CHAPTER 2

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE ALTERNATIVES, INCLUDING THE BLM PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION

The goal in formulating alternatives for a resource management plan environmental impact statement (RMP EIS) is to identify combinations of management practices for and uses of the public lands and resources that would resolve the planning issues. Each alternative is to represent a complete and reasonable interdisciplinary (or multiple use) land use plan to guide future management of the public lands and resources in the planning area. One alternative represents the continuation of existing management direction (no action alternative). The other alternatives provide a range of choices for solving problems associated with present management. Problems with present management are identified through scoping and issue identification for the planning process, and through impacts analysis.

Analysis of impacts that would be associated with the alternatives is required by BLM planning regulations and the NEPA-based Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations. Comparison of the differences among the alternatives is also required. Based upon this comparative analysis, BLM managers are able to choose a preferred alternative. The preferred alternative selected may be one of the initial alternatives considered, it may be made up from portions of two or more of those alternatives, or it may be a completely different alternative.

This chapter presents six resource management plan alternatives, including BLM's preferred alternative for managing the public lands and resources in the Snake River planning area. Alternative A, the Continuation of Existing Management Direction or "No Action" Alternative, would continue current management practices based on compliance with federal laws, regulations, and BLM policy, as well as adherence to court decisions granting recreational access and addressing livestock grazing within the Snake River corridor. Alternative A would provide for the parcels to remain in public ownership for public purposes; the parcels could be retained by the BLM, or parcels could be transferred to other public agencies or entities for management as public open space, recreation facilities, or parks. Alternative A would allow recreational activity to continue, with no management or fee program for recreation. Generally, mineral development would be prohibited, although mining for mineral materials, such as sand and gravel, would be allowed case by case.

Compared to Alternative A, Alternative B would reduce the level of land use restrictions while providing for higher levels of mineral development and recreational use. Recreation would be emphasized through the development of primitive, boat-in campsites, the construction of a new boat and river access site, and the posting of interpretive and directional signs. Under Alternative B, BLM would retain most of the parcels, although some lands could be removed from public ownership and use via exchange, transfer or sale to meet other objectives or to consolidate lands.

Alternative C would be similar to Alternative A in its level of land use restrictions but would further constrain access by motorized vehicles. The protection of wildlife habitat and a more isolated recreational experience would be pursued through a reduced level of river floating. As in Alternative B, public education would be highlighted through the use of interpretive signs. Generally, Alternative C would provide for the retention and possible consolidation of public lands. In cases where lands might be removed from public ownership and use, they would be protected from development through the use of conservation easements. Alternative C would close all federal mineral estate in the planning area to mineral extraction.

Alternative D provides for disposal of all the public land parcels as a primary goal. The parcels would be disposed of within 15 years. The BLM would retain all mineral rights; minerals management would be similar to the Preferred Alternative. While some parcels could be transferred to local government or other entities for use as public parks or conservation areas, there is a probability that all the parcels could end up in private ownership. Under this alternative, no intensive management would be invested in the parcels prior to their disposal. The plan would not restrict or limit the disposal of the lands, unless required by law. Entities or individuals acquiring the parcels would be free to close, develop, sell, or otherwise manage them.

Alternative E would provide limited options for disposal or exchange of the public land parcels, similar to Alternatives B and C; most of the parcels would be retained in BLM ownership. Recreation would be managed through a fee permit system for commercial outfitters. Mineral extraction would be limited in favor of protecting wildlife habitats, watersheds, and the quality of the recreational experience. Livestock grazing would be maintained in areas where it is currently occurring, with elimination of fall grazing and the provision that grazing leases would be forfeited if the leaseholder's adjacent private lands were converted to a use other than grazing.

The BLM preferred alternative provides for transfer of the parcels to another public land-managing agency, or to private non-profit land preservation entities. The goal would be to transfer the lands within 15 years. BLM would retain all mineral rights, and minerals management would be similar to Alternative E. There would be no intensive management of recreation use by the BLM in the interim prior to parcel disposal. Another option is that the actual land surface could be retained by BLM, if partners could be found to take over management of public uses of the parcels. For impact analysis it is assumed that the entities acquiring these parcels or taking over management responsibility would be obligated under the terms of the transaction to apply management prescriptions to retain the lands, and maintain them for public access, recreation use, open space, and wildlife habitat. This alternative assumes that agencies or public entities could be found to accept ownership or management of all the parcels.

ALTERNATIVES AND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS

The following alternatives and management options were considered as possible methods of resolving the planning issues and answering the planning questions, but were eliminated from detailed study because they were unreasonable or impractical due to technical, legal, or policy factors.

Disposal of Federal Mineral Estate

Disposal of the Federal mineral estate was considered as a logical management option as a facet of Alternative D. Regulations at 43 CFR 2720.0-2 provide a mechanism where mineral interests owned by the United States may be conveyed to an existing or future surface owner, in order to consolidate the surface and subsurface estates.

Disposal of the Federal mineral estate was eliminated from detailed analysis because these regulations only allow for such a disposal under two circumstances:

1. where there are no known mineral values underlying the private land, or

2. where the reservation of minerals underlying the private land interferes with or precludes appropriate non-mineral development of the private land, and such development is a more beneficial use of the land than the mineral development.

The first provision does not apply because most or all of the Federal mineral estate has at least some known potential for gravel or other saleable minerals.

In order to qualify under the 2nd provision, an applicant must show what the development is or will be. Leaving the land in an undisturbed or scenic state does not meet the criteria for development. If the applicant can meet the development test, and further processing is warranted, an exploratory program may need to be conducted to determine the extent and value of the mineral deposits in the land.

The surface owner must bear the cost of determining whether mineral values exist on the property as well as the cost of an appraisal on the value of the mineral estate. This cost must be paid up front with no guarantee that the surface owner will eventually gain title to the mineral estate. Prior to gaining title, the surface owner must also pay the government fair market value for this mineral estate. This program has had very minimal success in Wyoming since its inception.

Firewood Harvest

Allowing firewood harvest was eliminated from detailed analysis because of the small size of the parcels, lack of road access, the age of many of the trees, and the need for standing dead trees as roosting, nesting, and foraging sites for avian species, particularly raptors. No public interest in harvesting firewood on the parcels has been expressed.

Use of Prescribed Fire

Use of prescribed fire was eliminated from detailed analysis because of the scattered nature and small size of the parcels, and the age of most of the cottonwood stands. Due to the decreased probability of postfire sprouting by older mature trees, prescribed fires in narrowleaf cottonwood stands are not recommended past the pole and early maturation stages. In addition, spotted knapweed (*Centaurea maculosa*), a noxious species present on most or all of the public land parcels, will increase following fire (USDA 2002). Control of prescribed fires would be difficult due to the lack of natural firebreaks; fire control activities could cause erosion and siltation of the Snake River. Most of the BLM parcels are also very near private homes, barns, and meadows, making fire control extremely important; the expanded control measures required in these situations would be cost-prohibitive. While prescribed fire was used along the river by native

cultures, its use would be inappropriate today given the population, recreation use, and property values in the planning area. If vegetation treatment is needed in the future, mechanical or biological means would be used.

Desert Land Entry

The Desert Land Entry statute (43 CFR 2520.0-1) was enacted "to encourage and promote the reclamation, by irrigation, of the arid and semiarid public lands of the Western states through individual effort and private capital, it being assumed that settlement and occupation will naturally follow when the lands have been thus rendered more productive and habitable." Allowing Desert Land Entry was eliminated from detailed analysis for this RMP because the Snake River public land parcels are not suitable as defined by the criteria set forth in 43 CFR 2520.

Use of Lethal Animal Control Measures

Use of lethal animal control measures (including M-44's) was eliminated from detailed analysis because of the proximity of private homes and the level of public recreation on the parcels. Using traps or poison devices to control predators or other animal species carries too many risks in this environment. No requests to use these devices to control animals have been received.

Establishment of Wilderness Study Areas

Section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act requires the BLM to inventory public lands for wilderness qualities and recommend to the President those lands suitable for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System (NWPS). BLM handbook H-6310-1 Wilderness Inventory and Study Procedures provides the BLM policy, direction, general procedures, and guidance for making wilderness considerations as part of management plan development.

The federal lands within this planning unit were not found to possess the qualities of wilderness as described in the Wilderness Act of 1964. The lands considered here are of insufficient size to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition. Additionally, within the planning unit there are no adjacent, contiguous federal lands managed within the NWPS.

Maximum, Unconstrained Alternatives

Alternatives and general management options that proposed maximum development, production, or protection of one resource at the expense of other resources were not analyzed in detail. The purpose of the approved RMP is to provide multiple use management direction for the planning area. Generally, promoting a single land and resource use by eliminating all others does not meet the objectives of the BLM multiple use management mandate and responsibilities. However, the alternatives analyzed in detail do include various considerations for eliminating or maximizing individual resource values or uses in specific areas where conflicts exist.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IN DETAIL

Introduction/Overview

The six alternatives addressed in the Draft RMP EIS are detailed in Table 2-1. A complete resource management alternative can be read in each column of the table, from top to bottom. Resources and resource uses are listed in alphabetical order. For each resource, management objectives are listed first, followed by management actions that would be taken or allowed to meet these objectives. Actions that would be the same under all alternatives are listed at the beginning of the table; actions that would differ between the alternatives are listed beginning on page 17. The alternatives may be compared in this table format. Expected environmental consequences of the alternatives are detailed and compared in Table 4-2 in Chapter 4.

It should be noted that for many resources, actions are listed in the Preferred Alternative that would only apply for as long as BLM owns and is actively managing the lands, in the interim period before they are transferred to other public entities or management of resources and programs is transferred. An acquiring agency or entity would have more freedom in managing the lands and resources, as long as the basic requirements of public access, open space, and wildlife habitat are met.

The Standards for Healthy Rangelands (Appendix 1) would apply to all land uses, so long as the parcels are retained by BLM.

TABLE 2-1 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES	
Land Use or Resource	
ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES	
AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE:** Maintain or enhance air quality, protect public health and safety and sensitive resources, and minimize emissions that cause acid rain or degraded visibility.
	MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: Authorized actions on public lands would avoid violation of Wyoming and national air quality standards. This would be accomplished through the coordination of activities with the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
	Cooperation with EPA on monitoring concentrations and dry deposition at the 3 CASTNet stations in Wyoming would continue.
	Air quality standards and guidelines would be developed as needed in coordination with the Wyoming DEQ and the EPA.
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HISTORY RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** Site-specific inventories for cultural resources would be required before the start of surface-disturbing activities, or if BLM-administered lands are proposed to be transferred out of federal ownership. Adverse effects on significant cultural resources would be mitigated, or the resources themselves would be avoided.
	Sites listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places would be managed for their local and national significance and in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, the American Indians Religious Freedom Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, as appropriate.
	Consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office would be consistent with the National Cultural Programmatic Agreement (1994) and the State Protocol Agreement between the Wyoming BLM State Director and the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Officer (1998).
	If sites considered sacred, sensitive, or respected by Native Americans, or if traditional cultural properties (TCP) are identified, they would be managed in consultation with affected Native American representatives.
FIRE MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE:** Protect life, property, and resource values from wildfire.
	MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: Fire suppression would be coordinated through a protection agreement with the Bridger-Teton National Forest and an annual operating plan with Teton County.
	Firefighting would emphasize minimum-impact suppression techniques unless public safety would be jeopardized. For example, the construction of fire lines would be avoided if natural fire breaks can be used.
	The use of aerial fire suppression agents, surfactants, and foaming agents is approved for emergency fire suppression activities.
	Fuels management and Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation activities could take place.
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTES MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE:** Protect public health and safety and the environment on public lands, emphasize waste reduction for authorized actions, comply with applicable federal and state laws, prevent waste contamination from any authorized actions, minimize federal exposure to the liabilities associated with waste management on public lands, and integrate hazardous materials and waste management policies and controls into all management programs.

TABLE 2-1 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES	
Land Use or Resource	
ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES	
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTES MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** For authorized activities that involve hazardous materials or their use, precautions would be taken to guard against releases into the environment. In the event of a release of hazardous materials on the public land, appropriate warnings would be provided to potentially affected communities and individuals, and precautions would be taken against public exposure to contaminated areas.
	Sale, exchange, or other transfer of public lands on which storage or disposal of hazardous substances has been known to occur would require public notification of the type and quantity of the substances.
	Public lands contaminated with hazardous wastes would be reported, secured, and cleaned up according to federal and state laws, regulations, and contingency plans, including the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act. Parties responsible for contamination would be liable for cleanup and resource damage costs, as prescribed by law.
	Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities associated with all types of hazardous materials and waste management on public land parcels would be subject to appropriate mitigation developed through use of the mitigation guidelines described in Appendix 2.
LANDS AND REALTY MANAGEMENT	Parcel 27 would be transferred to Teton County.
Landownership Adjustments	Public lands within the Snake River corridor would be identified as unsuitable for agricultural development and would be closed to desert land entry and agricultural lease.
Rights-of-Way	New, amended, or renewed surface-disturbing and disruptive activities associated with all types of right-of-way maintenance and/or development would be subject to appropriate mitigation developed through use of the mitigation guidelines described in Appendix 2.
	The location of communication sites on public lands would be prohibited.
Withdrawals	Approximately 2,890 acres of public lands and mineral estate described in PLO 7143 (June 1, 1995) would remain closed to mineral or surface entry until June 1, 2005. (As described in the PLO, "mineral or surface entry" pertains to activities such as the staking and development of mining claims for locatable minerals and desert land entry, but does not apply to the sale, exchange, or transfer of public lands, or mineral leasing, or the extraction of sand and gravel through sales and permits). (Map 10)
	Areas with rare or sensitive resources may be proposed for withdrawal from mineral and/or surface entry on a case-by-case basis.
LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities associated with all types of range project construction and maintenance on public land parcels would be subject to appropriate mitigation developed through use of the mitigation guidelines described in Appendix 2.
MINERALS MANAGEMENT ***Geothermal***	**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** Public lands and federal mineral estate throughout the planning area would be closed to geothermal leasing consideration.
Oil and Gas	Public lands and federal mineral estate in the Snake and Gros Ventre River corridors (within ½ mile of either River) (comprising about 3535 acres) would be closed to leasing consideration for oil and gas. (Map 11)

TABLE 2-1 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES	
Land Use or Resource	
ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES	
Locatable Minerals	The public lands and mineral estate described in Public Land Order (PLO) 7143 (June 1, 1995; see Appendix 7) would remain closed to mineral entry and the staking and development of mining claims until June 1, 2005. (Map 10)
PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** The collection of vertebrate fossils on public lands would generally be prohibited. Only qualified institutions, individuals, or consultants who obtain a permit would be allowed to collect these fossils. Collecting common invertebrate fossils and petrified wood for hobby purposes would be allowed on public lands.
VEGETATION MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** Evaluation and designation of critical habitat for threatened or endangered plant species on public lands would be coordinated with the USFWS. If proposed surface-disturbing activities could affect these species, the USFWS would be consulted as required by the Endangered Species Act.
	Inventories for threatened, endangered, or BLM-Wyoming sensitive plant species would be required before surface-disturbing activities are conducted on public lands in areas with potential habitat for these species.
	Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities associated with all types of vegetation management on public land parcels would be subject to appropriate mitigation developed through use of the mitigation guidelines described in Appendix 2.
Noxious weeds and other invasive species	Noxious weeds and other undesirable vegetation on public lands in the Jackson Hole Weed Management Area would be controlled in accordance with the Jackson Hole Weed Management Plan and applicable BLM regulations and policy.
	Noxious weed treatments on public lands would avoid bird nesting seasons and other times when loss of cover or disturbance by equipment would be detrimental to wildlife. Projects that may affect threatened or endangered animals or plants, or BLM-Wyoming sensitive species, would be postponed or modified to protect these species. As necessary, the USFWS would be consulted.
VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	Visual resources would be considered before authorizing land uses that may affect them.
	Facilities or structures, such as power lines and storage tanks, would be screened, painted, buried, and otherwise designed to blend with the surrounding landscape.
WATERSHED MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES:** Maintain or improve water quality and comply with Wyoming DEQ water quality standards. Reduce erosion by improving vegetative production and ground cover. Maintain or improve wetland and riparian habitat.
	MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: The protection of watershed resources would be considered in the analysis of project proposals. Wyoming DEQ and Wyoming BLM Best Management Practices would be applied.
	Applications for water rights for water-related projects on public lands would be filed with the Wyoming State Engineer's office.
	To reduce the amount of nonpoint source pollution, pollution prevention plans for developments would be required under the "Wyoming Storm Water Discharge Program."
	Point sources of pollution would be subject to appropriate regulations and cleanup measures.
	Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities associated with watershed management on public land parcels would be subject to appropriate mitigation developed through use of the mitigation guidelines described in Appendix 2.

TABLE 2-1 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES	
Land Use or Resource	
ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES	
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT MANAGEMENT ***General***	**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities associated with wildlife and fish management would be subject to appropriate mitigation as developed through the mitigation guidelines described in Appendix 2.
Wildlife Habitat	Public lands in the Snake River corridor would be identified as public safety zones where the use of M-44 sodium cyanide devices, leg-hold traps, and kill-type traps are prohibited. Evaluation of other types of animal control methods undertaken to resolve human-wildlife conflicts would be conducted by and coordinated with USDA, Animal Plant and Health Inspection Service, Wildlife Services.
	Raptor nest sites and roosts, cottonwood trees, riparian areas, and other habitats related to raptor foraging and concentration areas would be protected by restricting surface-disturbing activities on public lands near these habitat areas.
	Fence construction on public lands would require site-specific analyses. Fence construction and modification would conform to applicable standards.
Threatened and Endangered Species	The "reasonable and prudent measures" identified by the USFWS in its Biological Opinion for Threatened and Endangered Species would be endorsed. The USFWS would be consulted as required or as necessary in accordance with the ESA.
	If proposed surface-disturbing or disruptive activities may affect threatened or endangered species, the USFWS would be consulted as required by the ESA.
	The evaluation and designation of critical habitat for threatened or endangered wildlife species on public lands would be coordinated with the USFWS.
Sensitive Species	If proposed surface-disturbing or disruptive activities may affect BLM-Wyoming designated sensitive species or their habitat, the appropriate mitigation would be applied to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation. Mitigation would be consistent with the accepted management objectives and best practices for managing those species, when known.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HISTORY RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES:** Protect and preserve important cultural, natural history, and paleontological resources.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Protect and preserve important cultural and natural history resources. Highlight opportunities for public education.
	MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: BLM would not pursue Rural Historic Landscape status.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The public lands in the Snake River corridor would be evaluated to determine their potential for designation as a Rural Historic Landscape.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative C.
	BLM would not develop interpretive facilities.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Interpretive facilities could be developed to highlight historic cultural resources such as old cabin locations, placer mining areas, historic levee constructions, and the remains of dams and bridges.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HISTORY RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (Continued)	The potential adverse effect created by transfer or sale of a National Register-eligible historic property to a state or county governing body or a privately administered land trust would need to be mitigated. Mitigation might include no sale or transfer of the historic property, formal data recovery, or by placing protective covenants on the patent.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The sale of lands containing National Register-eligible cultural resources is defined as an adverse effect under regulations at 36 CFR 800. Any cultural resources located on lands sold would either not be transferred or sold, or the adverse effect created by the sale or transfer would be subject to the appropriate mitigating treatments.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
LANDS AND REALTY MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE:** Maintain existing public access to the parcels. Provide for continuing public access and use of the parcels. Actual ownership and/or management of the parcels would be by other public agencies or entities.	Maintain existing public access to the parcels. Provide for continuing public access and use of the parcels.	Maintain or improve access for recreation and mining and respond to requests for land use authorizations, land sales, and exchanges.	With an emphasis on protection of wildlife habitat and natural conditions, maintain access for recreation and respond to requests for land use authorizations, land sales, and exchanges.	Respond to requests for land sales and exchanges. All the parcels would be transferred or sold.	Maintain access for recreation and respond to requests for land use authorizations, land sales, and exchanges, with emphasis on protection of wildlife habitat and natural conditions.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
LANDS AND REALTY MANAGEMENT (Continued) ***Access***	**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** Public access to the parcels would be maintained as a condition of their transfer to other agencies.	In general, opportunities for public access would be maintained. However, access to specific areas may be closed or restricted to protect public health and safety and sensitive resources (e.g., bald eagles).	Same as Alternative A.	In general, opportunities for public access (primarily nonmotorized) would be maintained. However, access to specific areas may be closed or restricted to protect public health and safety and sensitive resources (e.g., bald eagles).	Existing access would be maintained pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Alternative C.
	Information and directional signs would be posted on public lands, by the acquiring agency or entity, as appropriate.	No similar action.	Information and directional signs would be posted to identify public lands.	Same as Alternative B.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The Wilson Bridge boat and river access site would be maintained. BLM would not pursue an access easement to the ramp.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Public access would be maintained at the Wilson Bridge boat and river access site. BLM would pursue an access easement to the ramp. Opportunities to enhance public access in other areas would be pursued.	The Wilson Bridge boat and river access site would be maintained. BLM would pursue an access easement to the ramp.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative C.
	A boat and river access site could be developed near the South Park Bridge by an agency or entity other than BLM.	A boat and river access site could be developed near the South Park Bridge.	Same as Alternative A.	No boat ramp would be developed on public land at South Park.	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
LANDS AND REALTY MANAGEMENT (Continued) ***Landownership Adjustments***	Ownership of the parcels would be transferred from BLM. Parcels could be disposed of through transfer or sale to other agencies or public entities to remain available for public use. If BLM is unable to transfer the lands, management agreements would be pursued to allow other agencies or entities to manage public uses on the parcels.	Public lands in the planning area would be retained in public ownership. In some cases, this could include the sale, exchange, or transfer of public lands to meet the needs of the local community for parks and pathways, or for other public purposes, with a contingency for public use to be retained (see Appendix 5).	Proposals for the sale, exchange, or transfer of public lands would be considered case by case. Emphasis would be placed on acquiring public access for recreation (see Appendix 5).	In general, the parcels would be retained in public ownership. Proposals for the sale, exchange, or transfer (through recreation and public purposes (R&PP) lease or other authorizations) of public lands would be considered case by case (see Appendix 5).	Ownership of the parcels would be transferred from BLM. Parcels could be disposed of through transfer to other agencies, exchange for other lands outside the Jackson Hole area, or private sale.	Same as Alternative C.
	Management responsibility for some uses of the parcels would be transferred to other agencies; the parcels themselves may be retained by BLM or transferred to other public agencies or entities to remain open for public use.	BLM would retain management responsibility for all uses of the parcels that remain in BLM ownership.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Management responsibility for the parcels would be transferred with parcel disposition.	BLM would pursue cooperative management agreements for some public land uses with other county, state, and federal agencies.
	Access easements would not be retained by BLM. Public access would be provided for in the terms of parcel transfer or sale.	Access easements would not be necessary as parcels would only be disposed for public use.	Access easements to the river channel and the levees may be retained on lands exchanged or sold out of BLM ownership.	Access easements to the river channel and the levees would be retained on lands exchanged or sold out of BLM ownership.	No easements to the parcels would be retained.	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
LANDS AND REALTY MANAGEMENT (Continued)	BLM would not acquire recreation easements.	No similar action.	Recreation easements may be acquired through the exchange or sale of public lands.	No similar action.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative B.
***Landownership Adjustments* (Continued)**	Any sale, exchange, or transfer of public land would include, where appropriate, the use of conservation easements to prohibit development and preserve scenic values.	No similar action.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Situations involving trespass on public land would be resolved by removing the unauthorized use, so the lands can be transferred unencumbered to other agencies or entities.	Situations involving trespass on public land would be resolved by removing the unauthorized use, by establishing an annual rental of the affected public land, or by land sales or exchanges.	Situations involving trespass on public land would be resolved by removing the unauthorized use, or by land sales or exchanges in some cases.	Situations involving trespass on public land would be resolved by removing the unauthorized use.	Same as Alternative A.	Situations involving trespass on public land would be resolved by removing the unauthorized use, or by establishing an annual rental of the affected public land, at the discretion of the authorized officer.
	The area would not be designated a Special Project Area for the use of Land and Water Conservation Fund.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The Snake River corridor would be designated a Special Project Area to allow the use of Land and Water Conservation Fund to acquire recreation and conservation easements.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
LANDS AND REALTY MANAGEMENT (Continued) ***Rights-of-Way***	Rights-of-way proposals would be addressed case by case, with emphasis on avoiding conflict or sensitive areas. The location of rights-of-way to cross the Snake River on public land would only be allowed at Wilson Bridge and South Park Bridge.	Public lands in the planning area would be open to future rights-of-way development. Proposals would be addressed case by case with emphasis on avoiding certain conflict or sensitive areas. The location of rights-of-way to cross the Snake River would only be allowed on public land at Wilson Bridge and South Park Bridge.	Public lands in the planning area would be open to future rights-of-way development. Proposals would be addressed case by case with emphasis on providing access for mineral development and recreation.	Some public lands in the planning area would be open to future rights-of-way development. Proposals would be addressed case by case with emphasis on avoiding certain conflict or sensitive areas. The location of new rights-of-way to cross the Snake River would be prohibited on public land.	Same as Alternative A, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The following would be right-of-way exclusion areas: raptor nesting and concentration areas; threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species habitat; BLM Wyoming sensitive species habitat when the species is documented to occur at that location; Endangered Species Act (ESA)-designated critical habitat.	No similar action.	No similar action.	The following would be right-of-way exclusion areas: big game crucial winter habitat; raptor nesting and concentration areas; threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species habitat; aquatic and wetland sites; Wyoming BLM sensitive species habitat; important cultural resources that are listed or eligible for listing on the National Historic Register (Map 12).	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
LANDS AND REALTY MANAGEMENT (Continued) ***Rights-of-Way* (Continued)**	The following would be right-of-way avoidance areas: big game crucial winter habitat; aquatic & wetland sites; Wyoming BLM sensitive species habitat; important cultural resources that are listed or eligible for listing on the National Historic Register; and scenic areas identified as VRM Class II areas (Map 13).	The following would be right-of-way avoidance areas: big game crucial winter habitat; raptor nesting and concentration areas; threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species habitat; aquatic and wetland sites; Wyoming BLM sensitive species habitat; important cultural resources that are listed or eligible for listing on the National Historic Register; and scenic areas identified as visual resource management (VRM) Class II areas (Map 13).	No similar action.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative A, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
Withdrawals	A long-term protective withdrawal would be pursued for all public lands and federal mineral estate in the planning area (15,123 acres) to prohibit the staking and development of mining claims.	A long-term protective withdrawal would be pursued to go into effect on June 1, 2005, for the public lands and mineral estate covered by the withdrawal area described in PLO 7143 (2,890 acres) (Map 10).	The public lands and mineral estate described in PLO 7143 (2,890 acres) (Map 10) would be opened to mineral and/or surface entry after the current withdrawal expires in 2005.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
LANDS AND REALTY MANAGEMENT (Continued) ***Withdrawals* (Continued)**	A long-term protective withdrawal would be pursued for all public lands and federal mineral estate in the planning area (15,123 acres) to prohibit the staking and development of mining claims.	12,233 acres of public mineral estate outside the area described in PLO 7143 (Map 10) are and would remain open to mineral/surface entry.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE:** Maintain or improve ecological conditions for the benefit of livestock use, wildlife habitat, watershed values, and riparian areas.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Maintain or improve ecological conditions for the benefit of wildlife habitat, watershed values, and riparian areas.	Same as Preferred Alternative, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: The current amounts, kinds, and seasons of livestock grazing use would continue to be authorized as long as the parcels are held by BLM, unless monitoring indicates a grazing use adjustment is necessary, or an environmental assessment indicates a change in grazing use is appropriate.	The current amounts, kinds, and seasons of livestock grazing use would continue to be authorized unless monitoring indicates a grazing use adjustment is necessary, or an environmental assessment indicates a change in grazing use is appropriate, or public lands are sold, exchanged, or transferred.	Same as Alternative A.	The parcels would be closed to livestock grazing. All current grazing leases and authorizations would be cancelled.	The current amounts, kinds, and seasons of livestock grazing use would continue to be authorized, pending the ultimate disposal of the parcels.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT (Continued)	Existing grazing allotments would be categorized as follows: Walton, I (parcel 9-10); Porter Estate, I (parcel 21); Snake River Ranch, M (parcel 23).	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Adjustments in the levels of livestock grazing would be made as a result of monitoring and after consultation or negotiation with grazing permittees and other affected interests (including local and state governmental entities, as appropriate).	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No adjustments in livestock grazing would be necessary, as no grazing would be allowed.	Same as Preferred Alternative, pending parcel sale.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	If the lessee's adjacent property for any existing grazing lease were converted to other uses to the extent that livestock grazing is substantially excluded, then that grazing lease would expire, and would not be available to other applicants. This provision could ultimately affect 300 animal unit months (AUMs) of livestock grazing use on about 544 acres. (Map 14)	No similar action.	No similar action.	No similar action.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT (Continued)	No fall grazing would be permitted on parcels administered by BLM. The grazing season would end on August 31 annually.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar action.	No similar action.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Fence construction on BLM parcels would require site-specific analyses. Fence construction and modification would conform to applicable fencing standards.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative, pending parcel disposal. These restrictions would not apply after parcel disposal.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Relocation of fences to ownership boundaries, and marking of public lands contained therein, would be considered case by case to meet management objectives.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The implementation of management actions on the public lands, such as the use of grazing systems, land treatments, and range improvements, would be consistent with the Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management. (See Appendix 1)	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT (Continued)	All parcels not currently leased for livestock grazing would be closed to future applications.	Applications to graze on public lands would be addressed case by case.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Priority would be given to the modification of fences that are restricting wildlife movement in crucial big game habitat areas and along migration routes.	No similar action.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
MINERALS MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE:** Provide reduced opportunities for mineral exploration and development while emphasizing protection of other resource values.	Maintain opportunities for mineral exploration and development while maintaining other resource values.	Provide increased opportunities for mineral exploration and development while maintaining other resource values to the extent possible.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
General	**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities associated with mineral exploration and development would be subject to appropriate mitigation developed through use of the mitigation guidelines described in Appendix 2.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar action required as no mineral activities would be allowed.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
MINERALS MANAGEMENT (Continued) ***Oil and Gas***	Federal mineral estate outside the Snake and Gros Ventre River corridors (more than ½ mile from either River) (11,588 acres) would be closed to leasing consideration for oil and gas. (See page ___ for the decision regarding oil and gas leasing within ½ mile of the Rivers.)	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Federal mineral estate outside the Snake and Gros Ventre River corridors (more than ½ mile from either River) would be open to leasing consideration for oil and gas, with appropriate mitigation requirements determined case by case. (Map 11)	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
Other Leasable Minerals	Public lands and federal mineral estate (15,123 acres) would be closed to leasing consideration for phosphate, sodium, coal and all other leasable minerals.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Public lands and federal mineral estate (15,123 acres) would be open to leasing consideration for phosphate, sodium, coal, and all other leasable minerals. (Map 2)	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
Locatable Minerals	A long-term protective withdrawal would be pursued for all public lands and federal mineral estate in the planning area (15,123 acres) to prohibit the staking and development of mining claims.	A long-term protective withdrawal would be pursued to go into effect on June 1, 2005, for the public lands and mineral estate covered by the withdrawal area described in PLO 7143 (2,890 acres) (Map 10).	The public lands and mineral estate described in the PLO (2,890 acres) would be opened to mineral entry after the withdrawal expires in 2005. At that time, the staking and development of mining claims would be allowed.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
MINERALS MANAGEMENT (Continued) ***Locatable Minerals* (Continued)**	A long-term protective withdrawal would be pursued for all public lands and federal mineral estate in the planning area (15,123 acres) to prohibit the staking and development of mining claims.	12,233 acres of public mineral estate outside the area described in PLO 7143 (Map 10) are and would remain open to mineral/surface entry.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	No similar action because all public lands and federal mineral estate would be closed to locatable mineral exploration and development.	Plans of operations or notices of intent would be required for locatable minerals exploration and development consistent with regulations (43 CFR 3809).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
Salable Minerals	The extraction of sand and gravel would be considered, case by case, on public lands and federal mineral estate only in the active, unvegetated channel within the levees.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The extraction of sand and gravel would be considered, case-by-case, on public lands and federal mineral estate throughout the planning area.	The extraction of sand and gravel would be prohibited on public lands and federal mineral estate throughout the planning area.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The mining of sand and gravel, and associated access across public lands for this purpose, would be subject to seasonal requirements to protect fish spawning, important wildlife habitat areas, and periods of high recreational use.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
MINERALS MANAGEMENT (Continued) ***Salable Minerals* (Continued)**	Existing access would be continued across public lands near the Wilson and South Park bridges for mining of salable minerals on adjacent privately owned lands.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE:** Minimize motorized vehicle use. Maintain existing opportunities for non-motorized vehicle use.	Maintain opportunities for motorized and nonmotorized vehicle use while avoiding adverse effects on other resource values.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: Use of motorized vehicles on public lands in the planning area would be limited to the following designated roads: the Munger Mountain road; levee road at the Walton parcel; levee road west of the Snake River and south of Wilson Bridge; the access road to the Wilson boat ramp; the Evans Gravel road; and the Fall Creek road. (See Table 2-2.) Other roads may be designated as needed on a case-by-case basis. (Map 15)	Public lands in the planning area are currently not designated for motorized and nonmotorized vehicle use, although they are sometimes limited seasonally where needed to protect wildlife habitat or for administrative purposes.	Public lands in the planning area would be identified as limited to existing roads and trails for motorized and nonmotorized vehicle use.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE MANAGEMENT (Continued)	Nonmotorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and trails and limited seasonally where needed to protect wildlife habitat, except for authorized use.	Nonmotorized vehicle use would not be regulated, except seasonally where needed to protect wildlife habitat or for administrative purposes.	Nonmotorized vehicle use would be limited to existing roads and trails.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	OHV use limitations would be determined by the acquiring agency or entity.	No similar action necessary, as the parcels would be open to vehicle travel, except as currently closed for administrative purposes.	Same as Alternative A.	Vehicle use for levee maintenance and permitted uses for vehicles may be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Alternative C.
	OHV use limitations would be determined by the acquiring agency or entity.	Over-the-snow motorized vehicle use would not be regulated, except where needed to protect wildlife habitat or for administrative purposes.	Over-the-snow motorized vehicles would be subject to the same requirements and limitations as all other motorized vehicles. An exception could be allowed for grooming cross-country ski trails that are otherwise closed to motorized vehicles.	Over-the-snow motorized vehicles would be prohibited on public lands in the planning area.	Same as Preferred Alternative, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Alternative B.
PALEONTOLOGY RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE:** Protect and preserve important paleontological resources.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Protect and preserve important paleontological resources. Highlight opportunities for public education.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
RECREATION MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE:** Increase opportunities for quality recreation use and provide improved visitor services while protecting other sensitive resources. Provide for responsible commercial recreation use for the protection of visitor and public health and safety and natural resources, and manage visitor use.	Provide opportunities for recreation use while providing minimal visitor services.	Increase opportunities for recreation use and provide improved visitor services.	Reduce opportunities for recreation use in favor of other resource values.	Maintain opportunities for recreation use pending the ultimate disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: No Special Recreation Management Area would be designated.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Public lands along the Snake and Gros Ventre rivers would be designated a Special Recreation Management Area to facilitate management of recreational activities such as floating, fishing, hiking, winter sports, and commercial, competitive and group activities.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
RECREATION MANAGEMENT (Continued)	No RAMP would be prepared by BLM. Other agencies or entities would manage recreation use.	No RAMP would be prepared. No use limits or standards would be put in place.	A Recreation Area Management Plan (RAMP) would be prepared. The RAMP would provide for the management of public recreation use and the provision of services needed to maintain public health and safety, while protecting natural resources. The RAMP would direct the types and level of recreation use, services, facilities development, and public information.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
	Public access would be maintained at the Wilson Bridge boat and river access site for river floating.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Access could be lost if the parcel is sold to a private party.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	A boat and river access site could be developed near the South Park Bridge by an agency or entity other than BLM.	Boat and river access could be developed near the South Park Bridge.	Same as Alternative A.	No boat ramp would be developed on public lands at South Park Bridge.	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative A.
	Additional river boating access could be developed by an agency or entity other than BLM.	No new river boating access would be developed other than at South Park Bridge.	Additional river boating access could be developed.	No other boating access facilities would be developed on public lands.	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
RECREATION MANAGEMENT (Continued)	BLM would not pursue rights-of-way for public recreation access.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Rights-of-way for public recreation access would be pursued if necessary.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative B.
	The acquiring or managing agency or entity would determine the requirements for facility development.	There would be no requirement to maintain or develop recreation sites and facilities consistent with the protection of riparian habitat.	Recreation sites and facilities on public lands would be maintained or developed consistent with the protection of riparian habitat.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
	Decisions on signing would be made by the acquiring or managing agency or entity.	No signs would be posted on the public land parcels.	Information and directional signs would be posted to identify public lands.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Information and directional signs would be posted on public lands and recreation easements as appropriate.
	Decisions on user access fees would be made by the acquiring or managing agency or entity.	There would be no access fee program.	A required public access fee program would be established.	A voluntary access fee program would be established.	Same as Alternative A.	A user access fee system would be established consistent with other management agencies on the Snake River.
	Development of campgrounds could be considered by an agency or entity other than BLM.	The parcels would remain closed to camping.	Development of campgrounds could be considered.	Same as Alternative A.	The parcels would remain closed to camping pending their disposal.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
RECREATION MANAGEMENT (Continued)	Other agencies or public entities could choose to develop interpretive facilities after acquiring parcel(s) or management responsibility for parcel(s).	No similar action.	Interpretive facilities could be developed to highlight historic cultural resources such as old cabin locations, historic levee constructions, and the remains of bridges. Interpretive facilities could be developed to highlight scenic landforms, river processes, wildlife, geologic history, and noxious weed control.	Same as Alternative B.	No similar action.	The RAMP would direct the level of interpretation, facilities development, and public information.
	In the interim prior to parcel transfer, surface-disturbing and disruptive activities associated with the construction and use of roads and recreational facilities would be subject to appropriate mitigation developed through use of the mitigation guidelines described in Appendix 2.	Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities associated with the construction and use of roads and recreational facilities would be subject to appropriate mitigation developed through use of the mitigation guidelines described in Appendix 2.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative, pending disposal. These restrictions would not apply after parcel disposal.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
VEGETATION MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE:** Maintain or improve the diversity of plant communities to support wildlife habitat, watershed protection, scenic resources, and livestock grazing; control existing noxious weed infestations and prevent their spread.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Maintain or improve the diversity of plant communities to support wildlife habitat, watershed protection, and scenic resources; control existing noxious weed infestations and prevent their spread.	Same as Preferred Alternative, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
Noxious weeds and other invasive species	**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** Control of noxious weeds and other invasive species may include manual, mechanical, biological, or chemical methods. If herbicides are proposed for use, those with minimum toxicity to wildlife and fish would be selected. All herbicides applied must be on the BLM-approved list and applied in accordance with EPA label requirements.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Control of noxious weeds and other invasive species may include manual or biological methods. Chemical and mechanical control would be prohibited.	Same as Preferred Alternative, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Interpretive signs could be placed at selected public access areas with information on the spread and control of noxious weeds and other invasive species.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE:** Maintain or improve scenic values throughout the planning area, while allowing for modification and changes to occur to meet other resource objectives.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Maintain scenic values pending disposal of the public land parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: In the interim prior to disposal, public lands would be managed in conformance with Class II VRM objectives, except parcels 13, 26, and 27, which would be Class III. See Table 2-3, Visual Resource Management Classification by Alternative.	Public lands would be managed in conformance with Class II VRM objectives, except parcels 13, 26, and 27, which would be Class III. See Table 2-3, Visual Resource Management Classification by Alternative.	Public lands would be managed in conformance with Class III VRM objectives, except parcel 9, which would remain as a Class II, due to terms included in the judgment dated September 21, 1982. (Available for review in the Pinedale Field Office, BLM)	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (Continued)	Pending parcel disposal, all proposals for surface-disturbing actions and/or facilities installation would be analyzed for impacts to visual values. Appropriate mitigation would be developed and incorporated into project design in accordance with assigned VRM objectives.	All proposals for surface-disturbing actions and/or facilities installation would be analyzed for impacts to visual values. Appropriate mitigation would be developed and incorporated into project design in accordance with assigned VRM objectives.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A.
	Any transfers of public lands would require, where appropriate, the use of conservation easements to prohibit development and preserve scenic values.	No similar action.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
WATERSHED MANAGEMENT	Riparian areas would be maintained for wildlife habitat as a condition of transfer of the public land parcels.	Riparian area condition would be monitored and evaluated as part of site-specific activity or implementation plans. Management emphasis would be placed on riparian areas that are in less than proper functioning condition.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative, pending disposal. These restrictions would not apply after parcel disposal.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
WATERSHED MANAGEMENT (Continued)	Efforts would continue to improve water quality by cleaning up dumpsites on public lands, and encouraging dumpsite cleanup on adjacent lands.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	These efforts would continue in a minimal way until disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Riparian areas would be maintained for wildlife habitat as a condition of transfer of the public land parcels.	Riparian habitats that are outside the Snake River channel would be maintained in proper functioning condition. (Riparian habitats on the Snake River proper, between the levees, are in nonfunctioning condition because of the effects of flood control. This condition would remain constant.)	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, pending parcel disposal. These restrictions would not apply after parcel disposal.	Same as Alternative A.
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT MANAGEMENT	**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE:** Maintain or enhance riparian and upland habitat for wildlife and fish and promote species diversity.	Maintain existing habitat for wildlife and fish.	Provide for wildlife habitat to the extent possible while allowing other uses.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Maintain existing habitat for wildlife and fish, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT MANAGEMENT (Continued) ***Wildlife Habitat***	**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** Measures to protect avian habitats would include seasonal restrictions on surface-disturbing activities within distances to be determined based on species, individuals, and/or habitat characteristics.	Measures to protect only raptor habitats would include seasonal restrictions on surface-disturbing activities within 0.5 to 1 mile of nesting sites, depending on the species.	Measures to protect raptor habitats would include seasonal restrictions on surface-disturbing activities within 0.5 mile of nesting sites, or within view of nests, whichever is closer.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The acquiring or managing agency or entity would make decisions regarding actions necessary to maintain wildlife habitat.	No seasonal restrictions on recreational or other activities to protect avian habitats.	Same as Alternative A.	Where appropriate, measures to protect avian habitats would include seasonal restrictions on recreational and other disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative C.
	Priority would be given to the modification of fences that are restricting wildlife movement in crucial big game habitat areas and along migration routes.	No similar action.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar action.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	To the extent possible, suitable habitat and forage would be provided to support wildlife populations defined in the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) Strategic Plan objectives.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative, pending disposal. These restrictions would not apply after parcel disposal.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

Table 2-1 - Comparison of Alternatives						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B** BLM mgt for development	**Alternative C** BLM mgt for preservation	**Alternative D** Disposal	**Alternative E** BLM mgt for recreation and conservation
ACTIONS THAT DIFFER ACROSS ALTERNATIVES						
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT MANAGEMENT (Continued) ***Fish Habitat***	Projects that maintain or improve fisheries habitat as much as possible in a leveed system would be considered. Cooperative efforts with WGFD, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), Teton County, and others would continue. Projects that adversely affect fisheries would be mitigated to the extent possible.	Projects that maintain or improve fisheries habitat as much as possible in a leveed system would be considered. Cooperative efforts with WGFD, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), Teton County, and others would continue.	Projects that adversely affect fisheries would be mitigated to the extent possible.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Surface-disturbing activities that would add sediment to the Snake River would be prohibited when fish are spawning.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Projects that adversely affect fisheries would be mitigated to the extent possible.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 2-2
OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE DESIGNATION BY ALTERNATIVE

OHV Class	Preferred Alternative (acres)	No Action Current Management Alternative A (acres)	Alternative B (acres)	Alternative C (acres)	Alternative D (acres)	Alternative E (acres)
Open	0	0	0	0	0	0
Limited	631	0	1073	631	0	631
Closed	442	0	0	442	0	442

TABLE 2-3
VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT CLASSIFICATION BY ALTERNATIVE

VRM Class	Preferred Alternative (acres)	No Action Current Management Alternative A (acres)	Alternative B (acres)	Alternative C (acres)	Alternative D (acres)	Alternative E (acres)
I	0	0	0	0	0	0
II	999	999	295	999	0	999
III	74	74	778	74	0	74
IV	0	0	0	0	0	0