor experience. When alternative locations are requested, the Office of Special Park Uses will consult with subject matter experts for the protection of resources. Wedding parties over 35 people are required to have a resource monitor.

**Project Locations:**

Mariposa, Madera, and Tuolumne Counties, CA

**Mitigations:**

- The wedding permit coordinator will ensure that the parameters and specific criteria the permittees must adhere to ensure the protection of historic properties and other cultural resources.

**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):**

A.6 Commercial use licenses involving no construction.

**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//

Don L. Neubacher

**Date:** 12/15/14

*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: 10/03/2014

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:** 2014-028 Programmatic CE-Wedding Special Use Permit  
**PEPC Project Number:** 53266  
**Project Type:** Special Use Permit (SUP)  
**Project Location:**  
     **County, State:** Madera, California  
     **County, State:** Mariposa, California  
     **County, State:** Tuolumne, California  
**Project Leader:** Catherine Carlisle-McMullen  
**Administrative Record Location:** Environmental Planning and Compliance Office

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.	No				Wedding activities include specific locations throughout the park. These activities are temporary and have negligible effects to resources.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality	No				
4. Soundscapes	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>
5. Water quality or quantity	No				
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; no historic properties would be adversely affected by implementing this project.
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				

<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>
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	No				
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				The special use permit does not allow any part of the wedding activity to restrict other park visitors.
18. Archeological resources		Negligible			Conditions of the permit entail not disturbing, adversely effecting, altering, damaging, or removing any natural or cultural resources, archeological or historic artifacts.
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes	No				
21. Ethnographic resources		Negligible			
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	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>
resources					
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**

<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>
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		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>
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		

<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>
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><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
	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
Catherine Carlisle-McMullen	Project Leader
Madelyn Ruffner	Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
Renea Kennece	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>12/4/14</u>
<u>//Madelyn Ruffner//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>12/4/14</u>
<u>//Randy Fong//</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>12/9/14</u>

**Approved:**

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Don L. Neubacher//</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>12/15/14</u>

*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: November 14, 2014

### PROJECT INFORMATION

**Park Name:** Yosemite National Park  
**Project Title:** 2014-028 Programmatic CE-Wedding Special Use Permit  
**PEPC Project Number:** 53266  
**Project Type:** Special Use Permit (SUP)  
**Project Location:**  
     **County, State:** Madera, California  
     **County, State:** Mariposa, California  
     **County, State:** Tuolumne, California  
**Project Leader:** Catherine Carlisle-McMullen

### 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?		No		
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?	Yes			Parkwide
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		
Has a National Register form been completed?	Yes			Parkwide
Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?	Yes			
<b>WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor?	Yes			Merced and Tuolumne Rivers
Fall within the bed and banks AND will affect the free-flow of the		No		

<b>ESF Addendum Questions</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Data Needed to Determine/Notes</b>
river?				
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		
<b>WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
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:** 2014-028 Programmatic CE-Wedding Special Use Permit

**Prepared by:** Renea Kennec    **Date Prepared:** 10/03/2014    **Telephone:** 209-379-1038

**PEPC Project Number:** 53266

**Locations:**

**County, State:** Madera, CA

**County, State:** Mariposa, CA

**County, State:** Tuolumne, CA

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:**

**Archeological resources affected:**

**Name and numbers:** Park-Wide permit; presence/absence of resources determined on a site by site basis.

**Historical Structures/Resources Affected:**

**Name and numbers:** Park-Wide permit; presence/absence of resources determined on a site by site basis.

**Cultural Landscapes Affected:**

**Name and numbers:** Park-Wide permit; presence/absence of resources determined on a site by site basis.

**Ethnographic Resources Affected:**

**Name and numbers:** Park-Wide permit; presence/absence of resources determined on a site by site basis.

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

- No Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure
- No Replace historic features/elements in kind
- No Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure
- No Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)
- No Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape
- No Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible
- No Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible
- Yes Potentially affect presently unidentified cultural resources
- No Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting, landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources
- No Involve a real property transaction (exchange, sale, or lease of land or structures)
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**6. Supporting Study Data:**  
(Attach if feasible; if action is in a plan, EA or EIS, give name and project or page number.)

**B. REVIEWS BY CULTURAL RESOURCE SPECIALISTS**

The park 106 coordinator requested review by the park's cultural resource specialist/advisors as indicated by check-off boxes or as follows:

---

[ X ] Anthropologist  
 Name: Jennifer Hardin  
 Date: 10/09/2014  
 Comments: Wedding location language revised to indicate that weddings are not permitted at Soda Springs.

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: Wedding location language revised to indicate that weddings are not permitted at Soda Springs.  
 Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

---

[ X ] Archeologist  
 Name: Sonny Montague  
 Date: 10/06/2014

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

---

[ X ] Historical Architect  
Name: Gabrielle Harlan  
Date: 10/02/2014

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:

[ X ] Historical Landscape Architect  
Name: Kevin McCardle  
Date: 10/08/2014

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.

1999 Programmatic Agreement as amended in 2014

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

**SHPO/THPO Notes:**

**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 - The wedding permit coordinator will ensure that the parameters and specific criteria the permittees must adhere to ensure the protection of historic properties and other cultural resources.**

**D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:**

**Historic Preservation Officer:**

Kimball

Koch

//Kimball Koch//

**Date:** 11/14/2014

**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 L. Neubacher//

**Date:** 12/15/14

Don L. Neubacher

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