



# 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:** Kerstin Henry, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

**From:** Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

**Subject:** NEPA and NHPA Clearance: Yosemite Valley District/Museum Building Electrical Rehabilitation (55968)

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/action(s), therefore, is/are 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.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 55968.

//Lisa A Mendelson// acting for  
Palmer L. Jenkins

Enclosure

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:** 2014-033 Yosemite Valley District/Museum Building Electrical Rehabilitation

**PEPC Project Number:** 55968

**Project Description:**

The Valley District/Museum Building is a historic multiple story building that houses a public museum, exhibit room, research library, meeting rooms, and 12 multi-divisional office spaces. The approximate floor space area is 20,000 square feet. The existing electrical service components are of various ages dating back as far as the 1930s and the condition of these components significantly increases electrical fire potential and is an extreme hazard to visitors, maintenance personnel, and other staff. Current electrical code violations include NEC 110.12 (workmanship), NEC 110.26 (clear space), NEC 210.11 (branch circuit quantity), NEC 250 (grounding), NEC 406.3(A) (receptacle grounding).

This project, all work to be performed by a licensed contractor, will rehabilitate the electrical system and bring it into current electrical code compliance by completing the following:

1. Removing and replacing the existing 300 amp breaker with a 400 amp breaker, using the existing main switchboard, including installation of a new utility meter and current transformers. The existing main switchboard is not located in the District/Museum building, but across Village Drive in a utility maintenance yard. Connections to the main switchboard will utilize existing conduit and conductors, therefore there is no ground disturbance associated with this project.
2. Removing and replacing seven electrical service panel boards. Panels will be replaced in the current locations, to minimize any disruption to the historic fabric. Where limited patching is necessary, it will use a 3-coat system plaster finish, patched and painted to match. The plaster mix has been specified by the consultant's Historic Architect to match the existing finish.
3. Installation of two new electrical service panel boards. One new panel board will be installed in a storage area on the first floor, and the second panel board will be located in a storage area in the attic. Both of these areas are considered non-contributing to the historic character of the building, per the 2007 Historic Structure Report. New feeder lines in new conduit will be installed to connect the new panels. Conduit will be surface run, and painted to match existing, and will be located in the storage area on the first floor and the attic storage area.
4. Removing and replacing feeder conductors to the existing electrical service panel boards. To avoid disturbance to, and penetrations of, the historic finish, existing conduits and raceways are being utilized to run the new conductor lines. New penetrations will be limited to the areas directly adjacent to the two new electrical service panels, to surface the conduit into the service panel.
5. Removing and replacing all electrical service devices, such as receptacles, switches, dimmers, and wire-mold components. All replacement devices will be provided with new grounding bushings and pigtails in the existing back-boxes. Any wire-mold that is no longer needed will be removed, and the existing surface repaired and painted to match.

6. Temporarily removing each lighting fixture, properly grounding the fixture, and then reinstalling the fixture. Connecting all existing lighting circuits to ground fault circuit interrupter (GFCI) breakers in the associated panel. Three historic lighting fixtures will be refurbished to original condition and then reinstalled.

7. Installing GFCI receptacles or GFCI circuit breakers, in instances where testing indicates that proper grounding cannot be achieved by replacement of grounding bushing and pigtails.

8. In the Research Library on the second floor, additional duplex outlets are being installed using surface mounted wire-mold and table mounted tele-power poles. Connection will be made at existing junction boxes, reducing penetrations of the historic finish.

**Project Locations:**

**Mitigation(s):**

- No mitigations identified.

**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.

**Superintendent:** //Lisa A Mendelson// acting for

Palmer L. Jenkins

**Date:** 8/7/17

*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:** 2014-033 Yosemite Valley District/Museum Building Electrical Rehabilitation  
**PEPC Project Number:** 55968  
**Project Type:** Repair/Rehabilitation (REHAB)  
**Project Location:**  
**County, State:** Mariposa, California **District, Section:** Yosemite Valley,  
**Project Leader:** Kerstin Henry

### B. RESOURCE IMPACTS TO CONSIDER:

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
<b>Air</b> Air Quality	None	
<b>Biological</b> Nonnative or Exotic Species	None	
<b>Biological</b> Species of Special Concern or Their Habitat	None	
<b>Biological</b> Vegetation	None	
<b>Biological</b> Wildlife and/or Wildlife Habitat including terrestrial and aquatic species	None	
<b>Cultural</b> Archeological Resources	None	
<b>Cultural</b> Cultural Landscapes	None	
<b>Cultural</b> Ethnographic Resources	None	
<b>Cultural</b> Museum Collections	Potential	The museum houses collections, but project actions will not affect these resources.
<b>Cultural</b> Prehistoric/historic structures	None	The museum building is in a contributing building to the Yosemite Valley Historic District. The project has been reviewed by the historical architect and will not adversely affect the building.
<b>Geological</b>	None	

Environmental Screening Form (ESF) - Yosemite Valley District/Museum Building Electrical Rehabilitation - PEPC ID: 55968

<b>Resource</b>	<b>Potential for Impact</b>	<b>Potential Issues &amp; Impacts</b>
Geologic Features		
<b>Geological</b> Geologic Processes	None	
<b>Lightscares</b> Lightscares	None	
<b>Other</b> Human Health and Safety	None	Project brings building up to current electrical code.
<b>Other</b> Operational	None	
<b>Other</b> Other	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	None	
<b>Viewsheds</b> Viewsheds	None	
<b>Visitor Use and Experience</b> Recreation Resources	None	
<b>Visitor Use and Experience</b> Visitor Use and Experience	None	
<b>Water</b> Floodplains	None	
<b>Water</b> Marine or Estuarine Resources	None	
<b>Water</b> Water Quality or Quantity	None	
<b>Water</b> Wetlands	None	
<b>Water</b> Wild and Scenic River	None	
<b>Wilderness</b> Wilderness	None	

**Recommended:**

Environmental Screening Form (ESF) - Yosemite Valley District/Museum Building Electrical Rehabilitation - PEPC ID: 55968

Compliance Specialists	Date
<u>//Alan Kunz//</u> Compliance Specialist – Alan Kunz	<u>8/1/17</u>
<u>//Madelyn Ruffner//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Madelyn Ruffner	<u>8/2/17</u>
<u>//Ron Gaunt//</u> Acting Chief, Project Management – Ron Gaunt	<u>8/4/17</u>

**Approved:**

Acting Superintendent	Date
<u>//Lisa A. Mendelson// acting for</u> Palmer L. Jenkins	<u>8/7/17</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:** Yosemite Valley District/Museum Building Electrical Rehabilitation

**Prepared by:** Alan Kunz **Date Prepared:** 07/11/2017 **Telephone:** 209-379-1303

**PEPC Project Number:** 55968

#### **Locations:**

**County, State:** Mariposa, CA

**District, Section:** Yosemite Valley,

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

The Valley Museum Building.

#### 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 LCS

**Name and number(s):** Yosemite Valley Archeological District LCS

**Archeological Resources Notes:** The building is within the boundaries of a sensitive archeological resource, but there will be no ground disturbance and no impacts.

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

**Name and number(s):** Yosemite Valley Historic District and Yosemite Village Historic District

**Location:** Yosemite Village

**Historical Structures/Resources Notes:** The building is a contributor to both historic districts.

**Ethnographic Resources Affected Notes:** The building is within the boundaries of an area of ethnographic and traditional importance to the tribes. Building houses important ethnographic collections. The project actions will not affect these resources.

#### 5. **The proposed action will: (check as many as apply)**

☒ Yes Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure



Yes 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 or  
No 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  
Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting, landscape elements, or  
No 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:

---

[ X ] 106 Advisor

Name: Kimball Koch

Date: 08/01/2017

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [   ]

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

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: Streamlined Review (PA)

Streamlined Activity:

14. Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing Systems

---

[ X ] Anthropologist

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 07/24/2017

Comments: Traditional and ethnographic collections housed and exhibited in building will not be affected by project.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [   ]

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

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

---

[ X ] Archeologist

Name: Sonny Montague

Date: 01/06/2015

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [ X ]

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:

☒ Curator

Name: Greg Cox

Date: 07/24/2017

Comments: Not able to access PEPC, signed off by PEPC administrator for Greg. Greg has no comments on 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:

---

☒ Historian

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 07/24/2017

*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: Sueann Brown

Date: 07/25/2017

*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: Streamlined Review (PA)

Streamlined Activity:

14. Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing Systems

---

☒ Historical Landscape Architect

Name: Kimball Koch

Date: 07/04/2017

Comments: Work is interior to the building. No adverse effects to the landscape components of the Yosemite Valley/Village historic districts.

*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:

---

No Reviews From: 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.

Assessment of Effect Form - Yosemite Valley District/Museum Building Electrical Rehabilitation - PEPC ID: 55968

☒ 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.)

14. Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing Systems.

☐ 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 Process

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.)

No Assessment of Effect mitigations identified.

**D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:**

*Historic Preservation Officer:*

Kimball Koch     //Kimball Koch//     **Date:** 8/2/17

**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:** //Lisa A. Mendelson// acting for     **Date:** 8/7/17  
Palmer L. Jenkins

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