



IN REPLY REFER TO:  
L7615(YOSE-PM)

## United States Department of the Interior NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Yosemite National Park  
P. O. Box 577  
Yosemite, California 95389

### Memorandum

To: Kim Tucker, Project Manager, Yosemite National Park

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2010-063 Curry Village, Install Temporary Huff Employee Common Area (32175)

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

- Will not be any effect on threatened, endangered, or rare species and/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 subject proposed project, therefore, is now cleared for all NEPA and NHPA compliance requirements as presented above. Project plans and specifications are approved and construction and/or project implementation can commence.

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

- Contact American Indian Liaison to arrange consultation in the unexpected event that American Indian resources are discovered.
- Work will occur in a historic district. If any previously unknown archeological resources are discovered, stop work and contact Park Archeologist.

---

Don L. Neubacher

Enclosure (with attachments)

cc: Statutory Compliance File



National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite National Park  
Date: 08/16/2010

---

## Categorical Exclusion Form

**Project:** 2010-063 Curry Village, Install Temporary Huff Employee Outdoor Area

**PEPC Project Number:** 32175

**Project Description:** The purpose of this project is to provide a designated outdoor area for Huff Housing residents. The temporary area is approximately 20 feet by 40 feet and extends east of the Huff House community center. The outdoor area would have two BBQs (charcoal), four picnic tables, two shade structures (eight feet by eight feet brown temporary pop-up canvases), exterior lighting, two bear proof trashcans, two bear proof recycling cans, native wood chip flooring, and a cedar grape stake privacy fence installed. The adjacent community center will provide restroom and hand washing facilities. This proposed common area is temporary and could be easily removed if deemed appropriate in the future.

### Scope of Work:

- Purchase equipment.
- Install weed free, native wood chips.
- Install BBQ, tables, trash containers, fire extinguishers, lighting and signage.
- Install 30 lineal feet approved grape stake fence (see map).
- Stain fence Wosky or dark brown to match other fencing in the area.
- Perform final inspection.

### Special Considerations:

- Exterior lighting will meet NPS draft lighting guidelines for Yosemite National Park for appropriate levels of light for a developed area.
- Bear proof trash containers will be provided. Trash will be removed each night upon area closure. Wildlife awareness signs will be posted at the area, reminding users not to feed animals, leave food unattended, and to clean up after themselves.
- Sanitation facilities are available in the adjacent Community Center.
- Fire extinguishers will be posted as required nearby the BBQ fixtures.
- Wood chips will be from local wood material gathered from the clearing of downed trees from the 2010 winter snow event.

**Operational Concerns:** The area will be supervised by DNC employee services staff. The BBQ area will close at 11:00 pm each night.

### Project Location:

Mariposa County, CA

**Mitigations:**

- Contact American Indian Liaison to arrange consultation in the unexpected event that American Indian resources are discovered.
- Work will occur in a historic district. If any previously unknown archeological resources are discovered, stop work and contact the park Archeologist.

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.3 Routine maintenance and repairs to non-historic structures, facilities, utilities, grounds and trails.**

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** \\ Don L. Neubacher \\

**Date** 9/2/10



National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite National Park  
Date: 08/16/2010

## ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING FORM (ESF)

### DO-12 APPENDIX 1

Date Form Initiated: 08/03/2010

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:** 2010-063 Curry Village, Install Temporary Huff Employee Common Area  
**PEPC Project Number:** 32175  
**Project Type:** Concession Temporary Employee Recreation Area (OTHER)  
**Project Location:** County, State: Mariposa, California Other: Curry Village  
**Project Leader:** Kim Tucker

**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.	No				This project intends to add three inches of wood chips to the project area.
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality		Negligible			Two BBQs will be added, resulting in negligible air emissions.
4. Soundscapes	No				
5. Water quality or quantity	No				
6. Streamflow characteristics	No				
7. Marine or estuarine resources	No				
8. Floodplains or wetlands	No				
9. Land use, including occupancy, income, values,	No				

ownership, type of use					
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)	No				
16. Recreation resources, including supply, demand, visitation, activities, etc.	No				
17. Visitor experience, aesthetic resources	No				
18. Archeological resources	No				
19. Prehistoric/historic structure	No				
20. Cultural landscapes		Negligible			Camp Curry Historic District.
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				
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				
30. Other important environment resources (e.g. geothermal, paleontological resources)?	No				

### C. MANDATORY CRITERIA

<b>Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Comment or Data Needed to Determine</b>
A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?		No		
B. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		No		
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?		No		
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		No		
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		No		
F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		No		
G. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office?		No		
H. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		No		

I. Violate a federal 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 NPS, 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 DOI 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**

<b>Interdisciplinary Team</b>	<b>Field of Expertise</b>
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
Kim Tucker	Project Leader
Elexis Mayer	Environmental Planning and Compliance Program Manager
Jeannette Simons	NHPA Specialist
Renea Kennec	NEPA Specialist

**F. SUPERVISORY SIGNATORY**

*Based on the environmental impact information contained in the statutory compliance file and in this environmental screening form, environmental documentation for this stage of the subject project is complete.*

Recommended:

Compliance Specialists	Date
 <u>// Renea Kennec //</u> Compliance Specialist – Renea Kennec	 <u>8/16/10</u>
 <u>// Elexis Mayer //</u> Compliance Program Manager – Elexis Mayer	 <u>8/30/10</u>
 <u>// Mark A Butler //</u> Chief, Project Management – Mark Butler	 <u>9/2/10</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
 <u>//Don L. Neubacher //</u> Don L. Neubacher	 <u>9/2/10</u>



National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite National Park  
Date: 08/16/2010

## PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: **August 16, 2010**

### PROJECT INFORMATION

**Park Name:** Yosemite National Park  
**Project Title:** 2010-063 Curry Village, Install Temporary Huff Employee Common Area  
**PEPC Project Number:** 32175  
**Project Type:** Concession Employee Recreation Area (OTHER)  
**Project Location:** County, State: Mariposa, California Other: Curry Village  
**Project Leader:** Kim Tucker

### PARK ESF ADDENDUM QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
<b>SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST</b>				
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		
<b>NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
5. Entail ground disturbance?		No		
6. Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		No		
7. Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?	Yes			This project delineates a common area for the employees; the area is currently employee housing.
8. Has a National Register form been completed?		No		
9. Are there any structures on the		No		


ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
park's List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?				
<b>WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
10. Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor?	Yes			Merced River.
11. Fall within the bed and banks AND will affect 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			This project is a component of the Interim Employee Housing authorized by the Merced River Plan Settlement Agreement.
<b>WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST</b>				
18. Within designated Wilderness?		No		
19. Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		No		

# HUFF B&B Common Area

## HUFF HOUSE AREA CONCEPT PLAN



ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES GROUP  
ROYSTON HANAMOTO ALLEY & ABEY  
PROVOST & PRITCHARD





National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior

Yosemite National Park  
Date: 08/16/2010

## 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:** 2010-063 Curry Village, Install Temporary Huff Employee Common Area

b. **Date:** August 16, 2010

c. **PEPC Project ID Number:** 32175

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

   No

**X** Yes, Source or reference: Camp Curry Historic District.

**X** 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 Resources:**

Cultural landscapes affected?

Name and number(s): **Camp Curry Historic Site**

NR status: **1 - Listed in Register and documented**

5. **The proposed action will:**

   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. Measures to prevent or minimize loss or impairment of historic/prehistoric properties: 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:** August 16, 2010 **Title:** Environmental Protection  
Specialis **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: 07/14/2010  
Comments:

*Check if project does not involve ground disturbance* ☐  
Assessment of Effect: X No Historic Properties Affected ☐ No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse  
Effect ☐ Streamlined Review  
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: Work will occur in a historic district. If any previously  
unknown archeological resources are discovered, stop work and contact the park Archeologist.

---

☒ Historical Architect  
Name: Sueann Brown  
Date: 08/04/2010  
Comments:

*Check if project does not involve ground disturbance* ☐  
Assessment of Effect: ☐ No Historic Properties Affected X No Adverse Effect ☐ Adverse  
Effect ☐ Streamlined Review  
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: Canvas shades should be brown or black, not green

Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

---

☒ Anthropologist

Name: Jeannette Simons

Date: 08/17/2010

Comments: American Indian Liaison.

*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: Contact American Indian Liaison to arrange consultation in the unexpected event that American Indian resources are discovered.

---

☒ Historical Landscape Architect

Name: David Humphrey

Date: 08/11/2010

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

---

## **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 \_\_\_\_\_ // Jeanette Simmons //

Date: 8-19-10

**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 \_\_\_\_\_ \\ Don L. Neubacher \\

Date: 9/2/10