

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: Joseph Llewellyn, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2018-017 Sentinel Verizon 10-Year Right-of-Way Permit (79982)

The Superintendent and park interdisciplinary team have reviewed the proposed project and completed an impact analysis and documentation, and 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 to historic properties.
- 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 79982.

//Michael T. Reynolds//
Michael T. Reynolds, Superintendent

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: 2018-017 Sentinel Verizon 10-Year Right-of-Way Permit

PEPC Project Number: 79982

Project Description:

On March 18, 2015, Pinnacles Cellular, Inc. d/b/a Verizon Wireless (Permittee) applied to the National Park Service (NPS), for a ten-year Wireless Telecommunications Facility Right-of-Way Permit to use and occupy NPS-administered lands within Yosemite National Park (Park), through operating and maintaining a co-location wireless communication facility at the park's Turtleback Dome site. This categorical exclusion covers the permit issuance. Additional construction or infrastructure will undergo separate compliance.

Whereas, the NPS has promulgated regulations, codified at 36 C.F.R. part 14, governing the issuance, use, and management of rights-of-way over, across, on, or through federally owned or controlled lands administered by the NPS; and Whereas, the NPS has determined that the proposed use or occupancy of the NPS-administered lands or waters described herein for the operation and maintenance of a wireless communication facility is not incompatible with the public interest; Now, therefore, the NPS, acting pursuant to the authority of 54 U.S.C. § 100902(b) will grant to the Permittee this revocable, non-exclusive right-of-way permit (Permit) across the lands in the Permitted Area. This Permit constitutes only a revocable, non-exclusive license to use or occupy the Permitted Area for the purposes described in the Permit during the term of the Permit. By accepting this Permit, the Permittee agrees to comply with the regulations in 36 C.F.R. part 14 (or any successor regulations), other applicable laws and regulations, and the terms and conditions set forth in the Permit. The Park's Superintendent (Superintendent) will be the NPS official primarily responsible for administering this Permit.

Project Locations:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigations:

- No mitigations identified.

CE Citation: A.3 Reissuance/renewal of permits, rights-of-way or easements not involving new environmental impacts.

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: //Michael T. Reynolds//

Michael T. Reynolds

Date: 8/28/18

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: 2018-017 Sentinel Verizon 10-Year Right-of-Way Permit
PEPC Project Number: 79982
Project Type: Right-of-Way Permit (ROW)
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Joseph Llewellyn

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	This is only a permit issuance with no additional construction or infrastructure included.
Cultural Cultural Landscapes	None	
Cultural Ethnographic Resources	None	

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Cultural Museum Collections	None	
Cultural Prehistoric/historic structures	None	Per the Cultural Resources Team, the project would have no effect to historic properties
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 Floodplains	None	
Water Marine or Estuarine Resources	None	

Resource	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
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: 2018-017 Sentinel Verizon 10-Year Right-of-Way Permit

Prepared by: Renea Kennec **Date Prepared:** 06/26/2018 **Telephone:** 209-379-1038

PEPC Project Number: 79982

Locations:

County, State: Mariposa, CA

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

The extension of the Verizon permit is for the wireless communication tower at Sentinel Dome. No physical changes are being made to the tower and infrastructure.

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

Historical Structures/Resources Affected: No

Cultural Landscapes Affected: No

Ethnographic Resources Affected: No

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

No Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure

No Replace historic features/elements in kind

No 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

- Potentially affect presently unidentified cultural resources
- Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting, landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources
- 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: 07/18/2018

Comments: Per the Cultural Resources Team, the project would have no effect to historic properties.

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: 9. Maintenance or Replacement of Non-Historic Utility Lines, Transmission Lines, and Fences

[X] Anthropologist

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 07/18/2018

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:

[X] Archeologist

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 07/18/2018

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:

[X] Historian

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 07/18/2018

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:

[] **Historical Landscape Architect**

Name: Kimball Koch

Date: 07/17/2018

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: Streamlined Review (PA)

Streamlined Activity: 9. Maintenance or Replacement of Non-Historic Utility Lines, Transmission Lines, and Fences

No Reviews From: Curator, Historical Architect, 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.)

9. Maintenance or Replacement of Non-Historic Utility Lines, Transmission Lines, and Fences.

[] **C. Undertaking Related to Park Specific or Another Agreement**

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under another document such as a park, region or statewide agreement established in accord with 36 CFR 800.7 or 36 CFR 800.14.

[] **D. Combined NEPA/NHPA Process**

Process and documentation required for the preparation of an EA/FONSI or an EIS/ROD to comply with Section 106 is in accord with 36 CFR 800.8.c.

[] **E. Memo to Project File**

3. Consultation Information

SHPO Required: No
THPO Required: No
SHPO/THPO Notes:

Advisory Council Participating: No
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:

Ongoing use of the telecommunications equipment constitutes continued maintenance of the facilities at Sentinel Dome as addressed through the Nationwide PA Streamlined Activities Category 9D.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Kimball //Kimball Koch// 8/1/18
Koch _____ **Date:** _____

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// 8/28/18
_____ **Date:** _____
Michael T. Reynolds

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