

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: 2017-003 Yosemite Village Store North Wing Remodel to Accommodate HR Offices (2017 YH)
PEPC Project Number: 68919
Project Type: Repair/Rehabilitation (REHAB)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Anthony Paladino

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	
Cultural Cultural Landscapes	None	
Cultural Ethnographic	None	Work is within the building interior, no historic property with

Environmental Screening Form (ESF) – 2017-003 Yosemite Village Store North Wing Remodel to Accommodate HR Offices (2017 YH) - PEPC ID: 68919

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Resources		religious and cultural significance are affected
Cultural Museum Collections	None	
Cultural Prehistoric/historic structures	Potential	Issue: Work proposed will occur in non-public spaces identified in the draft Historic Structures Report as non-contributing and will have no effect on the exterior of the building. This review covers only the work at the store, not the warehouse work described in the attachment.
Geological Geologic Features	None	
Geological Geologic Processes	None	
Lightscares Lightscares	None	
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	None	
Visitor Use and Experience Recreation Resources	None	
Visitor Use and Experience Visitor Use and Experience	None	
Water	None	

Environmental Screening Form (ESF) – 2017-003 Yosemite Village Store North Wing Remodel to Accommodate HR Offices (2017 YH) - PEPC ID: 68919

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



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

Project Name: 2017-003 Yosemite Village Store North Wing Remodel to Accommodate HR Offices (2017 YH)

Prepared by: Erin Davenport **Date Prepared:** 05/22/2017 **Telephone:** 209-379-1067

PEPC Project Number: 68919

Locations:

County, State: Mariposa, CA

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

Project is entirely within the Village Store because it is an interior remodel.

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

No

Yes

Source or reference:

4. **Potentially Affected Resources:**

Archeological Resources Affected: No

Archeological Resources Notes: The project is not within the boundaries of any known archeological site but is within the Yosemite Valley Archeological District

Historical Structures/Resources Affected: Yes

Name and numbers: Yosemite Valley Historic District LCS

Historical Structures/Resources Notes: The Yosemite Village Store Complex has been recommended for inclusion in an update to the Yosemite Valley Historic District as one of 4 or 5 Mission 66 properties that may qualify for inclusion into the district should the period of significance be extended in an upcoming amendment.

Cultural Landscapes Affected: No

Ethnographic Resources Affected: No

Ethnographic Resources Notes: The project is not within the boundaries of any known historic property with religious and cultural significance.

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)

No 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

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:

[X] 106 Advisor

Name: Kimball Koch

Date: 03/06/2018

Comments: The park initiated SHPO consultation through correspondence dated January 3, 2018, requesting SHPO review and concurrence with Steps 1-3 under the standard review process. The park's cultural resources program lead had assessed the project as having "no adverse effects" to the Village Store. On Jan 11, 2018, Mark Beason of the SHPO's office requested additional information which the park provided by email on January 29, 2018. On February 14th, the park followed-up with an email inquiring as to the status of the SHPO review. In a February 23, 2018 email, the NPS notified the SHPO of its intention to move ahead with the project absent a response from the SHPO. In a Feb 26 email, Mark Beason requested additional information about the staircase and window including a request for additional information about the park's justification of its finding of no adverse effect. On March 6, the park responded by email and with additional information from Sueann Brown, the PWR Historical Architect, who provided CRM review the project. No additional correspondence has been received from the SHPO as of 3/28/2018.

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

[X] **Anthropologist**

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 11/28/2017

Comments: Work is within the building interior, no historic property with religious and cultural significance are affected.

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

[X] **Archeologist**

Name: Sara Dolan

Date: 04/24/2017

Comments: Work will be limited to structural repairs. There are no archeological concerns.

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] **Historian**

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 11/28/2017

Comments: Building is assumed eligible for compliance purposes.

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

[X] **Historical Architect**

Name: Sueann Brown

Date: 12/05/2017

Comments: Work proposed will occur in non-public spaces identified in the draft HSR as non-contributing and will have no effect on the exterior of the building. This review covers only the work at the store, not the warehouse work described in the PSR attachment.

Assessment of Effect Form – 2017-003 Yosemite Village Store North Wing Remodel to Accommodate HR Offices (2017 YH) - PEPC ID: 68919

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

[] **Historical Landscape Architect**

Name: Kimball Koch

Date: 11/28/2017

Comments: Work is interior to the building so no cultural landscapes are affected.

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, 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. 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.

D. 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

E. Memo to Project File

3. Consultation Information

SHPO Required: Yes

SHPO Sent: Dec 15, 2017

THPO Required: No

Advisory Council Participating: No

Advisory Council Notes:

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.

6. Assessment of Effect Notes:

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Kimball

Koch

//Kimball Koch//


Date: 3/29/18

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: //Michael T. Reynolds//

Date: 4/2/18



SECTION 1/A-2
 SCALE - 1/2" = 1'-0"




DESIGNED: WEBER INESS ASSOCIATES INC. 4130 N. WEST AVE. SUITE III FRESNO, CALIFORNIA 93711 PHONE: (559) 216-0900 alan@weberiness.com	SUB SHEET NO. A-2	TITLE OF SHEET SECTIONS AND DETAILS	DRAWING NO. 17155
CADD: ALW	TECH REVIEW ALW	H/R RELOCATION YOSEMITE VILLAGE YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK	PKG NO. CIF xxxx
DATE: 10 / 12 / 17			SHEET 2 OF 2

PHOTOGRAMMETRIC AND LASER SCANNING MEASUREMENTS - CAD DRAWINGS PLOTTED WITH VARIABLE SCALE FOR REFERENCE ONLY

DOCUMENTA SURVEYS

YOSEMITE N. P. - "AS-FOUND" ARCHITECTURAL (HISTORIC) DOCUMENTATION 2005/06 - YOSEMITE VALLEY
DRAWING (FILE) NAME: VL-VV-CPX 07-FLPLANS.dwg
CONTENTS: GROUND FLOOR PLAN / FIRST FLOOR PLAN


VILLAGE STORE COMPLEX
YOSEMITE VILLAGE
GROUND FLOOR PLAN
FIRST FLOOR PLAN
VL-VV-CPX 07-FLPLANS.dwg
DATE PLOT: 11/11/06




orig. space

altered space

PHOTOGRAMMETRIC AND LASER SCANNING MEASUREMENTS - CAD DRAWINGS PLOTTED WITH VARIABLE SCALE FOR REFERENCE ONLY



NORTH ELEVATION




SOUTH ELEVATION

SPORT SHOP



NORTH ELEVATION 1



EMPLOYEE SERVICES
SOUTH ELEVATION 1

ORIGINAL

ALTERED

VILLAGE STORE COMPLEX
YOSEMITE VILLAGE
NORTH ELEVATION/NORTH ELEVATION 1
SOUTH ELEVATION/SOUTH ELEVATION 1
VL-YV-CPX 12-N-S ELEVS.DWG
GRAPHIC SCALE
0 3 6 12 18FT


DOCUMENTA
SURVEYS

YOSEMITE N. P. - "AS-FOUND" ARCHITECTURAL (HISTORIC) DOCUMENTATION 2005/06 - YOSEMITE VALLEY

DRAWING (FILE) NAME: VL-YV-CPX 12-N-S ELEVS.dwg

CONTENTS: NORTH ELEVATION / SOUTH ELEVATION / NORTH ELEVATION 1 / SOUTH ELEVATION 1

PHOTOGAMMETRIC AND LASER SCANNING MEASUREMENTS - CAD DRAWINGS PLOTTED WITH VARIABLE SCALE FOR REFERENCE ONLY



ORIGINAL

ALTERED



VILLAGE STORE COMPLEX
YOSEMITE VILLAGE
EAST ELEVATION - DETAILS

VL-YV-CPX 10-E ELEV-DET.DWG
GRAPHIC SCALE
0 3 6 12 18 FT

DOCUMENTA
SURVEYS

YOSEMITE N. P. - "AS-FOUND" ARCHITECTURAL (HISTORIC) DOCUMENTATION 2005/06 - YOSEMITE VALLEY
DRAWING (FILE) NAME: VL-YV-CPX 10-E ELEV-DET.dwg
CONTENTS: EAST ELEVATION DETAIL

PHOTOGRAMMETRIC AND LASER SCANNING MEASUREMENTS - CAD DRAWINGS PLOTTED WITH VARIABLE SCALE FOR REFERENCE ONLY



ORIGINAL

ALTERED

VILLAGE STORE COMPLEX
YOSEMITE VILLAGE
WEST ELEVATION - DETAILS

VL-YV-CPX 11-W ELEV-DET.DWG
GRAPHIC SCALE
0 3 6 12 18FT

DOCUMENTA
SURVEYS

YOSEMITE N. P. - "AS-FOUND" ARCHITECTURAL (HISTORIC) DOCUMENTATION 2005/06 - YOSEMITE VALLEY

DRAWING (FILE) NAME: VL-YV-CPX 11-W ELEV-DET.dwg

CONTENTS: WEST ELEVATION DETAIL



