

**1. World Heritage Property Data**

**1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property**

Yosemite National Park

**1.2 - World Heritage Property Details**

**State(s) Party(ies)**

- United States of America

**Type of Property**

natural

**Identification Number**

308


**Year of inscription on the World Heritage List**

1984

**1.3 - Geographic Information Table**

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Yosemite National Park	37.746 / -119.597	308283	0	308283	1984
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>308283</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>308283</b>	

**1.4 - Map(s)**

Title	Date	Link to source
Yosemite National Park	01/03/2006	

**1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property**

- Jonathan Putnam  
US National Park Service Office of International Affairs  
World Heritage Program Officer

**1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency**

- Don Neubacher  
Yosemite National Park  
Superintendent

**1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)**

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
2. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](#)
3. [Yosemite National Park \(U.S. World Heritage\)](#)
4. [Yosemite National Park \(U.S. National Park Service\)](#)
5. [World Heritage in the United States](#)

**Comment**

Please delete links 1, 2 and 3 above

**1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)**

**Comment**

Most of Yosemite is federally designated wilderness.

**2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value**

**2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**

**Statement of Significance**

Yosemite National Park vividly illustrates the effects of glacial erosion of granitic bedrock, creating geologic features that are unique in the world. Repeated glaciations over millions of years have resulted in a concentration of distinctive landscape features, including soaring cliffs, domes, and free-falling waterfalls. There is exceptional glaciated topography, including the spectacular Yosemite Valley, a 914-meter (1/2 mile) deep, glacier-carved cleft with massive sheer granite walls. These geologic features provide a scenic backdrop for mountain meadows and giant sequoia groves, resulting in a diverse landscape of exceptional natural and scenic beauty.

**Criteria**  
(vii) Yosemite has exceptional natural beauty, including 5 of the world's highest waterfalls, a combination of granite domes and walls, deeply incised valleys, three groves of giant sequoia, numerous alpine meadows, lakes, diversity of life zones and variety of species.  
(viii) Glacial action combined with the granitic bedrock has produced unique and pronounced landform features including distinctive polished dome structures, as well as hanging valleys, tarns, moraines and U-shaped valleys. Granitic landforms such as Half Dome and the vertical walls of El Capitan are classic distinctive reflections of geologic history. No other area portrays the effects of glaciation on underlying granitic domes as well as Yosemite does.

**2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed**

(vii)(viii)

**2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion**

**2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised**

**2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value**

**3. Factors Affecting the Property**

**3.14. Other factor(s)**

**3.14.1 - Other factor(s)**

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact						Origin	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>								
3.1.1	Housing		⊖	🚩			🌱		
3.1.2	Commercial development		⊖	🚩	🚩		🌱		
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure		⊖	🚩	🚩		🌱		
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities	⊕		🚩			🌱	🔄	
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>								
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure		⊖	🚩	🚩		🌱	🔄	
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure		⊖	🚩			🌱	🔄	
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>								
3.3.1	Water infrastructure	⊕	⊖	🚩			🌱		
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities	⊕		🚩			🌱		
3.3.4	Localised utilities	⊕	⊖	🚩	🚩		🌱		
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>								
3.4.2	Ground water pollution		⊖	🚩			🌱		
3.4.3	Surface water pollution		⊖	🚩	🚩		🌱		
3.4.4	Air pollution		⊖	🚩	🚩			🔄	
3.4.5	Solid waste		⊖	🚩	🚩		🌱		
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>								
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)		⊖		🚩		🌱		
3.7.7	Pests		⊖	🚩	🚩		🌱		
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>								
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses	⊕		🚩				🔄	
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	⊕		🚩			🌱		
3.8.3	Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting	⊕		🚩			🌱		
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system		⊖	🚩	🚩			🔄	
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	⊕	⊖	🚩	🚩			🔄	
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	⊕	⊖	🚩	🚩		🌱	🔄	
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Other human activities</b>								
3.9.1	Illegal activities		⊖	🚩			🌱	🔄	
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage		⊖	🚩			🌱	🔄	
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>								
3.10.1	Storms		⊖		🚩		🌱	🔄	
3.10.2	Flooding	⊕	⊖	🚩	🚩		🌱		
3.10.3	Drought		⊖	🚩	🚩		🌱	🔄	
3.10.4	Desertification		⊖		🚩		🌱	🔄	
3.10.5	Changes to oceanic waters		⊖		🚩			🔄	
3.10.6	Temperature change		⊖	🚩	🚩			🔄	
3.10.7	Other climate change impacts		⊖	🚩	🚩			🔄	
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>								
3.11.1	Volcanic eruption		⊖		🚩			🔄	
3.11.2	Earthquake		⊖		🚩		🌱	🔄	
3.11.4	Avalanche/ landslide		⊖	🚩	🚩		🌱		
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition		⊖	🚩	🚩		🌱		

	Name	Impact	Origin
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)		
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>		
3.12.1	Translocated species		
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species		
3.12.3	Invasive / alien freshwater species		
3.12.5	Hyper-abundant species		
3.12.6	Modified genetic material		
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>		
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities		
3.13.2	High impact research / monitoring activities		
3.13.3	Management activities		
<b>Legend</b>	Current	Potential	Negative
	Positive	Inside	Outside

### 3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

#### 3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>					
3.1.1	Housing	localised	on-going	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
3.1.2	Commercial development	localised	on-going	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	localised	on-going	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	localised	frequent	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	localised	on-going	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>					
3.3.1	Water infrastructure	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	static
3.3.4	Localised utilities	localised	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>					
3.4.2	Ground water pollution	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
3.4.3	Surface water pollution	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.4.4	Air pollution	extensive	on-going	significant	high capacity	static
3.4.5	Solid waste	restricted	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	decreasing
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>					
3.7.7	Pests	localised	frequent	significant	medium capacity	static
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>					
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	localised	frequent	minor	medium capacity	static
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	extensive	on-going	significant	medium capacity	static
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Other human activities</b>					
3.9.1	Illegal activities	restricted	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	static
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>					
3.10.2	Flooding	localised	one off or rare	significant	medium capacity	static
3.10.3	Drought	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	static
3.10.6	Temperature change	extensive	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.10.7	Other climate change impacts	extensive	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	static
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>					
3.11.4	Avalanche/ landslide	restricted	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	static
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					

		Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.12.1	Translocated species	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	static
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	localised	frequent	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.12.3	Invasive / alien freshwater species	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.12.5	Hyper-abundant species	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.13	Management and institutional factors					
3.13.3	Management activities	localised	frequent	minor	medium capacity	static

### 3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

### 4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

#### 4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

##### 4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is no buffer zone, and it is not needed

##### 4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property **do not limit** the ability to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value but they could be improved

##### 4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The property had **no buffer zone at the time of its inscription** on the World Heritage List

##### 4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

##### 4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The property had **no buffer zone** at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

##### 4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

#### 4.2. Protective Measures

##### 4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional)

Juridical data :

Publicly owned land administered by the USNPS under the Department of the Interior. The Legislative summary includes 16 Acts, Proclamations and Resolutions made on the Park. Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Grove of giant sequoias have the distinction of being the first scenic natural area to have been set aside for public benefit and enjoyment (1864). Formal national park status was given in 1890.

Responsible Administration  
National Park Service, U.S Department of the Interior,  
Superintendent

By an Act of Congress, June 30, 1864 (13 Stat. 325) Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Big Tree Grove were granted to the

State of California to be held as places for public use and recreation. On October 1, 1890 (26 Stat. 650) the United States Congress established Yosemite National Park as a "Forest Reservation" to preserve and protect from injury all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities or wonders within the park area, and to retain them in their natural condition. The 1890 Act specifically excluded Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Big Tree Grove from Yosemite National Park, leaving them under the jurisdiction of the State of California as provided for the Act of 1864. March 3, 1905, the California Legislature regranted to the United States both Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Big Tree Grove "to be held for all time... for public use, resort, and recreation." A Joint Resolution of Congress, June 11, 1906 (34 stat. 831) accepted both sites.

The Raker Act, passed by Congress December 19, 1913, (38 Stat. 242) granted certain lands and accesses within Yosemite to the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of creation a municipal water supply and power and electric plants in the Hetch Hetchy Valley and Lake Eleanor Basin. The Act specified restrictions in use and activities within one mile leading to and including the reservoirs.

An Act of Congress, June 2, 1920, (41 Statutes of Large 731) accepted cession by California of exclusive legislative jurisdiction over lands embraced within Yosemite National Park. The Federal Government currently has the responsibility of preserving and protecting the cultural and natural resources within the exterior boundaries of Yosemite National Park.

Private park "inholdings" total up to 381 tracts comprising 727.75 hectares (1,798.25 ac). These private lands are in three separate locations near the Park's western boundary. The Federal Government is authorized to acquire privately owned land within the exterior boundaries of the park. The inholdings are under State, County, and Federal jurisdiction depending on the nature of a particular legal situation.

Since 1920, the Federal Government has had exclusive legislative jurisdiction over Yosemite National Park; however, the State of California has reserved the right to serve civil or criminal process, to tax persons and corporations, and to fix and collect fees for fishing within the Park. Four concessioners are authorized to provide visitor support services within the Park.

Yosemite National Park is legally established as a conservation unit per Act of Congress. Its natural resources are thus assured of perpetual protection and preservation by Federal Statute.

The Act of establishing the National Park Service, dated August 25, 1916, the Act establishing Yosemite National Park, dated October 1, 1890; and the Act of the California State Legislature, dated March 3, 1905 regranted Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Big Tree Grove back to the Federal Government; and numerous other laws and proclamations indicate the importance that both past and present leaders have given to the protection of outstanding natural features of the United States, and more specifically, the Yosemite National Park.

In association with these laws and proclamations, and with Congressional approval, the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, has established policies that further direct the management of the 333 areas of the National Park System, of which Yosemite National Park is one. The last revision of these policies occurred in 1978. The document is not a static one and additional amendments will be made when determined necessary.

Additionally, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the public is afforded the opportunity to provide input into major park management programs. Respective plans and related reports consequently reflect sound public proposals. These plans are updated as necessary and are basic documents used to manage the park. Yosemite's comprehensive General Management Plan, designed to assure the preservation and protection of the resources, was completed September, 1980.

**Comment**

The last revision of these policies occurred in 2006 (not 1978).

**4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?**

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

**4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?**

The property had **no buffer zone at the time of inscription** on the World Heritage List

**4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?**

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

**4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?**

There is **acceptable** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

**4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures**

**4.3. Management System / Management Plan**

**4.3.1 - Management System**

Three major plans affect the management of Yosemite National Park:

The 1980 General Management Plan (GMP)

[<http://www.nps.gov/yose/planning/gmp/intro97.html>]

The 2000 Merced River Wild and Scenic Comprehensive Plan (MRP)

[<http://www.nps.gov/yose/planning/mrp/>]

The Yosemite Valley Plan (YVP)

[<http://www.nps.gov/yose/planning/yvp/>].

The Merced River Plan amends the General Management Plan; both provide guidance to the Yosemite Valley Plan--an implementation plan. The 2000 Merced River Plan provides broad management direction for managing visitor use, land and facility development, and resource protection within the Merced River corridor. The Merced River Plan amends the 1980 General Management Plan and guides decisionmaking processes for actions within and adjacent to the Merced River Corridor. This corridor, affects most actions in the Yosemite Valley Plan. The Yosemite Valley Plan, is therefore an implementation plan of the General Management Plan as amended by the Merced River Plan. The plan proposes to provide opportunities for high-quality, in-situ-based visitor

experiences; restore, protect, and enhance the resources of Yosemite Valley; reduce traffic congestion; and provide effective park operations, including employee housing, to meet the mission of the NPS. The Yosemite Valley Plan was approved in December 2000 and provides a long-term, comprehensive visitor management and redevelopment strategy that fulfills the five main goals of the General Management Plan. After the 1997 flood in Yosemite, Congress appropriated monies for flood recovery efforts. Congress subsequently directed that these funds be expended to implement the General Management Plan and the Yosemite Valley Plan. Litigation challenging the Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan delayed implementation of many Yosemite Valley Plan actions.

**Comment**

PLEASE REPLACE with this: Yosemite is currently in the process of updating the Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan due to court order. Therefore the revised Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan plan as well as the Tuolumne River Wild and Scenic River Management Plan will amend the 1980 General Management Plan and will be the primary plans for the four developed areas of the park. Both plans will protect and enhance river values while managing use

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

**Comment**

Other management plans of note include: Mariposa Grove Restoration Plan (in development) Wilderness Stewardship Plan (planning to be initiated in 2013) Half Dome Trail Stewardship Plan (completed) Scenic Vista Management Plan (completed) Invasive Plants Management Plan (completed) More information on other plans can be found at: <http://www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/planning>.

**4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?**

There is **excellent coordination** between all bodies / levels involved in the management of the property

**4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?**

The management system / plan is **fully adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

**4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?**

The management system is being **fully** implemented and monitored

**4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?**

An annual work / action plan exists and **most or all activities** are being implemented and monitored

**4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following**

Local communities / residents	Good
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Fair

Landowners	Good
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Not applicable

**4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?**

Local communities **directly contribute** to some decisions relating to management

**4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?**

Indigenous peoples directly contribute to **some decisions** relating to management but their involvement could be improved

**4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?**

There is **regular contact** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone and **substantial co-operation** on management

**4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training**

**4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report**

**4.4. Financial and Human Resources**

**4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)**

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	49%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	7%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	5%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	18%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	17%
Other grants	4%

**4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)**

**4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?**

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

**4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?**

The existing sources of funding **are secure** in the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

**4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?**

There is a **major flow** of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the World Heritage property

**4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?**

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

**4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained?**

There is **basic** maintenance of equipment and facilities

**4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure**

**4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)**

Full-time	59%
Part-time	41%

**4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)**

Permanent	59%
Seasonal	41%

**4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)**

Paid	89%
Volunteer	11%

**4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?**

A range of human resources exist, but these are **below optimum** to manage the World Heritage Property.

**4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines**

Research and monitoring	Fair
Promotion	Good
Community outreach	Good
Interpretation	Good
Education	Good

Visitor management	Good
Conservation	Good
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Good
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

**4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines**

Research and monitoring	Medium
Promotion	Medium
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	Medium
Education	Medium
Visitor management	Medium
Conservation	Medium
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Medium
Tourism	Medium
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Medium

**4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?**

A capacity development plan or programme is **in place and fully implemented**; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, who are assuming leadership in management

**4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training**

Yosemite currently has many lapsed positions that remain unfilled due to budget constraints.

**4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects**

**4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?**

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

**4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?**

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme of research**, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

**4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?**

Research results are **shared widely** with the local, national and international audiences

**4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report**

Numerous studies related to the Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management plans. Links: [http://www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/mrp\\_research.htm](http://www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/mrp_research.htm), [http://www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/trp\\_science.htm](http://www.nps.gov/yose/parkmgmt/trp_science.htm) The George Wright Forum \_ Integrating Transportation with Visitor Capacity Research and Planning at Yosemite National Park (Volume 29, No. 3, 2012)

**4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects**

**4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building**

**4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?**

In **one location** and easily visible to visitors

**4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups**

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Average
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Average
Local businesses and industries	Average

**4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?**

There is a **planned and effective** education and awareness programme that contributes to the protection of the World Heritage property

**4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?**

World Heritage status has **partially influenced** education, information and awareness building activities

**4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?**

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

**4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property**

Visitor centre	Adequate
Site museum	Adequate
Information booths	Adequate
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Adequate



Other	Adequate
-------	----------

**4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building**

**4.7. Visitor Management**

**4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years**

Last year	Static
Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Minor Increase

**4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?**

Entry tickets and registries
Accommodation establishments
Transportation services
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?**

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is managed but **improvements could be made**

**4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?**

There is **excellent co-operation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

**4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?**

The fee is collected and makes a **substantial contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

**4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property**

The Merced and Tuolumne Wild and Scenic Rivers will address improvements needed for visitor use and experience.

**4.8. Monitoring**

**4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?**

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme** of monitoring, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

**4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?**

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient and key indicators have been defined but **monitoring the status of indicators could be improved**

**4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups**

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Not applicable
Local communities	Not applicable
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Average
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Average

**4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?**

Implementation is **underway**

**4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee**

**4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring**

Yosemite has excellent indicators and standards established through the Wild and Scenic Plans, but budget constraints may not allow for full implementation.

**4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs**

**4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)**

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>						
3.3.1	<b>Water infrastructure</b>	vii, viii (due to flooding from dam of glacial valley)	work with partners to ensure minimized impacts downstream of dam. Partners support reduction of impacts due to recreation upstream of reservoir	on going	ongoing	NPS and San Francisco Public Utilities Commission	n/a
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>						
3.4.4	<b>Air pollution</b>	vii	work with EPA, state and counties to mitigate impacts from air pollution	ozone, particulates, nitrogen, acid rain, mercury	on going	NPS, California Air Resources Board, multiple county air advisory boards	n/a
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>						
3.7.7	<b>Pests</b>	vii	implement integrated pest management techniques focused on vector borne disease pests	regular	on going	NPS, California Department of Public Health, Centers for Disease Control	n/a
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>						
3.8.6	<b>Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation</b>	vii	manage traffic congestion to protect visitor experience, mitigate visitor impacts to biological resources through fencing, erosion control,	Use indicators and standards to assess trends in conditions,	ongoing	nps	n/a
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>						
3.10.6	<b>Temperature change</b>	vii	monitor changes in weather patterns	weather stations throughout the park, fuel moisture monitoring	on going	NPS	n/a
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>						
3.12.2	<b>Invasive/alien terrestrial species</b>	vii	treat invasive plants through full suite of IPM techniques	monitor effectiveness of treatments through photos and plots	on going	NPS	n/a

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

<b>4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones</b>							
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.1.2	<b>Boundaries could be improved</b>	Working on additional lands in the process of being donated.	unknown	NPS	n/a		

**5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property**

**5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity**

Not applicable (for sites inscribed exclusively under criteria vii to x)

**5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity**

The integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

**5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value**

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **impacted** by factors described in this report, but this situation is being **addressed through effective management actions**.

**5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values**

Other important cultural and / or natural values and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

**5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property**

**5.4.1 - Comments**

**6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise**

**6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas**

Conservation	Positive
Research and monitoring	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	Positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

**6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status**

**6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report**

Governmental institution responsible for the property
---

**6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?**

yes

**6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire**

None to provide

**6.6 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire from the following entities**

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Fair

**6.7 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?**

Most of the required information was accessible

**6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following**

The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value

**6.9 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities**

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Unsatisfactory

**6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee**

Automatically generated in online version

**6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise**

no comments