

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
1. Geology, Geohazards, and Soils					
<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Meadow recovery from former pack stock grazing would continue to have local, long-term, minor, beneficial impacts. On a segmentwide and local level there would be long-term, minor, adverse impacts to soil resources at the extensive network of social trails in Segment 1.</p> <p>Existing visitor use and facilities would continue to result in segment-wide, long-term, minor, adverse impacts.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> The removal of minor structures would have a local long-term, minor, beneficial impact on soil resources by resulting in a slight reduction in the stresses on soils from visitor uses, overnight camping, and presence of infrastructure.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> The removal of minor structures would have a local long-term, minor, beneficial impact on soil resources by resulting in a slight reduction in the stresses on soils from visitor uses, overnight camping, and presence of infrastructure.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> The removal of minor structures would have a local long-term, minor, beneficial impact on soil resources by resulting in a slight reduction in the stresses on soils from visitor uses, overnight camping, and presence of infrastructure.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Restoration actions and reductions in overnight accommodations would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on soil resources.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities -</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> The general level of visitor use would slightly increase and visitor impacts, such as soil compaction and informal trail use, would continue. Restoration actions, however, would reduce the stresses on soils. The overnight accommodation actions would thus result in long-term, local, minor, adverse impacts on soil resources.</p>
<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Restoration projects in Yosemite Valley meadows and on the riverbanks would result in local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts.</p> <p>Continued riverbank erosion and trampling from informal trails and a stock trail would result in local, long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts.</p> <p>The presence of disturbed ground, construction-related fills, and the general coverage and density of developed facilities would continue to result in a segmentwide, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on soil resources.</p> <p><i>Geohazards:</i> Implementation of the 2012 Yosemite Valley Geologic Hazard Guidelines and associated visitor use and facilities actions would result in local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts with respect to geohazards.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Removal of campsites, informal trails, and other restoration actions would result in local, long-term, moderate beneficial impacts with respect to soil resources. On a segmentwide level, impacts would be long-term, minor and beneficial.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Geohazards:</i> Reduced visitation and removal of lodging from the rockfall hazard areas would reduce exposure to geohazards, which is a segment-wide, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact.</p> <p><i>Soils:</i> The removal of buildings, tent cabins and parking and reduced visitation would improve soils conditions and allow for soils to support plant growth resulting in local, long-term, minor, beneficial impacts. New concessioner housing and parking would directly affect soils through compaction and paving, resulting in local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Removal of campsites, informal trails, and other restoration actions would result in local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts with respect to soil resources. On a segmentwide level, impacts would be long-term, minor and beneficial.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Geohazards:</i> Reduced visitation and removal of lodging from the rockfall hazard areas would reduce exposure to geohazards, which is a segment-wide, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact.</p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Transportation, recreation, and restoration actions would restore floodplains, reduce parking areas, and spread out rafting takeout locations. These actions would improve soil conditions through decompaction and revegetation, and also potentially decrease foot traffic and associated soil stressors. This would have a local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impact on soil resources.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Removal of campsites, informal trails, and other restoration actions would result in local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts with respect to soil resources. On a segmentwide level, impacts would be long-term, minor and beneficial.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Geohazards:</i> Reduced visitation and removal of lodging from the rockfall hazard areas would reduce exposure to geohazards, which is a segment-wide, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impact.</p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Reduced lodging units and parking spaces would decrease impacts on soils, resulting in local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on soil resources.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Removal of campsites, informal trails, and other restoration actions would result in local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts with respect to soil resources. On a segmentwide level, impacts would be long-term, minor and beneficial.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Geohazards:</i> Reduced visitation and removal of lodging from the rockfall hazard areas would reduce exposure to geohazards, which is a segment-wide, long-term, minor, beneficial impact.</p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Increased overnight accommodations and parking spaces would result in impacts to soils, though they would not occur within sensitive meadow soils and riparian areas. Thus, actions would have long-term, local, negligible. Reductions in concessioner employee housing and visitor-use management actions would reduce the number of structures within the valley and include restoration. Therefore these actions would have a local, long-term,</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Removal of campsites, informal trails, and other restoration actions would result in local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts with respect to soil resources. On a segmentwide level, impacts would be long-term, minor and beneficial.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Geohazards:</i> Reduced visitation and removal of lodging from the rockfall hazard areas would reduce exposure to geohazards, which is a segment-wide, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact.</p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Increased overnight accommodations and parking spaces would result in impacts to soils, though they would be moved away from sensitive meadow soils and riparian areas. Thus, actions would have long-term, local, minor, adverse impacts on soil resources. Transportation impacts would result in local, long-term, minor adverse effects. Visitor-use management actions would include restorative actions, therefore these actions would have a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
				minor, beneficial impact.	impact.
1. Geology, Geohazards, and Soils (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Vehicles and foot traffic would continue to affect soils near valley oak trees in El Portal which would be a local, long-term, minor, adverse impact on soils supporting valley oak trees.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Oak protection activities would result in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impact on soils. In a segmentwide context, the actions would result in a minor, beneficial impact on soil resources.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> New housing facilities at Abbeville, El Portal Village Center, and Rancheria would disturb soil resources through installation, compaction, and paving, and would also lead to further compaction of soils and/or increased susceptibility to erosion through increased foot traffic. Therefore, these actions would result in a long-term, local, minor, adverse impact on soil resources.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Oak protection activities would result in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impact on soils. In a segmentwide context, the actions would result in a minor, beneficial impact on soil resources.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Visitor Use and Facilities:</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Facility actions would remove existing housing units at Abbeville and El Portal Trailer Court and restore the floodplain. These actions would result in long-term, minor beneficial impact at the local level. New housing development at El Portal Village Center and Rancheria Flatt would permanently disturb soil resources, resulting in a long-term, minor, adverse, impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Oak protection activities would result in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impact on soils. In a segmentwide context, the actions would result in a minor, beneficial impact on soil resources.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Facility actions would remove existing housing units at Abbeville and El Portal Trailer Court and restore the floodplain. These actions would result in long-term, minor beneficial impact at the local level. New housing development at El Portal Village Center and Rancheria Flatt would permanently disturb soil resources, resulting in a long-term, minor, adverse, impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Oak protection activities would result in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impact on soils. In a segmentwide context, the actions would result in a minor, beneficial impact on soil resources.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Facility actions would remove existing housing units at Abbeville restore the floodplain. These actions would result in long-term, minor beneficial impact at the local level. New housing development at El Portal Village Center Rancheria Flatt would permanently disturb soil resources, resulting in a long-term, minor, adverse, impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Oak protection activities would result in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impact on soils. In a segmentwide context, the actions would result in a minor, beneficial impact on soil resources.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Facility actions would remove existing housing units at Abbeville restore the floodplain. These actions would result in long-term, minor beneficial impact at the local level. New housing development at Abbeville, El Portal Village Center, and Rancheria Flatt would permanently disturb soil resources, resulting in a long-term, minor, adverse, impact.</p>
<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Continued riverbank erosion and soil compaction at Wawona Store picnic area and Wawona Campground would result in local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Actions include removal of the Wawona Golf Course, which would result in local, long-term, moderate beneficial impacts.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Soil stresses would be decreased due to the elimination of stable rides, the reduction in the number of visitors, and removal of campsites. These actions would have a local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impact on soils in the Wawona area.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Actions include removal of the Wawona Golf Course, which would result in local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Soil stresses would be reduced, resulting in local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Actions include relocation of the stock use campsite, which would result in local, long-term, minor beneficial impacts.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Soil stresses would be reduced, resulting in local, long-term, minor, beneficial impacts.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Actions include relocation of the stock use campsite, which would result in local, long-term, minor beneficial impacts.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Soil stresses would be reduced, resulting in local, long-term, minor, beneficial impacts.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Actions include relocation of the stock use campsite, which would result in local, long-term, minor beneficial impacts.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p><i>Soils:</i> Soil stresses would be reduced, resulting in local, long-term, minor, beneficial impacts.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
1. Geology, Geohazards, and Soils (cont.)					
<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p><i>Geohazards:</i> Past and present projects, combined with Alternative 1 expose visitor to risks from earthquakes and rock falls, which is a parkwide, long-term, moderate, adverse impact. Continued stabilization and rehabilitation work, and policy restrictions from development in rock-fall hazard zones in Segment 2, would provide some local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts.</p> <p><i>Soils</i> – A combination of adverse impacts from and beneficial impacts from restoration activities on soil resources would likely result in an overall balance which is considered a parkwide, long-term, negligible, adverse, cumulative effect.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p><i>Geohazards</i> – At a parkwide level, Alternative 2, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in a negligible, adverse, cumulative effect with respect to exposure of park visitors and facilities to geohazards.</p> <p><i>Soils</i> – Cumulatively, a combination of adverse and beneficial impacts would occur. Beneficial impacts (e.g., meadow/riparian restoration, removal of informal trails, directing of visitors away from sensitive areas) would likely outweigh adverse impacts (which would generally be short term or highly localized). Combined with the generally positive impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, Alternative 2 would result in a parkwide, minor to moderate, beneficial, cumulative impact.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p><i>Geohazards</i> – At a parkwide level, Alternative 2, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in a minor to moderate, beneficial impact with respect to exposure of park visitors and facilities to geohazards.</p> <p><i>Soils</i> – Cumulatively, a combination of adverse and beneficial impacts would occur. Beneficial impacts (e.g., meadow/riparian restoration, removal of informal trails, directing of visitors away from sensitive areas) would likely outweigh adverse impacts (which would generally be short term or highly localized). Combined with the generally positive impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, Alternative 2 would result in a parkwide, minor to moderate, beneficial, cumulative impact.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p><i>Geohazards</i> – At a parkwide level, Alternative 2, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in a minor to moderate, beneficial impact with respect to exposure of park visitors and facilities to geohazards.</p> <p><i>Soils</i> – Cumulatively, a combination of adverse and beneficial impacts would occur. Beneficial impacts (e.g., meadow/riparian restoration, removal of informal trails, directing of visitors away from sensitive areas) would likely outweigh adverse impacts (which would generally be short term or highly localized). Combined with the generally positive impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, Alternative 2 would result in a parkwide, minor, beneficial, cumulative impact.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p><i>Geohazards</i> – At a parkwide level, Alternative 2, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in a minor, beneficial impact with respect to exposure of park visitors and facilities to geohazards.</p> <p><i>Soils</i> – Cumulatively, a combination of adverse and beneficial impacts would occur. Beneficial impacts (e.g., meadow/riparian restoration, removal of informal trails, directing of visitors away from sensitive areas) would likely outweigh adverse impacts (which would generally be short term or highly localized). Combined with the generally positive impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, Alternative 2 would result in a parkwide, minor, beneficial, cumulative impact.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p><i>Geohazards</i> – At a parkwide level, Alternative 2, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in a negligible, beneficial impact with respect to exposure of park visitors and facilities to geohazards.</p> <p><i>Soils</i> – Cumulatively, a combination of adverse and beneficial impacts would occur. Beneficial impacts (e.g., meadow/riparian restoration, removal of informal trails, directing of visitors away from sensitive areas) would likely outweigh adverse impacts (which would generally be short term or highly localized). Combined with the generally positive impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, Alternative 2 would result in a parkwide, negligible, beneficial, cumulative impact.</p>
2. Hydrology, Floodplains and Water Quality					
<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p>The continued presence of the Nevada Fall Diversion Dam would slightly alter the natural processes of the Merced River, but would not have an overall affect on the character of the river. Water quality would be expected to remain high, with isolated instances of minor contamination, especially after storm events, but would not be expected to exceed water quality standards. These actions would have a local, long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impact on water quality</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Overnight capacities for both Little Yosemite Valley and Merced Lake would be reduced promoting dispersed camping. Concentrated campgrounds would be removed and replaced with dispersed camping, reducing the potential for informal trails and vegetation trampling, leading to an increase in the ability of the soil to infiltrate runoff. This action would result in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would reduce erosion and would result in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial, impact on water quality.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Overnight capacities for both Little Yosemite Valley and Merced Lake would be reduced promoting dispersed camping. Concentrated campgrounds would be removed and replaced with dispersed camping, reducing the potential for informal trails and vegetation trampling, leading to an increase in the ability of the soil to infiltrate runoff. This action would result in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would reduce erosion and would result in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial, impact on water quality.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Overnight capacities for both Little Yosemite Valley and Merced Lake would be reduced promoting dispersed camping. Concentrated campgrounds would be removed and replaced with dispersed camping reducing the potential for informal trails and vegetation trampling. This action would result in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would reduce erosion and would result in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial, impact on water quality.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p>Hydrology. The reduction in capacity at Merced Lake High Sierra Camp would slightly reduce the amount of localized vegetation trampling, leading to an increase in the ability of the soil to infiltrate runoff. This action would result in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. The reduction in capacity at Merced Lake High Sierra Camp would slightly reduce the amount of localized vegetation trampling, leading to a decrease in erosion. This action would result in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on water quality.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p>Hydrology. The continuation of current levels of visitor use and concentrated camping may increase informal trails and vegetation trampling, and would result in a local, long-term, negligible, adverse impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. The continuation of current levels of visitor use and concentrated camping may increase informal trails and vegetation trampling, increasing the potential for erosion, resulting in a local, long-term, negligible, adverse impact on water quality.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
2. Hydrology, Floodplains and Water Quality (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Bridges would continue to constrict flow, exacerbate scour, and cause streambank erosion leading to continued impediments to hydrology and the free-flowing character of the Merced River. This would cause corridorwide, long-term, moderate, adverse impacts on hydrology. Continued concentrated visitor use on riverbanks would adversely affect floodplains and would constitute a corridorwide, long-term, minor, adverse impact on hydrology. Water quality in Segment 2 would be expected to remain high, with isolated instances of minor contamination especially after storm events, but would not be expected to exceed water quality standards.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Removal of Stoneman, Sugarpine, and Ahwahnee bridges, among other development from 100-year floodplain, and restoration and/or redevelopment of these areas would have local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would reduce polluted stormwater runoff, channel scour, and erosion, resulting in local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on water quality.</p> <p>Floodplains: These actions would also reduce water surface elevations during floods, thereby resulting in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on floodplains.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Removal of Stoneman, Sugarpine, and Ahwahnee bridges, among other development from within 150 feet of the river, and restoration and/or reconfiguration of these areas would have local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would reduce polluted stormwater runoff, channel scour, and erosion, resulting in local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on water quality.</p> <p>Floodplains: These actions would also reduce water surface elevations during floods, thereby resulting in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on floodplains.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Removal of Sugarpine and Ahwahnee bridges, among other development from within 150 feet of the river, and restoration and/or reconfiguration of these areas would have local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would reduce polluted stormwater runoff, channel scour, and erosion, resulting in local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on water quality.</p> <p>Floodplains: These actions would also reduce water surface elevations during floods, thereby resulting in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on floodplains.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Removal of Sugarpine Bridge, among other development from within 100 feet of the river, and restoration and/or reconfiguration of these areas would have local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would reduce polluted stormwater runoff, channel scour, and erosion, resulting in local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact on water quality.</p> <p>Floodplains: These actions would also reduce water surface elevations during floods, thereby resulting in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on floodplains.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Placement of large wood and constructed logjams along the bases of Sugarpine, Ahwahnee, and Stoneman Bridges, removal of development from within 100 feet of the river, and development and redevelopment of areas beyond, would have a local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impacts on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would reduce polluted stormwater runoff, channel scour, and erosion, resulting in local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on water quality.</p> <p>Floodplains: These actions would also reduce water surface elevations during floods, thereby resulting in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on floodplains.</p>
<p><u>Segments 3 and 4</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Infrastructure along Highway 140; riprap along the river and abandoned infrastructure and imported fill remain, affecting natural river processes. Local, long-term, minor, adverse impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. Off-street and roadside parking areas and fuel station would continue to be located underneath valley oaks having the potential to introduce hydrocarbons and sediment to the river, resulting in a long-term, negligible, adverse local, impact on water quality.</p>	<p><u>Segments 3 and 4</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Oak protection, removal of fill, and decompaction would promote infiltration in the area, resulting in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Construction of new concessioner employee housing at Abbieville and Rancheria Flatt would involve vegetation removal, soils compaction, and increased areas of impervious surfaces, contributing to local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. Oak protection actions would have a long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on water quality.</p> <p>New housing development would have a local long-term, negligible, adverse impact on water quality.</p>	<p><u>Segments 3 and 4</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Oak protection, removal of fill, and decompaction and parking restrictions would promote infiltration in the area, resulting in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Construction of new concessioner employee housing at Abbieville and Rancheria Flatt would involve vegetation removal, soils compaction, and increased areas of impervious surfaces, contributing to local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would also have a local long-term, negligible, adverse impact on water quality.</p>	<p><u>Segments 3 and 4</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Oak protection, removal of fill, and decompaction and parking restrictions would promote infiltration in the area, resulting in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Construction of new concessioner employee housing at Abbieville and Rancheria Flatt would involve vegetation removal, soils compaction, and increased areas of impervious surfaces, contributing to local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would also have a local long-term, negligible, adverse impact on water quality.</p>	<p><u>Segments 3 and 4</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Oak protection, removal of fill, and decompaction and parking restrictions would promote infiltration in the area, resulting in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Construction of new concessioner employee housing at Abbieville and Rancheria Flatt would involve vegetation removal, soils compaction, and increased areas of impervious surfaces, contributing to local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would also have a local long-term, negligible, adverse impact on water quality.</p>	<p><u>Segments 3 and 4</u></p> <p>Hydrology. Oak protection, removal of fill, and decompaction and parking restrictions would promote infiltration in the area, resulting in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Construction of new concessioner employee housing at Abbieville and Rancheria Flatt would involve vegetation removal, soils compaction, and increased areas of impervious surfaces, contributing to local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would also have a local long-term, negligible, adverse impact on water quality.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
2. Hydrology, Floodplains and Water Quality (cont.)					
<p><u>Segments 5, 6, 7, and 8</u></p> <p>Facilities such as the Wawona Store Picnic Area, the impoundment and surface water withdrawals from the South Fork would present a local, long-term, minor, adverse impact on hydrology</p>	<p><u>Segments 5, 6, 7, and 8</u></p> <p>Hydrology. The removal and restoration of the Wawona Golf Course and campsites would result in a decrease of trampling and an increase in native vegetation and soil infiltration. Impervious surfaces would be reduced, thereby restoring the hydrologic regime resulting in a local, long-term minor, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would decrease trampling, established vegetation would be less likely to erode, which would reduce fine sediment loads resulting in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on water quality.</p> <p>Floodplain. These actions would also increase connectivity between the South Fork Merced River and its floodplain. This would result in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on floodplains.</p>	<p><u>Segments 5, 6, 7, and 8</u></p> <p>Hydrology. The removal and restoration of the Wawona Golf Course and campsites sites would result in a decrease of trampling and an increase in native vegetation and soil infiltration. Impervious surfaces would be reduced, thereby restoring the hydrologic regime resulting in a local, long-term minor, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would decrease trampling, established vegetation would be less likely to erode, which would reduce fine sediment loads resulting in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on water quality.</p> <p>Floodplain. These actions would also increase connectivity between the South Fork Merced River and its floodplain. This would result in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on floodplains.</p>	<p><u>Segments 5, 6, 7, and 8</u></p> <p>Hydrology. The removal and restoration of campsites sites would result in a decrease of trampling and an increase in soil infiltration. Impervious surfaces would be reduced, thereby restoring the hydrologic regime resulting in a local, long-term minor, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would decrease trampling, established vegetation would be less likely to erode, which would reduce fine sediment loads resulting in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on water quality.</p> <p>Floodplains. These actions would also increase connectivity between the South Fork Merced River and its floodplain. This would result in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on floodplains.</p>	<p><u>Segments 5, 6, 7, and 8</u></p> <p>Hydrology. The removal and restoration of campsites sites would result in a decrease of trampling and an increase in soil infiltration. Impervious surfaces would be reduced, thereby restoring the hydrologic regime resulting in a local, long-term minor, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would decrease trampling, established vegetation would be less likely to erode, which would reduce fine sediment loads resulting in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on water quality.</p> <p>Floodplains. These actions would also increase connectivity between the South Fork Merced River and its floodplain. This would result in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on floodplains.</p>	<p><u>Segments 5, 6, 7, and 8</u></p> <p>Hydrology. The removal and restoration of campsites sites would result in a decrease of trampling and an increase in soil infiltration. Impervious surfaces would be reduced, thereby restoring the hydrologic regime resulting in a local, long-term minor, beneficial impact on hydrology.</p> <p>Water Quality. These actions would decrease trampling, established vegetation would be less likely to erode, which would reduce fine sediment loads resulting in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on water quality.</p> <p>Floodplains. These actions would also increase connectivity between the South Fork Merced River and its floodplain. This would result in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on floodplains.</p>
<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>Overall development and recreational uses within the Merced River watershed have resulted in local, long-term, moderate, adverse impacts on natural hydrology, water quality, and floodplains throughout the Yosemite region.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>The removal of riprap, removal of three bridges and unnecessary infrastructure, restoration of meadow hydrology, and improvements to wastewater collection would result in increased alluvial processes, reconnection of the Merced River to its floodplain, and enhanced water quality. This would contribute to local, long-term, moderate to major, beneficial cumulative impacts on hydrology, and floodplains, and a local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial cumulative impact on water quality.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>The removal of riprap, removal of three bridges and unnecessary infrastructure, restoration of meadow hydrology, and improvements to wastewater collection would result in increased alluvial processes, reconnection of the Merced River to its floodplain, and enhanced water quality. This would contribute to local, long-term, moderate to major, beneficial cumulative impacts on hydrology and floodplains, and a local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial cumulative impact on water quality</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>The removal of riprap, removal of three bridges and unnecessary infrastructure, restoration of meadow hydrology, and improvements to wastewater collection would result in increased alluvial processes, reconnection of the Merced River to its floodplain, and enhanced water quality. This would contribute to local, long-term, moderate, beneficial cumulative impacts on hydrology and floodplains, and a local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial cumulative impact on water quality</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>Under Alternative 5, removal of riprap, removal of one bridge and unnecessary infrastructure, installation of logjams and other hydrology-enhancing actions, restoration of meadow hydrology, and improvements to wastewater collection would result in increased alluvial processes, reconnection of the Merced River to its floodplain, and enhanced water quality. This would contribute to local, long-term, moderate, beneficial cumulative impacts on hydrology and floodplains, and local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial cumulative impacts on water quality.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>Removal of riprap and unnecessary infrastructure, restoration of meadow hydrology, installation of logjams and other hydrologic would result in increased alluvial processes, reconnection of the Merced River to its floodplain, and enhanced water quality. This would contribute to local, long-term, minor, beneficial cumulative impacts on hydrology, floodplains, and water quality.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 - Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 - Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
3. Vegetation and Wetlands					
<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p>Impacts on vegetation and wetland resources in Segment 1 under the No-action Alternative would be local, long-term, and minor adverse.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on plant communities and wetlands in Segment 1.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on plant communities and wetlands in Segment 1.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on plant communities and wetlands in Segment 1.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on plant communities and wetlands in Segment 1.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in continued local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on vegetation and wetlands within Segment 1.</p>
<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Impacts on vegetation and wetland resources in Segment 2 through implementation of the No-action Alternative are considered to be local, long-term, and moderate adverse.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segment 2 under Alternative 2 would result in the restoration of approximately 271 acres of vegetation and 47.92 acres of wetland, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, major, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the loss of approximately 32.27 acres of vegetation, primarily located near previously developed areas, resulting in a long-term, local, minor to moderate, adverse impacts to the affected plant communities. Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the loss of 2.72 acres of jurisdictional wetlands.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segment 2 under Alternative 3 would result in the restoration of approximately 230 acres of vegetation and 39.85 acres of wetland, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, major, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the loss of 31.66 acres of vegetation primarily located near previously developed areas, resulting in long-term, local, minor to moderate, adverse impacts these communities. Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the loss of 2.72 acres of jurisdictional wetlands.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segment 2 under Alternative 4 would result in the restoration of 194 acres of vegetation and 44.52 acres of wetland, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, major, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the loss of 31.70 acres of vegetation primarily located near previously developed areas, resulting in long-term, local, minor to moderate, adverse impacts to these communities. Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the permanent loss of 1.17 acres of jurisdictional wetlands.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segment 2 under Alternative 5 would result in the restoration of 182 acres of vegetation and 40.37 acres of wetland, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, major, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the loss of 34.64 acres of vegetation primarily located near previously developed areas, resulting in long-term, local, minor to moderate, adverse impacts to these communities. Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the permanent loss of 1.17 acres of jurisdictional wetlands.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segment 2 under Alternative 6 would result in the restoration of 156 acres of vegetation and 37.32 acres of wetland, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, major, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the loss of 34.64 acres of vegetation primarily located near previously developed areas, resulting in long-term, local, minor to moderate, adverse impacts to these communities. Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the loss of 1.17 acres of jurisdictional wetlands.</p>
<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p>The impacts on valley oaks in Segment 4 (the El Portal area) are considered local, long-term, and moderate adverse.</p> <p>Impacts on wetlands and aquatic resources in Segments 3 and 4 under the No-action Alternative are considered to be local, long-term, and minor adverse.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 3 and 4 under Alternative 2 would result in the restoration of 13 acres of vegetation and 0.05 acres of wetland, resulting in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 3 and 4 would result in the restoration of 13 acres of vegetation and 0.05 acres of wetland, resulting in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 3 and 4 would result in the restoration of 12 acres of vegetation and 0.05 acres of wetland, resulting in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 3 and 4 would result in the restoration of 12 acres of vegetation and 0.05 acres of wetland, resulting in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 3 and 4 would result in the restoration of 12 acres of vegetation and 0.05 acres of wetland, resulting in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
3. Vegetation and Wetlands (cont.)					
<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> (cont.)	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in short-term, local, minor, adverse impacts to vegetation and wetlands.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in short-term, local, minor, adverse impacts to vegetation and wetlands.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in short-term, local, minor, adverse impacts to vegetation and wetlands.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in short-term, local, minor, adverse impacts to vegetation and wetlands.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in short-term, local, minor, adverse impacts to vegetation and wetlands.
<u>Segment 5, & 8</u> Impacts on vegetation and wetland resources in Segments 5 and 8, under the No-action Alternative, are considered to be local, long-term, and minor adverse.	<u>Segment 5, 6, 7 & 8</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 5, 6, 7 and 8 under Alternative 2 would result in the restoration of 52 acres of vegetation, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, major, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to vegetation and wetlands.	<u>Segment 5, 6, 7 & 8</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 5, 6, 7 and 8 under Alternative 3 would result in the restoration of 48 acres of vegetation, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, major, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to vegetation and wetlands.	<u>Segment 5, 6, 7 & 8</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 5, 6, 7 and 8 under Alternative 3 would result in the restoration of seven acres of vegetation, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, minor, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to vegetation and wetlands.	<u>Segment 5, 6, 7 & 8</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 5, 6, 7 and 8 under Alternative 5 would result in the restoration of three acres of vegetation, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, minor, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to vegetation and wetlands.	<u>Segment 5, 6, 7 & 8</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 5, 6, 7 and 8 under Alternative 6 would result in the restoration of three acres of vegetation, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, minor, beneficial impacts on vegetation and wetlands. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to vegetation and wetlands.
<u>Segment 6 & 7</u> Impacts on wetland and riparian resources in Segment 7, under the No-action Alternative, would be local, long-term, and moderate adverse. Impacts to habitat due to visitor use and existing infrastructure would result in local, long-term, minor, and adverse.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to vegetation and wetlands.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to vegetation and wetlands.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to vegetation and wetlands.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to vegetation and wetlands.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to vegetation and wetlands.
<u>Cumulative</u> Past, present, and future effects, in conjunction with the local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts of Alternative 1, would result in long-term, minor, adverse, impacts on wetlands.	<u>Cumulative</u> While Alternative 2 would not contribute toward adverse cumulative effects, the cumulative trend of other actions would result in long-term, minor adverse effects on regional vegetation patterns.	<u>Cumulative</u> While Alternative 3 would not contribute toward adverse cumulative effects, the cumulative trend of other actions would result in long-term, minor, adverse effects on regional vegetation patterns.	<u>Cumulative</u> While Alternative 4 would not contribute toward adverse cumulative effects, the cumulative trend of other actions would result in long-term, minor, adverse effects on regional vegetation patterns.	<u>Cumulative</u> While Alternative 5 would not contribute toward adverse cumulative effects, the cumulative trend of other actions would result in long-term, minor, adverse effects on regional vegetation patterns.	<u>Cumulative</u> While Alternative 6 would not contribute toward adverse cumulative effects, the cumulative trend of other actions would result in long-term, minor, adverse effects on regional vegetation patterns.
4. Wildlife					
<u>Segment 1</u> Overall, wildlife habitat in the Yosemite Wilderness would remain undisturbed under Alternative 1, with site-specific exceptions associated with trail corridors. Impacts would be local, minor, and long term adverse. Continuation of current wilderness policies, including protection of natural	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> The reduction in overnight facilities and overnight visitors represents a reduction in human presence, human-related pressures on wildlife, and reduced future impacts on wildlife habitat in localized areas of Segment 1. Collectively, actions	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Alternative 3 would reduce the amount of infrastructure and visitor use in Segment 1, resulting in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on wildlife.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Alternative 4 would reduce the amount of infrastructure in Segment 1 of the Merced River corridor through the removal of the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp and associated infrastructure. Collectively, actions to manage visitor	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Alternative 5 would accommodate the same kinds and amounts of use that exist today in Segment 1, with a slight reduction in overnight visitors. Collectively, actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in local, long-	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Collectively, actions to maintain similar kinds and levels of use as current levels would result in impacts similar to that described for Alternative 1 (No Action): continued local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on wildlife in Segment 1.

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
4. Wildlife (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 1 (cont.)</u></p> <p>processes, visitor education with an emphasis on Leave-No-Trace practices, use of the wilderness trailhead quota system, and restrictions on amounts and locations of overnight use, would protect intact natural habitats, including the distribution, numbers, population composition, and interaction of native species. In general, adverse impacts on wildlife resources in Segment 1 under Alternative 1 would be local, minor, and long term.</p>	<p>to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p>		<p>use and facilities under Alternative 4 would result in local, long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on wildlife in Segment 1.</p>	<p>term, minor beneficial impacts on wildlife. The removal and conversion of existing improvements would result in local, short-term, adverse impacts on wildlife. Adhering to proposed mitigation measures in Appendix I would reduce these short-term impacts to minor and adverse.</p>	
<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Continuation of current practices would result in long-term, minor, adverse impacts on aquatic and terrestrial wildlife associated with riverine habitat (including meadows and riparian habitat adjacent to the river).</p> <p>Streambank destabilization in the vicinity of wood removal would continue, causing a local, long-term, minor, adverse impact on aquatic habitat for fisheries and wildlife. By allowing the former Upper River and Lower River Campgrounds to passively revert to natural conditions, Alternative 1 would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impact on wildlife. Continued conifer encroachment would result in local, long term, minor, and adverse impacts.</p> <p>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities Existing improvements and visitor use would continue to affect the size, structure, productivity, and continuity (within habitat and between habitats) of wildlife habitats. Overall, adverse impacts on wildlife resources would be local, minor, and long term.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segment 2 under Alternative 2 would result in the restoration of approximately 268 acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, moderate, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the loss of approximately 24.48 acres of wildlife habitat primarily located near previously developed areas, resulting in a long-term, local, minor, adverse impact to wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segment 2 under Alternative 2 would result in the restoration of 228 acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, moderate, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the loss of 28.79 acres of wildlife habitats primarily located near previously developed areas, resulting in long-term, local, minor, adverse impacts wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segment 2 under Alternative 4 would result in the restoration of 194 acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, moderate, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the loss of 31.70 acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, local, minor, adverse impacts to wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segment 2 under Alternative 5 would result in the restoration of 174 acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, moderate, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the loss of 34.64 acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, local, minor, adverse impacts to wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segment 2 under Alternative 6 would result in the restoration of 166 acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, moderate, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in the loss of 34.64 acres of wildlife habitats and additional use over existing conditions, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, minor, adverse impacts to wildlife.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
4. Wildlife (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Current conditions would continue to result in long-term, local, minor, adverse impacts on channel free-flow, water quality, riparian habitat development, and aquatic and terrestrial wildlife that inhabit these habitats. Current practices would result in long-term, local, minor, adverse impacts on valley oak habitat, thereby affecting wildlife species that depend on this habitat type.</p> <p>Visitor pass-through use would continue to be the majority of use. Impacts from current actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in continued long-term, local, negligible, adverse impacts on wildlife habitat and wildlife species in these segments.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 3 and 4 under Alternative 2 would result in the restoration of 11 acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in short-term, local, minor, adverse impacts to wildlife.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 3 and 4 under Alternative 2 would result in the restoration of 12 acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in short-term, local, minor, adverse impacts to wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 3 and 4 under Alternative 4 would result in the restoration of 11 acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in short-term, local, minor, adverse impacts to wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 3 and 4 under Alternative 5 would result in the restoration of nine acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in short-term, local, minor, adverse impacts to wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 3 and 4 under Alternative 6 would result in the restoration of nine acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, local, moderate, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in short-term, local, minor, adverse impacts to wildlife.</p>
<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p>Continuation of current wilderness policies, including protection of natural processes, visitor education with an emphasis on Leave-No-Trace practices, and restrictions on amounts and locations of overnight use, would protect intact natural habitats, including the distribution, numbers, population composition, and interaction of native species. Overall, adverse impacts on</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 5, 6, 7 and 8 under Alternative 2 would result in the restoration of 46 acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, moderate, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 5, 6, 7 and 8 under Alternative 3 would result in the restoration of 46 acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, moderate, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 5, 6, 7 and 8 under Alternative 4 would result in the restoration of five acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, minor, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 5, 6, 7 and 8 under Alternative 5 would result in the restoration of two acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, minor, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values within Segments 5, 6, 7 and 8 under Alternative 6 would result in the restoration of two acres of wildlife habitats, resulting in long-term, segmentwide, minor, beneficial impacts on wildlife.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
4. Wildlife (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8 (cont.)</u></p> <p>wildlife resources are local, long-term, and negligible. There is less pressure by anglers on the South Fork Merced River fisheries than on the main stem because of the difficult access and terrain. There would therefore be short-term, local, negligible, adverse impacts on fisheries under Alternative 1.</p> <p>Visitor use in Segments 5 and 6 would remain very low, There are no overnight lodging accommodations in Segment 8. For the coniferous and deciduous forests adjacent to Wawona (Segment 7), habitat fragmentation caused by existing development and use would continue to affect wildlife, and would result in long-term, minor, adverse impacts on wildlife. Planned habitat restoration would mitigate for some of these adverse impacts, resulting in long-term, negligible, adverse impacts on wildlife.</p>	<p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to wildlife.</p>	<p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to wildlife.</p>	<p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to wildlife.</p>	<p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to wildlife.</p>	<p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long-term, local, minor, beneficial impacts to wildlife.</p>
<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>Although general effects associated with Alternative 1 would be negligible, the overall cumulative effect of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, in combination with this alternative would be regional, minor, adverse, and long term.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>Because the actions proposed for Alternative 2 would further increase the habitat value of the Merced River corridor, it would contribute towards a long-term, cumulative, beneficial effect on fish and wildlife and may, in some cases, reverse local population declines for some species. Songbirds, reptiles, and amphibians in particular would benefit cumulatively from Alternative 2 because the quantity of preferred habitat (meadows and riparian) would see a net increase.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>Because the actions proposed for Alternative 3 would further increase the habitat value of the Merced River corridor, this alternative would contribute toward a long-term, cumulative, beneficial effect on fish and wildlife and may, in some cases, offset or reverse local population declines for some species. Songbirds, reptiles, and amphibians in particular would benefit cumulatively from Alternative 3 because there would be a net increase in quantity of preferred habitat (meadows and riparian) compared to existing amounts</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>While Alternative 4 would cumulatively contribute beneficial impacts, the overall cumulative effect of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, in combination with this alternative would be long term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>Although general effects associated with Alternative 5 would be beneficial, the overall cumulative effect of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, in combination with this alternative, would be long term and negligible.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>While the cumulative contribution associated with Alternative 6 would be minor and adverse, the overall cumulative effect of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, in combination with this alternative, would also be long term, minor, and adverse.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 - Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 - Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
5. Special Status Species					
<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p>Currently, special status species or their habitats are affected by trampling, human disturbance, grazing and stock use. Impacts from habitat loss and competition for resources also affect these species through nonnative species encroachment. These adverse impacts would continue under Alternative 1 and be local, minor, and long-term.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>In the long-term, restoration actions would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on special status wildlife and plant species in the upper Merced watershed.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>In the long-term, restoration actions would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on special status wildlife and plant species in the upper Merced watershed. Beneficial impacts would be somewhat less than those described for Alternative 2.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Management actions would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on special status plant and wildlife species that use coniferous forests in the upper Merced River watershed.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>In the long-term, programmatic management actions would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on special status wildlife species that use coniferous forests in the upper Merced watershed. Beneficial effects would be less pronounced than Alternatives 2 and 3.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Alternative 6 would maintain the current level of use within Segment 1. Collectively, actions to maintain similar kinds and levels of use as current levels would result in continued local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on special status species within Segment 1.</p>
<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>In general, when combined with existing habitat management programs, the ongoing adverse effects on habitat combined with continued visitor use and the foreseeable increase in visitors under Alternative 1 would result in local, long-term, minor, adverse effects on rare, threatened, and endangered species within Segment 2.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>A total of 268 acres of riparian, floodplain meadow, woodland, and forest habitat would be restored in Segment 2 under Alternative 2, resulting in direct benefits to fish and wildlife that use these habitat types. Thus, over time these management actions would have long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts on species of special status plants and wildlife that use the Merced River and adjacent meadows and riparian habitats in Yosemite Valley.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Vegetation removed under Alternative 2 would not substantially fragment existing native vegetation communities, reduce species diversity, or substantially reduce the overall size or quality of native plant communities in Segment 2 because new construction would primarily occur in or adjacent to previously disturbed locations or in more resilient, upland habitat. Overall, these actions would result in local, long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on special status plant and animals in Segment 2.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>A total of 228 acres of riparian, floodplain, meadow, woodland, and forest habitat would be restored in Segment 2 under Alternative 3, resulting in direct benefits to fish and wildlife that use these habitat types. Thus, over time these management actions would have long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts on species of special status plants and wildlife that use the Merced River and adjacent meadows and riparian habitats in Yosemite Valley.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Vegetation removed under Alternative 2 would not substantially fragment existing native vegetation communities, reduce species diversity, or substantially reduce the overall size or quality of native plant communities in Segment 2 because new construction would primarily occur in or adjacent to previously disturbed locations or in more resilient, upland habitat. Overall, these actions would result in local, long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on special status plant and animals in Segment 2, although somewhat less so than Alternative 2.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>A total of 194 acres of floodplain, riparian, meadow, woodland, and forest habitat would be restored in Segment 2 under Alternative 4, resulting in direct benefits to fish and wildlife that use these habitat types. Thus, over time these management actions would have long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts on species of special status plants and wildlife that use the Merced River and adjacent meadows and riparian habitats in Yosemite Valley.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Restoring habitat following the removal of facilities and parking lots would increase the extent and contiguity of habitat for special status species; limiting day use activities and roadside parking would reduce impacts to sensitive habitats such as riparian woodland and wet meadows. These actions would result in local, long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on special status plant and animals in Segment 2.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>A total of 174 acres of floodplain, riparian, meadow, woodland, and forest habitat would be restored in Segment 2 under Alternative 5, resulting in direct benefits to fish and wildlife that use these habitat types. Thus, over time these habitat restoration management actions would have long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts on species of special status plants and wildlife that use the Merced River and adjacent meadows and riparian habitats in Yosemite Valley.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Maintaining and constructing new overnight camping and lodging facilities would maintain dense levels of the built environment within the Valley, resulting in long-term, minor, adverse impacts on wildlife in Segment 2 from human presence and human-related pressures (noise, human food, vegetation trampling, etc.).</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>A total of 166 acres of floodplain, riparian, meadow, woodland, and forest habitat would be restored in Segment 2 under Alternative 6, resulting in direct benefits to fish and wildlife that use these habitat types. Over time, these management actions would have long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts on special status plants and wildlife species that use the Merced River and adjacent meadows and riparian habitats in Yosemite Valley.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Constructing new overnight camping and lodging facilities would maintain and intensify dense levels of the built environment within the Valley, resulting in segmentwide, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on wildlife from human presence and human-related pressures (such as noise, human food, and vegetation trampling).</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
6. Lightscapes					
<p><u>Segment 1, 5 & 8</u></p> <p>There are no actions proposed under Alternative 1 that would explicitly affect lighting, and impacts would be local, negligible to minor, and adverse.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5 & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Reduced visitation and modifications to existing campgrounds would reduce nighttime lighting, and removal of the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp would eliminate sources of nighttime lighting in the vicinity of the camp. The associated impact on Segment 1 would be local, long-term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Reduced visitation and modifications to existing campgrounds would reduce nighttime lighting, and removal of the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp would eliminate sources of nighttime lighting in the vicinity of the camp. The associated impact on Segment 1 would be local, long-term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Reduced visitation could improve the lightscape environment within Segment 1. With a slight reduction in designated camping only and retention of several campground facilities, sources of artificial lighting would remain concentrated within these areas. However, the removal and conversion of the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp would eliminate nighttime lighting in the vicinity of the camp. The resulting impact on the park's lightscape environment would be local, long-term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5 & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Visitation, wilderness access quotas, and designated camping would not be expected to change, while modifications to overnight accommodations would be nominal within Segment 1. As such, potential sources of artificial night lighting would continue. Reduction in units at the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp would reduce slightly the amount of artificial lighting in the vicinity of the camp. The resulting long-term impact would be local, negligible, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Visitation and wilderness access quotas would remain the same, as well as operation of the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp at capacity, and modifications to overnight accommodations would be nominal. As such, potential sources of artificial night lighting would continue. The resulting impact on the environment would be local, long-term, negligible to minor, and adverse.</p>
<p><u>Segment 3 & 6</u></p> <p>Increased visitation could result in a relatively minor increase in transient night lighting from greater numbers of cars traveling through Segment 3, or from exterior safety lighting in Wawona, adjacent to Segment 6. As a result, impacts are considered to have a local, long-term, negligible, adverse effect.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 6</u></p> <p>No impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3, 5, 6 & 8</u></p> <p>No impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3, 5, 6 & 8</u></p> <p>No impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 6</u></p> <p>No impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3, 5, 6 & 8</u></p> <p>No impact.</p>
<p><u>Segment 2,4 & 7</u></p> <p>Lighting would continue to be most intense around those existing developed areas, but no new substantial sources of night lighting are anticipated. However, with increased visitation, potential sources of additional lighting could include those associated with increased nighttime traffic and greater numbers of overnight campground visitors during nonpeak seasons. Long-term implications would be local, negligible to minor, and adverse.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2,4 & 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>A substantial number of lodging and residential units and campsites would be removed or relocated within Segment 2. These actions would increase sources of nighttime lighting in some areas, but decrease lightscape impacts overall. The resulting impact on lightscapes within Segments 2 would be local, long-term, beneficial, and moderate.</p> <p>The park would construct new housing within the Old El Portal, Abbeville and Rancheria areas of Segment 4, contributing to area lightscape impacts.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2, 4 & 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>A substantial number of lodging and residential units would be removed or relocated, and number of campsites slightly increased within Segment 2. These actions would increase sources of nighttime lighting in some areas, but decrease lightscape impacts overall. The resulting impact on lightscapes within Segments 2 would be local, long-term, beneficial, and moderate.</p> <p>The park would construct new housing within the Rancheria area of Segment 4, contributing to area lightscape impacts.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2,4 & 7</u></p> <p>A considerable number of lodging and residential units would be removed or relocated, and number of campsites substantially increased within Segment 2. These actions would increase sources of nighttime lighting in some areas, but decrease lightscape impacts overall. The resulting impact on lightscapes within Segments 2 would be local, long-term, beneficial, and minor.</p> <p>The park would construct new housing within the Rancheria area of Segment 4, contributing to area lightscape impacts. However, with mitigation, the long-term</p>	<p><u>Segment 2,4 & 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>A considerable number of residential units would be removed, while lodging and campsite capacities would increase within Segment 2. These actions would increase sources of nighttime lighting in several areas, and decrease lightscape impacts in others. The resulting impact on lightscapes within Segments 2 would be local, long-term, negligible, and adverse.</p> <p>The park would construct new housing within the Rancheria area of Segment 4, contributing to area lightscape impacts.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2,4 & 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>A considerable number of residential units would be removed, while lodging and campsite capacities would increase substantially within Segment 2. These actions would increase sources of nighttime lighting throughout the developed areas of the valley. The resulting impact on lightscapes within Segments 2 would be local, long-term, minor, and adverse.</p> <p>The park would construct new employee housing within the Abbeville and Rancheria areas of Segment 4,</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 - Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 - Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
6. Lightscares (cont.)					
<u>Segment 2,4 & 7 (cont.)</u>	However, with mitigation, the long-term impact associated with the project would be local, moderate, and adverse. Within Segment 7, the Wawona stables would be removed and 32 campsites eliminated which would reduce lightscape impacts, and the long-term effect would be local, minor, and beneficial.	However, with mitigation, the long-term impact associated with the project would be local, minor, and adverse. Within Segment 7, the Wawona stables would be removed and 27 campsites eliminated, which would reduce lightscape impacts. The long-term effect would be local, minor, and beneficial.	impact associated with the project would be local, minor to moderate, and adverse. Within Segment 7, the Wawona stables would be removed and 27 campsites eliminated, which would reduce lightscape impacts. The long-term effect would be local, negligible, and beneficial.	However, with mitigation, the long-term impact associated with the project would be local, minor to moderate, and adverse. Within Segment 7, the park would remove 13 campsites from the Wawona Campground, reducing overnight visitation and lightscape impacts. The effect would be long-term, local, negligible, and beneficial.	contributing to area lightscape impacts. However, with mitigation, the long-term impact associated with the project would be local, moderate, and adverse. Within Segment 7, the Wawona stables would be removed and 13 campsites eliminated from the Wawona Campground, reducing overnight visitation and lightscape impacts. The effect would be long-term, local, negligible, and beneficial.
<u>Cumulative</u> A long-term, park-wide, negligible to minor, adverse	<u>Cumulative</u> Past actions, specifically the construction of housing for employees previously residing in hazard prone areas within Yosemite Valley, have slightly increased the amount of artificial lighting within the park. Present actions may result in regional increases in night-sky impacts, and the introduction of a few new individual sources of lighting within the park, but a continued overall reduction in the impacts associated with in-park lighting. As a result, cumulative effects would be local, long-term, minor to moderate, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative</u> There are no anticipated development projects outside of those described that would contribute to light pollution within the park. Combined impacts of past and present actions, including those originating from outside the park, the cumulative effect of actions would be local, long-term, minor to moderate, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative</u> There are no anticipated development projects outside of those described that would contribute to light pollution within the park. Combined impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, including those originating from outside the park, the cumulative long-term effect of actions would be local minor, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative</u> There are no anticipated development projects outside of those described that would contribute to light pollution within the park. Combined impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, including those originating from outside the park, the cumulative effect of would be local, long-term, negligible, and adverse.	<u>Cumulative</u> There are no anticipated development projects outside of those described that would contribute to light pollution within the park. Combined impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, including those originating from outside the park, the cumulative effect of would be local, long-term, minor, and adverse.
7. Soundscapes					
<u>Segment 1</u> Under this alternative a gradual increase in annual visitation over the next five years would occur, and a rise in human-related sounds would contribute to a long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impact on the soundscape environment.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions related to visitor use and facilities would require construction efforts which would yield construction noise. Where these operations are near sensitive receivers, and short-term, moderate, adverse impacts on soundscapes would occur. Changes to the trailhead quota system and removal of campsites would reduce long-term noise exposure in these areas, having an overall long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact on soundscapes.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions related to visitor use and facilities would require construction efforts which would yield construction noise. Where these operations are near sensitive receivers, and short-term, moderate, adverse impacts on soundscapes would occur. Changes to the trailhead quota system and removal of campsites would reduce long-term noise exposure in these areas, having an overall long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact on soundscapes.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> This alternative would require construction efforts that would yield construction noise that is short-term. Where these operations are near sensitive receivers, they would be expected to have short-term, moderate, adverse impacts. Changes to the trailhead quota system and removal of the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp would reduce noise exposure having an overall long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact on the soundscape environment.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Removal of certain facilities and infrastructure would yield short-term construction noise. Where these operations are near sensitive receivers, they would be expected to have short-term, moderate, adverse impacts. Reductions in the number of Merced Lake High Sierra Camp overnight visitors would reduce noise exposure having an overall long-term, negligible, beneficial impact.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Removal and replacement of certain facilities and infrastructure would yield short-term construction noise. Where these operations are near sensitive receivers, they would be expected to have short-term, moderate, adverse impacts on soundscapes in the vicinity.

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
7. Soundscapes (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Crowding and congestion would contribute to an increase of unnatural sounds. The continuation of present visitation trends would, therefore, contribute to a long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impact on the soundscape.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Impacts on the natural soundscape environment within areas where removal of buildings, rerouting and revegetating the Valley Loop Trail, and restorative actions would be short-term, minor to moderate, and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Construction noise and associated traffic would have a short-term, moderate, adverse impact. The reduction in lodging, campsites, and overall visitation would combine to reduce noise within these areas of Yosemite Valley, resulting in a long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impact on the soundscape environment.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Impacts on the natural soundscape environment within areas where removal of buildings, rerouting and revegetating the Valley Loop Trail, and restorative actions would be short-term, minor to moderate, and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>New camping and parking facilities would result in construction noise that have a short-term, moderate, adverse impact. In the long-term, minor impacts to soundscapes while the removal of lodging, campsites and parking would result in long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts in other areas.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Noise from demolition/construction work related to restoration activities would have a short-term, minor, adverse impacts.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>New camping and parking facilities would result in construction noise that have a short-term, moderate, adverse impact. In the long-term, minor impacts to soundscapes while the overall decrease in lodging and residential units, along with total visitation, would result in long-term, minor, beneficial impacts within Segment 2.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Projects involve rerouting, revegetating, and constructing a boardwalk along a portion of the Valley Loop Trail, as well as other restoration activities and removal of a bridge, would result in a short-term, minor to moderate, adverse impact.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Removal of residential units, construction of new campgrounds and lodging, and parking improvements would have a short-term, moderate, adverse impact. New camping, lodging, and parking facilities would result in long-term, minor, adverse impacts to soundscapes. Overall, reduced visitation and employee housing within the valley would contribute to long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impacts on the soundscape environment of Segment 2.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Projects proposed involve removing buildings, restoration activities, as well as rerouting, revegetating, and constructing a boardwalk along a portion of the Valley Loop Trail. The resulting impacts would be short-term, minor to moderate, and adverse to the soundscapes.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Parking improvements, construction of a roundabout and underpass, new lodging and campsite development at several locations, which would result in short-term, moderate, adverse noise impacts. New camping, lodging, and parking facilities, along with overall increased visitation, would result in long-term, negligible, adverse impacts on the Soundscape environment of Segment 2.</p>
<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Higher noise levels caused by vehicular use near roadways would persist, and the frequency and duration of transitory sound sources would increase with park visitation. The continued trends in visitor-related noise would result in a long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Proposed actions to protect and restore areas around valley oaks would result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts on soundscapes in the project vicinity.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Noise from demolition/ construction work would be expected to have a short-term, moderate, adverse impact on noise-sensitive uses in the vicinity. New employee housing would contribute to increased noise associated with housing occupation in Abbeville and Rancheria, and impacts would be long-term, minor, and adverse.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Proposed actions to protect and restore areas around valley oaks would result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts on soundscapes in the project vicinity.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Noise from demolition/ construction work would be expected to have a short-term, moderate, adverse impact on noise-sensitive uses in the vicinity. The construction of new employee housing would contribute to increased noise associated with housing occupation in Rancheria. The expected impact on soundscapes would be long-term, negligible to minor, and adverse.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Proposed actions to protect and restore areas around valley oaks would result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts on soundscapes in the project vicinity.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Noise from demolition/ construction work would be expected to have a short-term, moderate, adverse impact on noise-sensitive uses in the vicinity. The construction of new employee housing would contribute to increased noise associated with housing occupation in Rancheria. The expected impact on soundscapes would be long-term, minor, and adverse.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Proposed actions to protect and restore areas around valley oaks would result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts on soundscapes in the project vicinity.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Noise from demolition/ construction work would be expected to have a short-term, moderate, adverse impact on noise-sensitive uses in the vicinity. The construction of new employee housing would contribute to increased noise associated with housing occupation in Rancheria. The expected impact on soundscapes would be long-term, minor, and adverse.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Proposed actions to protect and restore areas around valley oaks would result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts on soundscapes in the project vicinity.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Noise from demolition/ construction work would be expected to have a short-term, moderate, adverse impact on noise-sensitive uses in the vicinity. The construction of new employee housing would contribute to increased noise associated with housing occupation in Abbeville and Rancheria. The expected impact on soundscapes would be long-term, minor, and adverse.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
7. Soundscapes (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p>The increase in visitor-related noise exposure in Segments 5, 6, and 8 is speculative due to continued limited accessibility to these areas. Therefore, it is not known whether visitation to these areas would increase relative to existing conditions.</p> <p>Noise levels caused by visitor crowding and congestion would continue in Segment 7, contributing to a long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Restoration activities would increase construction-related noise and project vehicles would add to the existing traffic noise production from nearby roadways, resulting in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts. In the long-term the removal of the golf course would result in minor, beneficial impacts as maintenance- and visitor-related sources of noise in this area would be eliminated.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Closure of the concessioner stable, campsite removal and relocation, and restroom improvements at Wawona would result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts from construction noise. The removal of campsites from culturally sensitive areas would reduce noise exposure in these areas, having an overall long-term, negligible, beneficial impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Restoration activities would increase construction-related noise and project vehicles would add to the existing traffic noise production from nearby roadways, resulting in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts. In the long-term the removal of the golf course would result in minor, beneficial impacts as maintenance- and visitor-related sources of noise in this area would be eliminated.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Closure of the concessioner stable, campsite removal and relocation, and restroom improvements at Wawona would result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts on soundscapes in the vicinity from construction noise. The removal of campsites from culturally sensitive areas would reduce noise exposure in these areas, having an overall long-term, negligible, beneficial impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Restoration activities involve heavy equipment which would have a short-term, moderate, adverse impact in the vicinity of the action.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Closure of the concessioner stable, campsite removal and relocation, and restroom improvements at Wawona would result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts on soundscapes in the vicinity from construction noise. The removal of campsites from culturally sensitive areas would reduce noise exposure in these areas, having an overall long-term, negligible, beneficial impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Restoration activities involve heavy equipment which would have a short-term, moderate, adverse impact in the vicinity of the action.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Campsite removal and relocation, and restroom improvements at Wawona, would require construction efforts that would result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts. The removal of campsites from culturally sensitive areas would reduce noise exposure in these areas, having an overall long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on soundscapes.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Restoration activities involve heavy equipment which would have a short-term, moderate, adverse impact in the vicinity of the action.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>The removal of campsites, changes to visitor and administrative facilities, and various visitor access and transportation improvements would result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts. The removal of campsites from culturally sensitive areas would reduce noise exposure in these areas, having an overall long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on soundscapes</p>
<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>Rehabilitation and restoration activities have and would continue to result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts, primarily in non-wilderness areas. Increasing numbers of visitors could result in long-term, negligible to minor impacts.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>Rehabilitation and restoration activities have and would continue to result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts. The construction of new facilities would contribute to long-term, minor, adverse noise impacts. However, these long-term increases would be offset by long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts from removal of housing and facilities in other areas of the Merced River corridor.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>Rehabilitation and restoration activities have and would continue to result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts. The construction of new facilities would contribute to long-term, minor, adverse noise impacts. However, these long-term increases would be offset by long-term, minor, beneficial impacts from removal of housing and facilities in other areas of the Merced River corridor.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>Rehabilitation and restoration activities have and would continue to result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts. The construction of new facilities would contribute to long-term, minor, adverse noise impacts. However, these long-term increases would be offset by long-term, minor, beneficial impacts from removal of housing and facilities in other areas of the Merced River corridor.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>Rehabilitation and restoration activities have and would continue to result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts. The construction of new facilities would contribute to long-term, minor, adverse noise impacts. However, these long-term increases would be offset by long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impacts from removal of housing and facilities in other areas of the Merced River corridor.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative</u></p> <p>Rehabilitation and restoration activities have and would continue to result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts. Increased visitation, in combination with new facilities construction and operation would contribute to long-term, minor, adverse noise impacts to soundscapes in the vicinity of these facilities.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
8. Air Quality					
<p><u>Segment 1, 5, 6, & 8</u></p> <p>There are no transportation facilities in these segments and none are proposed under this alternative, incidental future increases in traffic would affect these segments by pollutant drift. The overall effect on regional air pollution conditions would be long term, minor, and adverse.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5, 6, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation and associated campfires would be less than under Alternative 1. Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles in the vicinity, the overall effect on local air pollution conditions would be long term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5, 6, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation and associated campfires would be less than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles in the vicinity under Alternative 3, the overall effect on local air pollution conditions would be long term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5, 6, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation and associated campfires would be less than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles in the vicinity under Alternative 4, the overall effect on air pollution conditions would be long term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5, 6, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation and associated campfires would be only slightly less than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles in the vicinity under Alternative 5, the overall effect on air pollution conditions would be long term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5, 6, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation would not change from that of Alternative 1. With more vehicles on park roads and in the vicinity of wilderness, the overall effect on local, air pollution conditions would be long term, minor, and beneficial.</p>
<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>There would likely continue to be segmentwide, minor, long-term, adverse air quality impacts associated with traffic congestion and delays that would continue to occur at busy intersections. Future increase in visitors would also increase usage of campfires and vehicle emissions, resulting in greater impacts to air quality.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation and total daily use levels would be 26% and 33% less, respectively, than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles and potential for campfire smoke, the overall effect on local air pollution conditions would be long term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation and total daily use levels would be 23% and 37% less, respectively, than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles, the effect on local air pollution conditions would be long term, minor, and beneficial. Slightly more campsites would occur under this alternative, resulting in local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on sensitive receptors.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation would be 7% greater and total daily use levels would be 19% less than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles under this alternative, the overall effect on local air pollution conditions along roadways would be long term, minor, and beneficial. The expected increase in the usage of campfires would have a potentially local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on sensitive receivers.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation would be 16% greater and total daily use levels would be 5% less than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles, the overall effect on local air pollution conditions would be long term, minor, and beneficial. The expected increase in the usage of campfires would have a potentially local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on sensitive receivers.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation and total daily use levels would be 33% and 6% greater, respectively, than under Alternative 1. With more on-road vehicles, the overall effect on local air pollution conditions along roadways would be long term, negligible to minor, and adverse. With the expected increase in the usage of campfires, a potentially local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on sensitive receptors would occur.</p>
<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p>There are no NPS overnight accommodations, and thus few campfires or other visitor-related evening sources of smoke. With increases to visitation, road dust would be expected to increase associated with traffic congestion, which would result in long-term, local, minor, adverse impacts.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>There are no NPS overnight accommodations and thus few campfires or other visitor-related evening sources of smoke. Total daily use levels would be less than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles, despite increased housing, the overall effect on local air pollution conditions would be long term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>There are no NPS overnight accommodations and thus few campfires or other visitor-related evening sources of smoke. Total daily use levels would be less than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles, despite increased housing, the overall effect on local air pollution conditions would be long term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>There are no NPS overnight accommodations and thus few campfires or other visitor-related evening sources of smoke. Total daily use levels would be less than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles, despite increased housing, the overall effect on local air pollution conditions would be long term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>There are no NPS overnight accommodations and thus few campfires or other visitor-related evening sources of smoke. Total daily use levels would be less than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles, despite increased housing, the overall effect on local air pollution conditions would be long term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>There are no NPS overnight accommodations and thus few campfires or other visitor-related evening sources of smoke. Total daily use levels would be greater than under Alternative 1. With more on-road vehicles, the overall effect on local air pollution conditions would be regional and local, long term, negligible, and adverse.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
8. Air Quality (cont.)					
<u>Segment 7</u> Segmentwide, long-term, minor, adverse air quality impacts associated with traffic congestion and delays that would continue to occur, and possibly increase should visitation levels increase in the future. It is expected that the usage of campfires would increase and have a potentially long-term, local, major, adverse impact on sensitive receptors.	<u>Segment 7</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Thirty-two campsites, or 33% of all campsites within Wawona would be removed from the floodplain. This would result in a long-term, local, minor, beneficial impact on air quality due to reduced overnight visitation and campfire emissions.	<u>Segment 7</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Thirty-two campsites, or 28% of all campsites within Wawona would be removed from the floodplain. This would result in a long-term, local, minor, beneficial impact on air quality due to reduced overnight visitation and campfire emissions.	<u>Segment 7</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Thirty-two campsites, or 28% of all campsites within Wawona would be removed from the floodplain. This would result in a long-term, local, minor, beneficial impact on air quality due to reduced overnight visitation and campfire emissions.	<u>Segment 7</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Thirty-two campsites, or 13% of all campsites within Wawona would be removed from the floodplain. This would result in a long-term, local, minor, beneficial impact on air quality due to reduced overnight visitation and campfire emissions.	<u>Segment 7</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Thirty-two campsites, or 33% of all campsites within Wawona would be removed from the floodplain. This would result in a long-term, local, minor, beneficial impact on air quality due to reduced overnight visitation and campfire emissions.
<u>Cumulative</u> If visitation levels, VMT within the corridor, or usage of campfires were to increase, a local, long-term, minor to major, adverse impact on air pollution would occur, contributing to cumulative impacts.	<u>Cumulative</u> With reduced visitor capacity and campsites, this alternative would result in a long-term, cumulatively beneficial impact on air quality from reduced VMT and campfire usage. The continued management of traffic and encouragement of alternative forms of transportation would have regional and local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impacts on air quality.	<u>Cumulative</u> With reduced visitor capacity, this alternative would result in a long-term, cumulatively beneficial impact on air quality from reduced VMT. The number of campsites would increase which would result in a local, long-term, moderate adverse impact. The continued management of traffic and encouragement of alternative forms of transportation would have regional and local, long-term, negligible to minor beneficial impacts on air quality.	<u>Cumulative</u> With reduced overall visitor capacity, this alternative would result in a regional and local, long-term, minor cumulatively beneficial impact on air quality from reduced VMT. However, increased campsites could result in a local, moderate, adverse impact from increased campfire usage. The continued management of traffic and encouragement of alternative forms of transportation would have regional and local, long-term, negligible to minor beneficial impacts on air quality.	<u>Cumulative</u> With reduced overall visitor capacity, would result in a regional and local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact for ROG emissions. However, with the increased bus operations under this alternative, NOx emissions would be a regional and local, long-term, negligible adverse impact. Increased campsites could result in a local moderate, adverse impact from increased campfire usage. The continued management of traffic and encouragement of alternative forms of transportation would have regional and local, long-term, negligible to minor beneficial impacts on air quality.	<u>Cumulative</u> With increased overall visitor capacity, this alternative would result in a regional and local, long-term, negligible to minor cumulatively adverse impact on air quality from increased VMT and increased campfire usage. The continued management of traffic and encouragement of alternative forms of transportation would have regional and local, long-term, negligible to minor beneficial impacts on air quality.
9. Scenic Resources					
<u>Segment 1</u> Under this alternative, existing scenic resource impacts affecting natural resource areas and scenic views would occur. With increased park visitation under this alternative, ongoing visitor use impacts on natural resources would continue. Local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts would occur.	<u>Segment 1</u> Removal of structures, restoration of camping areas, expansion dispersed camping areas, and reduction in visitors would result in local, long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on the scenic resources.	<u>Segment 1</u> Removal of structures, restoration of camping areas, expansion dispersed camping areas, and reduction in visitors would result in local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on the scenic resources.	<u>Segment 1</u> Removal of structures, restoration of camping areas, expansion dispersed camping areas, and reduction in visitors would result in local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on the scenic resources.	<u>Segment 1</u> Retention of the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp, albeit reduced in capacity, and maintaining existing use levels within wilderness areas, along with various restoration measures, would result in conditions slightly improved from those of Alternative 1 (No Action). The resulting impact would be local, long-term, negligible, and beneficial.	<u>Segment 1</u> The Merced Lake High Sierra Camp and designated camping areas, among other human-made structures would be retained resulting in less restoration activities being implemented, and the existing wilderness permit numbers would be maintained. As such, local, long-term, negligible, adverse impacts would occur.

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 - Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 - Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
9. Scenic Resources (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Local, long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts would occur to scenic resources because ongoing visitor use impacts on natural resources would continue and vegetation management actions would not be implemented. Also, there would be the continued presence of visual intrusions, and increased visitation. Restoration projects and invasive species removal would improve scenic quality and the visibility of a number of scenic viewpoints.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Implementation of proposed actions would result in: removal of areas of resource damage that detract from the scenic quality of the river corridor; vegetation restoration; removal of a substantial number of housing, lodging, and campground facilities, and reduced visitors overall. These actions would have local, long-term, moderate to major, beneficial impacts on the scenic resources within Segment 2.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Implementation of proposed actions would remove areas of resource damage that detract from the scenic quality of the river corridor, and involve restoration of vegetation. Lodging and housing structures would be removed, and new campsites would be added. The overall number of visitors would be reduced. Local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts on the scenic resources would occur.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Implementation of proposed actions would result in: removal of areas of resource damage that detract from the scenic quality of the river corridor; vegetation restoration; reduced visitors overall; less development; and removal of structures. Meadow and riverbank restoration approaches are proposed, and various road and trail removal/relocation projects would occur. Local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on the scenic resources would occur.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Implementation of proposed actions would result in: vegetation restoration; maintenance of visitor capacity; new and expanded campgrounds; a greater number of campsites to be retained; and scenic vista points in some campground areas would not be improved. Local, long-term, minor, beneficial impacts would occur.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Implementation of the proposed actions would result in: vegetation restoration, an increase in visitor capacity; new campgrounds; more campground and overnight accommodations to be retained; extensive meadow and riverbank restoration. As such, local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impacts would occur.</p>
<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Ongoing visitor use impacts on natural and scenic resources would continue and vegetation management actions would not be implemented. The continued presence of human-made structures would remain and increased visitation could result in impacts on the scenic quality, and implementation of the <i>Scenic Vista Management Plan</i> would not occur. Local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on the scenic resources would occur.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Establishment of the oak tree recruitment zone would have a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on Segment 4. New housing developments in Abbeville and Rancheria would increase in man-made structures, although primarily developed areas. Thus, local, long-term, minor, adverse e impacts on the scenic resources would occur.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Establishment of the oak tree recruitment zone would have a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on Segment 4. New housing developments in Rancheria would increase in man-made structures, although primarily developed areas. Thus, local, long-term, minor, adverse e impacts on the scenic resources would occur.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Establishment of the oak tree recruitment zone would have a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on Segment 4. New housing developments in Rancheria would increase in man-made structures, although primarily developed areas. Thus, local, long-term, minor, adverse e impacts on the scenic resources would occur.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Establishment of the oak tree recruitment zone would have a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on Segment 4. New housing developments in Rancheria would increase in man-made structures, although primarily developed areas. Thus, local, long-term, minor, adverse e impacts on the scenic resources would occur.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Establishment of the oak tree recruitment zone would have a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on Segment 4. New housing developments in Abbeville and Rancheria would increase in man-made structures, although primarily developed areas. Thus, local, long-term, minor, adverse e impacts on the scenic resources would occur.</p>
<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p>Under this alternative, existing structures and facilities would remain in viewsheds, affected natural resource areas in scenic views would remain, and vegetative management actions to improve scenic view quality would not occur. Increased visitation could result in impacts on the scenic quality of the segments. Local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on the scenic resources would occur.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7 & 8</u></p> <p>Total daily use levels would not change and maximum overnight visitation would be less than under Alternative 1. The Wawona Golf Course and campsites at the Wawona Campground would be removed. These actions would result in local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on the scenic resources of Segment 7.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7& 8</u></p> <p>Total daily use levels would not change and maximum overnight visitation would be less than under Alternative 1. The Wawona Golf Course and campsites at the Wawona Campground would be removed. These actions would result in local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on the scenic resources of Segment 7.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7 & 8</u></p> <p>Total daily use levels would not change and maximum overnight visitation would be less than under Alternative 1. The Wawona Golf Course would be retained. Campsites at the Wawona Campground would be removed. These actions would result in local, long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on the scenic resources of Segment 7.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7 & 8</u></p> <p>Total daily use levels would not change and maximum overnight visitation would be less than under Alternative 1. The Wawona Golf Course would be retained. Campsites at the Wawona Campground would be removed. These actions would result in local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impacts on the scenic resources of Segment 7.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7 & 8</u></p> <p>Total daily use levels would not change and maximum overnight visitation would be less than under Alternative 1. The Wawona Golf Course would be retained. Campsites at the Wawona Campground would be removed. These actions would result in local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impacts on the scenic resources of Segment 7.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 - Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 - Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
9. Scenic Resources (cont.)					
<u>Cumulative</u> This alternative would contribute to worsening localized, adverse conditions in areas with concentrated visitor use and through the continued presence of facilities and infrastructure that are visible within scenic views, and presence of vegetation that is blocking scenic views. Cumulatively, the scenic resources impacts would be local, long term, minor to moderate, and adverse.	<u>Cumulative</u> Impacts of cumulative projects would remain adverse, while this alternative would result in primarily beneficial impacts. Cumulatively, the impact on scenic resources would be local, long term, moderate, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative</u> Impacts of cumulative projects would remain adverse, while this alternative would result in primarily beneficial impacts. Cumulatively, the impact on scenic resources would be local, long term, moderate, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative</u> Impacts of cumulative projects would remain adverse, while this alternative would result in primarily beneficial impacts. Cumulatively, the impact on scenic resources would be local, long term, minor to moderate, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative</u> Impacts of cumulative projects would remain adverse, while this alternative would result in primarily beneficial impacts. Cumulatively, the impact on scenic resources would be local, long term, minor to moderate, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative</u> Impacts of cumulative projects would remain adverse, while this alternative would result in primarily beneficial impacts. Cumulatively, the impact on scenic resources would be local, long term, minor, and beneficial
10. Visitor Experience/Recreation					
<u>Segment 1</u> Under this alternative, natural areas will be restored and all campgrounds will be retained to allow for a positive visitor experience. There will be wilderness zone capacities and limited wilderness permits, which could help in visitor perception of crowding. This would result in a segment-side, minor, long-term beneficial impact.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities within Segment 1 would have local, long-term, moderate, adverse impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 1.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities within Segment 1 would have local, long-term, moderate, adverse impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 1.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities within Segment 1 would have local, long-term, moderate, adverse impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 1.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities within Segment 1 would have local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 1.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities within Segment 1 would have local, long-term, negligible, adverse impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 1.
<u>Segment 2</u> Recreation activities and services would continue to operate as they do today and continue to exceed their intended visitor use capacity. Lodging, parking, and public transit would not be expanded under this alternative, which would not meet demand for these services. As such, segment-wide, major, long-term adverse impacts would occur.	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values would result local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 2. Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would also have minor beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 2.	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values would result local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 2. Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would also have minor beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 2.	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values would result local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 2. Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would also have minor beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 2.	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values would result local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 2. Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would also have minor beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 2.	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values would result local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 2. Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would also have minor beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 2.
<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> Under Alternative 1, human-made features and activities would continue to affect natural resources and water quality, but would not have a significant effect on the visitor experience due to the small number of visitors to Segment 4. Due to	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values would result in local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 4.	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values would result in local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 4.	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values would result in local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 4.	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values would result in local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 4.	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values would result in local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segment 4.

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
10. Visitor Experience/Recreation (cont.)					
<u>Segment 3 & 4 (cont.)</u> the projected growth, activities and recreation areas may become slightly more crowded as visitors choose to recreate in this area. These activities would continue to provide scenery, uncrowded conditions, and a variety of water-based recreation opportunities. As such, segment-wide, negligible, long-term, beneficial impacts would occur.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would have local, long-term, negligible, adverse impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segments 3 & 4.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would have local, long-term, negligible, adverse impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segments 3 & 4.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would have local, long-term, negligible, adverse impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segments 3 & 4.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would have local, long-term, negligible, adverse impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segments 3 & 4.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would have local, long-term, negligible, adverse impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segments 3 & 4.
<u>Segment 5,6,7 & 8</u> Existing facilities would continue to operate under this alternative as they do today. As such, crowding in areas like Wawona would occur, as well as a shortage of parking and lodging. Segment-wide, moderate, long-term, adverse impacts would occur.	<u>Segment 5,6,7 & 8</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would have local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segments 5-8.	<u>Segment 5,6,7& 8</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would have local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segments 5-8.	<u>Segment 5,6,7 & 8</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would have local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segments 5-8.	<u>Segment 5,6,7 & 8</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would have local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segments 5-8.	<u>Segment 5,6,7 & 8</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to manage user capacities, land use, and facilities would have local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impacts on visitor experience and recreation within Segments 5-8.
<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> Alternative 1 would contribute to the cumulative effect of allowing localized impacts on the river environment where visitor concentration is high, and contribute to the shortage in overnight lodging and parking. The cumulative impact would be regional, long-term, moderate, and adverse.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> Visitor services improvements and upgrades would enhance visitor experience and reduce the existing stress on visitor facilities. Visitors would also benefit from past and present habitat and riverbank restoration and resource management projects and plans The cumulative impact would be parkwide, long term, minor to moderate, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> Visitor services improvements and upgrades would enhance visitor experience and reduce the existing stress on visitor facilities. Visitors would also benefit from past and present habitat and riverbank restoration and resource management projects and plans The cumulative impact would be parkwide, long term, minor to moderate, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> Visitor services improvements and upgrades would enhance visitor experience and reduce the existing stress on visitor facilities. Visitors would also benefit from past and present habitat and riverbank restoration and resource management projects and plans The cumulative impact would be parkwide, long term, minor to moderate, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> Visitor services improvements and upgrades would enhance visitor experience and reduce the existing stress on visitor facilities. Visitors would also benefit from past and present habitat and riverbank restoration and resource management projects and plans The cumulative impact would be parkwide, long term, minor to moderate, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> Visitor services improvements and upgrades would enhance visitor experience and reduce the existing stress on visitor facilities. Visitors would also benefit from past and present habitat and riverbank restoration and resource management projects and plans The cumulative impact would be parkwide, long term, minor to moderate, and beneficial.
11. Wilderness Character					
<u>Segment 1</u> Current activities and actions that exhibit human control and manipulation of the landscape to repair visitor impacts would continue. As such, local, minor, long-term, and adverse impacts to untrammled quality of wilderness character would occur.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i> The park would eliminate most of the facilities, infrastructure, and activities that diminish wilderness character; reduce the number of overnight visitors to the Yosemite Wilderness; eliminate overnight stock trips; and designate the	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i> The park would eliminate most of the facilities, infrastructure, and activities that affect wilderness character, reduce by 50% the number of wilderness permits, reduce overnight stock trips, and designate the Merced Lake High	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i> The park would eliminate most of the facilities, infrastructure, and activities that affect wilderness character, reduce by 50% the number of wilderness permits in the Little Yosemite Valley zone, eliminate overnight stock trips,	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i> This alternative would include actions that together would have a local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact on the untrammled, natural, and undeveloped character of the wilderness and opportunities for	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i> The wilderness character would remain much the same as it is today. The number of wilderness permits issued would remain the same; the number of visitors to Yosemite Valley would remain close to existing numbers; and pack

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
11. Wilderness Character (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 1 (cont.)</u></p> <p>Current management activities would continue and serve to improve the natural conditions. The impact of these activities on the natural character would be local, minor, long-term and beneficial.</p> <p>The greatest impacts on the wilderness character would be from the infrastructure and visitor use associated with the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp and from improvements to and concentrated visitor use of the three campgrounds in this segment— Little Yosemite Valley, Moraine Dome, and Merced Lake. In addition, under this alternative, the agency requirement for wilderness permits detracts from the character of unconfined recreation. A local, moderate, long-term, adverse impact on wilderness character would occur.</p>	<p>Merced Lake High Sierra Camp area as wilderness. Together, these actions would have a segmentwide, long-term, major, beneficial impact on wilderness character in Segment 1.</p>	<p>Sierra Camp area as wilderness while providing a temporary pack camp. Together, these actions would have a local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on wilderness character.</p>	<p>and designate the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp area as wilderness. Together, these actions would have a segmentwide, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on wilderness character.</p>	<p>wilderness solitude and primitive recreation. This alternative would maintain approximately the current number of visitors, retain all three backpackers campgrounds at their current size and configuration, and reduce the capacity of the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp. Current wilderness permits and trail quotas for this zone would remain.</p>	<p>stock would continue to access the wilderness. Therefore, this alternative would improve wilderness character slightly. Local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impacts on wilderness character would occur.</p>
<p><u>Segments 2-4 & 6-8</u></p> <p>No impact.</p>	<p><u>Segments 2-4 & 6-8</u></p> <p>No impact.</p>	<p><u>Segments 2-4 & 6-8</u></p> <p>No impact.</p>	<p><u>Segments 2-4 & 6-8</u></p> <p>No impact.</p>	<p><u>Segments 2-4 & 6-8</u></p> <p>No impact.</p>	<p><u>Segments 2-4 & 6-8</u></p> <p>No impact.</p>
<p><u>Segment 5</u></p> <p>There are no man-made alterations to the biophysical environment, and the ecosystem would continue to function with limited human interference due to the near absence of facilities in this segment. No impact would occur.</p> <p>No development would occur under this alternative; thus, no impact would occur.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i></p> <p>No development would occur under this alternative; thus, the impact would remain the same as that of Alternative 1 (No Action).</p>	<p><u>Segment 5</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i></p> <p>No development would occur under this alternative; thus, the impact would remain the same as that of Alternative 1 (No Action).</p>	<p><u>Segment 5</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i></p> <p>No development would occur under this alternative; thus, the impact would remain the same as that of Alternative 1 (No Action).</p>	<p><u>Segment 5</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i></p> <p>No development would occur under this alternative; thus, the impact would remain the same as that of Alternative 1 (No Action).</p>	<p><u>Segment 5</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage Use and Facilities:</i></p> <p>No development would occur under this alternative; thus, the impact would remain the same as that of Alternative 1 (No Action).</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
11. Wilderness Character (cont.)					
<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Cumulative impacts would result in improved protection and enhancement of wilderness resources; continued limits on overnight use; and retention of manmade structures and facilities. Impacts would be local, moderate, long term and adverse.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Cumulative impacts would improve wilderness management and limit access to protect wilderness character. The cumulative impact would be segmentwide (in Segments 1 and 5), long term, major, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Cumulative impacts would improve wilderness management and reduce the number of wilderness visitors. The cumulative impact of the wilderness management measures would be segmentwide (in Segments 1 and 5), long term, moderate, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Cumulative impacts would improve wilderness management and reduce the number of wilderness visitors. The cumulative impact of the wilderness management measures would be segmentwide (in Segments 1 and 5), long term, moderate, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Cumulative impacts would improve wilderness stewardship and limit access to protect wilderness character. The cumulative impact of the wilderness management measures would be segmentwide (in Segments 1 and 5), long term, minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Cumulative impacts would improve wilderness stewardship and limit access to protect wilderness character. The cumulative impact of the wilderness management measures would be segmentwide (in Segments 1 and 5), long term, negligible to minor, and beneficial.</p>
12. Park Operations and Facilities					
<p><u>Segment 1, 5 & 8</u></p> <p>Merced Lake Ranger Station Meadow would continue to experience high levels of bare ground from pack stock grazing and trampling, and informal trails would continue to traverse park meadows. The continuing impact on park operations would continue to be long-term, negligible, and adverse.</p> <p>The number of designated campsites within the Merced River corridor's wilderness would remain as under present conditions. The park would continue to experience a long-term, negligible, adverse operational impact from these activities.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5 & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Visitation within Segment 1 would be reduced. The resulting decline would reduce the park's operational burden associated with visitation-related wilderness restoration. The long-term impact would be minor and beneficial.</p> <p>There would be a 100% reduction in the Merced River corridor's wilderness lodging units. These actions would have long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on concessioner operations.</p> <p>Removal of the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp and the associated visitor services would require a temporary commitment of park staff time, resources, and equipment. The short-term impact on park operations would be minor and adverse. However, the operational burden would be reduced with their conversion and removal. The long-term impact on park operations would be minor and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5 & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Visitation within Segment 1 would be reduced. The resulting decline would reduce the park's operational burden associated with visitation-related wilderness restoration. The long-term impact would be minor and beneficial.</p> <p>There would be a 100% reduction in the Merced River corridor's wilderness lodging units. These actions would have a long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact on concessioner operations.</p> <p>Removal of the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp, and the associated visitor services, would require a temporary commitment of park staff time, resources, and equipment. The short-term impact on park operations would be minor and adverse. The long-term impact on park operations would be negligible to minor and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5 & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Visitation within Segment 1 would be reduced. The resulting decline would reduce the park's operational burden associated with visitation-related wilderness restoration. The long-term impact would be minor and beneficial.</p> <p>There would be a 100% reduction in the Merced River corridor's wilderness lodging units. These actions would have long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on concessioner operations.</p> <p>Removal of the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp, and the associated visitor services, would require a temporary commitment of park staff time, resources, and equipment. The short-term impact on park operations would be minor and adverse. The long-term impact on park operations would be negligible to minor and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5 & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Visitation within Segment 1 would not be expected to change appreciably. The park's operational burden associated with visitation-related wilderness restoration would remain similar to that of Alternative 1. The long-term impact would be negligible to minor and adverse.</p> <p>NPS and primary park concessioner staff would continue to experience a long-term, negligible, adverse impact associated with staffing, supplying, and maintaining the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp operations.</p> <p>The removal of infrastructure and restoration of these camps would require a temporary commitment of park staff time, resources, and equipment. The short-term impact on park operations would be negligible to minor and adverse. The long-term impact on park operations would be negligible and adverse.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5 & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Visitation within Segment 1 would not be expected to change appreciably. The park's operational burden associated with visitation-related wilderness restoration would remain similar to that of Alternative 1. The long-term impact would be negligible to minor and adverse.</p> <p>NPS and primary park concessioner staff would continue to experience a long-term, negligible, adverse impact associated with staffing, supplying, and maintaining the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp operations.</p> <p>The removal of infrastructure and restoration of these camps would require a temporary commitment of park staff time, resources, and equipment. The short-term impact on park operations would be negligible to minor and adverse. The long-term impact on park operations would be negligible and adverse.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
12. Park Operations and Facilities (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Protecting river values under these conditions would necessitate ongoing maintenance and restoration activities, the impact on park operations would continue to be long-term, minor, and adverse.</p> <p>The impact on staffing and other resources required to restore areas affected by high visitor use, manage traffic, and maintain visitor-serving facilities would continue to be long-term, minor, and adverse.</p> <p>Overnight lodging facilities would remain in operation and continue to receive guests at present levels. The management and maintenance requirements of these facilities would continue to have a long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impact on park operations.</p> <p>The number of campsites within the valley would remain as under current conditions. Through the continued operation of these facilities, and maintenance and restoration required of high visitation in their vicinity, park staff would continue to incur a long-term, negligible to minor, adverse operational impact.</p> <p>Concessioner operations within the valley would stay in their present locations and conditions. Under these conditions, operational impact would continue to be negligible to minor, and adverse.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Restoration projects would require a considerable amount of park staff time and resources.</p> <p>These actions would benefit parkwide operations because they would lessen the need for future restoration. However, they would also increase the need for ongoing monitoring and maintenance of the restoration areas. The overall impact on park operations would be long-term, negligible, and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Changes in visitation, overnight accommodations, employee housing, and transportation infrastructure and management would have a parkwide, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on park operations and facilities.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Value:</i></p> <p>Restoration projects would require a considerable amount of park staff time and resources.</p> <p>These actions would benefit parkwide operations because they would lessen the need for future restoration. However, they would also increase the need for ongoing monitoring and maintenance of the restoration areas. The overall impact on park operations would be long-term, negligible, and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Changes in visitation, overnight accommodations, employee housing, and transportation infrastructure and management would have a parkwide, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on park operations and facilities.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Restoration projects would require a considerable amount of park staff time and resources.</p> <p>These actions would benefit parkwide operations because they would lessen the need for future restoration. However, they would also increase the need for ongoing monitoring and maintenance of the restoration areas. The overall impact on park operations would be long-term, negligible, and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Changes in visitation, overnight accommodations, employee housing, and transportation infrastructure and management would have a parkwide, long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on park operations and facilities.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Restoration projects would require a considerable amount of park staff time and resources.</p> <p>These actions would benefit parkwide operations because they would lessen the need for future restoration. However, they would also increase the need for ongoing monitoring and maintenance of the restoration areas. The overall impact on park operations would be long-term, negligible, and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Changes in visitation, overnight accommodations, employee housing, and transportation infrastructure and management would have a parkwide, long-term, negligible minor, beneficial impacts on park operations and facilities.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Restoration projects would require a considerable amount of park staff time and resources.</p> <p>These actions would benefit parkwide operations because they would lessen the need for future restoration. However, they would also increase the need for ongoing monitoring and maintenance of the restoration areas. The overall impact on park operations would be long-term, negligible, and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Changes in visitation, overnight accommodations, employee housing, and transportation infrastructure and management would have a parkwide, long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impacts on park operations and facilities.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
12. Park Operations and Facilities (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Park staff would continue to incur a long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impact associated with the incremental management of the impacts stemming from existing developments.</p> <p>There would continue to be no concessioner-operated lodging or campgrounds within these segments and thus a long-term, negligible adverse impact would result.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Development and implementation of oak tree protective measures would have a short-term, negligible, adverse effect on staff operations. The consequent long-term impact on park operations would be negligible and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>New high-density concessioner housing would be constructed in Abbeville and Rancheria. New housing would also be constructed in El Portal Village Center.</p> <p>The park would experience a short-term, moderate, adverse operational impact associated with the planning, design, relocation, and construction of new projects. These actions would also result in a long-term, minor, adverse impact on park operations associated with management and maintenance of the new facilities; and the law enforcement and emergency medical services to accommodate the increase in residential occupants.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Development and implementation of oak tree protective measures would have a short-term, negligible, adverse effect on staff operations. The consequent long-term impact on park operations would be negligible and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>New high-density concessioner housing would be constructed in Rancheria. New housing would also be constructed in Rancheria and El Portal Village Center.</p> <p>The park would experience a short-term, minor, adverse operational impact associated with the planning, design, relocation, and construction of new projects. These actions would also result in a long-term, negligible, adverse impact on park operations associated with management and maintenance of the new facilities; and the law enforcement and emergency medical services to accommodate the increase in residential occupants.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Development and implementation of oak tree protective measures would have a short-term, negligible, adverse effect on staff operations. The consequent long-term impact on park operations would be negligible and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>New high-density concessioner housing would be constructed in Rancheria. New housing would also be constructed in Rancheria and El Portal Village Center.</p> <p>The park would experience a short-term, minor to moderate, adverse operational impact associated with the planning, design, relocation, and construction of new projects. These actions would also result in a long-term, minor, adverse impact on park operations associated with management and maintenance of the new facilities; and the law enforcement and emergency medical services to accommodate the increase in residential occupants.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Development and implementation of oak tree protective measures would have a short-term, negligible, adverse effect on staff operations. The consequent long-term impact on park operations would be negligible and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>New high-density concessioner housing would be constructed in Rancheria. New housing would also be constructed in Rancheria and El Portal Village Center.</p> <p>The park would experience a short-term, minor to moderate, adverse operational impact associated with the planning, design, relocation, and construction of new projects. These actions would also result in a long-term, minor, adverse impact on park operations associated with management and maintenance of the new facilities; and the law enforcement and emergency medical services to accommodate the increase in residential occupants.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Development and implementation of oak tree protective measures would have a short-term, negligible, adverse effect on staff operations. The consequent long-term impact on park operations would be negligible and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>New high-density concessioner housing would be constructed in Rancheria and Abbeville. New housing would also be constructed in Rancheria and El Portal Village Center. The park would experience a short-term, moderate, adverse operational impact associated with the planning, design, relocation, and construction of new projects. These actions would also result in a long-term, minor, adverse impact on park operations associated with management and maintenance of the new facilities; and the law enforcement and emergency medical services to accommodate the increase in residential occupants.</p>
<p><u>Segment 6 & 7</u></p> <p>Park staff would continue to experience a long-term, negligible, adverse impact associated with the ongoing maintenance of infrastructure, specifically wastewater infrastructure, to avoid or minimize impacts on water supply and quality.</p> <p>Long-term management of impacts associated with development near the channel would continue to impose a negligible, adverse operational burden on the park.</p>	<p><u>Segment 6 & 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values include removal of the Wawona Golf Course would noticeably but temporarily disrupt the work of park staff. The undertaking would have a short-term, minor, adverse impact on park operations. Park staff would still incur a long-term, negligible to minor, adverse operational burden associated with monitoring and maintenance of these restoration areas.</p>	<p><u>Segment 6 & 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values include removal of the Wawona Golf Course would noticeably but temporarily disrupt the work of park staff. The undertaking would have a short-term, minor, adverse impact on park operations. Park staff would still incur a long-term, negligible, adverse operational burden associated with monitoring and maintenance of these restoration areas.</p>	<p><u>Segment 6 & 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Biological Resource Actions.</i> Specific projects include the relocation of stock use campsites. The resulting impacts on park operations would be parkwide, short-term, negligible, and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>The park would experience a short-term, negligible to minor, adverse operational impact associated with the planning and</p>	<p><u>Segment 6 & 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Biological Resource Actions.</i> Specific projects include the relocation of stock use campsites. The resulting impacts on park operations would be parkwide, short-term, negligible, and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>The park would experience a short-term, negligible to minor, adverse operational impact associated with the planning and</p>	<p><u>Segment 6 & 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p><i>Biological Resource Actions.</i> Specific projects include the relocation of stock use campsites. The resulting impacts on park operations would be parkwide, short-term, negligible, and adverse.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>The park would experience a short-term, negligible to minor, adverse operational impact associated with the planning and</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
12. Park Operations and Facilities (cont.)					
<u>Segment 6 & 7 (cont.)</u>	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> The park would experience a short-term, minor, adverse operational impact associated with the planning and execution of new projects. These actions would result in a long-term, minor, adverse impact on park operations associated with restoration monitoring and maintenance. Reduction in size of the Wawona Campground would result in a long-term, parkwide, minor, beneficial impact on park operations required to manage and maintain these facilities.	<i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> The park would experience a short-term, minor, adverse operational impact associated with the planning and execution of new projects. These actions would result in a long-term, negligible, adverse impact on park operations associated with restoration monitoring and maintenance. Reduction in size of the Wawona Campground would result in a long-term, parkwide, negligible to minor, beneficial impact on park operations required to manage and maintain these facilities.	execution of new projects. These actions would result in a long-term, negligible, adverse impact on park operations associated with restoration monitoring and maintenance. Reduction in size of the Wawona Campground would result in a long-term, parkwide, negligible to minor, beneficial impact on park operations required to manage and maintain these facilities.	execution of new projects. These actions would result in a long-term, negligible, adverse impact on park operations associated with restoration monitoring and maintenance. Reduction in size of the Wawona Campground would result in a long-term, parkwide, negligible, beneficial impact on park operations required to manage and maintain these facilities.	execution of new projects. These actions would result in a long-term, negligible, adverse impact on park operations associated with restoration monitoring and maintenance. Reduction in size of the Wawona Campground would result in a long-term, parkwide, negligible, beneficial impact on park operations required to manage and maintain these facilities.
<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> The cumulative effect would be long-term, negligible, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> The cumulative impact of Alternative 2, in light of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would be long-term, moderate, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> The cumulative impact of Alternative 3, in light of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would be long-term, moderate, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> The cumulative impact of Alternative 4, in light of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would be long-term, minor to moderate, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> The cumulative impact of Alternative 5, in light of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would be long-term, minor, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> The cumulative impact of Alternative 6, in light of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would be long-term, negligible, and beneficial.
13. Transportation					
<u>Segment 1, 5, 6 & 8</u> No impact as there are no transportation facilities in these segments.	<u>Segment 1, 5, 6 & 8</u> No impact as there are no transportation facilities in these segments.	<u>Segment 1, 5, 6 & 8</u> No impact as there are no transportation facilities in these segments.	<u>Segment 1, 5, 6 & 8</u> No impact as there are no transportation facilities in these segments.	<u>Segment 1, 5, 6 & 8</u> No impact as there are no transportation facilities in these segments.	<u>Segment 1, 5, 6 & 8</u> No impact as there are no transportation facilities in these segments.
<u>Segment 2</u> There could be segmentwide, long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts on transportation conditions from the continuation of current transportation management actions to address increases in park visitation, increases in traffic volumes on the park roadways, and increased parking demand that exceeds the parking supply (i.e., a larger parking deficit).	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Under this alternative, traffic flow and circulation would be improved and an at-grade pedestrian crossing to alleviate pedestrian/vehicle conflicts would be constructed. Actions to protect and enhance river values would primarily have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities.	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Under this alternative, traffic flow and circulation would be improved and an at-grade pedestrian crossing to alleviate pedestrian/vehicle conflicts would be constructed. Actions to protect and enhance river values would primarily have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities.	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Under this alternative, traffic flow and circulation would be enhanced with roadway improvements and construction of a pedestrian underpass. Actions to protect and enhance river values would primarily have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities.	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values would primarily have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities.	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions to protect and enhance river values would primarily have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities.

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
13. Transportation (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 2 (cont.)</u></p>	<p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Transportation and circulation would be improved due to the day use permit parking system, and the resulting substantially lower use levels, approximately 33% decrease from existing peak-day conditions. These actions would have segmentwide, moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts.</p>	<p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Transportation and circulation would be improved due to the day use reservation system with substantially lower use levels, approximately 37% decrease from existing peak-day conditions. These actions would have segmentwide, moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts.</p>	<p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Transportation and circulation would be improved due to the day use reservation system with substantially lower use levels, approximately 19% decrease from existing peak-day conditions, as well as expansion of regional bus service and the Valley shuttle. These actions would have segmentwide, moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts.</p>	<p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Implementation of the day use capacity management system, additional parking spaces, and transportation system improvements would lessen traffic jams, and improve the chance that visitors entering Yosemite have a place to park. These actions would have segmentwide, major, long-term, beneficial impacts on transportation conditions.</p>	<p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Although the total number of daily visitors to Yosemite Valley would be slightly higher than existing peak-day numbers, the implementation of the day use capacity management system, additional parking spaces, and transportation system improvements would lessen traffic jams, and ensure that visitors entering the park have a place to park (thus eliminating unnecessary circling). These management actions would have segmentwide, moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts on transportation conditions.</p>
<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Continuation of current transportation management actions to address increases in park visitation, increases in traffic volumes on the park roadways, and parking demand that exceeds supply, leading to a continuing deterioration of the quality of the transportation experience by prolonging time spent traveling in the park in a vehicle would occur. As such, there would be segmentwide, long-term, minor, adverse impacts.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values would have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>The total number of daily visitors would not change from existing peak-day conditions, and public transit would be expanded. As such, these actions would have segmentwide, minor, long-term, beneficial impacts on transportation conditions.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values would have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>The total number of daily visitors would not change from existing peak-day conditions, and public transit would be expanded. As such, these actions would have segmentwide, minor, long-term, beneficial impacts on transportation conditions.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values would have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>The total number of daily visitors would not change from existing peak-day conditions, public transit would be expanded, and a new remote, 200-space visitor day parking area would be provided. Combined, these actions would have segmentwide, minor, long-term, beneficial impacts on transportation conditions.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values would have segmentwide, minor, adverse short-term transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>The total number of daily visitors would not change from existing peak-day conditions, public transit would be expanded, and a new remote, 200-space visitor day parking area would be provided. Combined, these actions would have segmentwide, moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts on transportation conditions.</p>	<p><u>Segment 3 & 4</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values would have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>The total number of daily visitors would not change from existing peak-day conditions, public transit would be expanded, and a new remote, 200-space visitor day parking area would be provided. These management actions would have corridorwide, moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts on transportation conditions.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
13. Transportation (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 7</u></p> <p>Continuation of current transportation management actions to address increases in park visitation, traffic volumes on the park roadways, and parking demand that exceeds the parking supply would occur. As such, there could be segmentwide, long-term, minor, adverse impacts.</p>	<p><u>Segment 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values would have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities, but would have no long-term impacts because increased traffic would cease with completion of the construction work.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Because no significant changes to the kinds and amounts of use are proposed, and the total number of daily visitors would be unchanged from existing peak-day conditions, impacts of Alternative 2 actions would be similar to those of Alternative 1 (No Action), and result in segmentwide, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on transportation conditions in Segment 7.</p>	<p><u>Segment 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values would have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities, but would have no long-term impacts because increased traffic would cease with completion of the construction work.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Because no significant changes to the kinds and amounts of use are proposed, and the total number of daily visitors would be unchanged from existing peak-day conditions, impacts of Alternative 2 actions would be similar to those of Alternative 1 (No Action), and result in segmentwide, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on transportation conditions in Segment 7.</p>	<p><u>Segment 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values would have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities, but would have no long-term impacts because increased traffic would cease with completion of the construction work.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Because no significant changes to the kinds and amounts of use in Segment 7 are proposed, and the total number of daily visitors would be unchanged from existing peak-day conditions, impacts of Alternative 2 actions would be similar to those of Alternative 1 (No Action), and result in segmentwide, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on transportation conditions in Segment 7.</p>	<p><u>Segment 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values would have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities, but would have no long-term impacts because increased traffic would cease with completion of the construction work.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Because no significant changes to the kinds and amounts of use are proposed, and the total number of daily visitors would be unchanged from existing peak-day conditions, impacts of Alternative 2 actions would be similar to those of Alternative 1 (No Action), and result in segmentwide, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on transportation conditions in Segment 7.</p>	<p><u>Segment 7</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values would have segmentwide, short-term, minor, adverse transportation effects associated with restoration construction activities, but would have no long-term impacts because increased traffic would cease with completion of the construction work.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Because no significant changes to the kinds and amounts of use are proposed, and the total number of daily visitors would be unchanged from existing peak-day conditions, impacts of Alternative 2 actions would be similar to those of Alternative 1 (No Action), and result in segmentwide, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on transportation conditions in Segment 7.</p>
<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Cumulative projects are not anticipated to affect transportation conditions on Segments 1, 5, 6, and 8, and therefore, no cumulative impacts would occur. For segments 2, 3, 4 and 7, camping, lodging, parking, and circulation facilities are assumed to remain in their current locations, in their current conditions, and at their current capacities. Consequently, traffic congestion and delays would continue to occur at busy intersections resulting in segment-wide, long-term, minor, adverse impacts on transportation conditions.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Cumulative projects would result in a local, short-term, minor, adverse impact on transportation during construction periods. However, improvements realized through cumulative projects would further enhance the moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Cumulative projects would result in a local, short-term, minor, adverse impact on transportation during construction periods. However, the improvements realized through cumulative projects would further enhance the moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts on transportation.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Cumulative projects would result in a local, short-term, minor, adverse impact on transportation during construction periods. However, the improvements realized through cumulative projects would further enhance the moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts on transportation.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Cumulative projects would result in a local, short-term, minor, adverse impact on transportation during construction periods. However, the improvements realized through cumulative projects would further enhance the moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts on transportation.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Cumulative projects would result in a local, short-term, minor, adverse impact on transportation during construction periods. However, the improvements realized through cumulative projects would further enhance the moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts on transportation.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
14. Energy Consumption and Climate Change					
<p><u>Segment 1, 5, 6 & 8</u></p> <p>No new buildings or facilities would be constructed as part of Alternative 1, so no substantial new sources of energy consumption or emissions would be introduced. Although park visitation would be expected to increase, these segments do not have transportation facilities and are relatively inaccessible, so visitor use in these areas would not likely increase at the same rate. Therefore, this is a long-term and negligible impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5, 6 & 8</u></p> <p>No new buildings and facilities would be constructed, so no substantial new sources of energy consumption or emissions would be introduced. Maximum overnight capacity and total daily use levels would be less than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles in the vicinity, the overall effect on energy consumption and GHGs would be long term, negligible to minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5, 6 & 8</u></p> <p>No new buildings and facilities would be constructed so no substantial new sources of energy consumption or emissions would be introduced. Maximum overnight capacity and total daily use levels would be less than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles in the vicinity, the overall effect on energy consumption and GHGs would be long term, negligible to minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5, 6 & 8</u></p> <p>No new buildings and facilities would be constructed so no substantial new sources of energy consumption or emissions would be introduced. Maximum overnight capacity and total daily use levels would be less than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles in the vicinity, the overall effect on energy would be long term, negligible to minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5, 6 & 8</u></p> <p>No new buildings and facilities would be constructed within these segments so no substantial new sources of energy consumption or emissions would be introduced. Maximum overnight capacity and total daily use levels would be less than under Alternative 1. With fewer on-road vehicles in the vicinity, the overall effect on energy consumption and GHGs would be long term, negligible, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 1, 5, 6 & 8</u></p> <p>No new buildings and facilities would be constructed so no substantial new sources of energy consumption or emissions would be introduced. With more on-road vehicles in the vicinity, the overall effect on energy consumption and GHGs would be long term, negligible, and adverse.</p>
<p><u>Segment 2, 3, 4 & 7</u></p> <p>There would be long-term, moderate beneficial impacts associated with the continuation of NPS climate-action-plan sustainability strategies; however, because mobile sources generate the vast majority of all GHGs in the park, and visitation is projected to increase, an overall long-term, minor, adverse impact related to energy and GHGs would occur.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation and total daily use levels would be 26% and 33% less, respectively, than under Alternative 1. Reduced housing or lodging would result in a proportional reduction in area GHG emissions sources and facility energy usage. Since campsites would be reduced along this segment, there would also be a proportional reduction in campfire GHG emissions. With fewer on-road vehicles and potential area sources, the overall effect on energy consumption and GHGs would be long term, negligible to minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation and total daily use levels would be 23% and 37% less, respectively, than under Alternative 1. Reduced housing and lodging would result in a proportional reduction in area GHG emissions sources in facility energy usage. Since campsites would be increased along this segment, there would also be a proportional increase in campfires, which would result in a long-term, negligible, adverse impact for GHG emissions. However, with fewer on-road vehicles and potential area sources under Alternative 3, the overall effect on energy consumption and GHGs would be long term, negligible to minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation would be 7% greater and total daily use levels would be 19% less than under Alternative 1. Since campsites would be increased along this segment, there would also be a proportional increase in campfire GHG emissions, which would be a long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impact. Reduced housing and lodging would result in a proportional reduction in area GHG emissions sources and in facility energy usage. Overall, with fewer on-road vehicles and potential area sources, the effect on energy consumption and GHGs would be long term, negligible to minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Maximum overnight visitation would be 16% greater and total daily use levels would be 5% less than under Alternative 1. Since campsites would be increased along this segment, which would have a long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impact. With fewer on-road vehicles, despite increased lodging, energy consumption and related GHG emissions would be long term, negligible to minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u></p> <p>Maximum overnight capacity and total daily use levels would be 33% and 6% greater, respectively, than under Alternative 1. Since campsites would be increased along this segment, a long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impact would occur. Reduced housing would result in a proportional reduction, while increased lodging would contribute to a proportional increase in area GHG emissions sources and in facility energy usage. With more on-road vehicles and potential area sources, the overall effect on energy consumption and GHGs would be long term, negligible, and adverse.</p>
<p><u>Segments 3 & 4</u></p> <p>There would be long-term, moderate beneficial impacts associated with the continuation of NPS climate-action-plan sustainability strategies; however, because mobile sources generate the vast majority of all GHGs in the park, and visitation is projected to increase, an overall long-term, minor, adverse impact related to energy and GHGs would occur.</p>	<p><u>Segments 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Increased housing would result in a proportional increase in area GHG emissions sources (such as maintenance/landscaping, natural gas combustion for heating/cooling) and in facility energy usage. Reduced visitation would have the opposite effect due to fewer vehicles on the road. The overall effect on energy consumption and GHGs would be long term, negligible to minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segments 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Increased housing would result in a proportional increase in area GHG emissions sources (such as maintenance/landscaping, natural gas combustion for heating/cooling) and in facility energy usage. Reduced visitation would have the opposite effect due to fewer vehicles on the road. The overall effect on energy consumption and GHGs would be long term, negligible to minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segments 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Increased housing would result in a proportional increase in area GHG emissions sources (such as maintenance/landscaping, natural gas combustion for heating/cooling) and in facility energy usage. Reduced visitation would have the opposite effect due to fewer vehicles on the road. The overall effect on energy consumption and GHGs would be long term, negligible to minor, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segments 3 & 4</u></p> <p>Increased housing would result in a proportional increase in area GHG emissions sources (such as maintenance/landscaping, natural gas combustion for heating/cooling) and in facility energy usage. Reduced visitation would have the opposite effect due to fewer vehicles on the road. The overall effect on energy consumption and GHGs would be long term, negligible, and beneficial.</p>	<p><u>Segments 3 & 4</u></p> <p>No new buildings and facilities would be constructed so no substantial new sources of energy consumption or emissions would be introduced. With more on-road vehicles in the vicinity, the overall effect on energy consumption and GHGs would be long term, negligible, and adverse.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
14. Energy Consumption and Climate Change (cont.)					
	<p><u>Segment 7</u></p> <p>Total daily use levels would not change and overnight visitation would be less than under Alternative 1. The removal of the golf course for ecological restoration and the removal of the Wawona stables would have a beneficial effect. Energy consumption and GHGs associated with these facilities would be reduced, which would result in a long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact. Since campsites would be reduced along this segment, there would also be a proportional reduction in campfire GHG emissions, which would have a long-term, negligible, beneficial impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 7</u></p> <p>Total daily use levels would not change and maximum overnight visitation would be less than under Alternative 1. The removal of the golf course for ecological restoration would have a beneficial effect. Energy consumption and GHGs associated with this facility would be reduced, which would have a long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact. Since campsites would be reduced along this segment, there would also be a proportional reduction in campfire GHG emissions, which would have a long-term, negligible, beneficial impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 7</u></p> <p>Total daily use levels would not change and maximum overnight visitation would be less than under Alternative 1. Since campsites would be reduced along this segment, there would also be a proportional reduction in campfire GHG emissions, which would have a long-term, negligible, beneficial impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 7</u></p> <p>Total daily use levels would not change and maximum overnight visitation would be less than under Alternative 1. Since campsites would be reduced along this segment, there would also be a proportional reduction in campfire GHG emissions, which would have a long-term, negligible, beneficial impact.</p>	<p><u>Segment 7</u></p> <p>Total daily use levels would not change and maximum overnight visitation would be less than under Alternative 1. Since campsites would be reduced along this segment, there would also be a proportional reduction in campfire GHG emissions, which would have a long-term, negligible, beneficial impact.</p>
<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Long-term, minor, adverse</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>With reduced daytime and nighttime visitor capacity and continued management of traffic and encouragement of alternative forms of transportation, as well as continuation of NPS climate-action-plan sustainability strategies proposed management actions would also result in a long-term, cumulatively beneficial energy and climate change impact from reduced VMT and facility energy usage.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>With reduced daytime and nighttime visitor capacity and continued management of traffic and encouragement of alternative forms of transportation, as well as continuation of NPS climate-action-plan sustainability strategies, proposed management actions would result in a long-term, cumulatively beneficial energy and climate change impact from reduced VMT and facility energy usage.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>With reduced overall daily visitor capacity and continued management of traffic and encouragement of alternative forms of transportation, as well as continuation of NPS climate-action-plan sustainability strategies, Alternative 4 would result in a long-term, cumulatively beneficial energy and climate change impact from reduced VMT and associated fuel usage and GHG emissions. However, an increased number of campsites could result in an adverse impact.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>With reduced overall visitor capacity and continued management of traffic and encouragement of alternative forms of transportation, as well as continuation of NPS climate-action-plan sustainability strategies, Alternative 5 would result in a long-term, cumulatively beneficial effect on energy and climate change from reduced VMT and associated fuel usage and GHG emissions. However, an increased number of lodging units and campsites would result in an adverse impact from increased area source GHG emissions.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>With increased overall visitor capacity, number of campsites, and number of lodging units, Alternative 6 would result in a long-term, cumulatively adverse impact on energy and climate change from increased VMT, associated fuel usage and GHG emissions.</p>
15. Socioeconomics					
<p><u>All Segments</u></p> <p>Current trends would be expected to continue, and include full occupancy of lodging and day parking in the park during peak use periods, which implies there is additional unmet demand for visits to the park. Some of that unmet demand may increase the demand for visitor services in gateway communities. This impact would result in a regional, long term, negligible and beneficial effect.</p>	<p><u>All Segments</u></p> <p>This alternative would support 517 fewer jobs than Alternative 1, and because it would be less than 2.5% fewer jobs the impact would be regional, long term, negligible, and adverse.</p>	<p><u>All Segments</u></p> <p>Under a capacity-constrained scenario, this alternative would support 544 fewer jobs than Alternative 1, resulting in a long-term, adverse, and negligible impact.</p>	<p><u>All Segments</u></p> <p>Under a capacity-constrained scenario, this alternative would support 110 fewer jobs than Alternative 1, resulting in a long-term, adverse, and negligible impact.</p>	<p><u>All Segments</u></p> <p>This alternative would support four fewer jobs, resulting in long-term, regional, negligible, and adverse impacts.</p>	<p><u>All Segments</u></p> <p>This alternative would support approximately 356 more jobs than Alternative 1, resulting in long-term, regional, negligible, and beneficial impacts.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
15. Socioeconomics (cont.)					
<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> The overall cumulative effect would be that visitation is likely to continue to grow at an average rate of approximately 3% per year, and current total annual visitation would remain near the historic high experienced over the last decade. Therefore, the cumulative economic impact would be regional, long term, negligible, and beneficial.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> If public management actions reduce the supply of lodging and other commercial amenities within the park, demand pressures may result in private interests expanding the supply in surrounding areas. Additional demand may be satisfied by increasing hours and seasons of operations, and adding additional staff to expand capacities. The cumulative impact would be regional, long term, negligible, and adverse.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> If public management actions reduce the supply of lodging and other commercial amenities within the park, demand pressures may result in private interests expanding the supply in surrounding areas. Additional demand may be satisfied by increasing hours and seasons of operations, and adding additional staff to expand capacities. The cumulative impact would be regional, long term, negligible, and adverse.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> If public management actions reduce the supply of lodging and other commercial amenities within the park, demand pressures may result in private interests expanding the supply in surrounding areas. Additional demand may be satisfied by increasing hours and seasons of operations, and adding additional staff to expand capacities. The cumulative impact would be regional, long term, negligible, and adverse.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> If public management actions reduce the supply of lodging and other commercial amenities within the park, demand pressures may result in private interests expanding the supply in surrounding areas. Additional demand may be satisfied by increasing hours and seasons of operations, and adding additional staff to expand capacities. The cumulative impact would be regional, long term, negligible, and adverse.	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> If public management actions reduce the supply of lodging and other commercial amenities within the park, demand pressures may result in private interests expanding the supply in surrounding areas. Additional demand may be satisfied by increasing hours and seasons of operations, and adding additional staff to expand capacities. The cumulative impact would be regional, long term, negligible, and beneficial.
16. Historic Buildings, Structures, and Cultural Landscapes					
<u>Segment 1</u> Under this alternative, impacts on these resources would be negligible under NEPA criteria as management of resources and structures would remain the same.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> There are no actions to protect and enhance river values proposed that would result in an adverse impact on historic resources. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in a major, long term, local adverse impact on the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp Historic District under NEPA. <i>Segment 1 Impact Summary.</i> Overall actions in Segment 1 would result in a major, long term, local adverse impact on historic resources.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> No actions to protect and enhance river values would result in an adverse impact on historic resources. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use would result in a major, long term, local adverse impact on the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp Historic District under NEPA. <i>Segment 1 Impact Summary.</i> Overall actions in Segment 1 would result in a major, long term, local adverse impact on historic resources.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> No actions to protect and enhance river values would result in an adverse impact on historic resources. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in a major, long term, local adverse impact on the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp Historic District. <i>Segment 1 Impact Summary.</i> Overall actions in Segment 1 would result in a major, long term, local adverse impact on historic resources.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> No actions to protect and enhance river values would result in an adverse impact on historic resources. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in a negligible, long term, local adverse impact on the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp Historic District under NEPA. <i>Segment 1 Impact Summary.</i> Overall actions in Segment 1 would result in a moderate, long term, local adverse impact on historic resources.	<u>Segment 1</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> No actions to protect and enhance river values would result in an adverse impact on historic resources. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> No actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in an adverse impact on historic resources. <i>Segment 1 Impact Summary.</i> Overall actions in Segment 1 would result in no adverse impact on historic resources.
<u>Segment 2</u> Impacts on the majority of resources would be negligible under NEPA criteria, although there would be minor, segment-wide, adverse effects to the Yosemite Valley Historic District. Overall actions in Segment 2 would result in a long term, local, minor adverse impacts on historic resources.	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Biological resource actions to protect and enhance river values would result in minor or moderate, local, long term adverse impacts on the listed Yosemite Valley Historic District under NEPA.	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Biological resource actions to protect and enhance river values would result in minor, local, long term adverse impacts on the listed Yosemite Valley Historic District under NEPA.	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Biological resource actions to protect and enhance river values would result in moderate, local, long term adverse impacts on the listed Yosemite Valley Historic District under NEPA.	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Biological resource actions would involve the restoration of the meadow to its historic setting would result in a long term, local, beneficial impacts to the Yosemite Valley Historic District through restoration of meadows. Impacts resulting	<u>Segment 2</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Biological resource actions to protect and enhance river values would result in minor or beneficial, local, long term adverse impacts on the listed Yosemite Valley Historic District through restoration of meadows. Impacts resulting

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
16. Historic Buildings, Structures, and Cultural Landscapes (cont.)					
<u>Segment 2</u> (cont.)	<p>Hydrologic/geologic resource and non-specified resources actions to protect and enhance river values would result in long term, major, local, adverse impacts to both the Yosemite Valley Historic District and the Yosemite Village Historic District under NEPA.</p> <p>Cultural resource actions to protect and enhance river values would result in a long term, moderate, local, beneficial impact to the Yosemite Valley and Yosemite Village Historic Districts under NEPA.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities, including removal and alteration of contributing resources, in would result in long term, local, moderate to major adverse impacts to Yosemite Valley Historic District and the Yosemite Village Historic District under NEPA.</p> <p>Overall actions in Segment 2 would result in a long term, local, moderate to major adverse impacts on historic resources.</p>	<p>Hydrologic/geologic resource actions to protect and enhance river values would result in major, long term, local, adverse impacts on both the Yosemite Valley Bridges Historic District and the Yosemite Valley Historic District under NEPA.</p> <p>Cultural resource actions to protect and enhance river values would result in a long term, moderate, local, beneficial impact to the Yosemite Valley and Yosemite Village Historic Districts under NEPA.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to manage visitor use and facilities would result in long term, local, major to moderate adverse impacts to the Yosemite Valley and Yosemite Village Historic Districts under NEPA.</p> <p>Overall actions in Segment 2 would result in a long term, local, moderate to major adverse impacts on historic resources.</p>	<p>Hydrologic/geologic resource actions to protect and enhance river values would result in major, long term, local, adverse impacts on both the Yosemite Valley Bridges Historic District and the Yosemite Valley Historic District under NEPA.</p> <p>Cultural resource actions to protect and enhance river values would result in a long term, moderate, local, beneficial impact to the Yosemite Valley and Yosemite Village Historic Districts under NEPA.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions to protect and enhance river values would result in long term, local, moderate to major adverse impacts to the Camp Curry Historic District, Yosemite Village Historic District and the Yosemite Valley Historic District under NEPA.</p> <p>Overall actions in Segment 2 would result in a long term, local, moderate to major adverse impacts on historic resources.</p>	<p>from rerouting the Valley Loop Trail would require additional analysis prior to determination of impact</p> <p>Hydrologic/geologic resource actions to protect and enhance river values would result in major, long term, local, adverse impact on the Yosemite Valley Bridges Historic District and the Yosemite Valley Historic District under NEPA.</p> <p>Cultural resource actions to protect and enhance river values would result in a long term, moderate, local, beneficial impact to the Yosemite Valley and Yosemite Village Historic Districts under NEPA.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions would result in long term, local, moderate to major adverse impacts to both the Camp Curry Village Historic District and Yosemite Valley Historic District.</p> <p>Overall actions in Segment 2 would result in a long term, local, moderate to major adverse impacts on historic resources.</p>	<p>from rerouting the Valley Loop Trail would require additional analysis prior to determination of impact</p> <p>Hydrologic/geologic resource actions would result in long term, negligible adverse impacts on both the Yosemite Valley Bridges Historic District and the Yosemite Valley Historic District.</p> <p>Cultural resource actions to protect and enhance river values would result in a long term, moderate, local, beneficial impact to the Yosemite Valley and Yosemite Village Historic Districts under NEPA.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions would result in long term, local, moderate to major adverse impacts to both the Yosemite Valley Historic District.</p> <p>Overall actions in Segment 2 would result in a long term, local, moderate to major adverse impacts on historic resources.</p>
<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> Under this alternative, impacts on these resources would be negligible under NEPA criteria as management of resources and structures would remain the same. Overall actions in Segments 3-4 would result in a long term, local, negligible adverse impacts on historic resources.	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> No actions to protect and enhance river values within would result in an adverse impacts on historic resources. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Impacts from actions to manage visitor use and facilities would require additional analysis prior to the determination of impact on historic resources in El Portal. Overall actions in Segments 3-4 would require additional analysis prior to the determination of impact on historic resources in El Portal.	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> No actions intended to protect and enhance river values are anticipated to result in an adverse impacts on historic resources. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Removal or addition of facilities would potentially result in an adverse effect, but without further studies, it is not possible to determine the impact of this action under NEPA. Overall actions in Segments 3-4 would require additional analysis prior to the determination of impact on historic resources in El Portal.	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions intended to protect and enhance river values would not be likely to result in adverse impacts on historic resources. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Impacts from actions to manage visitor use and facilities would require additional analysis prior to the determination of impact on historic resources in El Portal under NEPA. Overall actions in Segments 3-4 would require additional analysis prior to the determination of impact on historic resources in El Portal.	<u>Segment 3 & 4.</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions intended to protect and enhance river values would not be likely to result in adverse impacts on historic resources. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Removal or addition of facilities would potentially result in an adverse effect, but without further studies, it is not possible to determine the impact of this action under NEPA Overall actions in Segments 3-4 would require additional analysis prior to the determination of impact on historic resources in El Portal.	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> <i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i> Actions intended to protect and enhance river values would not be likely to result in adverse impacts on historic resources. <i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i> Construction of new housing in El Portal would potentially result in an adverse effect to the historic setting, but without further studies, it is not possible to determine the impact of this action under NEPA resources. Overall actions in Segments 3-4 would require additional analysis prior to the determination of impact on historic resources in El Portal.

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
16. Historic Buildings, Structures, and Cultural Landscapes (cont.)					
<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p>Potential impacts under this alternative would include ongoing degradation of resources from visitor and operational use; however, ongoing maintenance and rehabilitation would result in negligible impacts under NEPA criteria.</p> <p>Overall actions in Segments 5-8 would result in a long term, local, negligible adverse impacts on historic resources.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>No actions to protect and enhance river values would result in an adverse impact on historic resources.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Implementation of this alternative would have a long term, minor, local, adverse impact on the Wawona Hotel and Pavilion Historic District, Pioneer Yosemite History Center, and Wawona Hotel and Thomas Hill Studio National Historic Landmark.</p> <p>Overall actions in Segments 5-8 would result in a long term, local, minor adverse impacts on historic resources.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>No actions to protect and enhance river values would result in an adverse impact on historic resources.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Implementation of this alternative would have a long term, minor, local, adverse impact on the Wawona Hotel and Pavilion Historic District, Pioneer Yosemite History Center, and Wawona Hotel and Thomas Hill Studio National Historic Landmark.</p> <p>Overall actions in Segments 5-8 would result in a long term, local, minor adverse impacts on historic resources.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>No actions to protect and enhance river values would result in an adverse impact on historic resources.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions intended to manage visitor use and facilities would long term, local, minor adverse impact Pioneer Yosemite History Center.</p> <p>Overall actions in Segments 5-8 would result in a long term, local, minor adverse impacts on historic resources.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>Actions intended to protect and enhance river values would not be likely to result in adverse impacts on historic resources.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>No actions intended to manage visitor use and facilities are anticipated to result in an adverse impact on historic resources.</p> <p>Overall actions in Segments 5-8 would result in no anticipated adverse impacts to historic resources.</p>	<p><u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u></p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Protect and Enhance River Values</i></p> <p>No actions intended to protect and enhance river values are anticipated to result in an adverse impact on historic resources.</p> <p><i>Impacts of Actions to Manage User Capacity, Land Use, and Facilities</i></p> <p>Actions intended to manage visitor use and facilities would long term, local, minor adverse impact Pioneer Yosemite History Center under NEPA.</p> <p>Overall actions in Segments 5-8 would result in a long term, local, minor adverse impacts on historic resources.</p>
<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>There would be no change in the treatment and management of historic buildings, structures, and cultural landscape resources. Any site-specific planning and compliance actions would be accomplished in accordance with stipulations in the park's 1999 programmatic agreement. The results of the benign neglect would contribute towards a moderate adverse cumulative effect.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>This alternative would involve impacts to several National Register-eligible, listed, or National Historic Landmark structures (Merced Lake High Sierra Camp, Camp Curry Historic District, the Yosemite Valley Historic District, the Yosemite Valley Bridges Historic District, the Yosemite Village Historic District, NR Ahwahnee Hotel, and the Wawona Hotel and Pavilion Historic District.). Additionally, relocation, alteration, or removal of National Register-eligible, listed, or National Historic Landmark structures would occur, potentially resulting in a long-term, major, adverse impact on both the individual cultural resources and districts, and the cumulative historic fabric of the Merced River corridor. The potential effect on the character-defining features of historic resources within the Merced River corridor would result in an adverse cumulative impact on historic resources.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>The alteration or removal of historic resources (including Merced Lake High Sierra Camp, Camp Curry Historic District, the Yosemite Valley Historic District, Camp 4, the Ahwahnee Hotel, the Yosemite Valley Bridges Historic District, the Pioneer Yosemite History Center, and the Wawona Hotel and Pavilion Historic District) would potentially result in a long-term, moderate to major, adverse impact on both the individual resources and districts and the cumulative historic fabric of the Merced River corridor. The potential effect on the character-defining features of historic resources within the Merced River corridor would result in an adverse cumulative impact on historic resources.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Demolition, alteration, or relocation of several National Register-eligible or -listed structures and historic districts (Merced Lake High Sierra Camp, Camp Curry Historic District, NR Ahwahnee Hotel, Camp 4, Yosemite Valley Historic District, and the Yosemite Valley Bridges Historic District) would potentially result in a long-term, moderate to major, adverse impact on both the individual cultural resources and districts, and the cumulative historic fabric of the Merced River corridor. The potential effect on the character-defining features of historic resources within the river corridor would result in a long-term, moderate adverse cumulative impact on historic resources.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Demolition, alteration, or relocation of several National Register-eligible or -listed structures and historic districts (Merced Lake High Sierra Camp, Camp Curry Historic District, the Yosemite Valley Historic District, Yosemite Village Historic District, and the Yosemite Valley Bridges Historic District) would potentially result in a long-term, moderate, adverse impact on both the individual cultural resources and districts, and the cumulative historic character of the Merced River corridor. The potential effect on the character-defining features of historic resources within the river corridor would result in a long-term, moderate, local adverse cumulative impacts on historic resources.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u></p> <p>Alteration or relocation of several National Register-eligible or -listed structures or districts (Camp Curry Historic District, the Yosemite Valley Historic District, and the Yosemite Valley Bridges Historic District) would potentially result in a long-term, minor, adverse impact on both the individual cultural resources and the cumulative historic fabric of the Merced River corridor. The potential effect on the character-defining features of historic resources within the river corridor would result in a long-term, moderate adverse cumulative impact on historic resources.</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
17. Archeological Resources					
<p><u>Segment 1</u> Ongoing impacts would be site-specific, negligible to minor, but potentially adverse impacts. Duration and type of impacts vary. For areas where proposed actions do not occur on or near known archeological sites, ongoing effects expected to be negligible to no adverse impact. (NEPA)</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u> Established trails are not known to be near known archeological sites. Corresponding impacts are expected to be negligible or non-existent. In the case of newly discovered archeological sites, found during ground disturbing activities trails may affect a small percentage of a site's surface. Impacts would be correspondingly site-specific, negligible to minor, but potentially adverse impacts. Effects to specific sites are localized, and duration and type of impacts vary, depending on if the site can be avoided. (NEPA)</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u> Proposed reduction of camping and limiting numbers of hikers in Segment and associated removal of infrastructure would potentially result in site-specific, long-term beneficial impacts on known archeological sites Ground disturbing activities associated with removal of infrastructure and restoration of former camping areas may result in site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impacts on known archeological sites, in cases where avoidance is not possible.(NEPA)</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u> Proposed reduction of camping and limiting numbers of hikers in Segment and associated removal of infrastructure would potentially result in site-specific, long-term beneficial impacts on known archeological sites Ground disturbing activities associated with removal of infrastructure and restoration of former camping areas may result in site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impacts on known archeological sites, in cases where avoidance is not possible.(NEPA)</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u> Proposed reduction of camping and limiting numbers of hikers in Segment and associated removal of infrastructure would potentially result in site-specific, long-term beneficial impacts on known archeological sites Ground disturbing activities associated with removal of infrastructure and restoration of former camping areas may result in site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impacts on known archeological sites, in cases where avoidance is not possible.(NEPA)</p>	<p><u>Segment 1</u> Proposed reduction of camping and limiting numbers of hikers in Segment and associated removal of infrastructure would potentially result in site-specific, long-term beneficial impacts on known archeological sites Ground disturbing activities associated with removal of infrastructure and restoration of former camping areas may result in site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impacts on known archeological sites, in cases where avoidance is not possible.(NEPA)</p>
<p><u>Segment 2</u> Under this alternative, impacts would be ongoing, site-specific and local, minor to moderate, and likely adverse impacts (NEPA)</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u> If previously unknown archeological sites are discovered during associated ground disturbing activities, site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impact may result, in cases where avoidance is not possible. Proposed removal of campsites and associated infrastructure would potentially result in localized, long-term beneficial effect on the known archeological sites found within the campgrounds. Ground disturbing activities associated with removal of infrastructure and restoration of former camping areas may result in site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impact. Ground disturbance and rerouting of the Valley Loop Trail would result in a long-term major adverse impact as this trail is itself an historic property. Removing the northern abutment of Sugar Pine Bridge would potentially result in a long-term major adverse impact to the known archeological site. General reduction in focused visitor use at areas on or near known archeological resources would potentially result in site-specific, long-term beneficial impacts. Overall reduced visitor numbers would have a negligible effect on archeological sites. (NEPA)</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u> If previously unknown archeological sites are discovered during associated ground disturbing activities, site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impacts may result, in cases where avoidance is not possible. Proposed reduction of camping and limiting numbers of hikers in Segment and associated removal of infrastructure would potentially result in site-specific, long-term beneficial impacts on known archeological site. Ground disturbing activities associated with removal of infrastructure and restoration of former camping areas may result in site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impacts on known archeological sites, in cases where avoidance is not possible. (NEPA)</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u> If previously unknown archeological sites are discovered during associated ground disturbing activities, site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impacts may result, in cases where avoidance is not possible. Proposed reduction of camping and limiting numbers of hikers in Segment and associated removal of infrastructure would potentially result in site-specific, long-term beneficial impacts on known archeological site. Ground disturbing activities associated with removal of infrastructure and restoration of former camping areas may result in site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impacts on known archeological sites, in cases where avoidance is not possible. (NEPA)</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u> If previously unknown archeological sites are discovered during associated ground disturbing activities, site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impacts may result, in cases where avoidance is not possible. Proposed removal of campsites and associated infrastructure would potentially result in localized, long-term beneficial effect on the known archeological sites found within the campgrounds. Ground disturbing activities associated with removal of infrastructure and restoration of former camping areas may result in site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impacts. Ground disturbance and rerouting of the Valley Loop Trail would result in a long-term major adverse impact, as this trail is itself an historic property. (NEPA)</p>	<p><u>Segment 2</u> If previously unknown archeological sites are discovered during associated ground disturbing activities, site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impacts may result, in cases where avoidance is not possible. Proposed removal of campsites and associated infrastructure would potentially result in localized, long-term beneficial effect on the known archeological sites found within the campgrounds. Ground disturbing activities associated with removal of infrastructure and restoration of former camping areas may result in site-specific, short-term, minor, adverse impacts. Ground disturbance and rerouting of the Valley Loop Trail would result in a long-term major adverse impact, as this trail is itself an historic property. (NEPA)</p>

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 - Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 - Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
17. Archeological Resources (cont.)					
<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> Ongoing impacts would be site-specific, negligible to minor, but potentially adverse impacts. Duration and type of impacts vary. For areas where proposed actions do not occur on or near known archeological sites, ongoing effects expected to be negligible to no adverse impact. (NEPA)	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> Removal of informal trails and infrastructure from their locations within archeological sites would result in a long-term, beneficial effect. Potential site-specific, minor to moderate, adverse impacts from the relocation of housing units and removal of conifers could result from ground-disturbing activities and concentration of uses in areas sensitive for archeological sites.(NEPA)	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> Removal of informal trails, abandoned infrastructure, asphalt, imported fill, and a gravel road from their locations within archeological sites would ultimately result in a long-term, beneficial impact Other ground disturbing activities in or near known archeological sites would be correspondingly site-specific, negligible to minor, but potentially adverse, if the site cannot be avoided. Impacts to specific sites are localized, and duration and type of impacts vary. (NEPA)	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> Removal of informal trails, abandoned infrastructure, asphalt, imported fill, and a gravel road from their locations within archeological sites would ultimately result in a long-term, beneficial impact Other ground disturbing activities in or near known archeological sites would be correspondingly site-specific, negligible to minor, but potentially adverse, if the site cannot be avoided. Impacts to specific sites are localized, and duration and type of impacts vary.(NEPA)	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> Removal of informal trails, abandoned infrastructure, asphalt, imported fill, and a gravel road from their locations within archeological sites would ultimately result in a long-term, beneficial impact Other ground disturbing activities in or near known archeological sites would be correspondingly site-specific, negligible to minor, but potentially adverse, if the site cannot be avoided. Impacts to specific sites are localized, and duration and type of impacts vary. (NEPA)	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> Removal of informal trails, abandoned infrastructure, asphalt, imported fill, and a gravel road from their locations within archeological sites would ultimately result in a long-term, beneficial impact Other ground disturbing activities in or near known archeological sites would be correspondingly site-specific, negligible to minor, but potentially adverse, if the site cannot be avoided. Impacts to specific sites are localized, and duration and type of impacts vary. (NEPA)
<u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u> Impacts would be ongoing, site-specific and local, minor to moderate, and likely adverse impacts, especially within the known archeological areas, including the Wawona Archeological District, as well as several sites that are not contributors to the district. (NEPA)	<u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u> Ground disturbing activities may occur in or near known archeological sites. Impacts would be site-specific, negligible to major, and potentially adverse. Impacts to specific sites are localized, and duration and type of impacts vary, in cases where avoidance is not possible. Actions to remove two stock campsites from near known archeological sites would result in localized long-term, beneficial impacts by stabilizing elements of archeological features. (NEPA)	<u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u> Elimination of stables, relocation of stock campsites, and removal of sites within the Wawona Campground may have a long-term, beneficial impact on archeological sites within and near these areas. During ground disturbing activities, impacts would be site-specific, minor to moderate, and potentially adverse. Impacts to specific sites are localized, and duration and type of impacts vary, in cases where avoidance is not possible.(NEPA)	<u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u> Continued use of golf course will occur in or near known archeological sites; impacts would likely be negligible as golf course fill covers the site. Elimination of stables, relocation of stock campsites, and removal of sites within the Wawona Campground may have a long-term, beneficial impact on archeological sites within and near these areas. During ground disturbing activities, impacts would be site-specific, minor to moderate, and potentially adverse. Impacts to specific sites are localized, and duration and type of impacts vary, in cases where avoidance is not possible.(NEPA)	<u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u> Elimination of stables, relocation of stock campsites, and removal of sites within the Wawona Campground may have a long-term, beneficial impact on archeological sites within and near these areas. During ground disturbing activities, impacts would be site-specific, minor to moderate, and potentially adverse. Impacts to specific sites are localized, and duration and type of impacts vary, in cases where avoidance is not possible.(NEPA)	<u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u> Elimination of stables, relocation of stock campsites, and removal of sites within the Wawona Campground may have a long-term, beneficial impact on archeological sites within and near these areas. During ground disturbing activities, impacts would be site-specific, minor to moderate, and potentially adverse. Impacts to specific sites are localized, and duration and type of impacts vary, in cases where avoidance is not possible.(NEPA)
<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> There are a number of archeological resource sites in the Merced River corridor at, or adjacent to trails, structures, utility systems, and other facilities and are subject to ongoing disturbances such as trampling, surface collection, and ground disturbance associated with facility maintenance. Any present projects that would result in ground disturbance and/or excavation (trail/road improvements, new facility or infrastructure development, restoration) have the potential to result in site-specific, long-term adverse impacts on known or unknown archaeological resources, when avoidance is not possible. (NEPA)	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> Actions to remove facilities near, or reroute visitors from known archeological sites would result in localized long-term, beneficial impacts by stabilizing elements of archeological features. Ground disturbance associated with projects that would result in ground disturbance and/or excavation (trail/road improvements, new facility or infrastructure development, restoration) have the potential to result in site-specific, long-term adverse impacts on known or unknown archaeological resources, when avoidance is not possible. (NEPA)	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> Actions to remove facilities near, or reroute visitors from known archeological sites would result in localized long-term, beneficial impacts by stabilizing elements of archeological features. Ground disturbance associated with projects that would result in ground disturbance and/or excavation (trail/road improvements, new facility or infrastructure development, restoration) have the potential to result in site-specific, long-term adverse impacts on known or unknown archaeological resources, when avoidance is not possible. (NEPA)	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> Actions to remove facilities near, or reroute visitors from known archeological sites would result in localized long-term, beneficial impacts by stabilizing elements of archeological features. Ground disturbance associated with projects that would result in ground disturbance and/or excavation (trail/road improvements, new facility or infrastructure development, restoration) have the potential to result in site-specific, long-term adverse impacts on known or unknown archaeological resources, when avoidance is not possible. (NEPA)	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> Actions to remove facilities near, or reroute visitors from known archeological sites would result in localized long-term, beneficial impacts by stabilizing elements of archeological features. Ground disturbance associated with projects that would result in ground disturbance and/or excavation (trail/road improvements, new facility or infrastructure development, restoration) have the potential to result in site-specific, long-term adverse impacts on known or unknown archaeological resources, when avoidance is not possible. (NEPA)	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> Actions to remove facilities near, or reroute visitors from known archeological sites would result in localized long-term, beneficial impacts by stabilizing elements of archeological features. Ground disturbance associated with projects that would result in ground disturbance and/or excavation (trail/road improvements, new facility or infrastructure development, restoration) have the potential to result in site-specific, long-term adverse impacts on known or unknown archaeological resources, when avoidance is not possible. (NEPA)

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 – Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 – Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
18. American Indian Traditional Cultural Resources					
<u>Segment 1</u> Under this alternative, impacts on traditional cultural resources would be negligible. There would be no planned changes in the treatment of traditional cultural resources. Impacts on these resources would occur as a result of ongoing park operations and programs, such as facilities maintenance and repair, as well as visitor use.	<u>Segment 1</u> These actions may have either a beneficial or adverse impact on traditional cultural resources, particularly areas of traditional plant use. As an example, construction may result in disruption of ethnobotanical species' habitats, and may be an adverse impact, while removal of informal trails may have a beneficial impact on the same plant use area. If avoidance is possible, impacts will be negligible, but if avoidance is not possible, impacts may be moderate to major (NEPA).	<u>Segment 1</u> These actions may have either a beneficial or adverse impact on traditional cultural resources, particularly areas of traditional plant use. As an example, construction may result in disruption of ethnobotanical species' habitats, and may be an adverse impact, while removal of informal trails may have a beneficial impact on the same plant use area. If avoidance is possible, impacts will be negligible, but if avoidance is not possible, impacts may be moderate to major (NEPA).	<u>Segment 1</u> These actions may have either a beneficial or adverse impact on traditional cultural resources, particularly areas of traditional plant use. As an example, construction may result in disruption of ethnobotanical species' habitats, and may be an adverse impact, while removal of informal trails may have a beneficial impact on the same plant use area. If avoidance is possible, impacts will be negligible, but if avoidance is not possible, impacts may be moderate to major (NEPA).	<u>Segment 1</u> No ecosystem restoration would occur in Segment 1 under this alternative, and impacts on traditional cultural resources (both beneficial and adverse) would likely be negligible (NEPA).	<u>Segment 1</u> No ecosystem restoration would occur in Segment 1 under this alternative, and impacts on traditional cultural resources (both beneficial and adverse) would likely be negligible (NEPA).
<u>Segment 2</u> Under this alternative, impacts to traditional cultural resources would be adverse, as restoration of ethnobotanical resources would not occur, but also beneficial, as potential for adverse impacts associated with physical disturbance and access to resources during restoration activities would not occur (NEPA).	<u>Segment 2</u> Site specific restoration actions may have long-term, beneficial impacts on meadows, however construction at Yosemite Lodge, Yosemite Village, and Housekeeping camp may result in long term, adverse impacts to ethnohistoric sites at these locations (NEPA).	<u>Segment 2</u> Site specific restoration actions may have long-term, beneficial impacts on meadows, however construction at Yosemite Lodge and Housekeeping camp may result in long term, adverse impacts to ethnohistoric sites at these locations (NEPA)	<u>Segment 2</u> Site specific restoration actions may have long-term, beneficial impacts on meadows, however construction at Yosemite Lodge and Housekeeping camp may result in long term, adverse impacts to ethnohistoric sites at these locations (NEPA)	<u>Segment 2</u> Site specific restoration actions may have long-term, beneficial impacts on meadows, however construction at Yosemite Lodge and Upper Pines may result in long term, adverse impacts to ethnohistoric sites at these locations (NEPA)	<u>Segment 2</u> Site specific restoration actions may have long-term, beneficial impacts on meadows, however construction at Yosemite Lodge and Housekeeping camp may result in long term, adverse impacts to ethnohistoric sites at these locations (NEPA)
<u>Segment 4</u> Under this alternative, impacts to traditional cultural resources would be adverse, as restoration of ethnobotanical resources would not occur, as well as beneficial, as potential for adverse impacts associated with physical disturbance and access to resources during restoration activities would not occur.	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> Site specific Actions to protect valley oaks would have a long term, beneficial impact on resources, while the construction of employee housing and administrative camping may have a long term, adverse impact (NEPA).	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> Site specific Actions to protect valley oaks would have a long term, beneficial impact on resources, while the construction of employee housing may have a long term, adverse impact (NEPA).	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> Site specific Actions to protect valley oaks would have a long term, beneficial impact on resources, while the construction of employee housing may have a long term, adverse impact (NEPA).	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> Site specific Actions to protect valley oaks would have a long term, beneficial impact on resources, while the construction of employee housing may have a long term, adverse impact (NEPA).	<u>Segment 3 & 4</u> Site specific Actions to protect valley oaks would have a long term, beneficial impact on resources, while the construction of employee housing may have a long term, adverse impact (NEPA).
<u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u> Under Alternative 1 no opportunities for limiting access to sensitive areas would occur in Segment 7.	<u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u> Relocation and construction actions in the Wawona area have the potential to have a long term, adverse impact on traditional cultural resources (NEPA).	<u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u> Relocation and construction actions in the Wawona area have the potential to have a long term, adverse impact on traditional cultural resources (NEPA).	<u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u> Relocation and removal of campgrounds in the Wawona area have the potential to have a long term, adverse impact on traditional cultural resources (NEPA).	<u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u> Relocation and removal of campgrounds in the Wawona area have the potential to have a long term, adverse impact on traditional cultural resources (NEPA).	<u>Segment 5,6,7, & 8</u> Relocation and removal of campgrounds in the Wawona area have the potential to have a long term, adverse impact on traditional cultural resources (NEPA).

Segment 1 – Above Nevada Falls
Segment 2 - Yosemite Valley
Segment 3 – Merced Gorge

Segment 4 – El Portal
Segment 5 – South Fork of Merced Above Wawona
Segment 6 – Wawona Impoundment

Segment 7 - Wawona
Segment 8 – South Fork Merced River

TABLE 9-259: MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER PLAN ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY COMPARISON TABLE (CONTINUED)

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Self-Reliant Visitor Experiences and Extensive Floodplain Restoration	Alternative 3 Dispersed Visitor Experiences and Extensive Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 4 Resource-Based Visitor Experiences and Targeted Riverbank Restoration	Alternative 5 Enhanced Visitor Experience and Essential River Bank Restoration	Alternative 6 Diversified Visitor Experiences and Selective Riverbank Restoration
18. American Indian Traditional Cultural Resources					
<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u> Cumulative impacts would be negligible.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u> The proposed management actions associated with Alternatives 2 may have reduced or negligible impacts following consultation, or beneficial impacts resulting from enhanced communities of traditionally used plants, restrictions on some kinds and amounts of visitor use, or protection or enhancement of site settings.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u> The proposed management actions associated with Alternatives 3 may have reduced or negligible impacts following consultation, or beneficial impacts resulting from enhanced communities of traditionally used plants, restrictions on some kinds and amounts of visitor use, or protection or enhancement of site settings.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u> The proposed management actions associated with Alternatives 4 may have reduced or negligible impacts following consultation, or beneficial impacts resulting from enhanced communities of traditionally used plants, restrictions on some kinds and amounts of visitor use, or protection or enhancement of site settings.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u> The proposed management actions associated with Alternatives 5 may have reduced or negligible impacts following consultation, or beneficial impacts resulting from enhanced communities of traditionally used plants, restrictions on some kinds and amounts of visitor use, or protection or enhancement of site settings.</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Impacts</u> The proposed management actions associated with Alternatives 6 may have reduced or negligible impacts following consultation, or beneficial impacts resulting from enhanced communities of traditionally used plants, restrictions on some kinds and amounts of visitor use, or protection or enhancement of site settings.</p>