

United States Department of the Interior

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

IN REPLY REFER TO: L7617 (YOSE-PM)

Memorandum

- To: Kathy Dimont, Project Manager, Interpretation, Yosemite National Park Louie Oliveira, Project Manager, UC Merced, Sierra Nevada Research Institute
- From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park
- Subject: Notice to Proceed, 2007-053 Wawona Sierra Nevada Research Institute Field Station Generator Installation

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* (*4*) - *Routine maintenance and repairs to cultural resource sites, structures, utilities, and grounds if the action falls under an approved Historic Structures Preservation Guide or would not adversely affect the cultural resource.*

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.

//R. Kevin Cann// Michael J. Tollefson 5/31/07 Date

Enclosure (with attachments)

cc: Statutory Compliance File

Categorical Exclusion

(Version: OCT06)

Compliance Tracking Number: 2007-053 PEPC Project Number: 18214

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: Wawona Sierra Nevada Research Institute Field Station Generator Installation Location: Wawona, Mariposa County, California Project Manager: Kathy Dimont, Interpretation, 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* (4) - *Routine maintenance and repairs to cultural resource sites, structures, utilities, and grounds if the action falls under an approved Historic Structures Preservation Guide or would not adversely affect the cultural resource.*

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

Preservation Assessment Form (YOSE-XXX)

Wilderness Minimum Requirement Analysis

Wild and Scenic River Section 7 Determination

Other:

C. 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.

//R. Kevin Cann//

5/31/07 Date

Michael J. Tollefson, Superintendent

Original: Statutory Compliance File cc: Project Proponent

Attachments (2)

Environmental Screening Form

(Version: NOV06)

Compliance Tracking Number: 2007-053 PEPC Project Number: 18214

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: Wawona Sierra Nevada Research Institute Field Station Generator Installation Location: Wawona, Mariposa County, California Project Manager: Kathy Dimont, Interpretation, Yosemite National Park

Project Manager: Louie Oliveira, UC Merced, Sierra Nevada Research Institute

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

Wawona is subject to numerous power failures each year, and because some of the failures last up to several days, a propane powered generator is needed at the University of California, Merced field station. It will be installed by UC Merced maintenance personnel and will ensure continuous power to computers, freezers, and other sensitive equipment necessary for UC Merced research operations. The unit will be powered by an existing propane tank. There will be no ground disturbance. It comes with its own base and will simply be placed on the ground at the rear of the building. Conduit to the electrical panel and gas lines will be run through the crawl space of the building. The electrical panel will be installed next to the current circuit breaker box on the west side of the building. Specifications for the unit and photos with drawings will be submitted with this proposal. All expenses, including unit purchase and installation, will be covered by the university.

Table B1 – Background Information Yes No N/A **Explanation/Notes** Did NPS staff conduct a site visit? If yes, list 1. \square \square Interpretation staff. attendees. If no, explain. 2a. Is the project providing compliance for an action associated with but not covered by an approved \boxtimes plan? (Identify the plan and provide a section or page citation.); OR 2b. Is the project in an approved plan? (Identify the \square \square plan and provide a section or page citation. \boxtimes 2c. Is the project consistent with that plan? 2d. Is the Plan's CE, FONSI, or ROD current? \boxtimes \square 3a. Are there any interested or affected parties? 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?

Table B2 – Environmental Screening Form Attachments (provide Attachment letter—A, B, etc.)

| | | Yes | No | N/A | Explanation/Notes |
|----|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----|--|
| 1. | Maps: (vicinity map or site map) | \boxtimes | | | Wawona vicinity map; see Attachment A. |
| 2. | Drawings (e.g., design, construction) | | \boxtimes | | |
| 3. | Site Plans | | \boxtimes | | |
| 4. | Photographs | \boxtimes | | | Proposed site and control panel; see Attachment B. |
| 5. | Non-NEPA/NHPA Approvals (Explain) | | \boxtimes | | |
| 6. | Other (Explain) | | \boxtimes | | |

C. ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL RESOURCE EFFECTS

| | e any impacts possible on the following ources? | Yes | No | N/A | Data Needed to Determine/Notes |
|------------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| 1. | Geologic resources: soils, bedrock, streambeds, etc | | \boxtimes | | |
| 2. | From geohazards | | \boxtimes | | |
| 3. | Air quality | | \bowtie | | |
| 4. | Soundscapes | \boxtimes | | | Negligible: temporary noises during installation. |
| 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 | | \bowtie | | |
| 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 | | |
| | 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. | | \square | | |
| 17. | Visitor experience, aesthetic resources | | \boxtimes | | |
| 18. | Cultural resources including cultural landscapes, ethnographic resources | \boxtimes | | | Negligible; the assessment of effect is "No Adverse Effect;" see Section F, National Historic Preservation Act Checklist and attached XXX. |
| 19. | Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure | | \bowtie | | |
| 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 | | \bowtie | | |
| 23. | Resource, including energy, conservation potential | | \boxtimes | | |
| 24. | Urban quality, gateway communities, etc. | | \boxtimes | | |
| 25. | Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity | | \boxtimes | | |
| 26 | Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal, paleontological resources)? | | \square | | |
| Con 1. | nments, Mitigations and Conditions: None | | | | |
| 1. | NUIE | | | | |

D. MANDATORY CRITERIA

| If | implemented, would the proposed action: | Yes | No | N/A | Data Needed to Determine/Notes |
|-----|--|-----|-------------|-----|---|
| | Have material adverse effects on public health or safety? | | | | |
| 2. | · · · | | | | 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? | | \bowtie | | |
| 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? | | \boxtimes | | The assessment of effect is "No Adverse Effect;" see Section F, National Historic Preservation Act Checklist, below. |
| 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? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 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)? | | \square | | |
| 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? | | | | |
| 17. | Have the potential for significant impact as indicated by a federal, state, or local agency or Indian tribe? | | | | |
| 18. | Have the potential to be controversial because of disagreement over possible environmental effects? | | \square | | |
| 19. | Have the potential to violate the NPS Organic Act by impairing park resources or values? | | \boxtimes | | |

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.

E. SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST

| Within the area of potential effect, are there: | Yes | No | N/A | Data Needed to Determine/Notes | |
|--|-----|-------------|-----|--------------------------------|--|
| 1. Listed or proposed threatened or endangered species (Federal or State)? | | \boxtimes | | | |
| 2. Species of special concern (Federal or State)? | | \square | | | |
| 3. Park rare plants or vegetation? | | \boxtimes | | | |
| 4. Potential habitat for any special-status species listed above? | | \square | | | |
| If "yes" to any of the above questions, a Special-Status Species Checklist must be completed and attached. | | | | | |
| Comments, Mitigations and Conditions: | | | | | |

1. None

F. NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST

| Within 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 | | |
| 3. | Are there any Native American Indian traditional cultural resources? | | \square | | |
| 4. | Is there a historic property (a building, structure, feature, or all or any part of an archeological district or site, or a historic district or site, or any associated landscape element) that is listed or eligible for listing on the <i>National Register</i> ? | | | | Wawona Ranger Station |
| 5. | Is there a National Historic Landmark? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 6. | Is there a structure(s) on the park's <i>List of Classified Structures</i> ? | | | | Project is designed to avoid impact to the historic property; the assessment of effect is "No Adverse Effect;" see the attached XXX. |
| 7. | Is there any cultural resource requiring an evaluation of eligibility as a historic property under NHPA, Section 106, before an affect determination can be made? | | \boxtimes | | |
| 8 | Would there be alteration of any historic property or associated landscape element covered by 2-7, above? | | | | Negligible: the assessment of effect is "No Adverse Effect;" see the attached XXX. |
| If ' | yes" to any of the above, then an Assessment | of Effe | cts fo | rm (Y | OSE-XXX) must be completed and attached. |
| Mi | tigations and Conditions: | | | | |
| 1. | None | | | | |

G. WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST

| Is the proposed project: | | No | N/A | Data Needed to Determine/Notes | | |
|--|--|-------------|-----|--------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. Within designated Wilderness? | | \boxtimes | | | | |
| 2. Within a Potential Wilderness Addition? | | \boxtimes | | | | |
| If "yes" to either of the above, then a Wilderness Minimum Requirements Analysis must be completed and attached. | | | | | | |
| Mitigations and Conditions: | | | | | | |
| 1. None | | | | | | |

H. WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST

| Does 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) | \bowtie | | | South Fork of the Merced River | | | |
| 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. | | \boxtimes | | | | | |
| 5a. Fall on a tributary of a Wild and Scenic River? | | \bowtie | | | | | |
| 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 Section 7 determination must be completed and attached. | | | | | | | |
| Mitigations 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(4) - Routine maintenance and repairs to cultural resource sites, structures, utilities, and grounds if the action falls under an approved Historic Structures Preservation Guide or would not adversely affect the cultural resource.


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. (Environmental Planning and Compliance)
- 2. Ensure building is tested for lead paint prior to generator installation. (Administration Management)
- **3.** Coordinate project with the Historic Preservation Specialist (Rod Kennec, 379-1262) to ensure proper generator installation. (Project Management)
- 4. Ensure that the electrical panel and associated conduit is painted white to match existing building. (Project Management)

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.


| //ReneaKennec// | 5/16/07 |
|----------------------------|---------|
| Compliance Specialist | Date |
| //Mark A Butler// | 5/18/07 |
| Compliance Program Manager | Date |
| | |
| //Bill Delaney// | 5/23/07 |
| Chief, Project Management | Date |

Attachment A




Map 1 - Wawona, Building 4000, 7799 Chilnualna Road

Attachment B



Control Panel



Proposed Generator Location

Preservation Assessment Form (YOSE XXX)

(Version: AUG06)

Compliance Tracking Number: 2007-053 PEPC Project Number: 18214

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

Title: Wawona Sierra Nevada Research Institute Field Station Generator Installation **Project Location and Area of Potential Effect:**

Wawona, Mariposa County, California

Building 4000, 7799 Chilnaulna Fall Rd

Project Manager: Kathy Dimont, Interpretation, Yosemite National Park

Project Manager: Louie Oliveira, UC Merced, Sierra Nevada Research Institute,

Project Description: Wawona is subject to numerous power failures each year, and because some of the failures last up to several days, a propane powered generator is needed at the University of California, Merced field station. It will be installed by UC Merced maintenance personnel and will ensure continuous power to computers, freezers, and other sensitive equipment necessary for UC Merced research operations. The unit will be powered by an existing propane tank. There will be no ground disturbance. It comes with its own base and will simply be placed on the ground at the rear of the building. Conduit to the electrical panel and gas lines will be run through the crawl space of the building. The electrical panel will be installed next to the current circuit breaker box on the west side of the building. Specifications for the unit and photos with drawings will be submitted with this proposal. All expenses, including unit purchase and installation, will be covered by the university.

| 1. Atta | ched Sensitive Information** | Yes | No | Explanation/Source/Notes |
|---------|------------------------------|-----|-------------|--------------------------|
| a. | Maps | | \boxtimes | |
| b. | Drawings | | \boxtimes | |
| с. | Site Plans | | \boxtimes | |
| d. | Photographs | | \boxtimes | |
| e. | Sample | | \boxtimes | |
| f. | List of Materials | | \boxtimes | |
| g. | Other (Explain) | | \boxtimes | |

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

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). | \boxtimes | | | LCS 055762 |
| | a. Would the proposed action affect a known historic property? | | \square | | |
| | | | | | |
| 2. | List all Historic Properties in the Area of Potential Effect: | Affec Yes | ted? No | | Explanation/Notes |
| | a. Wawona Ranger Station LCS 055762 | | \boxtimes | Proje prope | ect designed to avoid impact to historic erty. |
| | b. | | | | |
| | с. | | | | |
| 2 | T - 4 | A 66 | 4 . 19 | - | |
| 3. | List resources in the Area of Potential Effect to which American Indians attach | Affec | ted? | | Explanation/Notes |
| | cultural and religious significance: | Yes | No | | Explanation (vecs |
| _ | a. | | \boxtimes | | |
| | b. | | | | |
| | с. | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 4. | The proposed action will: | Yes | No | N/A | Explanation/Note |
| | • Destroy, remove, or alter features or | | \boxtimes | | |
| | elements from a historic structure | | | | |
| | • Replace historic features/elements in kind | | \square | | |
| | • Add nonhistoric features/elements to a historic structure | | \square | | |
| | • Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (including terrain) | | | | |
| | • Add nonhistoric features/elements (including visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape | \boxtimes | | | Equipment situated to avoid visual impact. |
| | • Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible, or alter associated terrain | | \boxtimes | | |
| | • Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible, or alter associated terrain | | \boxtimes | | |
| | • Begin or contribute to the deterioration of historic fabric, terrain, setting, landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources | | | | |
| | • Involve a real property transaction affecting historic cultural properties (i.e., the exchange, sale, or lease of land or structures) | | \boxtimes | | |
| | • Potentially affect presently unidentified historic resources | | \boxtimes | | |
| | • Other | | \square | | |

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:

Checklist prepared by: Jeannette Simons Title: Historic Preservation Officer Date: 03/30/07

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: 4/02/07 |
|--|------------------------|---------------|
| Ground Disturbance Involved Assessment of Effect: "No Effect" Recommended Conditions: | Yes: 🖾 No: 🗌 | |
| Signature of Archeologist: //Laura | Kirn// | |
| Cultural Anthropologist Comments: Assessment of Effect: Recommended Conditions: | Name: Sonny Montague | Date: |
| Signature of Cultural Anthropologis | t: | |
| Curator Comments: Assessment of Effect: Recommended Conditions: | Name: Jonathan Bayless | Date: |
| | | |

Signature of Curator:

| Historian Comments: | Name: Charles Palmer | Date: | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| Assessment of Effect: | | | | | | |
| Recommended Conditions: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Signature of Historian: | | | | | | |
| Historic Architect Comments: | Name: Sueann Brown | Date: 4/11/07 | | | | |
| Assessment of Effect: "No Advers Recommended Conditions: | e Effect'' | | | | | |
| Signature of Historic Architect: //Sueann Brown// | | | | | | |
| Historical Landscape Architec Comments: | t Name: Dave Humphrey | Date: 4/2/07 | | | | |
| Assessment of Effect: "No Advers Recommended Conditions: | e Effect'' | | | | | |

Signature of Historic Landscape Architect: //David T. Humphrey//

| Preservation Specialist | Name: Rod Kennec | Date: 4/02/07 | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Assessment of Effect: "No Adverse Effect" | | | | |
| Recommended Conditions: Recommended Conditions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Cianatura of Dressmustica Speciali | | | | |
| Signature of Preservation Speciali | st: <u>//Boa B Kennec//</u> | | | |
| Native American Liaison | Name: Jeannette Simons | Date: | | |
| Comments: | Name. Jeannette Simons | Date. | | |
| Comments. | | | | |
| Assessment of Effect: | | | | |
| Recommended Conditions: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Signature of Native American Lia | ison: | | | |
| | | | | |
| Specialist Title | Name: | Date: | | |
| Comments: | | | | |
| Assessment of Effect: | | | | |
| Recommended Conditions: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Signature of <Enter Specialist's Title>: _____

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 management policies, standards, guidelines, or US DOI standards and guidelines, Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings, or others, and incorporates measures to avoid Adverse Effects.

Reviewed and Accepted by:

| Signature: | //Niki Stephanie Nicholas// | Date: <u>4/12/07</u> |
|------------|--|----------------------|
| - | Chief of Resources Management & Science Division | |

2. Compliance Requirements: The following is the park's assessment of Section 106 process needs and requirements for this undertaking.

Standard 36 CFR Part 800 Consultation

Consultation under 36 CFR is needed subsequent to the preparation of this form and its review by appropriate historic resource management advisors.

Undertaking related to the 1995 NPS Programmatic Agreement

The above action meets all conditions for a programmatic exclusion under Stipulation IV. A of the 1995 NPS programmatic agreement, and is listed in Stipulation IV. B, as:

<Choose Type of Undertaking>

Plan-Related Undertaking

Consultation and review of the proposed undertaking were completed in the context of a plan review process, in accordance with the 1995 NPS programmatic agreement and 36 CFR Part 800.

Undertaking Related to Another Agreement

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under a document such as a statewide agreement written in accordance with 37 CFR Part 800.7 or counterpart regulations.

Agreement: <Enter Agreement Information>

□ Flood-Recovery Related Undertaking

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under the letter-based agreement between the NPS, the State Historic Preservation Office, and the Council for Historic Preservation for "Highwater 97" flood repair and recovery

Undertaking Related to the 1999 Yosemite Programmatic Agreement

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under the park's 1999 programmatic agreement for planning, design, construction, operations and maintenance; the undertaking meets the stipulations identified 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: Historic Preservation Officer

Signature: //Jeannette Simons// Date: 4/12/07

E. SUPERINTENDENT'S APPROVAL

The proposed work conforms to NPS Management Policies and NPS-28 and I approve the recommendations, stipulations, and conditions noted in Section B of this form.

Signature of Superintendent: //R. Kevin Cann// Michael J. Tollefson **Date:** <u>6/4/07</u>