



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: Ron Gaunt, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park
From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park
Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2015-002 Yosemite Lodge Generator Replacement (56597)

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 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:

- Recommend screening generator from employee housing, with a design compatible with the Yosemite Lodge to further minimize the visual impact. The screen could be similar to the condenser fence.

Recommendations for Conditions or Stipulations:

None

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 56597.

//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.*



Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2015-002 Yosemite Lodge Generator Replacement

PEPC Project Number: 56597

Project Description:

The purpose of this project is to replace the existing generator located at Yosemite Lodge (YL) back dock utility area with a new code compliant model that supplies power to the YL core area. The existing generator will be removed from the interior location, and the new generator will be installed outside and nearby the original location. All work will be code compliant and performed by a qualified contractor.

The new generator will be free standing. The fuel supply and return will be routed above ground in a surface trench; excavation for fuel lines will not be necessary. Some surface grading in a rectangular area approximately 24 feet long and 9 feet wide is necessary to install the generator on a level surface. Park High Voltage staff was consulted on electrical service for the generator and their request was underground installation of the new electrical lines. Trenching from electrical source to the generator will involve a 24 inch wide, 42 inch deep and approximately 30 feet long trench. Two mid-size Cedar trees and one stump must be removed for the project to proceed.

Project Locations:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

- Recommend screening generator from employee housing, with a design compatible with the Yosemite Lodge to further minimize the visual impact. The screen could be similar to the condenser fence.

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: 3/31/15

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: 03/24/2015

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: 2015-002 Yosemite Lodge Generator Replacement
PEPC Project Number: 56597
Project Type: Equipment Replacement (EQR)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California **District:** Yosemite Valley
Project Leader: Ron Gaunt

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			Generator pad measures 24 feet long and 9 feet wide. Trenching will include 30 feet long, 24 inches wide and 42 inches deep.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			The generator will only be used during power outages but there will be air emissions produced during emergency situations.
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			The generator will produce some equipment noises but the new model has sound attenuation and will be quieter than the existing model.

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 (plant or animal)	No				
16. Recreation resources, including	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
supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.					
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				Yosemite Lodge visitors will still have access to electricity during power outages.
18. Archeological resources		Negligible			Yosemite Valley Archeological District
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes		Negligible			Yosemite Valley Historic District and proposed eligible Yosemite Lodge Historic District; the park Historic Landscape Architect recommends screening generator from employee housing, with a design compatible with the Yosemite Lodge to further minimize the visual impact. The screen could be similar to the condenser fence.
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.	No				
25. Energy	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
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

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? 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
Kathleen Morse	Chief of Planning
Randy Fong	Chief of Project Management
Jeff 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
Ron Gaunt	Project Leader
Madelyn Ruffner	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> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	<u>3/25/15</u>
<u>//Madelyn Ruffner//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>3/30/15</u>
<u>//Randy Fong//</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>3/31/15</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Don L. Neubacher//</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>3/31/15</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 25, 2015

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2015-002 Yosemite Lodge Generator Replacement
PEPC Project Number: 56597
Project Type: Equipment Replacement (EQR)
Project Location:
 County, State: Mariposa, California **District:** Yosemite Valley
Project Leader: Ron Gaunt

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			Generator pad measures 24 feet long and 9 feet wide. Trenching will include 30 feet long, 24 inches wide and 42 inches deep.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		No		
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		
Has a National Register form been completed?	Yes			Proposed Yosemite Lodge Historic District; Yosemite Valley Historic District

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
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: 2015-002 Yosemite Lodge Generator Replacement

Prepared by: Renea Kennec **Date Prepared:** 03/24/2015 **Telephone:** 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 56597

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

Proposed Yosemite Lodge Historic District; 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

Name and numbers: Yosemite Lodge Historic District - Determination of Eligibility in process

NR status: 5 - Found eligible for 106 purposes pending consultation with the SHPO

Historical Structures/Resources Notes: The park Historic Landscape Architect recommends screening generator from employee housing, with a design compatible with the Yosemite Lodge to further minimize the visual impact. The screen could be similar to the condenser fence.

Ethnographic Resources Affected:

Name and numbers: Resources of Religious and Cultural Significance

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)
- Yes 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:

Archeologist
 Name: Sonny Montague
 Date: 03/25/2015

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

Anthropologist
 Name: Brian Lefler
 Date: 03/26/2015
 Comments: Mike Turek reviewed and agrees with Jennifer Hardin - "No archeological or tribal concerns".

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

Historical Architect

Name: Randy Fong

Date: 03/25/2015

Comments: No comments

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 Landscape Architect

Name: Kevin McCardle

Date: 03/25/2015

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: Recommend screening generator from employee housing, with a design compatible with the Lodge to further minimize the visual impact. It could be similar to the fence around the condenser it will be next to.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

No Reviews From: Curator, Historian, 106 Advisor, Other Advisor, Anthropologist

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.

Assessment of Effect Form - Yosemite Lodge Generator Replacement - PEPC ID: 56597

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 - Recommend screening generator from employee housing, with a design compatible with the Yosemite Lodge to further minimize the visual impact. The screen could be similar to the condenser fence.**

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Historic Preservation Officer:

Kimball

Koch

//Kimball Koch//

Date: 3/26/15

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: 4/1/15

Don L. Neubacher

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