

Hanford Reach National Monument

Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Impact Statement Adams, Benton, Grant and Franklin Counties, Washington

- Type of Action:** Administrative
- Lead Agency:** United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service
- Cooperating Agencies:** Army Corps of Engineers; Bureau of Reclamation; U.S. Department of Energy (Including Bonneville Power Administration); Federal Highway Administration; Washington State Departments of Ecology, Fish and Wildlife, and Natural Resources; Adams, Benton and Grant Counties; City of Richland, Washington
- Consulting Governments:** Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, Nez Perce Tribe
- Responsible Official:** Ren Lohofener, Acting Regional Director, Pacific Region
- Comments Due:** Comments on this draft are due to the address below by February 23, 2007.
- Further Information:** Dan Haas, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 3250 Port of Benton Boulevard, Richland, Washington 99354, (509) 371-1801

Abstract: Six alternatives, including a No Action Alternative, are described, compared and assessed for the Hanford Reach National Monument. Alternative A is the No Action Alternative, as required by National Environmental Policy Act regulations. The alternatives are described below. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has selected Alternative E as its draft Preferred Alternative.

Alternative A: No Action–Continuation of Existing Management: Alternative A assumes no change from existing management and thus provides a baseline for evaluating impacts in the other alternatives. There would be no major changes in habitat management or public use programs.

Alternative B: Alternative B would provide a greater emphasis on the conservation, protection and monitoring of natural and cultural resources. Public use would be secondary to habitat protection; restoration would be a priority.

Alternative C: Alternative C concentrates on protecting and conserving natural and cultural resources by creating extensive areas that are free of development. Restoration is still a top priority, but large areas are open to public use.

Alternative D: Alternative D emphasizes increasing public access and recreational opportunities. Restoration is de-emphasized, although protection of sensitive natural and cultural resources is continued.

Alternative E: Alternative E combines the public use emphasis of Alternative D with the open space concept of Alternative C. Sensitive natural and cultural resources are still protected.

Alternative F: Alternative F uses the restoration and protection emphasis of Alternative B as a base, although it allows public use in more areas. Protection of natural and cultural resources is accomplished through a user permit system.