

# **United States Department of the Interior**

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Yosemite National Park
P.O. Box 577
Yosemite, California 95389

#### Memorandum

To: John Leonard, Project Manager, Resources Management and Science, Yosemite

National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: Notice to Proceed, 2007-057 Foresta Big Meadow Historic Fence Restoration

Your proposed project is an action that has been determined to result in no measurable environmental effects. It is therefore categorically excluded from further National Environmental Policy Act analysis under Categorical Exclusion: DO12 3.4 *C* (18) - Installation of fencing enclosures, exclosures, or boundary fencing posing no effect on wildlife migrations.

Necessary compliance coordination has been completed regarding the National Historic Preservation Act, the Wilderness Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Endangered Species Act, as applicable. This project clearance is valid providing that you adhere to any conditions that may be stipulated in the enclosed *Categorical Exclusion Form* and associated documents when implementing this project.

//MJTollefson//	6/08/07
Michael J. Tollefson	Date
Enclosure (with attachments)	The signed original of this document is on file at
cc: Statutory Compliance File	the Environmental Planning and Compliance
cc. Statutory Compilance The	Office in Yosemite National Park.

# **Categorical Exclusion**

(Version: OCT06)

Compliance Tracking Number: 2007-057
PEPC Project Number: 18183

#### A. PROJECT INFORMATION

**Title:** Foresta Big Meadow Historic Fence Restoration **Location:** Foresta, Mariposa County, California

Project Manager: John Leonard, Resources Management and Science, Yosemite National Park

#### **B.** COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

This project is an action that has been determined to result in no measurable environmental effects. It is therefore categorically excluded from further National Environmental Policy Act analysis under Categorical Exclusion: DO12 3.4 *C* (18) - Installation of fencing enclosures, exclosures, or boundary fencing posing no effect on wildlife migrations.

Necessary compliance coordination has been completed regarding the National Historic Preservation Act, the Wilderness Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Endangered Species Act, as applicable. Environmental impacts will be negligible or less when the project is implemented with the conditions stipulated under **Project Mitigations and Conditions** in **Section I** at the end of the attached *Environmental Screening Form*.

Additional supporting information for this determination and the stipulated conditions can be found in the following attachments (when checked):

Environmental Screening Form

	U
$\boxtimes$	Preservation Assessment Form (YOSE-XXX)
	Wilderness Minimum Requirement Analysis
	Wild and Scenic River Section 7 Determination
	Other:

#### **DECISION**

On the basis of the environmental impact information in the statutory compliance file, with which I am familiar, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No exceptional circumstances or conditions in DO12 3.5 or 3.6 apply and the action is fully described in DO12, Section 3.4/

//MJTollefson// 6/08/07
Michael J. Tollefson, Superintendent Date

Original: Statutory Compliance File

cc: Project Proponent

Attachments (2)

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

# **Environmental Screening Form**

(Version: NOV06)

Compliance Tracking Number: **2007-057** 

PEPC Project Number: **18183** 

#### A. PROJECT INFORMATION

**Title:** Foresta Big Meadow Historic Fence Restoration **Location:** Foresta, Mariposa County, California

Project Manager: John Leonard, Resources Management and Science, Yosemite National Park

#### B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

This project entails rebuilding less than one fourth of a mile of fence between the Foresta Road and Big Meadow. The proposed fence will run from the metal pipe gate at the Y intersection back toward the highway. This fence replaces one that was burned down in the 1990 A-rock fire. From old photographs, we have identified that it was a stacked rail zigzag fence, 5 to 6 rails tall, with cross bracing at the intersections of the zigzags from under the top rail to the ground (see historic photos). This design does not require digging fence post holes. We will work with the Historic Preservation crew to restore the fence to its former state as much as possible. The fence will be built by the Youth Conservation Corps and community volunteers.

The staging area will be in the Foresta Barn. Any scrap wood will be removed and taken to the Foresta wood yard burn pile. Fence posts and rails will be supplied by a contractor. Contractor's vehicles will be cleaned and inspected for non-native or noxious weeds prior to entering the park.

**Table B1 – Background Information** 

Non-NEPA/NHPA Approvals (Explain)

Other (Explain)

		res	NO	N/A	Explanation/Notes
1.	Did NPS staff conduct a site visit? If yes, list attendees. If no, explain.	$\boxtimes$			Resources Management and Science staff.
2a.	Is the project providing compliance for an action associated with but not covered by an approved plan? (Identify the plan and provide a section or page citation.); OR				
2b.	Is the project in an approved plan? (Identify the plan and provide a section or page citation.		$\boxtimes$		
2c.	Is the project consistent with that plan?			$\boxtimes$	
2d.	Is the Plan's CE, FONSI, or ROD current?			$\boxtimes$	
3a.	Are there any interested or affected parties?		$\boxtimes$		
3b.	Has a diligent effort been made to communicate with them?				
4a.	Are there any affected agencies or tribes?		$\boxtimes$		
4b.	Has consultation been completed?				
Ta	ble B2 – Environmental Screening Form	ı Atta	chm	ents (j	provide Attachment letter—A, B, etc.)
		Yes	No	N/A	Explanation/Notes
1.	Maps: (vicinity map & site map)	$\boxtimes$			Foresta vicinity map; see Attachment A.
2.	Drawings (e.g., design, construction)		$\boxtimes$		
3.	Site Plans		$\boxtimes$		
4.	Photographs	$\boxtimes$			Historic and existing site photos; see

# Compliance Tracking Number: 2007-057

# C. ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL RESOURCE EFFECTS

	Are any impacts possible on the following  Yes No N/A  Data Needed to Determine/Notes							
res	ources?	165		11//1	Data Accused to Determine/Notes			
1.	Geologic resources: soils, bedrock, streambeds, etc		$\boxtimes$					
2.	From geohazards		$\boxtimes$					
3.	Air quality		$\boxtimes$					
4.	Soundscapes		$\boxtimes$					
5.	Water quality or quantity		$\boxtimes$					
6.	Stream flow characteristics		$\boxtimes$					
7.	Marine or estuarine resources			$\boxtimes$				
8.	Floodplains or wetlands		$\boxtimes$					
9.	Land use, including occupancy, income, values, ownership, type of use		$\boxtimes$					
	Rare or unusual vegetation – old growth timber, riparian, alpine		$\boxtimes$					
11.	Species of special concern (plant or animal; state or federal listed or proposed for listing) or their habitat		$\boxtimes$					
12.	Unique ecosystems, biosphere reserves, World Heritage Sites				Yosemite National Park is a World Heritage site; no historic properties would be adversely affected by implementing this project; see Section F, National Historic Preservation Act Checklist, below.			
13.	Unique or important wildlife or wildlife habitat		$\boxtimes$					
14.	Unique or important fish or fish habitat		$\boxtimes$					
15.	Introduce or promote non-native species (plant or animal)	$\boxtimes$			Mitigated; see Section D. Mandatory Criteria, below.			
16.	Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.		$\boxtimes$					
17.	Visitor experience, aesthetic resources		$\boxtimes$					
18.	Cultural resources including cultural landscapes, ethnographic resources				Negligible; the assessment of effect is "No Adverse Effect;" see Section F, National Historic Preservation Act Checklist and the attached XXX.			
19.	Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure		$\boxtimes$					
20.	Minority and low income populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.		$\boxtimes$					
21.	Energy resources		$\boxtimes$					
22.	Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies		$\boxtimes$					
23.	Resource, including energy, conservation potential		$\boxtimes$					
24.	Urban quality, gateway communities, etc.		$\boxtimes$					
25.	Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity				The proposed fence installation will protect the fragile meadow and maintain the park's long-term management of natural resources.			
26	Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal, paleontological resources)?							
Con 1.	nments, Mitigations and Conditions: None							

# Compliance Tracking Number: 2007-057

### D. MANDATORY CRITERIA

If	implemented, would the proposed action:	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes			
1.	1		$\boxtimes$					
2.	Have adverse effects on such unique 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; floodplains; or ecologically significant or critical areas, including those listed on the National Register of Natural Landmarks?				Mitigated; the assessment of effect is "No Adverse Effect;" see Section F, National Historic Preservation Act Checklist and the attached XXX.			
3.	Have highly controversial environmental effects?		$\boxtimes$					
4.	Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		$\boxtimes$					
5.	Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		$\boxtimes$					
6.	Be directly related to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?							
7.	Have adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places?							
8.	Have adverse effects on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species or have adverse effects on designated Critical Habitat for these species?							
9.	Require compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act?		$\boxtimes$					
10.	Threaten to violate a federal, state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?							
11.	Involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA sec. 102(2)(E)?		$\boxtimes$					
12.	Have a disproportionate, significant adverse effect on low-income or minority populations (EO 12898)?							
13.	Restrict access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 130007)?		$\boxtimes$					
14.	Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of federally listed noxious weeds (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act)?				Mitigated: see Condition 1, below.			
15.	Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of non-native invasive species or actions that may promote the introduction, growth or expansion of the range of non-native invasive species (EO 13112)?				Mitigated: see Condition 1, below.			
16.	Require a permit from a federal, state, or local agency to proceed, unless the agency from which the permit is required agrees that a CE is appropriate?		$\boxtimes$					
17.	Have the potential for significant impact as indicated by a federal, state, or local agency or Indian tribe?		$\boxtimes$					
18.	Have the potential to be controversial because of disagreement over possible environmental effects?							
	Have the potential to violate the NPS Organic Act by impairing park resources or values?							
<b>C</b> o	Comments, Mitigations and Conditions:  1. Ensure that all equipment and materials brought into the park are free of non-native, invasive plants and animals, and							

1. Ensure that all equipment and materials brought into the park are free of non-native, invasive plants and animals, and noxious weeds. All staff working on site shall be informed of and follow best management practices for preventing the introduction and spread of non-native, invasive species as described in Division 1 Specifications, Section 1355.

Compliance	<b>Tracking</b>	Number:	2007-057
•	•		4 of 4

# E. SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST

Wi	thin the area of potential effect, are there:	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
1.	Listed or proposed threatened or	П	$\boxtimes$	П	
2	endangered species (Federal or State)?				
2.	Species of special concern (Federal or State)?		$\boxtimes$		
3.	Park rare plants or vegetation?	П	$\boxtimes$	П	
4.	Potential habitat for any special-status				
	species listed above?	Ш		Ш	
	'yes" to any of the above questions, a Special-S	Status	Specie	es Che	cklist must be completed and attached.
	mments, Mitigations and Conditions:				
1.	None				
F.	NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVA	TION	AC'	Г СН	ECKLIST
Wi	thin the area of potential effect:	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
1.	Will there be ground disturbance?		$\boxtimes$		
2.	Are there any archeological sites?	$\boxtimes$			Foresta Big Meadow Archeological District
3.	Are there any Native American Indian	$\boxtimes$	П	П	Fence installation will not impact traditional
1	traditional cultural resources?		_		American Indian values.
4.	Is there a historic property (a building, structure, feature, or all or any part of an				
	archeological district or site, or a historic		_	_	Foresta Historic District; the assessment of
	district or site, or any associated landscape	$\boxtimes$	Ш	Ш	effect is "No Adverse Effect;" see the
	element) that is listed or eligible for listing				attached XXX.
	on the National Register?				
5.	Is there a National Historic Landmark?		$\boxtimes$		
6.	Is there a structure(s) on the park's <i>List of Classified Structures</i> ?				
7.	Is there any cultural resource requiring an				
	evaluation of eligibility as a historic	$\boxtimes$	П	П	
	property under NHPA, Section 106, before an affect determination can be made?		_	_	
8	Would there be alteration of any historic				
	property or associated landscape element	$\boxtimes$	П	П	
	covered by 2-7, above?				
	'yes" to any of the above, then an Assessment	of Effe	ects fo	rm (Y	OSE-XXX) must be completed and attached.
	tigations and Conditions:				
1.	None				
G.	WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST				
Is 1	the proposed project:	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
1.	Within designated Wilderness?		$\boxtimes$		
2.	Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		$\boxtimes$		
_	yes" to either of the above, then a Wilderness Mi	nimun	1 Requ	iiremer	nts Analysis must be completed and attached.
	tigations and Conditions:				
1.	None				

Compliance Tracking Number: 2007-057 5 of 5

# H. WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST

Doc	es the proposed project:	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
1.	Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor? If 'yes', name the river(s)		$\boxtimes$		
2.	Fall within the bed and banks AND affect the free-flow of the river?			$\boxtimes$	
3.	Potentially affect water quality of the area?			$\boxtimes$	
4.	Diminish or other wise change the values for which the river was designated as a Wild and Scenic River? If "yes", explain.				
5a.	Fall on a tributary of a Wild and Scenic River?		$\boxtimes$		
5b.	If 5a is "yes", will the project affect the Wild and Scenic River corridor?			$\boxtimes$	
5c.	If 5a is "yes", will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values?			$\boxtimes$	
If "	yes" to questions 2, 5b, or 5c, then a WSRA Se	ection	7 dete	erminat	tion must be completed and attached.
Mit	igations and Conditions:				
1.	None				

#### I. NEPA Analysis and Approval Conditions

When implemented as detailed in the project description and following all Project Mitigations and Conditions listed below, this project meets the terms and conditions of a categorical exclusion to NEPA.

#### **Applicable Categorical Exclusion:**

DO12 3.4 C (18) - Installation of fencing enclosures, exclosures, or boundary fencing posing no effect on wildlife migrations.

#### **Project Mitigations and Conditions:**

1. Ensure that all equipment and materials brought into the park are free of non-native, invasive plants and animals, and noxious weeds. All staff working on site shall be informed of and follow best management practices for preventing the introduction and spread of non-native, invasive species as described in Division 1 Specifications, Section 1355. (Planning and Compliance Office)

This project has been reviewed in accordance with the above criteria and it has been determined that the project will result in no or minimal environmental effects. Therefore, it is categorically excluded from further environmental review required under the National Environmental Policy Act. Additionally, the necessary compliance coordination has been completed with regard to the National Historic Preservation Act, the Wilderness Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

//Renea Kennec//	5/10/07
Compliance Specialist	Date
(0.5, 1.4, 5, 1.4)	5/10/05
//Mark A Butler//	5/10/07
Compliance Program Manager	Date
//Bill Delaney//	5/23/07
Chief, Project Management	Date

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

# Attachment A

**Error! Objects cannot be created from editing field codes.** 

### **Attachment B**



George Meyer and Peter Mieson split about 10,000 feet of rails to fence their Big Meadow acreage. Several kinds of fences were built to separate stage company horses from ranch mounts, and milk cows from cattle. Johnny Brown and fellow Indians were the fence-makers. (Yosemite Research Library, (YRL) Collection.)

Historic Fence



Historic Fence





Proposed Site



Proposed Site

### **Preservation Assessment Form (YOSE XXX)**

(Version: AUG06)

Compliance Tracking Number: 2007-057
PEPC Project Number: 18183

#### A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

Title: Foresta Big Meadow Historic Fence Restoration

#### **Project Location and Area of Potential Effect:**

Foresta, Mariposa County, California

Big Meadow

**Project Manager:** John Leonard, Resources Management and Science, Yosemite National Park **Project Description:** This project entails rebuilding less than one fourth of a mile of fence between the Foresta Road and Big Meadow. The proposed fence will run from the metal pipe gate at the Y intersection back toward the highway. This fence replaces one that was burned down in the 1990 Arock fire. From old photographs, we have identified that it was a stacked rail zigzag fence, 5 to 6 rails tall, with cross bracing at the intersections of the zigzags from under the top rail to the ground (See historic photos). This design does not require digging fence post holes. We will work with the Historic Preservation crew to restore the fence to its former state as much as possible. The fence will be built by the YCC and community volunteers.

The staging area will be in the Foresta Barn. Any scrap wood will be removed and taken to the Foresta wood yard burn pile. Fence posts and rails will be supplied by a contractor. Contractor's vehicles will be cleaned and inspected for non-native or noxious weeds prior to entering the park.

1. Att	ached Sensitive Information**	Yes	No	Explanation/Source/Notes
a.	Maps	$\boxtimes$		CR GIS Map
b.	Drawings		$\boxtimes$	
c.	Site Plans		$\boxtimes$	
d.	Photographs		$\boxtimes$	
e.	Sample		$\boxtimes$	
f.	List of Materials		$\boxtimes$	
g.	Other (Explain)		$\boxtimes$	

<sup>\*\*</sup> Sensitive documents not for duplication or distribution beyond park management, subject matter experts, and the project statutory compliance file.

### 2 of 8

# **B. DESCRIPTION OF EFFECTS**

		Yes	No	N/A	Explanation/Notes
1.	Has the Area of Potential Effect been surveyed to identify historic properties? If Yes, provide reference for the Survey (s).				Foresta Big Meadow Archeological District
	Would the proposed action affect a known historic property?				No ground disturbance.
2.	List all Historic Properties in the Area of Potential Effect:	Affec Yes	ted? No		Explanation/Notes
	a. Foresta Historic District	$\boxtimes$		Cultu	ral landscape incomplete. Restoration.
	b.				•
	c.				
3.	List resources in the Area of Potential	Affec	ted?		
	Effect to which American Indians attach cultural and religious significance:	Yes	No		Explanation/Notes
	a. Traditional American Indian cultural place		$\boxtimes$		oration will not impact traditional American n values.
	b.				
	c.				
4.	The proposed action will:	Yes	No	N/A	Explanation/Note
	• Destroy, remove, or alter features or elements from a historic structure		$\boxtimes$		
	• Replace historic features/elements in kind	$\boxtimes$			Replacement in-kind.
	• Add nonhistoric features/elements to a historic structure				
	<ul> <li>Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (including terrain)</li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>Add nonhistoric features/elements (including visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape</li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible, or alter associated terrain</li> </ul>		$\boxtimes$		
	<ul> <li>Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible, or alter associated terrain</li> </ul>		$\boxtimes$		
	Begin or contribute to the deterioration of historic fabric, terrain, setting, landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources				
	<ul> <li>Involve a real property transaction affecting historic cultural properties (i.e., the exchange, sale, or lease of land or structures)</li> </ul>		$\boxtimes$		
	<ul> <li>Potentially affect presently unidentified historic resources</li> </ul>		$\boxtimes$		
	• Other		$\boxtimes$		

**Yosemite National Park** 

5. Describe any measures that are incorporated as part of this project that will be taken to prevent or minimize loss or impairment of prehistoric or historic fabric, setting, integrity, or data:

Coordination with Historic Preservation Shop to ensure appropriate design and materials are used.

**Checklist prepared by:** Jeannette Simons **Date:** <u>04/10/07</u>

**Title:** Historic Preservation Officer

# Compliance Tracking No. **2007-057** 4 of 8

#### C. SPECIALIST SECTION

**Specialists**: Your comments here (or attached) show that you have reviewed this proposal for conformity with requirements of *National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106*; with the 1995 *Servicewide Programmatic Agreement* (if applicable); with applicable parts of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation*; with the NPS *Management Policies* and *Cultural Resource Management Guideline*; and have given your best professional advice about this project and the issues relevant to the Section 106 process, including identification and evaluation of historic properties and further consultation needs.

Archeologist Comments:	Name: Laura Kirn	Date: 4/10/07
Ground Disturbance Involved Assessment of Effect: Recommended Conditions:	Yes:	
Signature of Archeologist: //Laura	a <u>Kirn//</u>	
<b>Cultural Anthropologist</b> Comments:	Name: Sonny Montague	Date:
Assessment of Effect:		
Recommended Conditions:		
Signature of Cultural Anthropologi	st·	
Signature of Cultural Financipologi		
Curator Comments:	Name: Jonathan Bayless	Date: 4/11/07
Assessment of Effect: "No Effect"		
Recommended Conditions:		
Signature of Curator: //Jonathon Bo	nyless//	

Historian	Name: Charles Palmer	Date:		
Comments:				
Assessment of Effect:				
Recommended Conditions:				
Signature of Historian:				
Signature of Historian.				
Historic Architect	Name: Sueann Brown	Date: 4/11/07		
Comments:				
Assessment of Effect: "No Adverse Effect"				
Recommended Conditions:				
Signature of Historic Architect: _//Sueann Brown//				
Signature of Historic Architect	ueum Brown//			
Historical Landscape Architect	Name: <b>Dave Humphrey</b>	Date: 4/11/07		
Comments:				
Assessment of Effect: "No Adverse	Effect''			
Recommended Conditions:				
Signatura of Historic Landscape Ar	phitact: //David T. Humphray//			
Signature of Historic Landscape Architect: //David T Humphrey//				

Preservation Specialist Comments:	Name: Rod Kennec	Date: 4/11/07
Assessment of Effect: "No Adv	rerse Effect''	
Recommended Conditions: Recommended Conditions	ommended Conditions	
Signature of Preservation Specia	alist: <u>//Rod B Kennec//</u>	
Native American Liaison Comments:	Name: <b>Jeannette Simons</b>	Date:
Assessment of Effect:		
Recommended Conditions:		
Signature of Native American L	.iaison:	
Specialist Title Comments:	Name:	Date:
Assessment of Effect:		
Recommended Conditions:		
Signature of Specialist's Title:		

#### Compliance Tracking No. 2007-057 7 of 8

#### D. RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND SCIENCE DIVISION AND PARK 106 COORDINATOR REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Review by specialists: The appropriate subject-matter experts have reviewed the project and entered their comments and recommendations in Section C, above.

The foregoing assessment is adequate: the proposed action is consistent with all applicable NPS

		ent policies, standards, g	guidelines, or US DOI standards ar incorporates measures to avoid Ad	nd guidelines, Rehabilitation of
Re	viewe	l and Accepted by:		
Sią	gnatur	e: // Niki Stephanie Nic Chief of Resources I	cholas// Management & Science Division	<b>Date:</b> <u>4-12-07</u>
2.	Com	pliance Requirements:	The following is the park's assessmeeds and requirements for this un	•
		Standard 36 CFR Par	t 800 Consultation	
			R is needed subsequent to the preparative management advisors.	ion of this form and its review by
	$\boxtimes$	Undertaking related to	o the 1995 NPS Programmatic Ag	greement
			Il conditions for a programmatic exclus agreement, and is listed in Stipulation I	
			mited to retaining or preserving, protects or features, consistent with Secretary	
		Plan-Related Underta	king	
			of the proposed undertaking were comp th the 1995 NPS programmatic agreem	
		<b>Undertaking Related t</b>	to Another Agreement	
			g is covered for Section 106 purposes uten in accordance with 37 CFR Part 800	
		<b>Agreement</b> : <enter ag<="" td=""><td>greement Information&gt;</td><td></td></enter>	greement Information>	
		Flood-Recovery Relate	ed Undertaking	
			ng is covered for Section 106 purposes at the Historic Preservation Office, and the drepair and recovery	
		<b>Undertaking Related t</b>	to the 1999 Yosemite Programma	tic Agreement
			g is covered for Section 106 purposes u lesign, construction, operations and ma in Article VII.C.2.	

#### 3. Assessment of Effects: No Adverse Effect

#### 4. Project Stipulations and Conditions

Following are listed any stipulations or conditions necessary to ensure that the assessment of effects above is consistent with 36 CFR 800 criteria of effect or to mitigate potential adverse effects:

a. None

Recommended by Park Section 106 Coordinator:					
Name:	Jeannette Simons				
Title:	<b>Historic Preservation Officer</b>				
Signature:	//Jeannette Simons// Date:	4-17-07			
The propos	INTENDENT'S APPROVAL  ed work conforms to NPS Management Policies lations, stipulations, and conditions noted in Sec	1.1			
Signature	of Superintendent: //MJ Tollefson//	<b>Date:</b> 6/8/07			
	Michael J. Tollefson				

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