



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: Chad O. Thomas, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2015-016 White Wolf Water Utility Building Replacement (59280)

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:

- Consult with the Resources Management and Science Vegetation and Ecological Restoration branch to salvage any appropriate vegetation and soils that will be excavated during the construction of the new building.
- Ensure the exterior of the structure is painted brown to assure different appearance from surrounding historic buildings.

Recommendations for Conditions or Stipulations:

None

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 59280.

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

Enclosure (with attachments)

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

cc: Statutory Compliance File

Letter of Compliance Completion - White Wolf Water Utility Building Replacement - PEPC ID: 59280



Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2015-016 White Wolf Water Utility Building Replacement

PEPC Project Number: 59280

Project Description:

This project will replace existing water utility building measuring 7 ft. x 9 ft. The current building is structurally compromised with cracks running through the concrete floor and the exterior door has gaps along the bottom allowing for rodent intrusion. The existing building will be removed at the end of the season once the water system has been taken offline and replaced with the new building. Site preparation will include ground disturbance in the same footprint as the existing structure. Ground will be leveled and compacted over an area of 15 ft. x 18 ft. and could be disturbed to a depth of as much as 18 to 24 inches prior to compaction.

The replacement structure will be a prefabricated concrete structure 8 ft. x 10 ft. with solid concrete floor. The exterior treatment will appear to be board and batten siding, brown in color. The roof will appear to be brown cedar shake. The color and style selected for the exterior envelope of this structure was selected to differentiate the utility building from the nearby historic White Wolf Lodge. A minimum of two lodgepole pine trees will be removed for the placement of the new structure.

Project Locations:

Tuolumne County, CA

Mitigations:

- Consult with the Resources Management and Science Vegetation and Ecological Restoration branch to salvage any appropriate vegetation and soils that will be excavated during the construction of the new building.
- Ensure the exterior of the structure is painted brown to assure different appearance from surrounding historic buildings.

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.8 Replacement in kind of minor structures and facilities with little or no change in location, capacity or appearance.

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: _____ **Date:** _____
Don L. Neubacher



ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 07/22/2015

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: 2015-016 White Wolf Water Utility Building Replacement
PEPC Project Number: 59280
Project Type: Reconstruction (REC)
Project Location:
County, State: Tuolumne, California
Project Leader: Chad Thomas

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			Ground disturbance will include leveling and compacting of a 15 ft x18 ft area to a depth of 24 inches.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			Temporary air emissions from construction equipment during preparation of building site.
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			Temporary equipment noise during building construction.
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				Project will ensure appropriate vegetation and soils will be excavated and salvaged during the construction of the new building.
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				

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
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				
18. Archeological resources	No				
19. Prehistoric/historic structure		Negligible			White Wolf Lodge is in close proximity to the new utility building.
20. Cultural landscapes	No				
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 resources	No				
26. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	No				
27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability	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
28. Urban quality, gateway communities, etc.	No				
29. Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity	No				The replacement of the building will minimize rodent intrusion and the risk of hantavirus.
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		

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

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

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
Chad Thomas	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>7/22/2015</u>
<u>// Madelyn Ruffner //</u> Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>7/28/2015</u>
<u>// Randy Fong //</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>7/29/2015</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>// Don L. Neubacher //</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>7/30/2015</u>



PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: July 22, 2015

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2015-016 White Wolf Water Utility Building Replacement
PEPC Project Number: 59280
Project Type: Reconstruction (REC)
Project Location:
County, State: Tuolumne, California
Project Leader: Chad Thomas

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)?	Yes			Yosemite Toad
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			Ground disturbance will include leveling and compacting of a 15 ft x18 ft area to a depth of 24 inches.
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?			N/A	
Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?	Yes			White Wolf Lodge, LCS #55887 is in close proximity to the new utility building.
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?			N/A	
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: 2015-016 White Wolf Water Utility Building Replacement

Prepared by: Renea Kennec **Date Prepared:** 07/22/2015 **Telephone:** 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 59280

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

White Wolf Lodge

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

 No

 X Yes

Source or reference:

4. **Potentially Affected Resource(s):**

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

 Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment
 Yes (inc. terrain)

 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

 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: Scott Carpenter

Date: 07/21/2015

Comments: No issues with ethnographic or traditional/religious properties.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: X No Potential to Cause Effect No Historic Properties Affected No

Adverse Effect Adverse Effect Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

[X] Archeologist

Name: Sara Dolan

Date: 07/20/2015

Comments: No known archaeological sites within immediate project area.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: No Potential to Cause Effect X No Historic Properties Affected No

Adverse Effect Adverse Effect Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: No monitoring is necessary.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

[X] Historical Architect

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 07/20/2015

Comments: Select brown exterior paint to assure differnt appearance from surrounding historic buildings

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [X]

Assessment of Effect: No Potential to Cause Effect X No Historic Properties Affected No

Adverse Effect Adverse Effect X Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: Select brown exterior paint to assure differnt appearance from surrounding historic buildings

Doc Method: Streamlined Review (PA)

Streamlined Activity:

4. Health and Safety Activities

No Reviews From: Curator, Historian, 106 Advisor, Other Advisor, Historical Landscape Architect

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.

Explanation: 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 - Ensure the exterior of the structure is painted brown to assure different appearance from surrounding historic buildings.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Historic Preservation Officer:

Kimball Koch // Kimball Koch // Date 7/22/2015

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: 7/30/2015
Don L. Neubacher