TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT	Noise and airborne dust would result from the use of motorized vehicles along levees and at the Wilson Bridge boat and river access site, and from the mining of sand and gravel.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Compared to the Preferred Alternative, noise and dust would be reduced. Some noise and dust could be generated by vehicles transporting sand and gravel into the planning area from other areas.	Compared to the Preferred Alternative, noise and dust could be reduced since public vehicle access to the river could be lost. However, uses by future landowners may cause similar impacts.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Noise, dust, and vehicle emissions would be increased by truck traffic on highways if it is necessary to haul gravel in from outside the valley.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	This impact would be less as more gravel would be available from the public lands.	This impact could be greater, as no gravel would be available from the public lands in the planning area.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Noise and dust would increase if additional river access or recreation sites are developed.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The effects of noise and dust would be local and temporary, lasting a few minutes as vehicles travel along levees, and during periods of active sand and gravel mining.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The relatively minor effects of noise and dust would be local and temporary. There would be no dust or noise generated from sand and gravel mining.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Smoke from campfires at primitive campgrounds would affect air quality on a local basis during the summer.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HISTORY RESOURCES	The inventory and protection of cultural resources would prevent unintentional damage to these resources from surface-disturbing activities. New information about these resources would be acquired through detailed inventories.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The required inventory and study of cultural resources before parcel sale would add time and expense to the disposal of the parcels. New information about these resources would be acquired through detailed inventories.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Permits e issued for the scientific study of cultural resources on public lands would ensure that important sites are protected and new scientific information is made available to the public.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The use of minimum-impact suppression techniques for fighting wildfires would protect some cultural resources from surface-disturbing activities.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HISTORY RESOURCES (Continued)	There would be no adverse effects on **identified** significant cultural or natural history resources from the sale, exchange, or transfer of public lands. Any **unidentified** significant cultural or natural history resources could suffer adverse effects from the sale, exchange or transfer of public lands.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Inventories conducted for proposed surface-disturbing activities or proposed land transfers out of Federal ownership would identify any potentially threatened sites. Significant sites would be either avoided or mitigated as appropriate.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative. The potential for discovery of significant sites would be lost when the parcels are sold.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Interpretive signs could increase public appreciation for, and the protection of, cultural resources, if used by the acquiring agencies and/or entities.	No similar impact.	The use of interpretive signs could increase public appreciation for, and the protection of, rare and sensitive resources.	Compared to Alternative B, the beneficial effects could be greater because of the added emphasis on interpretive signs.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HISTORY RESOURCES (Continued)	Sporadic unauthorized collection of cultural resources would take place. Inventories conducted for proposed surface-disturbing activities would mitigate the loss of data to some extent. Unauthorized collection will always result in some loss of data.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Compared to the Preferred Alternative, greater visitor use associated with river floating and visits to recreational sites would increase the potential for unauthorized collecting.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
FIRE MANAGEMENT	Aerial fire retardants would most likely not cause adverse changes in watershed function or water quality. The use of aerial fire suppressants has the potential to produce short-term local changes in the level of nutrients in adjacent waters. Avoiding application of aerial fire retardants to open waters, and the relatively large amount of dilution that can be provided by the discharge of the Snake River, would most likely reduce this effect further in terms of concentration and duration.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative. After parcel sale, Teton County would make the decisions regarding fire retardant use.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
FIRE MANAGEMENT (Continued)	The use of surfactants and foaming agents for fire suppressing activities has the potential to produce local changes in water quality. However, the level of dilution that could be provided by the Snake River, the rapid biological breakdown of the agents, and the practice of avoiding direct application of surfactant or foam solutions to open waters would most likely reduce concentrations to acceptable levels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	There would be some potential for wildfires due to human activities on the public land parcels.	More potential for wildfires because the area is open to OHV use.	Same as Alternative A.	Potential for wildfires from unauthorized camping would be reduced.	The risk of wildfires from human activities would be lessened as public access is lost; however, the activities of future landowners could also lead to a risk of fire.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The use of campfires at campgrounds would increase the risk of wildfire.	No risk of wildfire from campgrounds.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
LANDS AND REALTY MANAGEMENT	Opportunities for the management of public areas by Teton County, or jointly by the county, state, and(or) federal agencies, would increase; this increase would be greater than under other alternatives.	Opportunities for the management of public areas by Teton County, or jointly by the county, state, and(or) federal agencies, would increase to a lesser extent.	Opportunities for the management of public areas by Teton County, or jointly by the county, state, and(or) federal agencies, would increase.	Same as Alternative A.	Opportunities for the management of public areas by Teton County, or jointly by the county, state, and(or) federal agencies, could increase.	Same as Alternative B.
	Landownership adjustments would not affect the level of public use of lands within the Snake River corridor.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Landownership adjustments could reduce the level of public use of some lands within the Snake River corridor, although this effect would be mitigated where recreation easements are retained, or offset by the consolidation of public lands in areas of high recreational use.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Landownership adjustments would reduce the level of public use of some lands within the Snake River corridor. Generally, use would become more congested on adjacent public lands, as long as they are available. Eventually, all public use areas could be lost.	Same as Alternative B.
	By retaining public lands for public use, this alternative would help to ensure affordable recreational opportunities for low-income residents of Teton County. This alternative is appropriate to meet the requirements of Environmental Justice (E.O. 12898).	Same as Preferred Alternative.	This alternative is less appropriate to meet the requirements of Environmental Justice.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Private sales could eliminate these opportunities. Potential for all access onto current public parcels to be lost. This alternative is less appropriate to meet the requirements of Environmental Justice.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
LANDS AND REALTY MANAGEMENT (Continued)	The posting of informational and directional signs could enhance recreational experiences and reduce trespass, if acquiring agencies or entities choose to erect the signs.	Lack of signing would result in continued confusion about the location of public lands, inappropriate resources uses, and trespass.	The posting of informational and directional signs to identify public lands with public access would enhance recreational experiences, protect resources, and reduce trespass.	Same as Alternative B.	Impacts to natural resources may occur. Private lands trespass would be more likely.	Same as Alternative B.
	The level of public use would decline seasonally on public lands that are developed for sand and gravel mining.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Compared to the Preferred Alternative, the decline of public use would be greater and more use would be concentrated on adjacent public lands.	Public use would not be impacted by sand and gravel mining on public lands or mineral estate.	Same as Preferred Alternative	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Attempts to resolve occupancy trespass through removal would be difficult and may result in litigation.	Trespass resolution would be less difficult than under the Preferred Alternative, as the authorized officer would have more options for resolution.	The option of resolving agricultural or occupancy trespass on public land through land sales or exchanges could encourage these unauthorized land uses.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.
LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT	There could be some temporary reductions in forage from certain allowed surface-disturbing activities such as development of rights-of-way. Following reclamation of these areas, forage production would return to pre-disturbance levels.	Temporary reductions in forage would be greater than under the preferred alternative as more surface-disturbing activities would be allowed. Following reclamation of disturbed areas, forage production would return to pre-disturbance levels.	Temporary reductions in available forage from surface-disturbing activities would be the greatest of all alternatives. Following reclamation of these areas, forage production would return to pre-disturbance levels.	Temporary forage reductions would not impact livestock as no grazing would be permitted.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT (Continued)	The transfer of parcels could cause a reduction in livestock grazing, if grazing is determined to be incompatible with the uses to be established by the acquiring agencies or entities.	The potential transfer of parcels could cause a reduction in livestock grazing, if grazing is determined to be incompatible with the uses to be established by the acquiring agencies or entities.	Same as Alternative A.	Livestock grazing would be reduced by 300 AUMs on 620 acres of land that is currently grazed by livestock.	Transfer and sale of all the parcels would reduce the acreage available for livestock grazing. Potentially, all the parcels could be removed from livestock grazing use.	Same as Alternative A.
	Recreational use could cause conflicts with livestock grazing, if grazing continues to be allowed after transfer of the parcels. No similar impact if livestock grazing is not allowed.	Recreational use could cause minor conflicts with livestock grazing.	Recreational use could cause conflicts with livestock grazing, although the potential for this would be reduced by the posting of signs at boat and river access sites with information on safety, river etiquette, and minimum impact recreation.	Recreational use would not impact livestock grazing on public land parcels.	Same as Alternative A, although this impact could disappear if the lands are sold and no longer available for recreation or livestock grazing use.	Same as Alternative B.
	The prohibition of some forms of predator control on public lands to protect the safety of recreational users and their pets could result in livestock losses to predators. However, these effects would be minimal.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT (Continued)	Continued suppression of all fires would affect the vegetation and possibly the grazing capacity of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Changes in the vegetation and grazing capacity of the parcels would not impact livestock as no grazing would be permitted.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	A long-term withdrawal to prohibit the staking and development of mining claims would keep land undisturbed for livestock grazing and other purposes.	Possible mining development could make lands unavailable for livestock grazing, to a lesser extent than under Alternative B.	Possible mining development could make lands unavailable for livestock grazing.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Minor conflicts between campground development and livestock use could occur, if these uses are allowed by the agencies or entities that acquire the parcels.	There would be no impacts to campgrounds on public lands from livestock grazing (no campgrounds under this alternative).	Campground development would conflict with livestock grazing due to loss of acreage as cattle are fenced out.	Same as Alternative A.	Uses specified by the new parcel owners would control the potential impacts. There would be no conflicts with public livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative B.
	Requirements to blend livestock management structures on public lands with the landscape could increase operator costs, if livestock grazing is allowed by the agencies or entities that acquire the parcels.	Modifying livestock management structures or range improvements to blend with the landscape could increase costs and reduce options for livestock management.	Same as Alternative A.	No impact on livestock on public lands as no grazing would be permitted. However, requirements to modify livestock management structures, particularly fences on the public land parcels, could affect management of livestock on adjacent private lands.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
MINERAL RESOURCES	There would be no effects related to the management prescriptions for geothermal energy, phosphate, sodium, and coal because these resources are not anticipated to exist in commercial amounts on public lands in the planning area.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	There would be no development of oil and gas in the planning area from public lands.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	There would be potential for oil and gas development from one or two wells.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	2,890 acres of public land and mineral estate included in PLO 7143 (Map 10) would be closed to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Public lands and mineral estate inside the area included in PLO 7143 (Map 10) (2,890 acres) would be opened to locatable mineral development after June 1, 2005. Small scale recreational gold panning and dredging could take place on public lands within the Snake River channel. The discovery of commercial amounts of gold is not anticipated.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
MINERAL RESOURCES (Continued)	12,233 acres of public lands and federal mineral estate outside the PLO area would be closed to locatable mineral entry.	Public lands and federal mineral estate outside the area included in PLO 7143 (12,233 acres) would be available for locatable mineral development. (Map 10)	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Longer haul distances for gravel would result in more truck traffic and potential for accidents, both to other motorists and to wildlife crossing highways.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	This impact would be less, as more gravel extraction from the public lands would be allowed.	This impact would be greater, as no gravel would be available from public lands in the planning area.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLES	Motorized access to certain parcels and levees would be prohibited. The opportunity to recreate on public lands by a small portion of the public would be foregone. Recreational use would decrease on some parcels.	Motorized access to the parcels would be the greatest under this alternative; however, some parcels would still be inaccessible to motorized vehicles.	Compared to alternative A, motorized and non-motorized recreational opportunities would be less. The loss of this opportunity would be minimal since the public lands parcels are small and access is limited.	Motorized access to certain parcels and levees would be prohibited. The opportunity to recreate on public lands by a small portion of the public would be foregone. Recreational use would decrease on some parcels.	The opportunity for public use of motorized OHVs on public lands would be foregone.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
PALEONTO-LOGICAL RESOURCES	Sand and gravel operations in the river channel would not impact vertebrate fossils.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	There is a small potential that sand and gravel operations outside the active river channel could impact vertebrate fossils.	There would be no impact from sand and gravel extraction on fossils.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
PALEONTO-LOGICAL RESOURCES (Continued)	Permits issued for the scientific study of paleontological resources on public lands would ensure that important sites are protected and new scientific information is made available to the public.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact. There is a very small chance that significant paleontological resources could be lost to the public with parcel sales.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	There would be no adverse effects on **identified** significant paleontological resources from the sale, exchange, or transfer of public lands. Any **unidentified** significant paleontological resources would suffer adverse effects from the sale, exchange, or transfer of public lands.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The use of minimum-impact suppression techniques for fighting wildfires could protect some paleontological resources from surface-disturbing activities.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	There is a small change that paleontological resources could be affected, as BLM restrictions would not apply.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
PALEONTO-LOGICAL RESOURCES (Continued)	Sporadic unauthorized collection of paleontological resources would take place. Inventories conducted for proposed surface-disturbing activities would mitigate the loss of data to some extent. Unauthorized collection will always result in some loss of data.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Compared to the Preferred Alternative, greater visitor use associated with river floating and visits to recreational sites would increase the potential for unauthorized collecting, slthough the potential for finding significant vertebrate fossils is very low.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
RECREATION	Landownership adjustments would not affect the level of public use of lands within the Snake River corridor.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Landownership adjustments could increase the level of public use and access to some lands within the Snake River corridor, through the acquisition of lands for public access and improved recreation opportunities. Access to some remote parcels could be lost.	Same as Alternative B.	Landownership adjustments could eliminate public use of lands within the Snake River corridor.	Landownership adjustments could reduce the level of public use of some lands within the Snake River corridor, although this effect may be mitigated where recreation easements are retained or offset by the consolidation of public lands in areas of high recreational use.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
RECREATION (Continued)	Information and directional signs posted on public lands where appropriate could enhance recreational experiences and reduce trespassing on private lands, if the signs are used by the acquiring agencies and/or entities.	Confusion about parcel location and appropriate uses would continue.	Information and directional signs posted on all public lands may enhance the recreational experience and reduce trespass.	Same as Alternative B.	Public access to the parcels would be lost; signs would not be necessary.	Information and directional signs posted on public lands where appropriate could enhance recreational experiences and reduce trespassing on private lands.
	The benefits listed for Alternative A would be realized if the managing agency or entity develops boat access at South Park (parcel 26).	The development of boating access at South Park (parcel 26) would improve vehicle access, reducing traffic hazards. Visitor experience would be enhanced with improved facilities and river access.	Same as Alternative A.	The traffic hazards associated with the existing public access (located on private land) would remain the same.	No recreation access after parcel disposal, thus no related traffic hazards.	Same as d Alternative A.
	If recreation easements are acquired by the managing agency or entity, they would enhance recreation opportunities and public access.	No similar impact.	The acquisition of recreation easements through the sale or exchange of public lands would enhance recreation opportunities and public access.	No similar impact.	No similar impact.	Same as Alternative B.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
RECREATION (Continued)	Withdrawal of the federal mineral estate from locatable minerals development after June 1, 2005 provides for long-term protection of recreation opportunities.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Lands not withdrawn from the federal mineral estate for locatable minerals after June 1, 2005 are at risk for staking and development. Some long-term recreation opportunities may be forgone if lands are not withdrawn.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No recreation access after parcel disposal.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The closure of federal lands and mineral estate in the planning area to oil and gas leasing would ensure long-term recreation benefits would not be impacted by oil and gas development.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The development of oil and gas extraction on federal lands and mineral estate outside the Snake River corridor could create some long-term impacts to recreation facilities and opportunities, although closure of the river corridor to leasing for oil and gas would preserve most recreation benefits.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No recreation access after parcel disposal.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The closure of leasing on federal lands and mineral estate in the planning area for phosphate, sodium and other leasable minerals would ensure long-term recreation benefits would not be impacted by development of these minerals.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The development of phosphate, sodium, and other leasable minerals on federal lands and mineral estate in the planning area could create long-term impacts to recreation facilities and opportunities.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No recreation access after parcel disposal.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
RECREATION (Continued)	The closure of federal lands and mineral estate in the planning area tor geothermal leasing would ensure long-term recreation benefits would not be impacted by geothermal development.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No recreation access after parcel disposal.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Recreational use could decline on public lands that are developed for sand and gravel mining. With mitigation, impacts to recreation would be low.	Recreational use could decline on public lands that are developed for sand and gravel mining.	Compared to Alternative A, the decline in public use would be greater. More recreational use could be concentrated on adjacent public lands.	There would be no impact on recreational use from salable mineral development on public land or mineral estate.	No recreation access after parcel disposal.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Industrial vehicle access across public lands for mining sand and gravel would reduce the quality of recreational experiences and increase hazards to public health and safety. With mitigation and seasonal restrictions these impacts would be minimal.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact.	No recreation access after parcel disposal.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
RECREATION (Continued)	Plans of operations submitted for saleable mineral exploration and development must address the protection of natural resource values. Mitigation of recreation impacts could be stipulated.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact, as no minerals could be developed.	No recreation access after parcel disposal.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	No similar impact.	No similar impact.	No similar impact.	The prohibition on the use of motorized vehicles, except at the Wilson Bridge boat and river access site, would make some levee pathways and fishing areas inaccessible to people unable to travel without mechanized transportation. Recreational experiences for boaters and hikers, by comparison, would improve.	No similar impact. No recreation access after parcel disposal.	No similar impact.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
RECREATION (Continued)	The quality of recreational experience would likely deteriorate without recreation management (e.g., education, signing, regulating use levels).	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative E. Public benefits for river floating and upland activities may increase as management prescriptions emphasize expanding facilities and services to meet public demand.	Same as Alternative E except that public benefits for river floating and upland activities may decrease as management prescriptions emphasize reducing public use to protect wildlife habitat.	No recreation access after parcel disposal.	The quality of recreational experience would improve as management provides services, resolves conflicts, regulates use for desired future conditions developed through the Limits of Acceptable Change process (LAC), and provides for the protection of natural resources.
	Commercial floating opportunities would be improved.	The commercial floating experience would decline.	The benefits enjoyed from commercial recreation use would continue.	Same as Alternative B.	Commercial floating use may continue, but would not be regulated by the BLM.	Same as Alternative B.
	The maintenance of the Wilson Bridge river access would provide continued enjoyment of recreation opportunities.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Public benefits of the Wilson boat ramp could be lost.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The development of facilities at the South Park location would enhance recreational experiences.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The improvement of visitor facilities at the Wilson Bridge boat and river access site and the development of facilities at the South Park location would enhance recreational experiences.	No similar impact.	No recreation access after parcel disposal.	Same as Alternative B.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
RECREATION (Continued)	Adverse effects on public safety would be mitigated by development of a boat and river access site in the South Park area, which would include improvements made to the exit off U.S. Highway 191.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Recreation facilities and services would be maintained by the managing agency or entity. Impacts are likely to be similar to Alternative B.	Facilities and services would continue to be minimally maintained through agreements with Teton County. The quality of recreational experience may decrease.	The implementation of an access fee program would allow for the enhancement of visitor services and facilities. A fee system may deter or eliminate recreational use by some of the public.	Same as Alternative B except that the choice of contributing to user services would be voluntary. Revenue income for recreation management and natural resource protection would be uncertain.	No recreation access after parcel disposal.	Same as Alternative B.
	Benefits could be realized if the managing agencies and/or entities develop additional boating access.	The Wilson Bridge and South Park river access facilities would remain congested, as no other access facilities would be developed.	Added river boating access facilities could ease congestion and provide an enhanced recreational experience.	The Wilson Bridge boat ramp would remain very congested, as no other access facilities would be developed.	Public river access may be lost after parcel disposal.	Same as Alternative B.
	The benefits of authorized camping could be realized if the managing agencies and/or entities develop camping facilities.	Some unauthorized camping would occur along the Snake River corridor. Authorized camping opportunities would be forgone.	Unauthorized camping would be reduced because camping would be allowed in designated campgrounds on public lands.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
SOCIO-ECONOMICS	Given the importance of land disposal issues, protection of wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, minerals management, and the management of recreation to the Willingness to Pay (WTP) considerations, the Preferred Alternative is superior to Alternatives A, B, and D, inferior to Alternative C, and equal to Alternative E.	Given the importance of land disposal issues, protection of wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, minerals management, and the management of recreation to the Willingness to Pay (WTP) considerations, Alternative A is inferior to the Preferred Alternative and Alternatives C and E, and superior to Alternatives B and D.	Given the importance of land disposal issues, protection of wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, minerals management, and the management of recreation to the Willingness to Pay (WTP) considerations, Alternative B is inferior to the Preferred Alternative and Alternatives A, C, and E; and superior to Alternative D.	Given the importance of land disposal issues, protection of wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, minerals management, and the management of recreation to the Willingness to Pay (WTP) considerations, Alternative C is superios to the Preferred Alternative and and all other alternatives.	Given the importance of land disposal issues, protection of wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, minerals management, and the management of recreation to the Willingness to Pay (WTP) considerations, Alternative D is inferior to the Preferred Alternative and all other alternatives.	Given the importance of land disposal issues, protection of wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, minerals management, and the management of recreation to the Willingness to Pay (WTP) considerations, Alternative E is equal to the Preferred Alternative, superior to Alternatives A, B, and D, and inferior to Alternative C.
VEGETATION	Stipulations and management actions implemented to protect other resources could prevent surface disturbances and protect vegetation and Special Status Plant Species.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities could cause a loss of vegetation and an increase in weeds.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued)	The absence of flooding outside the levees, the exclusion of fire, and late season grazing by livestock and wildlife (during the fall and early winter) would inhibit cottonwood regeneration. The cottonwood-dominated community would change to a shrub-grass or conifer community with time.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The absence of flooding outside the levees, the exclusion of fire, and late season grazing by wildlife (during the fall and early winter) would inhibit cottonwood regeneration. The cottonwood-dominated community would change to a shrub-grass or conifer community with time.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Increases in public access or facilities (e.g., South Park access site) could cause the removal of vegetation and the increase of weeds.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The resolution of agriculture or occupancy trespass and subsequent reclamation could benefit native vegetation in the long term.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Elimination of fall livestock grazing would allow for an increase in shrub production and diversity of understory habitats in cottonwood stands.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact.	Elimination of all livestock grazing would allow for greater shrub production and diversity of understory habitats in cottonwood stands.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued)	Salt and mineral supplements used for livestock can leach into the soil, affecting plant survival and growth. These supplements can also attract wildlife.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Plant survival and growth would be benefited as salt and mineral supplements would not be used as there is no allowed grazing.	Same as Preferred Alternative, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	No similar impact.	No similar impact.	Oil and gas development on federal mineral estate outside the Snake River corridor could cause a short-term loss of vegetation followed by an increase in vegetation with the reestablishment of desirable grass and forb species after reclamation measures. The long-term loss in vegetation would not be significant. There could be an increase in weeds in the short-term until reclamation success.	No similar impact.	No similar impact.	No similar impact.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued)	No similar impact.	No similar impact.	Other leasable minerals development on federal mineral estate outside the Snake River corridor could cause a short-term loss of vegetation followed by an increase in vegetation with the reestablishment of desirable grass and forb species after reclamation measures. The long-term loss in vegetation would not be significant. There could be an increase in weeds in the short-term until reclamation success.	No similar impact.	No similar impact.	No similar impact.
	A long-term protective withdrawal to prohibit the staking and development of mining claims could benefit vegetation in the long term.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Opening public lands and federal mineral estate to the staking and development of mining claims in 2005 could cause removal of vegetation and an increase in weeds.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued)	The extraction of sand and gravel on public lands and federal mineral estate only within the active unvegetated channel could cause a temporary increase in weeds in the area during each season of use.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The extraction of sand and gravel on public lands and federal mineral estate could cause the loss of vegetation and an increase in weeds in the area for the duration of the operations. Reclamation activities would cause an increase in desirable species in the long term.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative, pending disposal of the parcels.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued)	Repeated off-road vehicle (OHV) use would damage vegetation because vehicle tires crush and tear plant tissues and eventually destroy plant cover. OHV activity often occurs in areas that are erosive. The combination of vegetation loss and activity on erosive soils produces excessive soil erosion and causes further impacts associated with sedimentation on adjacent areas. The impacts could be the most beneficial to vegetation as public lands in the planning area would be closed to motorized vehicle use except at the Wilson Bridge and certain designated roads and non-motorized vehicles would be limited to designated roads and trails.	The impacts could be greater than under the Preferred Alternative as more areas would be open for motorized and non-motorized use.	The impacts could be greater than under the Preferred Alternative as public lands in the planning area would be either closed or limited to existing roads and trails for motorized and non-motorized vehicle use.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Repeated off-road vehicle (OHV) use would damage vegetation because vehicle tires crush and tear plant tissues and eventually destroy plant cover. OHV activity often occurs in areas that are erosive. The combination of vegetation loss and activity on erosive soils produces excessive soil erosion and causes further impacts associated with sedimentation on adjacent areas.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued)	An increase in the number of visitors and improvement or development of new facilities or camping areas could cause an increase of disturbance, loss of vegetation, and an increase in weeds.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	A decrease in the number of visitors and fewer improvements or developments of new facilities could cause an increase of vegetation and a decrease in weeds, causing an overall beneficial effect to the native plant species.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Visual resource management could benefit vegetation through Class II VRM management actions on selected parcels to maintain or improve scenic values.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Visual resource management could benefit vegetation less than the Preferred Alternative through conformance with Class III VRM management actions.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
Noxious weeds and other invasive species	Fire suppression efforts may lead to spread of noxious weeds and other invasive species through soil disturbance or introduction of seed from outside sources.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued) ***Noxious weeds and other invasive species* (Continued)**	Livestock grazing, recreational use, interpretive sites, additional access, and surface-disturbing activities would result in more seed dispersal than in the Preferred Alternative and the increased establishment of noxious weeds and other invasive species. Seed dispersal would occur both within and outside of the planning area. These effects would be mitigated by implementation of the Jackson Hole Weed Management Plan.	Same as Alternative A.	Impacts would be less than those described for the Preferred Alternative because there would be no livestock grazing.	Livestock grazing, recreational use, interpretivesites, and surface-disturbing activities would not cause seed dispersal or the increased establishment of noxious weeds and other invasive species. However, uses of the new parcel landowners could contribute to establishment of weeds. Seed dispersal would occur both within and outside of the planning area.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Livestock grazing, recreational use, interpretive sites, and surface-disturbing activities would result in seed dispersal and the establishment of noxious weeds and other invasive species. Seed dispersal would occur both within and outside of the planning area. These effects would be mitigated by implementation of the Jackson Hole Weed Management Plan.
	Access and rights-of-way could lead to surface disturbance or the introduction of noxious weed seed dispersal agents.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Strict water quality protection measures for public lands could reduce ability to treat noxious weeds and other invasive species with chemicals.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued) ***Noxious weeds and other invasive species* (Continued)**	Delaying weed treatments on public lands to avoid special wildlife needs could impede efforts to control noxious weeds and other invasive species.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Interpretive sites, improved visitor services, and recreation easements could increase the potential for noxious weed dispersal (i.e., vehicles, pets, humans).	These impacts would not occur as these developments would not be implemented.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	More options would be available for the control of noxious weeds on public lands.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Removal of chemical control will impede efforts to control noxious weeds and other invasive species.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
Riparian	Fire management activities (i.e., suppression) would be mitigated through emergency fire rehabilitation, if needed, resulting in no adverse impact to riparian/wetland areas.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Actions to protect public lands from hazardous waste would positively benefit riparian/wetland areas.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued) ***Riparian* (Continued)**	Closing the parcels along the Snake River to Desert Land Entry would benefit riparian/wetland areas.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Private sale would have similar impacts to Desert Land Entry.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Sale or transfer of public lands could remove riparian/wetlands from BLM management.	Sale of public lands could remove riparian/wetlands from BLM management. Exchange of riparian/wetlands for other lands may not be for those of equal or better functional value or habitat value.	Same as Alternative A.	Sale of public lands could remove riparian/wetlands from BLM management but would allow public access to other riparian/wetland areas.	Sale of public lands will remove riparian/wetlands in Teton County from BLM management.	Same as Alternative C.
	BLM would not be managing the riparian/wetland areas.	This impact would not occur, as BLM would not be acquiring parcels.	BLM management of riparian/wetland areas may be improved through acquisition or exchange of parcels.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative B.
	The imposition of conservation easements on disposals could assist the management and protection of riparian/wetland areas.	This impact would not occur, as BLM would not be retaining conservation easements.	Same as Alternative A.	The imposition of conservation easements on disposals would assist the management and protection of riparian/wetland areas.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative C.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued) ***Riparian* (Continued)**	Resolving occupancy trespass by removing the trespass would have no impact or would be a positive impact to riparian/wetland areas.	Resolving occupancy trespass by removing the trespass would have no impact or would have a positive impact to riparian/wetland areas.	Land sales in the case of occupancy trespass could result in removal of riparian/wetland areas from BLM management.	Same as Alternative A.	No similar impact.	Resolving agricultural or occupancy trespass by removing the trespass would have no impact or would be a positive impact to riparian/wetland areas. However, resolving the issue through rental agreement would continue any impacts that may be occurring.
	Riparian/wetland areas would generally be avoided by ROW development. Mitigation measures to rehabilitate areas would be developed case by case. However, some trees could be lost.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Some riparian/wetland areas could be permanently lost (e.g., from road development). Other situations (e.g., buried utility lines) could be mitigated through rehabilitation of the affected area. Trees could be permanently lost.	Aquatic and wetland sites are exclusion areas for ROW development. Other riparian areas would be restored if ROWs were allowed. However, some trees could be lost.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued) ***Riparian* (Continued)**	Elimination of fall grazing would increase the recovery and productivity of riparian/wetland shrub species. Should grazing permits be relinquished in the future, the removal of livestock grazing would allow for quicker recovery of any degraded vegetative conditions.	Fall grazing would be detrimental to riparian/wetland shrub condition. Should grazing permits be relinquished in the future, the removal of livestock grazing would allow for quicker recovery of any degraded vegetative conditions.	Same as Alternative A.	Elimination of livestock grazing would lead to a greater increase in the recovery and productivity of riparian/wetland shrub species than under the Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	There would be no adverse impact to riparian/wetland areas in the Snake River Corridor due to geothermal or oil and gas development activities.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	There would be no adverse impact to riparian/wetland areas in the Snake River Corridor due to any leasable minerals.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Leasing lands for phosphate, sodium, or other leasable minerals development could have an adverse impact to riparian/wetland areas during development (surface disturbance and vegetation loss).	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued) ***Riparian* (Continued)**	A long-term mineral withdrawal in the planning area would protect riparian/wetland areas from mineral development.	Public mineral estate outside the area included in PLO 7143 (2896 acres) would be available for locatable mineral development. This could affect riparian or wetland habitats in some areas.	Public mineral estate in the planning area (15,123 acres) would be available for locatable mineral development. This could affect riparian or wetland habitats in some areas.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Confining sand and gravel operations to the active, unvegetated channel within the levees would have minimal adverse effect on the riparian/wetland plant community.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Sand and Gravel operations could result in widespread loss of riparian/wetland habitat outside the levees.	There would be no impact to riparian/wetland habitat due to Salable mineral development.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Increased access to public lands may have an adverse effect on riparian/wetland areas, depending on the level and type of use by the public. Restrictions on motorized access would benefit riparian/wetland resources.	Increased access to public lands may have an adverse effect on riparian/wetland areas depending on the level and type of use by the public. Access, by itself, has no impact to riparian/wetland areas.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact. Access to the parcels would decrease or be lost entirely.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued) ***Riparian* (Continued)**	Limiting motorized vehicle use to specific existing roads, non-motorized traffic to designated roads and trails and possibly limiting all but authorized traffic seasonally where needed would benefit riparian/wetland resources.	Riparian/wetland habitat could be adversely affected by allowing all public lands to be open to OHVs. This could create new roads and trails over time, and increase erosion and the destruction of riparian/wetland plants.	Limiting OHVs to existing roads and trails, and closing trails causing resource damage, would be beneficial to riparian/wetland habitats.	Same as Alternative B.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	There could be some limited adverse impact to riparian/wetland shrubs due to over-the-snow vehicles, primarily in low snow years.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	There would be no adverse impact to riparian/wetland resource due to over-the-snow vehicles.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Riparian/wetland resources could be impacted negatively with increased "land-based" recreation activity; however, monitoring, mitigation, and informational signing could help to alleviate these impacts.	Most recreational activity in this area has not impacted the riparian/wetland resource. However, some negative impact to riparian/wetland resources has occurred due to "land-based" recreation. This impact has been limited to specific areas and has been a result of non-authorized activity.	Riparian/wetland resources could be impacted negatively with increased "land-based" recreation activity; however, monitoring, mitigation, and informational signing could help to alleviate these impacts.	The decrease in "land-based" recreation and the implementation of signing and a fee system could protect riparian/wetland resources.	No similar impact.	Same as Alternative B.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued) ***Riparian* (Continued)**	These benefits could be realized if the managing agencies and/or entities maintain the existing boat access facilities, and develop additional boating accesses.	Maintaining existing and developing additional float boating access and visitor facilities at specific locations may be beneficial to riparian/wetland resources by concentrating use in designated areas, providing educational opportunities, and eliminating unintended encroachment into other areas.	Same as Alternative A.	Maintaining existing float boating access and visitor facilities at specific locations may be more beneficial to riparian/wetland resources by concentrating use in fewer designated areas, providing educational opportunities, and eliminating unintended encroachment into other areas	No similar impact.	Same as Alternative A.
	If additional boat ramp facilities (such as parking areas) cannot be located outside of riparian areas, a limited amount of riparian vegetation could be permanently lost.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	This impact would not occur, as no additional facilities would be constructed.	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Regulated overnight camping at specific boat-in campground areas could have some localized adverse effect to riparian/wetland resources.	No camping would be allowed, so there would be no impact to riparian/wetland resources.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	No similar impact.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VEGETATION (Continued) ***Riparian* (Continued)**	All vegetation management activities on public lands would be designed to enhance riparian/wetland health and would have positive impacts.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Chemical control of noxious weeds and other invasive species could damage some riparian plants in the short term, but long-term vegetation health should be improved.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	This impact would not occur, as chemical control of noxious weeds and other invasive species would be prohibited.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Riparian/wetland areas may not be managed specifically for proper functioning condition, but for more broadly-defined wildlife habitat goals.	Managing riparian/wetland areas to maintain proper functioning condition or later seral stages (outside of the levees) would be beneficial to this resource.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Riparian/wetland areas would probably not be managed for proper functioning condition.	Same as Alternative A.
	All wildlife and watershed management activities on public lands would be designed with riparian/wetland health as a priority and would thus positively benefit this resource.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
VISUAL RESOURCES	Visibility would be affected on a local and temporary basis by airborne dust from the use of motorized vehicles along levees and by mining of sand and gravel.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Compared to the Preferred Alternative, dust and associated visual impacts would increase as additional areas are mined for sand and gravel.	Compared to the Preferred Alternative, dust and associated visual impacts would be reduced since mining would be prohibited and motorized vehicle use would be confined to the Wilson Bridge boat and river access site.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Management of the parcels by the acquiring agencies or entities for wildlife habitat and open space would probably allow for a low degree of alteration to the existing scenic values. Some impacts to visual quality could occur; the extent of visual changes is difficult to predict as BLM would not be managing the parcels.	Management of visual resources to assigned VRM objectives would allow for a low degree of alteration to the existing scenic values. Changes in visual quality would be minimal due to restrictions on development.	Compared to the Preferred Alternative, the management of visual resources to assigned VRM objectives would allow a greater degree of alteration to the existing scenic values. Changes in visual quality would be increased under this alternative.	Management of visual resources to assigned VRM objectives would allow for a low degree of alteration to the existing scenic values. Changes in visual quality would be the least under this alternative.	No VRM objectives would be assigned. Private landowners could make alterations to scenic values. Changes in visual quality could be greatest under this alternative.	Management of visual resources to assigned VRM objectives would allow for a low degree of alteration to the existing scenic values. Changes in visual quality would be minimal.
	Smoke from campfires at primitive campgrounds, if allowed by the managing agencies or entities, would affect visibility locally during the summer.	This impact would not occur, as no camping would be allowed.	Smoke from campfires at primitive campgrounds would affect visibility locally during the summer.	This impact would not occur, as no camping would be allowed.	This impact would not occur, as no camping would be allowed.	Same as Alternative B.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WATERSHED	The lower levels of mining or soil disturbance under this alternative would create a lower potential for water quality degradation.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The higher levels of disturbance within and outside the levees would create a greater potential for water quality degradation, due not only to greater levels of direct disturbance but increased channel modification as well.	As this alternative has the lowest levels of soil disturbance and no mining activity, water quality degradation from these activities would the lowest of all alternatives.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Disturbance within the channel due to gravel mining could create short-term decreases in water quality. Continued mining over time will have both short-term local and long-term remote effects on river morphology.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The areas outside the levees that might be disturbed under this alternative would have a less direct and smaller initial effect on water quality and watershed function but would most likely exist longer as visual disturbances.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The existence of the levee system will be the primary long-term factor affecting channel condition and sediment related water quality.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WATERSHED (Continued)	Continued grazing at past levels would result in the maintenance of existing grazing related conditions. If grazing pressures were altered, the impacts to the system would change.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The extended grazing season would create additional disturbance to vegetation and soil, increasing the potential for water quality degradation over the Preferred Alternative.	The removal of grazing by domestic animals would result in a lower potential for water quality degradation. Because grazing would still take place on private lands, the effect would not be entirely eliminated from the system.	No similar impact; there would be no livestock grazing.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Impacts from OHV activity would be dependent on the OHV management practiced by the acquiring or managing agencies or entities.	Increased runoff from OHV related disturbances would create a potential for water quality degradation.	Compared to the Preferred Alternative, the higher levels of OHV use and potential loss of management ability due to potential land sales would create a potential for increased water quality degradation.	Compared to the Preferred Alternative, the potential for water quality degradation would be less due to lower levels of OHV-related disturbance.	There would be no similar impact as there would be no public access to the parcels. However, management by private landowners may result in similar impacts.	OHV activity will most likely increase with time. Improved management of this activity could reduce the potential for accelerated runoff from public lands and the associated water quality degradation. Given the relatively small size of the public lands in comparison to the planning area, this would not eliminate the potential for OHV related damage.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WATERSHED (Continued)	The potential for water quality degradation would increase with increased recreation activities. Actions taken to inform and direct the recreating public could reduce the potential per capita influence, but the overall level of recreation related disturbance would increase.	Runoff from recreation related disturbances would create a potential for water quality degradation. With increased recreation pressures, the potential for recreation related disturbance would increase.	The higher levels of recreational use and loss of management ability due to potential land sales would create a potential for water quality degradation greater than the Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	There would be a lower potential for general public related water quality impacts and an increased potential for impacts due to the management practices of private landowners with the increased privatization of the land.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	The addition of a boat ramp at the South Park bridge and the signing of public land, if carried out by the acquiring or managing agencies or entities, would create areas of concentrated disturbance but could also assist in reducing overall disturbance.	This impact would be lessened, as the South Park boat ramp would be built but no signs would be placed on the public land parcels.	The addition of a boat ramp at the South Park bridge and the signing of public land would create areas of concentrated disturbance but could also assist in reducing overall disturbance.	The signing of public land would create areas of concentrated disturbance but could also assist in reducing overall disturbance.	There would be no public access to the parcels after sale; no similar impacts.	Same as Alternative B.
	Sanitation facilities provided at key recreation sites would reduce water quality impacts from human waste.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No public recreation sites on the parcels; this impact would not occur.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WATERSHED (Continued)	Given the existence and the extent of the levee system and the comparatively small amount of public land involved, the actions taken on public land will most likely have only minor impacts on the channel condition and non-point source related water quality.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Isolated oxbows, within the levee system, would continue to be affected by both the movements of the active channel and channel reclamation efforts.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT	There would be no "jeopardy" effects on threatened or endangered species including Canada lynx, gray wolves, grizzly bears, bald eagles, and whooping cranes.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Actions of private landowners that might impact threatened or endangered species cannot be predicted.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Prohibiting firewood harvest on public lands would benefit wildlife that require deadwood for nesting or reproductive habitat.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	This prohibition would not be in effect on the lands; impacts to wildlife habitat could occur.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	Closing public lands to Desert Land Entry and agricultural lease could benefit wildlife by prohibiting development or impacts to forage.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Sale of the parcels into private ownership may have the same impacts as Desert Land Entry.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Fire suppression would generally benefit wildlife habitats. The potential exists for adverse impacts due to human-wildlife interactions or habitat alterations from construction of fire breaks/roads.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Actions to clean up hazardous materials and wastes on public lands, and prevent their release onto public lands and water, would benefit wildlife, fish, and amphibians.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Maintaining public access to the parcels could adversely impact wildlife due to human-wildlife interactions. However, seasonal closures/restrictions would minimize adverse impacts.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Reducing or eliminating public access to the parcels may benefit wildlife by reducing human presence and human-wildlife interactions.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	Changes in landownership that increase the incidence of human-wildlife interactions may cause adverse impacts to wildlife. Construction of parks and pathways could expand human presence into new areas not previously accessible.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Requiring the acquiring or managing agencies or entities to manage the lands for open space and wildlife habitat would protect wildlife migration routes and corridors.	Wildlife migration routes and corridors would be protected.	Same as Alternative A.	Compared to Alternative A, wildlife migration corridors would be protected to a greater extent by landownership adjustments to consolidate public lands, the use of conservation easements, management prescriptions for fence modification, and prohibitions on mining.	No protection of wildlife migration corridors.	Same as Alternative C.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	The retention of conservation easements would benefit wildlife by protecting select areas from development-related wildlife disturbances.	Parcels sold or transferred out of BLM ownership would not be protected by conservation easements; development of these parcels would cause wildlife disturbances and impacts to habitat quantity and quality.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	No additional recreation easements would be acquired by BLM; there would be no impact to wildlife from additional human presence due to acquired recreation easements.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The acquisition of recreational easements using Land and Water Conservation Fund could adversely impact wildlife by increasing the potential human-wildlife interactions.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative B.
	The removal of trespasses on public land could benefit wildlife if human-wildlife interactions are reduced.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Landownership changes could adversely impact wildlife if there is a subsequent increase in human presence in areas previously excluding general publics.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	Linear rights-of-way that cross the Snake River could create some adverse impact to fish habitat due to short-term sedimentation.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	These impacts would not occur as no rights-of-way would be allowed to cross the Snake River.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Allowing future rights-of-way on public lands could adversely impact wildlife if this permits increased human-wildlife interactions or destruction of forage.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Prohibiting communication sites on public lands would eliminate the potential for avian-tower collisions. The potential for human-wildlife interactions associated with maintenance activities at these sites would be eliminated.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Impacts to raptors and other birds may occur, as these restrictions would not apply after parcel sale.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Implementation of management actions consistent with the Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management could benefit certain wildlife species dependent on post-grazing forage for fall/winter survival.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Wildlife species dependent on post-grazing forage would benefit, as there would be no livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative C; however, other impacts may occur due to the management practices of private landowners.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	Impacts to wildlife forage could occur if livestock grazing were allowed by the acquiring or managing agencies or entities.	Approval of additional grazing permits on public lands could adversely impact available forage for migrating and/or wintering wildlife.	Same as Alternative A; this impact could be increased as fall livestock grazing would be allowed.	There would be no impact to wildlife forage from livestock grazing on public land parcels.	There would be no impact to wildlife forage from livestock grazing on public land parcels; impacts may occur due to the management practices of private landowners.	There would be no additional impact to wildlife forage, as no additional livestock grazing would be allowed.
	Conformance to applicable fencing standards would ensure minimal disruption to wildlife movements.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Fences not compatible with wildlife movements may be constructed, impacting wildlife migration and other movements.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Closing public lands and federal mineral estate to geothermal leasing would benefit wildlife by preventing potential adverse development in sensitive habitats.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Closing public lands and federal mineral estate in the Snake River corridor to oil and gas leasing would benefit wildlife by preventing potential adverse development in sensitive habitats.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	Closing federal mineral estate outside the Snake River corridor to oil and gas leasing would benefit wildlife by preventing potential adverse development in sensitive habitats and preventing potential increases in human disturbances.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Leasing for oil and gas on federal mineral estate outside the Snake River corridor could have detrimental impacts on wildlife due to direct loss of habitat or increases in human disturbance.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Closing public lands and federal mineral estate to phosphate, sodium, and other leasable minerals to leasing would benefit wildlife by preventing potential adverse development in suitable habitats.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Leasing on public lands and federal mineral estate for phosphate, sodium, and other leasable minerals could have detrimental impacts on wildlife due to direct loss of habitat or increases in human disturbance.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Prohibiting mineral or surface entry through June 1, 2005 under PLO 7143 would prevent adverse impacts to foraging, nesting and wintering habitats.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	Pursuing a long-term protective withdrawal to prohibit the staking and development of mining claims (inside the PLO 7143 area) would benefit wildlife by preventing potential adverse impacts to foraging, nesting or wintering habitats.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Allowing mineral and/or surface entry in the area included in PLO 7143 after the withdrawal expires in 2005 could adversely impact wildlife forage/habitat and increase the potential for human-wildlife interactions.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Pursuing a long-term protective withdrawal to prohibit the staking and development of mining claims (including the area outside PLO 7143) would benefit wildlife by preventing potential adverse impacts to foraging, nesting or wintering habitats.	Allowing mineral and/or surface entry outside the PLO 7143 area could adversely impact wildlife forage/habitat and increase the potential for human-wildlife interactions.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	Sand and gravel mining would be most likely during mid-fall to late winter when river flows are lowest, and operations would remain outside critical wintering habitats and nest site buffer zones. These factors and the use of site-specific seasonal requirements would prevent most impacts to nesting, foraging, and wintering habitat on the Snake River and tributaries. Fish habitat could be affected through channel manipulation and sedimentation.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Impacts to migrating and wintering avian species from sand and gravel mining would be greatest under this alternative.	The prohibition on mining and the use of site-specific seasonal requirements for other surface-disturbing and disruptive activities would prevent most impacts to nesting, foraging, and wintering habitat on the Snake River and tributaries. There would be no adverse fisheries impacts.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Permitting access across public lands near the Wilson and South Park bridges for mining of salable minerals on adjacent privately-owned lands could have an adverse impact on nesting or foraging birds, or other wildlife that encounter an increased human disturbance.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	These impacts would not occur as mining for salable minerals would not occur on public lands or mineral estate.	No similar impact. BLM would not have authority to grant access across private lands. Impacts may occur if private landowners grant access.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	The use of appropriate mitigation measures for surface-disturbing and disruptive activities on public lands could reduce adverse impacts to wildlife.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative; benefits from the use of mitigation measures would be lost as the parcels are sold into private ownership.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Collecting of fossils could adversely impact wildlife due to increased human-wildlife interactions or destruction of vegetation from excavation.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Maintaining visitor facilities at the Wilson Bridge boat and river access would have an undetermined impact on wildlife due to the potential for future increased use.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Improving the visitor facilities at the Wilson Bridge boat and river access could have a detrimental impact on wildlife if this promotes an increased use of river-related activities that cause higher levels of human-wildlife conflicts or impact corridor vegetation.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Impacts cannot be determined, as it is not known whether public access to the Wilson Bridge boat ramp site would be available after parcel sale.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	Development of a boat and river access near the South Park Bridge could have an adverse impact to avian species which nest or forage near the facilities. If this development increases on-river use, adverse impacts could increase proportionally due to adverse human-wildlife interactions.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	These impacts would not occur, as no boat ramp would be constructed at the South Park Bridge.	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Development of additional boat ramps/river access points could have detrimental effects to wildlife due to direct loss of habitats or increases in human-wildlife conflicts.	These impacts would not occur, as no additional boat access facilities would be constructed.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Development of campgrounds could have detrimental effects to wildlife due to direct loss of habitats, human excursions into previously undisturbed habitats, or increases in human-wildlife conflicts.	These impacts would not occur, as no campgrounds would be constructed.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	Overnight camping could have detrimental effects to wildlife due to direct impacts on vegetation, human incursions into previously undisturbed habitats or increases in human-wildlife conflicts, if camping is allowed by the acquiring or managing agencies or entities.	Continued prohibition of overnight camping would prevent detrimental impacts to vegetation and wildlife habitat due to firewood harvest and nighttime disturbance of wildlife.	Overnight camping could have detrimental effects to wildlife due to direct impacts on vegetation, human incursions into previously undisturbed habitats or increases in human-wildlife conflicts.	Same as Alternative A.	No similar impact.	Same as Alternative B.
	Posting signs at boat and river access sites on public land to educate river users about potential wildlife impacts, could help to minimize conflicts and to heighten awareness of viewable wildlife, if the signs were posted by the acquiring or managing agencies or entities.	No similar impact.	Posting signs at boat and river access sites on public land to educate river users about potential wildlife impacts, could help to minimize conflicts and to heighten awareness of viewable wildlife.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact.	Same as Alternative B.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	With expansion of recreational activities into big game habitat, human-wildlife interactions would increase. Human injuries could occur and some wildlife might be displaced. Depending on the extent of the activities, wildlife reproductive success and species diversity could be affected.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	No similar impact. There would be no recreational access to the parcels. However, private landowners' uses of the parcels may cause other impacts to wildlife or wildlife habitat.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Any level of human activity in areas of breeding, nesting or foraging raptors can be expected to influence raptor behaviors. Some degree of adverse impacts may be possible.	River activities such as fishing and floating may adversely affect spring nesting and young rearing by birds that depend on the Snake River. The effects would be greatest on bald eagle nesting areas that are viewable from some portion of the river or its banks.	Compared to the Preferred Alternative, these effects would be increased by the higher levels of river recreation and emphasis on mining.	Compared to the Preferred Alternative, impacts on raptors due to recreation activity would be less.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	An increase in land-based recreational use would likely increase the potential for adverse impacts to wildlife due to detrimental, direct effects to vegetation/forage, and/or increased human-wildlife conflicts.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	A decrease in land-based recreational use would likely benefit wildlife by reducing impacts to vegetation/forage or decreasing human-wildlife conflicts.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Control of noxious weeds and other undesirable vegetation would benefit wildlife by providing appropriate vegetation/forage types, so long as the control method minimizes toxicity.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Lesser ability to control noxious weeds and other undesirable vegetation could impact wildlife habitat through the presence of more weeds. Prohibition on the use of chemical control would reduce the potential for a toxic affect to wildlife.	Impacts are unknown as the extent of weed control that private landowners would employ is unknown.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Under the Snake River Restoration Project, fisheries habitat may be improved. "Spring creeks" or channels which cross some BLM parcels could provide fish habitat if, in the future, connection to the Snake River were made suitable to fish passage and barriers were removed.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	Maintaining riparian habitats (outside the Snake River channel) in proper functioning condition would benefit wildlife habitat by providing a sustained level of available forage and water quality.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Habitats may be of lesser quality as proper functioning condition of riparian areas may not be maintained.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	Cooperation with the WGFD and USFWS to identify active or historic raptor nest locations and to impose seasonal restrictions to reduce human intrusions would ensure minimal impacts on nesting pairs and nestlings.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Private landowners' management of habitats near raptor nest locations may cause impacts on nesting pairs and nestlings.	Same as Preferred Alternative.
	River recreation and sand and gravel mining could cause impacts to bald eagle nesting success due to disturbance of the birds from human presence.	Impacts could be greater, as recreation would be unregulated and could increase substantially.	The higher levels of river recreation and emphasis on mining under this alternative could cause greater impacts to bald eagle nesting success.	These impacts would be less than under the Preferred Alternative, as no sand and gravel mining would be allowed.	Impacts would be similar to Alternative A until parcel sale. Other impacts to bald eagle nesting and habitat could occur after parcel sale due to the management practices of private landowners.	Same as Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 4-2 COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES						
Land Use or Resource	**Preferred Alternative**	**No Action Current Management Alternative A**	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D**	**Alternative E**
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT (Continued)	Anticipated actions and activities would not adversely affect smaller mammals, such as furbearers and predators, or amphibians and reptiles. Anticipated beneficial management practices in riparian areas would enhance habitat for these animals.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	Compared to the Preferred Alternative, increased recreational activity in riparian areas, such as pulling rafts through vegetation and foot travel creating new trails, would negatively affect these animals.	Same as Preferred Alternative.	The impacts of private landowners' actions cannot be predicted. Benefits from BLM management practices would not be realized.	Same as Preferred Alternative.