



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: Chad Andrews

From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park

Subject: NEPA and NHPA Clearance: 2010-076 Badger Pass Ranger Station Shed Replacement (33230)

The Leadership Team has reviewed the proposed project/action 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.

Describe the category used to exclude action from further NEPA analysis and indicate the number of the category

C8. Replacement in kind of minor structures and facilities with little or no change in location, capacity, or appearance.

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

- No mitigations identified.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 33230.

\\Micheal Gauthier\\ - for

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: 2010-076 Badger Pass Ranger Station Shed Replacement

PEPC Project Number: 33230

Project Description:

This project will replace the existing 10 foot by 15 foot shed at the Badger Pass Ranger Station with a new 14 foot by 24 foot structure. The current shed is used by both the Visitor Protection and Facilities Management Divisions for storage and workspace. The present shed is over utilized for storage. Items that cannot be kept within the existing shed are stored outside in the space immediately adjacent to the shed in the parking lot for the Badger Pass Ranger Station. Facilities Management uses the shed as the location of an emergency power generator for the Badger Pass lift station. Presently this generator must be kept at Wawona and is brought to Badger Pass only during power failures, resulting in a delay in providing emergency power to the lift station. This project will:

- Provide for enough storage and workspace to accommodate the operations of both divisions inside the structure, removing the need for outside storage.
- Create a permanent storage place for the lift station emergency generator. By allowing the emergency generator to be stored at Badger Pass, this project will allow more rapid response to the power loss situations at Badger Pass.
- The new shed will be certified to withstand snow loads at Badger Pass.
- The footprint of both the existing and new shed structure will reside on top of an existing asphalt parking lot. Placement of the new structure may require minimal cutting into existing asphalt to place pier blocks or pour footers. Existing power and gas lines will be used.
- The park Historical Architect will be consulted on the design and color of the new structure.
- Cost of both purchase and installation of the new shed will be shared by both the Facilities Management and Protection Divisions.

Project Locations:

Mariposa County, CA

Mitigation(s):

- No mitigations identified.

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):

C8. Replacement in kind of minor structures and facilities with little or no change in location, capacity or appearance.

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 (e.g. all boxes in the ESF are marked "no") or conditions in Section 3-6 apply, and the action is fully described in Section 3-4 of DO-12.

Park Superintendent: \\Micheal Gauthier\\ - for
\\Don L. Neubacher\\

Date: 11-10-10

*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: 11/02/2010

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: 2010-076 Badger Pass Ranger Station Shed Replacement
PEPC Project Number: 33230
Project Location: Mariposa County, CA
Project Leader: Chad Andrews

Background information 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			Structure will be placed on an existing asphalt pad
2. From geohazards	No				
3. Air quality	No				
4. Soundscapes		Negligible			Negligible construction noise will be encountered during the construction phase
5. Water quality or quantity	No				
6. Streamflow characteristics	No				
7. Marine or estuarine resources	No				
8. Floodplains or	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
wetlands					
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)	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	No				Badger Pass Ski Area

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
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

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
A. Have significant impacts on public health		No		

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

Mandatory Criteria: If implemented, would the proposal:	Yes	No	N/A	Comment or Data Needed to Determine
Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?				
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

<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
Chad Andrews	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>11-4-10</u>
<u>//Elexis Mayer//</u> Compliance Program Manager – Elexis Mayer	<u>11-4-10</u>
<u>//Mark A Butler//</u> Chief, Project Management – Mark Butler	<u>11-9-10</u>

Approved:

Superintendent	Date
<u>//Don L. Neubacher//</u> Don L. Neubacher	<u>11-10-10</u>

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



PARK ESF ADDENDUM

Today's Date: November 2, 2010

PROJECT INFORMATION

Park Name: Yosemite National Park
Project Title: 2010-076 Badger Pass Ranger Station Shed Replacement
PEPC Project Number: 33230
Project Type: Facility Rehabilitation (FR)
Project Location: Mariposa, California
Project Leader: Chad Andrews

PARK ESF ADDENDUM QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

ESF Addendum Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES CHECKLIST				
Listed or proposed threatened or endangered species (Federal or State)?		No		
Species of special concern (Federal or State)?		No		
Park rare plants or vegetation?		No		
Potential habitat for any special-status species listed above?		No		
NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT CHECKLIST				
Entail ground disturbance?	Yes			Minimal disturbance will occur from stakes being driven through an existing paved asphalt area to anchor the shed
Are any archeological or ethnographic sites located within the area of potential effect?		No		
Entail alteration of a historic structure or cultural landscape?		No		
Has a National Register form been completed?			N/A	
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				
Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor?		No		
Fall within the bed and banks AND will affect the free-flow of the river		No		

Have the possibility of affecting water quality of the area?		No		
Remain consistent with its river segment classification?			N/A	
Fall on a tributary of a Wild and Scenic River?		No		
Will the project encroach or intrude upon the Wild and Scenic River corridor		No		
Will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values		No		
Consistent with the provisions in the Merced River Plan Settlement Agreement?	Yes			
WILDERNESS ACT CHECKLIST				
Within designated Wilderness?		No		
Within a Potential Wilderness Addition?		No		



Site Map



Existing Shed



ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. **Park:** Yosemite National Park

2. **Project Description:**

a. **Project Name** 2010-076 Badger Pass Ranger Station Shed Replacement

b. **Date:** November 2, 2010

c. **PEPC Project ID Number** 33230

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

☐ No

☒ Yes, Source or reference: Badger Pass Ski Area

☐ 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(s):**

No affected resources.

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:

8. Attachments:

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

Prepared by Peter Lenz Date: November 2, 2010 Title: Environmental Protection
Assistant Telephone: 209-379-1366

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: 10/26/2010
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:
Doc Method: No Potential to Cause Effects [800.3(a)(1)]

☒ Historical Architect
Name: Gabrielle Harlan
Date: 11/01/2010
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:
Doc Method: Park Specific Programmatic Agreement

☒ Historical Landscape Architect
Name: David Humphrey
Date: 11/01/2010
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:

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.

Signature of NHPA Specialist \\Jeanette Simmons\\ fs

Date: 11-4-2010

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: 11-10-2010

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