



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: Kevin M. Keheley
From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park
Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2014-037 Valley Fort Unsafe Door Replacement (55426)

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.

Recommendations for Conditions or Stipulations:

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 is consulted on final door design.
- Coordinate with park historical architect to correctly remove and retain the original doors on site.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 55426.

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

Enclosure (with attachments)

cc: Statutory Compliance File

Letter of Com

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

ID: 55426



Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2014-037 Valley Fort Unsafe Door Replacement

PEPC Project Number: 55426

Project Description:

This project proposes to replace five original doors in the Yosemite Valley Group Utility Building (Fort Yosemite #527), built in 1935, which is a contributing structure to the Yosemite Village developed area listed in the Yosemite Valley District (placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2006). The doors are character defining elements to the building. Currently, seven of the personnel doors do not comply with 29 CFR 1910.36(b) Headroom; 29 CFR Sec. 5 (1) Fundamental Requirements; UBC 1003.3.1.3 width and height. In 2008, the buildings and Grounds Branch replaced the Trails Shop door with a code compliant and historically compatible equivalent. This project will continue to utilize the same design drawings as the Trails Shop door.

Under the supervision of the park Historical Architect, the original doors will be removed, cleaned, labeled, photo documented, and stored safely and securely on location. Photo documentation will occur before and after removal, and include storage facilities. All records will be deposited in the park archives. In addition, photographs meeting the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) will be taken prior to removal, including exterior elevations with the doors intact and detailed photographs of doors that are being removed. These will be submitted to HABS. The original doors will be strapped to an adjoining interior wall and encased with a framed and sheeted wall to minimize exposure. Signs will be affixed to the protective cover and the doors, alerting their historical value to the building and instructing that they shall not be moved or discarded. The replacements for the five doors will be designed to match the existing doors as closely as possible, including window sizing and placement and exterior wall and door treatments. Final design of these doors will be approved by the park Historical Architect.

Project Locations:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

- Ensure park historical architect is consulted on final door design.
- Coordinate with park historical architect to correctly remove and retain the original doors on site.

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: //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: 02/06/2015

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: 2014-037 Valley Fort Unsafe Door Replacement
PEPC Project Number: 55426
Project Type: Routine Maintenance (ROU)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Kevin Keheley

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				
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality	No				
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			The removal and replacement of the doors will create temporary noises.
5. Water quality or quantity	No				
6. Streamflow characteristics	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
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				
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	No				
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic 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
18. Archeological resources	No				
19. Prehistoric/historic structure		Negligible			Yosemite Valley Group Utility Building (Fort Yosemite) #059779
20. Cultural landscapes	No				Yosemite Valley Historic District; the replacement doors will be compatible with the existing door design.
21. Ethnographic resources	No				
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.					
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				

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
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 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		

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
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 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
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
Kevin Keheley	Project Leader
Madelyn Ruffner	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>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

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2014-037 Valley Fort Unsafe Door Replacement
PEPC Project Number: 55426
Project Type: Routine Maintenance (ROU)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Kevin Keheley

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?		No		
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		No		
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?	Yes			
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?	Yes			Yosemite Valley Group Utility Building (Fort Yosemite) #059779
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	
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: 2014-037 Valley Fort Unsafe Door Replacement

Prepared by: Renea Kennec **Date Prepared:** 03/11/2015 **Telephone:** 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 55426

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

Yosemite Valley Historic District; the Yosemite Fort is a contributing feature to the historic district.

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

No

Yes

Source or reference:

4. Potentially Affected Resources:

Historical Structures/Resources Affected:

Name and numbers: Yosemite Valley Historic District

NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

Name and numbers: Yosemite Valley Group Utility Building (Fort Yosemite), 1935

Location: Yosemite Valley Historic District

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

Yes Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure

No Replace historic features/elements in kind

Yes Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure

No Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment

No (inc. terrain)

No Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric)

No to a historic setting or cultural landscape

No Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible

- No Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible
- No 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:

Anthropologist
 Name: Jennifer Hardin
 Date: 02/09/2015

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:

Archeologist
 Name: Sonny Montague
 Date: 01/06/2015

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:

Historical Architect
 Name: Paul Stephens
 Date: 02/17/2015

Comments: Permanent on site storage of doors makes this work reversible, therefore achieving no adverse effect.

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 - Valley Fort Unsafe Door Replacement - PEPC ID: 55426

[X] Historical Landscape Architect

Name: Kevin McCardle

Date: 02/17/2015

Comments: Condition is reversible as long as door are kept on premises.

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 - Coordinate with park historical architect to correctly remove and retain the original doors on site.**

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.*



VALLEY UTILITIES
WATER & SEWER



VALLEY
UTILITIES

07/31/2007



Current Trails Shop Doors