



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: Rod Kennec, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2015-001 Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Office Addition (56265)

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:

- No mitigations identified.

Recommendations for Conditions or Stipulations:

None

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 56265.

// 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: 2015-001 Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Office Addition

PEPC Project Number: 56265

Project Description:

The Yosemite Historic Preservation Shop will add 280 square feet of structure, (17' x 16'6") to the rear of the Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Office (TMRO). The office addition is scheduled to be constructed in conjunction with the completion of the two year rehabilitation of the existing 1925 structure. Ground disturbance is necessary in the immediate footprint of the addition (280 square feet). The excavation consists of a perimeter footing measuring 12" deep by 46' long by 2' wide for a total of 92 cubic feet of soil to be removed. Possible improvements for site drainage could affect another 100 square feet to the west of the structure but no greater than six inches deep. Adding on to the existing ranger office triggers the requirement to provide an accessible path of travel from an accessible parking place to the building. Minimal ground disturbance will occur during the installation of the accessible path and parking as they will closely follow the existing terrain.

Eight Lodgepole pine trees need to be removed from behind the TMRO that are near or inside the 280 square feet footprint of the addition. The quantity and diameter of the trees are, one at 14", three at 10", two at 8", one at 6" and one at 5".

The addition will be constructed in a similar method as the existing structure with distinguishing exterior differences. To differentiate the addition, the outside wall of the addition will be offset from the existing and the roof ridge will be lower on the addition. The siding will be conventional board and batten as opposed to the reverse board and internal batten used on the existing 1925 structure. The rafters will be log and the roofing will be corrugated metal as is currently covering the existing structure. The floor will be of conventional wood construction and the interior walls will be tongue and groove pine to match the existing. Electrical and communication systems will be extended from the existing structure to the addition. There will be no plumbing in either the existing or the additional structure. This will be accomplished by placing a 16' x 16' designated parking place at the edge of the existing Tuolumne Lodge Road, east of the ranger office. The parking place will be paved with asphalt with minimal ground disturbance, just leveling. The accessible path of travel will be 4' wide by 50' long and less than five percent grade to the rear of the building. The path will be paved with a hardened surface material such as "Stalok" or compacted road base.

Project Locations:

Tuolumne County, CA

Mitigations:

- No mitigations identified.

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

Categorical Exclusion Form - Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Office Addition - PEPC ID: 56265

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:** 7/30/2015
Don L. Neubacher



ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 05/18/2015

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: 2015-001 Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Office Addition
PEPC Project Number: 56265
Project Type: Repair/Rehabilitation (REHAB)
Project Location:
County, State: Tuolumne, California
Project Leader: Rod Kennec

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 includes 12 inches for 100 square feet and 6 inches for 180 square feet under the addition; 6 inches for 100 square feet for drainage and 6 inches for 500 square feet for the path and parking.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			The project will produce some temporary air emissions around the construction site.
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			There will be temporary construction noises during the placement of the addition.
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,	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
aesthetic resources					
18. Archeological resources		Negligible			Tuolumne Meadows Archeological District
19. Prehistoric/historic structure		Negligible			The Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Station is on the National Register of Historic Places; Building #3000.
20. Cultural landscapes		Negligible			Tuolumne Meadows Historic District and Cultural Landscapes Inventory.
21. Ethnographic resources		Negligible			February 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				
26. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	No				
27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability	No				
28. Urban quality, gateway	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
communities, etc.					
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		No		

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

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
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? Yes
- 2.A. If so, plan name: Tuolumne River Plan
Plan Project ID:
- 2.B. Is the project still consistent with the approved plan? Yes
- 2.C. Is the environmental document accurate and up-to-date?
FONSI: No ROD: Yes Date approved: 06/24/2014
3. Are there any interested or affected agencies or parties? Yes
- 3.A. Did you make a diligent effort to contact them? Yes
4. Has consultation with all affected agencies or tribes been completed? Yes
5. Are there any connected, cumulative, or similar actions as part of the proposed action? (*e.g., other 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
Korwin Kirk	Project Leader
Madelyn Ruffner	Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
Renea Kennec	NEPA Specialist

F. SUPERVISORY SIGNATORY

Environmental Screening Form (ESF) - Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Office Addition - PEPC ID: 56265

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>7/21/2015</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 21, 2015

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2015-001 Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Office Addition
PEPC Project Number: 56265
Project Type: Repair/Rehabilitation (REHAB)
Project Location:
County, State: Tuolumne, California
Project Leader: Rod Kennec

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			Ground disturbance includes 12 inches for 100 square feet and 6 inches for 180 square feet under the addition; 6 inches for 100 square feet for drainage and 6 inches for 500 square feet for the path and parking.
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		No		SHPO recommended having a qualified archeologist monitor ground

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
				disturbing activities during the project.
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?	Yes			This is an addition to the historic ranger station. SHPO concurred with the park's assessment of No Adverse Effect.
Has a National Register form been completed?	Yes			Listed on the National Register of Historic Places as Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Stations and Restrooms
Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?	Yes			List of Classified Structures #005788
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST				
Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor?	Yes			Tuolumne 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: 2015-001 Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Office Addition

Prepared by: Renea Kennec **Date Prepared:** 05/18/2015 **Telephone:** 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 56265

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

Tuolumne Meadows Archeological District; Tuolumne Meadows Historic District; listed on the National Register of Historic Places, Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Stations and Restroom

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

 No

 X Yes

Source or reference:

4. **Potentially Affected Resources:**

Historical Structures/Resources Affected:

Name and numbers: Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Station LCS 5788

Location: Tuolumne Meadows

NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

Cultural Landscapes Affected:

Name and numbers: Tuolumne Meadows Historic District

Location: Tuolumne Meadows

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

 Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment
 No (inc. terrain)

 Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric)
 Yes 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:

☒ Anthropologist

Name: Mike Turek

Date: 05/14/2015

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: 06/16/2015

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 by the Archeology Office is recommended. If buried historical or prehistoric cultural materials are encountered during construction, stop ground-disturbing activities and contact the Archeology Office at 379-1313 or 379-1314.

☒ Historical Architect

Name: Randy Fong

Date: 05/18/2015

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: Ensure that entry and internal spaces of addition meet ADA-ABA accessibility guidelines.

[X] Historical Landscape Architect
Name: Kevin McCardle
Date: 05/26/2015

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: Standard 4-Step Process

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:

[X] 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.

[] 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: SHPO concurred with the proposed Finding of No Adverse Effect. SHPO recommended having a qualified archeologist monitor ground disturbing activities during the project.

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.)**

No Assessment of Effect mitigations identified.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Historic Preservation Officer:

Kimball

Koch

// Kimball Koch //

Date: 7/28/2015

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 //

Don L. Neubacher

Date: 7/30/2015