



A PDF text file of the project's approved environmental compliance package containing the letter of compliance completion, categorical exclusion form, environmental screening form, and any other associated environmental clearance forms, as applicable (e.g., Wilderness Minimum Requirement Analysis, Wild and Scenic River Section 7 Analysis). The signed originals of the package are on file in the Environmental Planning and Compliance Office at Yosemite National Park.

Letter of Compliance Completion

To: Ephriam Dickson, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Cicely Muldoon, Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2021-041 Studhorse Fire Interpretive Sign (PEPC: 96516)

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 96516.

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 historic Properties affected
- 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.

Required Mitigations - For the proposed project actions to be within compliance requirements during construction and/or project implementation, the following mitigations must be adhered to:

- Only project actions reviewed in PEPC 96516 are approved for implementation. Changes to plans must be reviewed and approved by the Yosemite National Park Compliance Office.
- All sign content must be agreed upon between the Fire Communication and Education Specialist, Exhibits Specialist, and the American Indian Liaison.
- Park staff will obey speed limits to protect special status wildlife.

Superintendent: _____
Cicely Muldoon, Superintendent

Date: _____
2/24/2021

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



Categorical Exclusion Documentation Form (CE Form)

Project: Studhorse Fire Interpretive Sign

PEPC Project Number: 96516

Description of Action (Project Description):

This project proposes to put an interpretive single-post metal sign at the Studhorse Overlook pullout that would positively reflect the role of prescribed fire in the restoration of the landscape and provide public education. The park would install it with a metal post with either concrete to compact it or hardened road base. The proposed location is a large parking area adjacent to the Wawona Road that has intersecting wilderness trails.

This location was one of the first prescribed fire units in Yosemite National Park in 1970 after years of active fire suppression. It paved the way for integrated long-term research of fire ecology in Yosemite and the American West. It is a living classroom of prescribed fire management and fire ecology.

Public support for prescribed fire is a necessary component to a successful landscape restoration and fuel management program.

Project Locations:

Location

County: Mariposa **State:** CA

Mitigation(s):

- Only project actions reviewed in PEPC 96516 are approved for implementation. Changes to plans must be reviewed and approved by the Yosemite National Park Compliance Office.
- All sign content must be agreed upon between the Fire Communication and Education Specialist, Exhibits Specialist, and the American Indian Liaison.
- Park staff will obey speed limits to protect special status wildlife.

CE Citation: C.5 Installation of signs, displays, kiosks, etc.

CE Justification: NA

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: Cicely Muldoon
Cicely Muldoon, Superintendent

Date: 2/24/2021

*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?		This criterion is no longer applicable per 2020 CEQ regulations and DOI direction.
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:	Studhorse Fire Interpretive Sign
PEPC Project Number:	96516
Project Type:	Fire - Prevention/Education (FPE)
Project Location:	
County, State:	Mariposa, California
Project Leader:	Epriam Dickson

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

See Categorical Exclusion Form

C. 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 <i>Pacific fisher</i>	Potential	Issue: Pacific fisher occurs in project area. Impact: No anticipated impact to fisher due to minor project work being short in duration and without significant noise or disturbance.
Biological Vegetation	None	
Biological Wildlife and/or Wildlife Habitat including terrestrial and aquatic species	None	
Cultural Archeological Resources <i>Ground disturbance</i>	Potential	Issue: Project requires ground disturbance. The project area was archeologically surveyed in 1992 and no archeological sites have been identified. No additional archeological work is recommended. Impact: Work area is not archeologically sensitive, no impacts anticipated.

Cultural Cultural Landscapes	None	
Cultural Ethnographic Resources <i>Sign interprets American Indian Burning Practices</i>	Potential	Issue: Sign interprets the benefits of anthropogenic fire on the landscape, including modern controlled burns and American Indian traditional burning practices that continue today. Impact: The park consulted with American Indian tribes on the sign's content.
Cultural Museum Collections	None	
Cultural Prehistoric/historic structures	None	
Geological Geologic Features	None	
Geological Geologic Processes	None	
Lightscapes Lightscapes	None	
Other Human Health and Safety	None	
Other Operational	None	
Other Other	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 <i>Sign</i>	Potential	Issue: The sign is intended to interpret fire management to visitors.

		Impact: The sign will improve visitor experience by providing interpretive content in an opportune location for visitors to witness and interact with the benefits of prescribed fire.
Water Floodplains	None	
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: Studhorse Fire Interpretive Sign

Prepared by: Wesley Wills **Date Prepared:** **Telephone:** (209) 379-1455

PEPC Project Number: 96516

Locations:

County, State: Mariposa, CA

Describe project: See Categorical Exclusion form.

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

The project involves installation of a small interpretive sign at the edge of an existing large gravel pullout on the northwest side of Wawona Road. Multiple NPS trails pass through the area. The sign will be minimally visible from the road. Ground disturbance is limited to a 6-x-6-inch diameter hole dug to three feet deep to support the metal post sign. The sign will be 3 feet tall and approximately 2-x-2-feet and rectangular. The surrounding area is heavily forested.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	Source or reference:

4. **Potentially Affected Resource(s):**

Archeological Resources Present: No

Historical Structures/Resources Present: No

Cultural Landscapes Present: No

Ethnographic Resources Present: 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>
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: Hope Schear

Date: 02/11/2021

Comments: No HA/HLA required. Compliance completed under streamlined review YOSE 2020 PA 9b.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: ___No Potential to Cause Effect ___X___No Historic Properties Affected ___No
Adverse Effect ___Adverse Effect ___Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: Please see anthropologists comments.

Doc Method: Park Specific or Other Programmatic Agreement

[X] Anthropologist

Name: Liz Williams

Date: 02/11/2021

Comments: Tribal consultation yielded substantive comments from three tribes. Jan Van Wagendonk provided edits in response to tribal comments. Tribal liaison sent edited version to the three tribes that provided comments. One tribe reviewed and approved the edits. Tribal liaison included the requested edits and re-worded text to accommodate tribal edits. Draft final text follows. Tribes requested companion sign address tribal fire technology AND the continuation of tribal burning. Location at Studhorse or other locations: Tall or Big Trees. Tribal Liaison and Museum Curator will meet with tribal member to address the companion sign.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: ___No Potential to Cause Effect ___X___No Historic Properties Affected ___No
Adverse Effect ___Adverse Effect ___Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: Review complete per agreements in Feb 11 2021 email with all parties. Please SEE Above text Please see files in PROJECT SET UP TAB for documents and correspondence.

COMMENTS IN DOCUMENT: Re Emily Dayhoff comment: This is a lovely and relevant quote. Part of the tribal objection to the original language of the sign is that it sounds like tribal fire management is in the past and was not the precursor to prescribed burning. Tribes have been begging to burn the valley for years. Re statement that begins with In 1970, During this time, several Yosemite Indians worked in YOSE fire. Tribal memory

indicates they were vocal about the need to proactively burn...reduce fuels. It is impossible to tease out who influenced whom and no doubt western fire management is important and came to the prescribed burning technique independently or maybe inspired by trad burning. However, it is hard for Yosemite tribal people to see the landscape now, know they have been forbidden to burn and somehow not be acknowledged in this sign as part of the present approach. Justifications in addition to tribal comments: Please refer to first few pages of Jan Van Wagtendonk dissertation and see the tribal perspective from the Mariposa Grove fire technology sign (both in file)

Doc Method: Park Specific or Other Programmatic Agreement

[X] Archeologist

Name: Wesley Wills

Date: 07/08/2020

Comments: The project area was archeologically surveyed in 1992 and no archeological sites have been identified. No additional archeological work is recommended.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: ___No Potential to Cause Effect ___**X**___No Historic Properties Affected ___No
Adverse Effect ___Adverse Effect ___Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: Park Specific or Other Programmatic Agreement

[X] Historian

Name: Scott Carpenter

Date: 08/03/2020

Comments: No historical architect or historical landscape architect review necessary as sign installation is outside of the road corridor.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance []

Assessment of Effect: ___No Potential to Cause Effect ___**X**___No Historic Properties Affected ___No
Adverse Effect ___Adverse Effect ___Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: Park Specific or Other Programmatic Agreement

No Reviews From: Curator, Historical Architect, Other Advisor, Historical Landscape Architect

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

	No Potential to Cause Effects
X	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 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

SHPO Sent: NA

SHPO Received: NA

THPO Required: Yes

THPO Sent: 11/19/2020

THPO Received: 1/11/2021

SHPO/THPO Notes: Responses were received from the American Indian Council of Mariposa County, The North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians, and the Mono Lake Kutzadikaa. The incorporated tribal feedback into the final sign narrative and designs.

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.)

Required Mitigations - For the proposed project actions to be within compliance requirements during construction and/or project implementation, the following mitigations must be adhered to:

- Only project actions reviewed in PEPC 96516 are approved for implementation. Changes to plans must be reviewed and approved by the Yosemite National Park Compliance Office.

- All sign content must be agreed upon between the Fire Communication and Education Specialist, Exhibits Specialist, and the American Indian Liaison.

6. Assessment of Effect Notes:

YOSE Parkwide PA #9(b)

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

NHPA Specialist Hope Schear **Date:** 2/19/2021
Hope Schear

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: Cicely Muldoon **Date:** 2/24/2021
Cicely Muldoon, Superintendent

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



Other Compliance/Consultations Form

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
PEPC Project Number: 96516
Project Title: Studhorse Fire Interpretive Sign
Project Type: Fire - Prevention/Education
Project Location:
County, State: Mariposa, CA
Project Leader: Ephriam Dickson

ESA

Any Federal Species in the project Area? Yes If species in area: No Effect Was Biological Assessment prepared? Yes If Biological Assessment prepared, concurred? Formal Consultation required? No Formal Consultation Notes: Fisher occur in the general area. We have a fisher biological opinion in place with US Fish and Wildlife Service. Park biologists think this project will have 'no effect' on fisher because it does not modify habitat or cause disturbance to fisher. Formal Consultation Concluded: Any State listed Species in the Project Area? No Consultation Information: General Notes:	
Data Entered By: Heather Mackey	Date: Oct 8, 2020

ESA Mitigations

Mitigation ID	Text
107809	Park staff will obey speed limits to protect special status wildlife.

Floodplains/Wetlands/§404 Permits

Question	Yes	No	Details
A.1. Is project in 100- or 500-year floodplain or flash flood hazard area?		No	Not in floodplain or flash flood hazard area.
A.2. Is Project in wetlands as defined by NPS/DOI?		No	Not in wetland as defined by NPS/DOI.
B. COE Section 404 permit needed?		No	No placement of fill in waters of the United States.
C. State 401 certification?		No	

D. State Section 401 Permit?		No	Issue Date: Expiration Date:
E. Tribal Water Quality Permit?		No	
F. CZM Consistency determination needed?			N/A
G. Erosion & Sediment Control Plan Required?		No	
H. Any other permits required?		No	Permit Information:
Other Information:			
Data Entered By:	Ninette Daniele		Date: Feb 5, 2021

Floodplains & Wetlands Mitigations: None associated with this project

Wilderness

Question	Yes	No	
A. Does this project occur in or adjacent to Designated, Recommended, Proposed, Study, Eligible, or Potential Wilderness?		No	
B. Is the only place to conduct this project in wilderness?		No	
C. Is the project necessary for the administration of the area as wilderness?		No	
D. Would the project or any of its alternatives adversely affect (directly or indirectly) Designated, Recommended, Proposed, Study, Eligible, or Potential Wilderness? (If Yes, Minimum Requirements Analysis required)		No	
E. Does the project or any of its alternatives involve the use of any of the Wilderness Act Section 4(c) prohibited uses: commercial enterprise, permanent road, temporary road, motor vehicles, motorized equipment, motorboats, landing of aircraft, mechanical transport, structure, or installation? (If Yes, Minimum Requirements Analysis required)		No	
If the answer to D or E above is "Yes" then a Minimum Requirements Analysis is required. Describe the status of this analysis in the column to the right.			Initiation Date: Completed Date: Approved Date:
Other Information:			
Data Entered By:	Ninette Daniele		Date: Feb 5, 2021

Other Permits/Laws *Questions A & B are no longer used.*

Question	Yes	No
C. Wild and scenic river concerns exist?		No
D. National Trails concerns exist?		No

E. Air Quality consult with State needed?		No
F. Consistent with Architectural Barriers, Rehabilitation, and Americans with Disabilities Acts or not Applicable? (If N/A check Yes)	Yes	
G. Other:		No

Other Information:

Data Entered By:	Ninette Daniele	Date:	Feb 5, 2021
-------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-------------