



BIA ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES SUMMARY BY ALTERNATIVE:

Resource	No Action Alternative	Alternative A:	Alternative B:	Alternative C:	Alternative D:
Air	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No direct impacts from fluid mineral leasing Indirect impacts from oil and gas development could introduce new sources of air pollutants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as the No Action Alternative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as the No Action Alternative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as the No Action Alternative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as the No Action Alternative
Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least effective option for maintaining water resources efficiently Least protective of water resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most protection of water resources, homes, and similar structures More restrictions around water in oil & gas development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on water quality and water supplies would be same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides the fewest impacts on water quality and water bodies, but impacts would be similar to Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts would be similar to Alternative A and only for the Navajo Tribal trust lands
Fluid Minerals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current management would continue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictions on oil and gas leasing would reduce surface use but would not reduce total development unless they rendered development uneconomical 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative A
Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to have no stipulations on infrastructure to minimize disturbance Placement of new infrastructure spread across the landscape, affecting vegetation and soils 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surface disturbances and resulting impacts are expected Focus on protecting vegetation communities Roads, utilities, and pipelines share rights-of-way (ROWs) to minimize disturbance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative A
Geology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to limit surface disturbances from new roads and facilities Could limit risk of impacts on traditional mineral gathering areas and culturally significant formations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased reclamation and restrictions on surface use resulting in less potential for damage to traditional mineral gathering and cultural formations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts would be similar to but less than those in the No Action alternative
Cultural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts could be significant Historical and physical integrity could be potentially threatened 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewer potential direct and indirect impacts on cultural resources Stipulations require consultation with Tribes, local communities and chapters, as well as setbacks from culturally important properties (CIMPPs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most protection for cultural resources, emphasizing preservation and protection of the cultural landscapes in Northern NM Stipulations to limit noise at Chacoan sites and light pollution at certain locations, including some CIMPPs, could reduce potential impacts on cultural resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least protective of cultural resources; most acres open to oil & gas leasing



BIA ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES SUMMARY BY ALTERNATIVE:

Resource	No Action Alternative	Alternative A:	Alternative B:	Alternative C:	Alternative D:
Native American and Tribal Interests and Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential for direct or indirect impacts on CIMPPs ▪ BIA would manage to avoid impacts on water-related Indian Trust Assets (ITAs) for Navajo Nation ▪ Effects on CIMPPs/ITAs would be determined through Section 106 process and consultation with Tribes at site-specific APD level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Setbacks for CIMPPs would limit potential direct and indirect impacts ▪ Lack of stipulations for dark skies and Yádiłhił could affect certain CIMPPs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most protection for Native American cultural resources and interest ▪ Stipulations and COAs to limit light pollution at certain locations/CIMPPs could limit impacts on dark skies and Yádiłhił 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similar to the No Action Alternative, except stipulations and COAs to limit noise and light pollution at CIMPPs could reduce direct and indirect impacts on CIMPPs and Yádiłhił. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similar to Alternative C
Lands and Realty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ROWs continue to be managed by a case-by-case basis with few limitations on placement in the observed area ▪ Meets demand for new ROWs associated with energy and mineral development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fewer locations where new ROWs could be developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as Alternative A
Social and Economic Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social and economic impacts would continue to occur as they currently do ▪ Total economic output and production of Tribal trust and Indian allotted wells is estimated \$108,391,089 at year 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Economic impacts on allottees, lessees, and operators could be increased ▪ More enforceable regulations at the lease, drilling, and operation stages of development ▪ Total economic output and production of Tribal trust and Indian allotted wells is estimated \$108,391,089 at year 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similar to Alternative A ▪ More focus on economic development and extending the land's uses ▪ Emphasizes maximizing resource production and royalty income ▪ Total economic output and production of Tribal trust and Indian allotted wells is estimated \$108,391,089 at year 1
Public Health and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Risks to public health and safety would be greatest under this alternative ▪ Direct impacts caused by noise and light from surface facilities ▪ Indirect impacts, such as increased traffic and air and water pollution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stipulations would reduce localized noise, light, and other health impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as Alternative A