



BLM ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES SUMMARY BY ALTERNATIVE:

Resource	No Action Alternative	Alternative A:	Alternative B:	Alternative C:	Alternative D:
Air	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More surface disturbance and oil & gas wells resulting in greater potential for new sources of criteria pollutants, hazardous pollutants, and greenhouse gas emissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Larger area closed compared to No Action Alternative Maintains or minimizes impacts related to fugitive dust before surface-disturbing activities begin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least predicted air emissions Largest areas are closed for development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emissions like Alternatives A & B but vary depending on how much area is closed or subject to NSO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to No Action Alternative
Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No management regarding reuse of produced water and flowback water in oil & gas development Potential for reduced or depleted natural water supplies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More regulations around water in oil & gas development More areas closed to leasing would decrease potential water impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewest impacts on water quality and water supplies; most protection for water resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to No Action Alternative but impacts would be reduced because regulations around produced water and flowback for oil & gas developments same as Alternative B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least protective of water resources
Fluid Minerals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to the acres open for mineral extraction 1,873 projected new oil & gas wells in the next 20 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some unleased acres with high/moderate oil and gas potential would be closed Impacts to fluid minerals would be greater than No Action Up to 1,399 projected new wells in next 20 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greatest amount of high and moderate-potential unleased acres would be closed to leasing 1,402 and 1,125 projected new wells under Sub-Alternative B1 & B2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No unleased acres with high development potential would be closed 1,865 projected new wells under Sub-Alternatives C1-C5; 1,853 wells under Sub-Alternative C6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less restrictive setbacks would result in more acres opened for mineral extraction No closure of high-potential unleased acres 1,873 projected new oil & gas wells
Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least protective to upland vegetation and soil conditions High potential damage to vegetation and soil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protects vegetation and soils through closures, NSOs, and right-of-way (ROW) exclusion areas Formalizes treatment purposes in GMUs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most protective of vegetation; least number of acres open to leasing Potential for more opportunities to affect vegetation and soil conditions Formalizes treatment purposes in GMUs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surface disturbances and resulting impacts are expected Formalizes treatment purposes in GMUs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least protective of vegetation with most acres open to leasing Formalizes treatment purposes in GMUs
Geology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased potential for surface disturbances 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 areas and culturally significant geological formations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most restrictive designation of surface disturbances stipulations Fewest impacts to geologic formations, traditional mineral gathering, and cultural formations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts vary depending on how much area is subject to surface use restrictions. Impacts could be greater than those under Alternatives A and B. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as 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"> Impacts to cultural resources could be reduced due to additional restrictions on oil & gas leasing and managing areas to protect wilderness characteristics as a priority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most protection for cultural resources with the least acres open for oil & gas leasing Stipulations to limit noise at Chacoan sites and light pollution at certain locations/culturally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Certain vegetation treatments focused on reducing impacts on Indian trust assets and CIMPPS would result in less potential for impacts Leasing stipulations would also reduce direct impacts on historic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least protective of cultural resources; most acres open to oil & gas leasing



BLM ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES SUMMARY BY ALTERNATIVE:

Resource	No Action Alternative	Alternative A:	Alternative B:	Alternative C:	Alternative D:
			important properties (CIMPPS) could reduce potential impacts	properties; specifically, CCNHP, Pueblo Pintado and Kin Bineola.	
Native American and Tribal Interests and Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traditional plant gathering may be destroyed through fluid mineral leasing Impacts greatest in areas managed as open to leasing, as surface disturbance would be unrestricted. Development in certain areas could diminish ability of Tribes to conduct ceremonies or use CIMPPs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restriction zones around the CCNHP and Chacoan outliers would reduce potential for direct/indirect impacts on CIMPPs and Indian Trust Assets BLM would consult with Tribes with cultural affinity for CIMPPs to avoid or minimize impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most protection for Native American cultural resources and interest; least amount of area would be open to leasing Stipulations and COAs could limit light pollution at certain locations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce indirect visual, noise, and vibration impacts that could diminish aspects of historic integrity, such as setting or feeling. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offers the least protection out of the action alternatives
Lands and Realty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ROWs continue to be managed by a case-by-case basis with few limitations Meets demand for new ROWs associated with energy and mineral development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ROWs would be excluded in certain areas. ROWs would be subject to special siting criteria, design requirements, or other constraints to minimize impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewer areas would be available for ROW development and infrastructure placement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ROW placement would be excluded or avoided in fewer areas than Alternatives A and B; thus impacts similar to No Action Alternative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative C
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasize other multiple uses as a priority over protecting wilderness characteristics, which would diminish natural setting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four lands with wilderness characteristics units managed to protect wilderness characteristics as a priority over other multiple uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as the No Action Alternative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as the No Action Alternative
Social and Economic Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports employment, income, and economic contributions Economic output expected to be around \$461,660,882 at year one Economic output focused around Oil and gas industry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May see a positive non-quantitative social / economic effect from restricting oil and gas leasing Economic output expected to be around \$409,713,062 at year one 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May see a positive non-quantitative social / economic effect from restricting oil and gas leasing Traditional local setting preserved Economic output expected to range between \$369,794,770 and \$409,306,729 at year one depending on the sub-alternative Sub-Alternative B1 brings more output than Sub-Alternative B2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to Alternative B with less preservation of local setting Economic output expected to range between \$461,377,202 and \$461,456,280 at year one depending on the sub-alternative Sub-Alternative C5 brings in the least economic output while Sub-Alternative C4 brings in the most 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritize development of traditional market resources while sustaining land health Economic output expected around \$465,939,968 at year one
Public Health and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk to public health and safety greatest Fewest acres closed, increased traffic, and water pollution are expected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generalized risk to public health and safety from air emissions, noise, light, pollution, and traffic would decrease 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowest generalized risk to public health and safety from air emissions, noise, light, pollution, and traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to Alternative A Aims to minimize impacts on surrounding communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative C