



IN REPLY REFER TO:
L7615(YOSE-PM)

United States Department of the Interior NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Yosemite National Park
P. O. Box 577
Yosemite, California 95389

Memorandum

To: Parker Davis, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2015-034 Tioga Pass Entrance Station Increased Security (61428)

The Executive Leadership Team has reviewed the proposed project/action 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 a tribal monitor is on hand during ground disturbing portions of the project.
- Work with Historical Architect on final design so that camera locations are compatible with and unobtrusive to the historic setting.
- Ensure all vegetation is salvaged to use for re-vegetation.
- Ensure the light fixtures protect night skies.
- Archeological monitoring during utility trenching is required.

Recommendations for Conditions or Stipulations: None

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 61428.

// Don Neubacher //

Don L. Neubacher

Enclosure (with attachments)

cc: Statutory Compliance File

Letter of Compliance Completion - Tioga Pass Entrance Station Increased Security - PEPC ID: 61428

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



Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: 2015-034 Tioga Pass Entrance Station Increased Security

PEPC Project Number: 61428

Project Description:

There are currently no security cameras, intrusion alarms, or duress alarms at the Tioga Pass Entrance station, where there have been two burglaries over the last two years. All of the entrance stations to Yosemite collect roughly 22 million dollars annually, and the other four gates have these security systems in place. The goal of this project is to install a system of cameras and alarms that provides security at Tioga Pass for the entrance station employees, park visitors, revenue collected and park assets.

The system itself will mirror those at the other entrance stations. The park will install the following: cameras on the interior and exterior of the kiosk, the office, and possibly one in the snag which has housed the webcam; an intrusion alarm system within the kiosk and the office; fiber connecting the kiosk to the office (current set-up is through a wireless bridge) laid in 2" conduit in a trench (18" deep x 66' long) with two pull boxes; three exterior lights on the office; and other associated equipment to safeguard and establish the system, switches, power supply, etc.

The trench will be different widths across the Tioga Road and through the meadow. Across the road (13'8" from curb to edge of pavement) it will be 16" wide to accommodate a backhoe with a 12" bucket, leaving enough room to compact the base course and repave afterwards. Through the meadow, the trench will be hand-dug (53' long x 8" wide) to minimize disturbance to the meadow. The trenching will be between the kiosk and the office and will dogleg into the rear corner where all utilities currently enter the building.

All cameras will be flush-mounted, dome style camera with a 4 1/2" base and a 3 1/2" height (to top of dome). The colors will match the paint of the mounted surface. Exposed conduit will be minimized.

The three lights will be on motion sensors and timers and will be directed light so as not to cause undue light pollution to the nightscape. The lights will allow the cameras to capture images at night which would otherwise be areas around the building shrouded in darkness, rendering the cameras ineffective at that time of day.

The park may also install the same type of camera in the snag north of the office which has held a webcam from the Scripps Institute. However, this is contingent upon there already being a data line from that tree to the office so that trenching an additional 50' for one camera is avoided. If installation of this camera involves an additional trench, this camera will not be a part of this project.

Project Locations:

Tuolumne County, CA

Mitigations:

- Ensure a tribal monitor is on hand during ground disturbing portions of the project.
- Work with Historical Architect on final design so that camera locations are compatible with and unobtrusive to the historic setting.
- Ensure all vegetation is salvaged to use for re-vegetation.

- Ensure the light fixtures protect night skies.
- Archeological monitoring during utility trenching is required.

CE Citation: C.15 Installation of underground utilities in previously disturbed areas having stable soils, or in an existing utility right-of-way.

Decision: I find that the action fits within the categorical exclusion above. Therefore, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No extraordinary circumstances apply.

Superintendent: // Don Neubacher // **Date:** 6/23/2016
Don L. Neubacher

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

Extraordinary Circumstances:

If implemented, would the proposal...	Yes/No	Notes
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	
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, 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 (EO 12898)?	No	
K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 130007)?	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	



ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

Updated Sept 2015 per NPS NEPA Handbook

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: 2015-034 Tioga Pass Entrance Station Increased Security
PEPC Project Number: 61428
Project Type: Emergency Repair (ER)
Project Location:
County, State: Tuolumne, California
Project Leader: Parker Davis

B. RESOURCE IMPACTS TO CONSIDER:

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Air Air Quality	Potential	Temporary, minimal dust created when trenching.
Biological Nonnative or Exotic Species	None	
Biological Species of Special Concern or Their Habitat	None	
Biological Vegetation	Potential	Vegetation will be salvaged during excavation for restoration work.
Biological Wildlife and/or Wildlife Habitat including terrestrial and aquatic species	None	
Cultural Archeological Resources	Potential	There are archeological sites in the near vicinity. Archeological monitoring is required for this project.
Cultural Cultural Landscapes	None	
Cultural Ethnographic Resources	Potential	No Ethnographic Resources Identified within project area. Tribal consultation conducted in February 2016. Bishop Paiute Tribe responded on April 7, 2016 and requested a Tribal Monitor for ground disturbing portions of the project. Recommendations: Tribal

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
		monitor on hand during ground disturbing portions of the project.
Cultural Museum Collections	None	
Cultural Prehistoric/historic structures	None	
Geological Geologic Features	Potential	Trenching includes 65 feet long, 18 inches deep and 4 inches wide.
Geological Geologic Processes	None	
Lightscares Lightscares	Potential	Lighting will be chosen to protect the dark night sky.
Other Human Health and Safety	None	
Other Operational	None	
Socioeconomic Land Use	None	
Socioeconomic Minority and low-income populations, size, migration patterns, etc.	None	
Socioeconomic Socioeconomic	None	
Soundscapes Soundscapes	None	
Viewsheds Viewsheds	Potential	The Tioga Pass Entrance Station is a existing developed area. The viewshed will be minimally impacted.
Visitor Use and Experience Recreation Resources	None	
Visitor Use and Experience Visitor Use and Experience	None	
Water Floodplains	None	

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Water Marine or Estuarine Resources	None	
Water Water Quality or Quantity	None	
Water Wetlands	None	
Water Wild and Scenic River	None	
Wilderness Wilderness	None	

Recommended:

Compliance Specialists	Date
<u>// Renea Kennec //</u> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	<u>6/21/2016</u>
<u>// Madelyn Ruffner //</u> Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>6/21/2016</u>
<u>// Randy Fong //</u> Chief, Project Management – Randy Fong	<u>6/22/2016</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>// Don Neubacher //</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>6/23/2016</u>

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



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

Project Name: 2015-034 Tioga Pass Entrance Station Increased Security

Prepared by: Renea Kennec **Date Prepared:** 05/10/2016 **Telephone:** 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 61428

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

Tioga Pass Entrance Station (NR); Tioga Road Historic District (DOE)

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

☐ No

☒ Yes

Source or reference:

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

Archeological resources affected:

Name and number(s): Archeological Site

Historical Structures/Resources Affected:

Name and number(s): Tioga Pass Entrance Station **LCS** 005794 **Asset** MA03200

NR status: 1 - Listed in Register and documented

Name and number(s): Tioga Road Historic District

NR status: 10 - Concurrence Determination of Eligibility with SHPO

Historical Structures/Resources Notes: The Tioga Pass Entrance Station is within the Tioga Road Historic District, but not contributing. Tioga Pass Entrance Station is not part of the eligible Tuolumne Meadows Historic District.

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)

☐ 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:

☒ 106 Advisor

Name: Kimball Koch

Date: 06/01/2016

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: Final camera size/location information needs to be reviewed by HA (through Scott Carpenter) to ensure minimization of visual effects within road corridor

☒ Anthropologist

Name: Eirik Thorsgard

Date: 05/31/2016

Comments: No Ethnographic Resources Identified within project area. Tribal consultation conducted in February 2016. Bishop Paiute Tribe responded on April 7, 2016 and requested a Tribal Monitor for ground disturbing portions of the project.

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: Tribal monitor on hand during ground disturbing portions of the project.

☒ Archeologist

Name: Sara Dolan

Date: 03/10/2016

Comments: The project area is located nearby a sensitive archeological resource.

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: Archeological monitoring during utility trenching is required.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

[X] Historian

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 06/01/2016

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:

[X] Historical Architect

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 03/08/2016

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: Paint housing of exterior cameras to match color of trim piece of building to which cameras are attached.

[X] Historical Landscape Architect

Name: Kimball Koch

Date: 05/17/2016

Comments: Work with Historical Architect on final design so that camera locations are compatible with and unobtrusive to the historic setting.

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: Work with Historical Architect on final design so that camera locations are compatible with and unobtrusive to the historic setting.

No Reviews From: Curator, 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 2016

☐ 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 a tribal monitor is on hand during ground disturbing portions of the project.

- Assessment of Effect - Work with Historical Architect on final design so that camera locations are compatible with and unobtrusive to the historic setting.
- Assessment of Effect - Archeological monitoring during utility trenching is required.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Kimball
Koch // Kimball Koch // **Date:** 6/21/2016

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 Neubacher // **Date:** 6/23/2016
Don L. Neubacher

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