



# 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:** Treacy Stone, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

**From:** Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

**Subject:** NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2016-003 Degnan's Restaurant and Loft Remodel (63550)

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:

- The current plans indicate there are no ground disturbing actions. PM staff are required to inform the cultural resources staff if the existing plans change and ground disturbance is proposed.
- Conditional Approval - Fire and Smoke Detection and Suppression System - requires resubmission of design development and final construction documents for review, comment and approval prior to field action.
- Project approval based on design and level of detail presented; requires resubmission of design development and final construction documents for final approval.
- Design changes must be resubmitted for review and comment prior to commencing related work in the field.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 63550.

//Jeff Hilliard// for

Woody Smeck

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:** 2016-003 Degnan's Restaurant and Loft Remodel

**PEPC Project Number:** 63550

**Description of Action (Project Description):**

This action will implement requirements of the concession contract CC-YOSE004-16 with Yosemite Hospitality LLC which began March 1, 2016. Construction is planned for winter of 2017.

The project undertaking includes the rehabilitation of Degnan's Restaurant and Loft in Yosemite Valley. A principal selection factor in the current concessioner contract was to provide visitors improved food and beverage operations, product quality, consistency, and availability. The current concessioner was selected, in part, because their bid proposal addressed innovative solutions to better serve Park visitors. The objectives of this undertaking are:

- Maximize operational efficiency for food service and office space
  - Consolidate kitchen and ware washing on first level
  - Install new equipment and layout in back-of-house areas
  - Install full-service bar on second level
  - Reconfigure back-of-house area on second level for office space and minor prep area
- Improve customer experience and minimize wait times
  - Reconfigure and expand front-of-house food service concepts and dining areas
  - Repair three fireplaces to working order with propane inserts
  - Provide pizza and fresh-baked bakery items
- Address deferred maintenance
  - Upgrade electrical system
  - Comprehensive heating, ventilation and cooling upgrades
  - Replace grease interceptor
- Meet fire, safety, accessibility, and Operational Safety and Health code compliance
  - Modify bathrooms for ADA compliance
  - Install lighting, motion sensors, sprinklers, fire alarms, etc. as required per historic building code
  - Meet code-compliant headroom on internal stairway
- Avoid all adverse effects to historic properties

The building is a simple, two-story, A-frame building designed to fit into the landscape. The building was not listed or evaluated for listing on either the Yosemite Village Historic District or the Yosemite Valley Historic District because it was built after the period of significance for each of these properties. The building has been evaluated for eligibility. A historic structure report is being developed to inform the design process for rehabilitation.

**Project Locations:**

Mariposa County, CA

**Mitigations:**

- The current plans indicate there are no ground disturbing actions. PM staff are required to inform the cultural resources staff if the existing plans change and ground disturbance is proposed.
- Conditional Approval - Fire and Smoke Detection and Suppression System - requires resubmission of design development and final construction documents for review, comment and approval prior to field action.
- Project approval based on design and level of detail presented; requires resubmission of design development and final construction documents for final approval.
- Design changes must be resubmitted for review and comment prior to commencing related work in the field.

**CE Citation:** 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.

**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.

**Acting**

**Superintendent:**

//Jeff Hilliard// for

Woody Smeck

**Date:** 11/9/16

*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
<b>A.</b> Have significant impacts on public health or safety?	No	
<b>B.</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	
<b>C.</b> Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?	No	
<b>D.</b> Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?	No	
<b>E.</b> Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?	No	
<b>F.</b> Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?	No	
<b>G.</b> 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	
<b>H.</b> 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	
<b>I.</b> Violate a federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?	No	
<b>J.</b> Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EO 12898)?	No	
<b>K.</b> 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	
<b>L.</b> 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:** 2016-003 Degnan's Restaurant and Loft Remodel

**PEPC Project Number:** 63550

**Project Type:**  
Concessions (CON)

**Project Location:**

**County, State:**  
Mariposa, California

**Project Leader:**  
Treacy Stone

### B. RESOURCE IMPACTS TO CONSIDER:

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Air Air Quality	None	
Biological Nonnative or Exotic Species	None	
Biological Species of Special Concern or Their Habitat	None	
Biological Vegetation	None	
Biological Wildlife and/or Wildlife Habitat including terrestrial and aquatic species	None	
Cultural Archeological Resources	None	Project managers are required to inform cultural resources staff if the existing plans change and ground disturbance is proposed.
Cultural Cultural Landscapes	None	
Cultural Ethnographic	None	Tribal consultation occurred on the June tribal spreadsheet dated 06/24/2016. No comments or concerns have been expressed in regards to

<b>Resource</b>	<b>Potential for Impact</b>	<b>Potential Issues &amp; Impacts</b>
Resources		this project. This review is based on the project as currently proposed. Additional information will be addressed as it becomes available.
<b>Cultural</b> Museum Collections	None	
<b>Cultural</b> Prehistoric/historic structures	None	
<b>Geological</b> Geologic Features	None	
<b>Geological</b> Geologic Processes	None	
<b>Lightscares</b> Lightscares	None	
<b>Other</b> Human Health and Safety	None	
<b>Other</b> Operational	None	
<b>Socioeconomic</b> Land Use	None	
<b>Socioeconomic</b> Minority and low- income populations, size, migration patterns, etc.	None	
<b>Socioeconomic</b> Socioeconomic	None	
<b>Soundscapes</b> Soundscapes	Potential	Temporary, interior construction noise during working hours.
<b>Viewsheds</b> Viewsheds	None	
<b>Visitor Use and Experience</b> Recreation Resources	Potential	Degnan's Restaurant and Loft services will temporarily be closed from November 2016 through February 2017.
<b>Visitor Use and Experience</b> Visitor Use and Experience		
<b>Water</b> Floodplains	None	
<b>Water</b> Marine or Estuarine Resources	None	
<b>Water</b> Water Quality or Quantity	None	
<b>Water</b>	None	

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Wetlands		
<b>Water</b> Wild and Scenic River	Potential	This project takes place in the Merced Wild and Scenic River Corridor.
<b>Wilderness</b> Wilderness	None	

**Recommended:**

Compliance Specialists	Date
<u>//Renea Kennecc//</u> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennecc	<u>11/8/16</u>
<u>//Erin Davenport//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Erin Davenport	<u>11/9/16</u>
<u>//Madelyn Ruffner//</u> Chief, Project Management – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>11/9/16</u>

**Approved:**

Acting Superintendent	Date
<u>//Jeff Hilliard// for</u> Woody Smeck	<u>11/9/16</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:** 2016-003 Degnan's Restaurant and Loft Remodel  
**Prepared by:** Erin Davenport    **Date Prepared:** 10/11/2016    **Telephone:** 209-379-1067  
**PEPC Project Number:** 63550

**Area of potential effects (as defined in 36 CFR 800.16[d])**  
Yosemite Valley Historic District Degnan's Restaurant 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 Resource(s):**

#### **Archeological resources affected:**

**Name and number(s):** CA-MRP-56/H  
**NR status:** 1 - Listed in Register and documented

#### **Historical Structures/Resources Affected:**

**Name and number(s):** Yosemite Valley Historic District  
**NR status:** 1 - Listed in Register and documented

**Name and number(s):** Degnans Restaurant  
**NR status:** 5 - Found eligible for 106 purposes through consultation with the SHPO

**Historical Structures/Resources Notes:** Degnan's Restaurant was determined eligible for listing on the national register of historic places by the SHPO on October 5, 2016. The Degnan-Donohue, Inc. building (Degnan's Restaurant and Loft) was built in 1958 in the new Yosemite Village as part of the Mission 66 program expanding visitor services and amenities. It contained a restaurant, soda fountain, bakery, and delicatessen. The building was designed by San Francisco architect Eldridge Theodore "Ted" Spencer who was instrumental in the development and re-development of buildings throughout Yosemite. The building is a simple, two-story, A-frame building designed to fit into the landscape. The building is not identified as a contributing resource to either the Yosemite Village Historic District or the Yosemite Valley Historic District because neither nomination included Mission-66 resources at the time they were written.

### 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 (inc. terrain)  
Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting  
No 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:

---

106 Advisor  
Name: Kimball Koch  
Date: 11/08/2016

Comments: Project reviewed by historical architect who has worked closely with the project designers to ensure that there is no adverse effect to the building.

*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:

---

Anthropologist  
Name: Eirik Thorsgard  
Date: 09/01/2016

Comments: Project is near Ethnographic sites, but not within their boundaries. Tribal Consultation was in the June Tribal Spreadsheet dated 06/24/2016. No comments or concerns have been expressed in regards to this project. This review is based on the project as currently proposed. Additional information will be addressed as it becomes available.

*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: Sara Dolan  
Date: 11/01/2016

Comments: This review is based on the project as currently proposed. Additional information will be evaluated as it becomes available.

*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: The current plans indicate there are no ground disturbing actions. Project managers are required to inform cultural resources if the existing plans change and ground disturbance is proposed.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

---

Historian  
Name: Scott Carpenter  
Date: 11/08/2016

*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:

---

Historical Architect  
Name: Cooper Norman  
Date: 11/02/2016

Comments: Proposal retains original building footprint and massing, preserving the site plan and interior functional organization, retaining character of public access areas; reinforcing continuation of historic occupancy patterns. Kitchen interior reorganization and equipment improvements will promote robust food preparation and service operations without adversely affecting the public experience.

Building interior has been subjected to previous renovation efforts. Proposed front of the house improvements are confined to in kind renovation of deteriorating finish systems executed with respect to the original pallet of materials and workmanship; in some instances reversing prior actions that had resulted in loss of historic integrity. Life Safety and Property Protection interests led to proposed addition of fire detection and suppression (sprinkler) systems. Reviewed schematic design plans for compatibility with spatial and finish character of the building. Conditional Approval of this aspect of the work requires submission of completed design documents.

*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: 1. Conditional Approval - Fire and Smoke Detection and Suppression System - requires resubmission of design development and final construction documents for review, comment and approval prior to field action. 2. Project Approval based on design and level of detail presented; requires resubmission of design development and final construction documents for final approval. 3. Design Changes must be resubmitted for review and comment prior to commencing related work in the field.

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

---

Historical Landscape Architect

Name: Kimball Koch

Date: 11/01/2016

Comments: No work is being performed that would effect the landscape components (e.g. vegetation, pavement) associated with the building.

*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, 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 PA 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

