



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: Randy Fong, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park
From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park
Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2010-031 Curry Village -
Construct ADA Path of Travel to Restrooms (30466)

The Leadership Team has reviewed the proposed project actions and completed its environmental assessment documentation, and we have determined that there:

- Will not be any effect on threatened, endangered, or rare species or their critical habitat.
- Will not be any effect on historical, cultural, or archeological resources.
- Will not be serious or long-term undesirable environmental or visual effects.

The proposed project, therefore, is now cleared for all NEPA and NHPA compliance requirements as presented above. Project plans and specifications are approved, and construction or project implementation can commence.

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

- Consultation with the park hydrologist, Jim Roche (379-1446) would occur prior to beginning the work, to prevent any impact on the natural subsurface and surface flows between the cliffs and Stoneman Meadow.
- Ensure that all equipment and materials brought into the park are free from non-native, invasive plants and animals, and noxious weeds. All staff working on the site would 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 1335.

//Stan Austin// (acting)
Don L. Neubacher

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: 2010-031 Curry Village Construct ADA Path of Travel to Restrooms

PEPC Project Number: 30466

Project Description: This project would extend an accessible path of travel to several temporary employee and visitor facilities in Curry Village. Recent projects have created a need to install pathways that comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). These pathways would provide access the Curry Village Shower House and the new guest accommodations in Boys Town. In addition, ADA compliant pathways leading to four new cabins and the new commons facility would be installed in the Huff House Employee Accommodations area.

Project Scope:

A. Curry Village Shower House

1. Remove four standard parking stalls and replace with two ADA compliant parking stalls (striping included).
2. Remove pathway from parking area to shower facilities and replace with an ADA compliant pathway; tie the pathway into the entrance leading to the ramp. The pathway width of six feet would stay the same.

B. Boys Town Guest Area

1. Install a new ADA compliant pathway leading from the Curry Village Shower House to five tents near the basketball courts. This pathway is currently paved, but it is uneven and deteriorated in some areas. This pathway would be 36-inches wide, the minimum width required by the ADA.
2. Install ADA compliant ramps to five tent cabins. These ramps would be constructed of wood. In some locations, the paving would be flush with the cabin entrances, so ramps would not be required.
3. Install ADA compliant parking stalls at the basketball court and tie into new pathway.

C. Huff House Employee Area

1. Remove three standard parking stalls and replace with two ADA compliant stalls (striping included).
2. Install ADA complaint pathway leading to four cabins and the shower and kitchen facilities. This pathway would be the width of the existing gravel road, which also provides approved and adequate fire support access.

Pavement for all three areas would be 3-inches thick using PG64-10 hot asphalt over 2-inch Type II Base. The use of permeable surfaces would be explored.

Project Location:

Mariposa, California

Mitigation(s):

- Consultation with the park hydrologist, Jim Roche (379-1446) would occur prior to beginning the work, to prevent any impact on natural subsurface and surface flows between the cliffs and Stoneman Meadow. Saving stop
- 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 the site would 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 1335.

Describe the category used to exclude action from further NEPA analysis and indicate the number of the category (see Section 3-4 of DO-12):

C.19 Construction or rehabilitation in previously disturbed or developed areas, required to meet health or safety regulations, or to meet requirements for making facilities accessible to the handicapped.

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 Section 3-6 apply, and the action is fully described in Section 3-4 of DO-12.

Park Superintendent //Stan Austin// (acting)

Date 6/9/10

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



ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 5/19/2010

Updated May 2007 - per 2004 Departmental Manual revisions and proposed Director's Order 12 changes

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2010-031 Curry Village - Construct ADA Path of Travel to Restrooms
PEPC Project Number: 30466
Project Type: Capital Improvement (CI)
Project Location: **County, State:** Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Randy Fong

Preliminary drawings attached? Yes

Is project a hot topic (controversial or sensitive issues that should be brought to attention of Regional Director)? No

B. RESOURCE EFFECTS TO CONSIDER:

Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources	No Effect	Negligible Effects	Minor Effects	Exceeds Minor Effects	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
1. Geologic resources – soils, bedrock, streambeds, etc.		Negligible			Pathways would need 6-inches of soil removed prior to installing the accessible path.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			Temporary air emissions during the installation of the pathway.
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			This project has associated construction noises during the asphalt installation.
5. Water quality or quantity	No				
6. Streamflow characteristics	No				
7. Marine or estuarine resources	No				
8. Floodplains or wetlands	No				

Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources	No Effect	Negligible Effects	Minor Effects	Exceeds Minor Effects	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
9. Land use, including occupancy, income, values, ownership, type of use	No				
10. Rare or unusual vegetation – old growth timber, riparian, alpine	No				
11. Species of special concern (plant or animal; state or federal listed or proposed for listing) or their habitat	No				
12. Unique ecosystems, biosphere reserves, World Heritage Sites	No				Yosemite National Park is a World Heritage Site.
13. Unique or important wildlife or wildlife habitat	No				
14. Unique or important fish or fish habitat	No				
15. Introduce or promote non-native species (plant or animal)		Negligible			This project is contingent on ensuring that all equipment and materials brought into the park are free of non-native, invasive plants and animals.
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	No				
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				The visitor experience would be enhanced by an accessible pathway to facilities.
18. Archeological resources	No				
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes		Negligible			Camp Curry Historic Site.
21. Ethnographic resources	No				
22. Museum collections (objects, specimens, and archival and manuscript collections)	No				
23. Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base, infrastructure	No				
24. Minority and low income populations, ethnography, size, migration patterns, etc.	No				
25. Energy resources	No				

Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources	No Effect	Negligible Effects	Minor Effects	Exceeds Minor Effects	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
26. Other agency or tribal land use plans or policies	No				
27. Resource, including energy, conservation potential, sustainability	No				
28. Urban quality, gateway communities, etc.	No				
29. Long-term management of resources or land/resource productivity	No				This pathway would also be used for emergency vehicle access; this would aid in the long-term management of resources.
30. Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal, paleontological resources)?	No				

C. MANDATORY CRITERIA

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
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		

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
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 law, or a 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 (Executive Order 12898)?		No		
K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		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		

For the purpose of interpreting these procedures within the National Park Service, any action that has the potential to violate the NPS Organic Act by impairing park resources or values would constitute an action that triggers the Department of Interior exception for actions that threaten to violate a federal law for protection of the environment.

D. OTHER INFORMATION

Are personnel preparing this form familiar with the site? Yes

Did personnel conduct a site visit? No

Is the project in an approved plan such as a General Management Plan or an Implementation Plan with an accompanying NEPA document? No

Are there any interested or affected agencies or parties? No

Has consultation with all affected agencies or tribes been completed? No

Are there any connected, cumulative, or similar actions as part of the proposed action? (e.g., other development projects in area or identified in GMP, adequate/available utilities to accomplish project)? No

E. INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM SIGNATORIES

<u>Interdisciplinary Team</u>	<u>Field of Expertise</u>
Don L. Neubacher	Superintendent
Kathleen Morse	Chief of Planning
Mark Butler	Chief of Project Management
Katariina Tuovinen	Chief of Administration Management
Ed Walls	Chief of Facilities Management
Niki Nicholas	Chief of Resources Management & Science
Marty Nielson	Chief of Business and Revenue Management
Tom Medema	Chief of Interpretation and Education
Charles Cuvelier	Chief of Visitor and Resource Protection Chief Ranger
Randy Fong	Project Leader
Elexis Mayer	Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
Jeannette Simons	NHPA Specialist
Renea Kennec	NEPA Specialist

F. SUPERVISORY SIGNATORY

Recommended:

Compliance Specialists	Date
<u>//Renea Kennec//</u> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	<u>6/3/10</u>
<u>//Elexis Mayer//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Elexis Mayer	<u>6/3/10</u>
<u>//Mark A. Butler//</u> Chief, Project Management – Mark Butler	<u>6/8/10</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Stan Austin// (acting)</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>6/9/10</u>

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



National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite National Park
Date: 05/24/2010

PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: May 24, 2010

PROJECT INFORMATION


Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2010-031 Curry Village - Construct ADA Path of Travel to Restrooms
PEPC Project Number: 30466
Project Type: Capital Improvement (CI)
Project Location: **County, State:** Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Randy Fong

PARK ESF ADDENDUM QUESTIONS & ANSWERS


ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST				
1. Listed or proposed threatened or endangered species (Federal or State)?		No		
2. Species of special concern (Federal or State)?		No		
3. Park rare plants or vegetation?		No		
4. Potential habitat for any special-status species listed above?		No		
NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST				
5. Entail ground disturbance?	Yes			Six inches of soil would need to be removed from the pathways prior to installing the accessible path.
6. Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		No		Yosemite Valley Archeological District; this project will not affect archeological resources. The assessment of effect is "No Historic Properties Affected."
7. Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		
8. Has a National Register form been completed?		No		


ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
9. Are there any structures on the park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?		No		
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST				
10. Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor?	Yes			Merced River.
11. Fall within the bed and banks AND will effect the free-flow of the river?		No		
12. Have the possibility of affecting water quality of the area?		No		
13. Remain consistent with its river segment classification?	Yes			
14. Fall on a tributary of a Wild and Scenic River?		No		
15. Will the project encroach or intrude upon the Wild and Scenic River corridor?		No		
16. Will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values?		No		
17. Consistent with the provisions in the Merced River Plan Settlement Agreement?	Yes			
WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST				
18. Within designated Wilderness?		No		
19. Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		No		


ADA Compliant Path of Travel for:
(A) Repair pathwath from parking to guest shower (Compliance complet 2009-057 (256000))
(B) Pave pathway into Boustovon. (currently paved + gravel mix.




Curry Village Temporary Guest Shower House Concept Plan



 = Location 'C' proposed for paving. Currently gravel.



HUFF HOUSE AREA CONCEPT PLAN - SITE PLAN





ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park **Park district:** Yosemite Valley

2. Project Description:

a. **Project Name:** 2010-031 Curry Village - Construct ADA Path of Travel to Restrooms

b. **Date:** May 24, 2010

c. **PEPC project ID No:** 30466

3. Has the area of potential effects been surveyed to identify cultural resources?

No

Yes, Source or reference: Camp Curry Historic Site.

Check here if no known cultural resources will be affected. (If this is because area has been disturbed, please explain or attach additional information to show the disturbance was so extensive as to preclude intact cultural deposits.)

4. Potentially Affected Resource:

Cultural landscapes affected?

Name and number(s): Camp Curry Historic Site

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

Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure

Replace historic features/elements in kind

Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure

Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)

Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape

Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible

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. 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

7. Supporting Study Data:

(Attach if feasible; if action is in a plan, EA or EIS, give name and project or page number.)

8. Attachments:

Maps Archeological survey, if applicable Drawings Specifications Photographs
 Scope of Work Site plan List of Materials Samples Other:

Prepared by: Renea Kennec

Date: May 24, 2010

Title: Environmental Compliance Specialist

Telephone: (209) 379-1038

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:

Archeologist

Name: Laura Kirn

Date: 3/30/2010

Comments:

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance

Assessment of Effect: No Historic Properties Affected No Adverse Effect Adverse Effect Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: No Potential to Cause Effects [800.3(a)(1)]

Historical Architect

Name: Sueann Brown

Date: 5/19/2010

Comments:

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance

Assessment of Effect: No Historic Properties Affected No Adverse Effect Adverse Effect Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

Historical Landscape Architect

Name: David Humphrey

Date: 5/20/2010

Comments:

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance

Assessment of Effect: No Historic Properties Affected No Adverse Effect Adverse Effect Streamlined Review

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

No Reviews From: Curator, Historian, 106 Advisor, Other Advisor, Anthropologist

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

No Historic Properties Affected No Adverse Effect Adverse Effect

2. Compliance requirements:

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. PLAN-RELATED UNDERTAKING

Consultation and review of the proposed undertaking were completed in the context of a plan review process, in accordance with the 2008 Servicewide PA and 36 CFR Part 800.

Specify plan/EA/EIS: _____

D. UNDERTAKING RELATED TO ANOTHER AGREEMENT

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

Specify: 1999 Programmatic Agreement

E. COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS SATISFIED BY USE OF NEPA

Documentation is required for the preparation of an EA/FONSI or an EIS/ROD has been developed and used so as also to meet the requirements of 36 CFR 800.3 through 800.6

F. No Potential to Cause Effects [800.3(a)(1)]

[] G. STIPULATIONS/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.

Recommended by Park Section 106 coordinator:

Signature of Historic Preservation Officer //Elexis Mayer// (acting)

Date: 6/3/10

D. 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.

Signature of Superintendent //Stan Austin// (acting)

Date: 6/9/10

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