



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: Garrett Chun, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2014-034 Church Bowl Area Restroom Installation (55102)

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 adverse 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:

- Ensure park historical architect reviews the final building design.
- Ensure final location is reviewed by park archeology staff. Spot checking might be necessary to protect archeological sites.
- Ensure Project Management and park historical landscape architect reviews final design to address accessibility, circulation connections, and conformance with Design Guidelines.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 55102.

//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 - Church Bowl Area Restroom Installation - PEPC ID: 55102



Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2014-034 Church Bowl Area Restroom Installation

PEPC Project Number: 55102

Project Description:

The Church Bowl Picnic area, located between the Ahwahnee Hotel and the medical clinic in Yosemite Valley, currently has four portable toilets that require frequent maintenance. This area is impacted by moderately high visitor use. This project will replace these portable toilets with a new accessible restroom about 17 feet x 23 feet consisting of a men's and women's restroom that will each have two fixtures, one accessible and one additional fixture (for a total of four fixtures). A concrete walkway will be installed for an accessible path of travel. This project will meet current standards for accessibility, including American with Disabilities Act and the Architectural Barriers Act requirements. The exterior envelope will be designed to be compatible with the architectural features of Yosemite Valley (see *Sense of Place, Design Guidelines for Yosemite Valley*). Exterior roofing material will be recycled aluminum material. Exterior siding shall be commercially grown lumber or a fiber cement material that looks like wood. The electrical system shall emphasize energy conservation by using low wattage lighting and incorporating natural ambient light from windows. This project will incorporate proper signage into the project to interpret the efforts of the park to reduce waste to increase conservation. The interior envelope will be tiled with a product composed of recycled, sustainable materials. The privacy partitions would be a manufactured recycled monolithic vinyl material to increase longevity and improve aesthetics. All fixtures will be installed with water saving features including motion detectors on hand washing fixtures, waterless urinal, low flush water closets and utility sinks with pressure activated faucets. Utility work includes trenching 200 feet long by 2 feet wide by 5 feet deep.

Project Locations:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

- Ensure park historical architect reviews the final building design.
- Ensure final location is reviewed by park archeology staff. Spot checking might be necessary to protect archeological sites.
- Ensure Project Management and park historical landscape architect reviews final design to address accessibility, circulation connections, and conformance with Design Guidelines.

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.18 Construction of minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas.

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:** 3/19/15
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: 03/11/2015

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: 2014-034 Church Bowl Area Restroom Installation
PEPC Project Number: 55102
Project Type: Capital Improvement/New Construction (CI)
Project Location:
 County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Garrett Chun
Administrative Record Location: Environmental Planning and Compliance Office
Administrative Record Contact: Renea Kennec
Notes:

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			Foundation work measures 17 feet by 23 feet. The site is fairly level so there will be minimal vertical ground disturbance. Utility trenching includes 200 foot long by 2 feet wide by 5 feet deep.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			Installation of the building has the potential to disperse some temporary dust and exhaust emissions.
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			During the building installation there will be temporary construction noises.

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
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.
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	No				This project will be constructed using day labor with no equipment coming into the park.

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
(plant or animal)					
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	No				
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources		Negligible			Visitor experience will be enhanced by the restroom upgrade from portables to a permanent structure.
18. Archeological resources		Negligible			Yosemite Valley Archeological District
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes		Negligible			Yosemite Valley Historic District
21. Ethnographic resources		Negligible			This project was placed on the October 2014 tribal spreadsheet; no comments were received.
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				

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
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 water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or		No		

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

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
federal lands 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? No
4. Has consultation with all affected agencies or tribes been completed? Yes, October Tribal Spreadsheet
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

Interdisciplinary Team	Field of Expertise
Don L. Neubacher	Superintendent
Michael Gauthier	Chief of Staff
Kathleen Morse	Chief of Planning
Randy Fong	Chief of Project Management
Jeffrey Hilliard	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
Garrett Chun	Project Leader

Madelyn Ruffner Renea Kenec	Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager 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>3/11/15</u>
<u>//Madelyn Ruffner//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>3/16/15</u>
<u>//Randy Fong//</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>3/17/15</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Don L. Neubacher//</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>3/19/15</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: March 11, 2015

(This form should be attached to ESF document sent to the regional director's office for signature. While you may modify this form to fit your needs, you must ensure that the form includes information detailed below and must have your modifications reviewed and approved by the regional environmental coordinator.)

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: Church Bowl Area Restroom Installation
PEPC Project Number: 55102
Project Type: Capital Improvement/New Construction (CI)
Project Location:
 County, State: Mariposa, 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)?		N		
Species of special concern (Federal or State)?		N		
Park rare plants or vegetation?		N		
Potential habitat for any special-status species listed above?		N		
NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST				
Entail ground disturbance?	Y			Foundation work measures 17 feet by 23 feet. Utility trenching includes 200 foot long by 2 feet wide by 5 feet deep.

Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?	Y			Final building location will be reviewed by park archeological staff to determine if spot monitoring is necessary.
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?	Y			The restroom will add another structure onto Yosemite Valley's landscape.
Has a National Register form been completed?	Y			Yosemite Valley Historic District and Yosemite Valley Archeological District
Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?		N		
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST				
Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor? (Name the river corridor)		N		
Fall within the bed and banks AND will affect the free-flow of the river? >>If Yes, WSRA Section 7 determination required<<		N		
Have the possibility of affecting water quality of the area?		N		
Remain consistent with its river segment classification?				
Fall on a tributary of a Wild and Scenic River?		N		
Will the project encroach or intrude upon the Wild and Scenic River corridor? >>If Yes, WSRA Section 7 determination required<<		N		
Will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values? >>If Yes, WSRA Section 7 determination required<<		N		
WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST				
Within designated Wilderness? >>If yes, a Wilderness Minimum Requirements Analysis is required.>>		N		

Within a Potential Wilderness Addition? >>If yes, a Wilderness Minimum Requirements Analysis is required.>>		N		
---	--	---	--	--



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Name:** 2014-034 Church Bowl Area Restroom Installation

Prepared by: Renea Kennec **Date Prepared:** 01/13/2015 **Telephone:** 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 55102

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

Yosemite Valley Historic District; Yosemite Valley Archeological District

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: 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

Ethnographic Resources Affected:

Name and numbers: Resources of Religious and Cultural Significance

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
- 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:

Anthropologist

Name: Jennifer Hardin

Date: 01/13/2015

Comments: Proposed project submitted to traditionally associated tribes and groups via October 2014 Tribal Review List. No comments received as of January 13, 2015. Ethnographic resources are present in the project area but will not be affected.

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

Archeologist

Name: Sonny Montague

Date: 01/13/2015

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: Spot-check monitoring recommended for any potential inadvertent discoveries, due to close proximity to archeological sites.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

Historical Landscape Architect

Name: Kevin McCardle

Date: 02/17/2015

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:

[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.

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

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 - Cultural Landscapes - Ensure park historical architect reviews the final building design.**
- **Assessment of Effect - Archeology - Ensure final location is reviewed by park archeology staff. Spot checking might be necessary to protect archeological sites.**

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Historic Preservation Officer

Kimball Koch //Kimball Koch// **Date** 3/12/15

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:** 3/19/15
Don L. Neubacher

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