

Table 3D-6. Summary Comparison of Aquatic Resource Effects of the Alternatives: Mono Lake Tributary Streams

Alternative or Condition	Meets Pre-1941 Habitat Condition Standards Set by Court	Rush Creek		Significant Impacts from High Flows	Lee Vining Creek		Significant Impacts from High Flows	Modified Tennant Descriptor		Net Effect on Parker and Walker Creeks
		% Change in Brown Trout Adult Habitat	% Change in Brown Trout Spawning Habitat		% Change in Brown Trout Adult Habitat	% Change in Brown Trout Spawning Habitat		Parker Creek	Walker Creek	
Point of reference	No	0	0	N/A	0	0	No	Severe	Severe	N/A
No restriction	No	-75*	-79*	No	-55*	-57*	No	Severe	Severe	None
6,372 Ft	No	+16	+69	No	+91	+209	No	Good	Good	Substantial benefits
6,377 Ft	No	+17	+73	Yes	+93	+218	Yes	Good	Fair-good	Substantial benefits
6,383.5 Ft	No	+18	+75	Yes	+96	+220	Yes	Good	Fair-good	Substantial benefits
6,390 Ft	No	+19	+78	Yes	+98	+228	Yes	Good	Fair-good	Substantial benefits
6,410 Ft	No	+20	+105	Yes	+108	+288	Yes	Good	Fair-good	Substantial benefits
No diversion	No	+20	+107	Yes	+109	+317	Yes	Good	Good-excellent	Substantial benefits
Prediversion		Unknown	Unknown	N/A	Unknown	Unknown	No	Good	Good	N/A

Notes: All effects are summarized without mitigation measures.

Significant cumulative fisheries impacts (✓) for Rush, Lee Vining, Parker, and Walker Creeks apply to all alternatives. They include permanently altered channel morphology, constraints on fish passage and spawning gravel movement due to the presence of diversion facilities, and resulting decreases in the prediversion fish populations. These cumulative impacts are partially mitigable through restoration.

* = significant adverse project impact.

N/A = not applicable.