### BLM Environmental Consequences Summary by Alternative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative A:</th>
<th>Alternative B:</th>
<th>Alternative C:</th>
<th>Alternative D:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Air               | • More surface disturbance and oil & gas wells resulting in greater potential for new sources of criteria pollutants, hazardous pollutants, and greenhouse gas emissions | • Larger area closed compared to No Action Alternative  
• Maintains or minimizes impacts related to fugitive dust before surface-disturbing activities begin | • Least predicted air emissions  
• Largest areas are closed for development | • Emissions like Alternatives A & B but vary depending on how much area is closed or subject to NSO | • Similar to No Action Alternative  
• Least protective of water resources |
| Water             | • No management regarding reuse of produced water and flowback water in oil & gas development  
• Potential for reduced or depleted natural water supplies | • More regulations around water in oil & gas development  
• More areas closed to leasing would decrease potential water impacts | • Fewest impacts on water quality and water supplies; most protection for water resources | • 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 | • Least protective of water resources |
| Fluid Minerals    | • No change to the acres open for mineral extraction  
1,873 projected new oil & gas wells in the next 20 years | • Some leased 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 | • Greatest amount of high and moderate-potential leased acres would be closed  
1,402 and 1,125 projected new wells under Sub-Alternative B1 & B2 | • No leased acres with high development potential would be closed  
1,865 projected new wells under Sub-Alternative C1-C5; 1,853 wells under Sub-Alternative C6 | • Less restrictive setbacks would result in more acres opened for mineral extraction  
• No closure of high-potential leased acres  
1,873 projected new oil & gas wells |
| Vegetation        | • Least protective to upland vegetation and soil conditions  
• High potential damage to vegetation and soil | • Protects vegetation and soils through closures, NSOs, and right-of-way (ROW) exclusion areas  
• Formalizes treatment purposes in GMUs | • 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 | • Surface disturbances and resulting impacts are expected  
• Formalizes treatment purposes in GMUs | • Least protective of vegetation with most acres open to leasing  
• Formalizes treatment purposes in GMUs |
| Geology           | • Increased potential for surface disturbances  
• Could limit risk of impacts on traditional mineral gathering areas and culturally significant formations | • Increased reclamation and restrictions on surface use resulting in less potential for damage to traditional mineral gathering areas and culturally significant geological formations | • Most restrictive designation of surface disturbances stipulations  
• Fewest impacts to geologic formations, traditional mineral gathering, and cultural formations | • Impacts vary depending on how much area is subject to surface use restrictions. Impacts could be greater than those under Alternatives A and B. | • Same as the No Action Alternative  
• Least restrictive setbacks would result in more acres opened for mineral extraction  
• No closure of high-potential leased acres  
1,873 projected new oil & gas wells |
| Cultural Resources| • Impacts could be significant  
• Historical and physical integrity could be potentially threatened | • 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 | • 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 | • 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 | • Least protective of cultural resources; most acres open to oil & gas leasing |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative A:</th>
<th>Alternative B:</th>
<th>Alternative C:</th>
<th>Alternative D:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American and Tribal Interests and Uses</td>
<td>• Traditional plant gathering may be destroyed through fluid mineral leasing</td>
<td>• Restriction zones around the CCNHP and Chacoan outliers would reduce potential for direct/indirect impacts on CIMPPs and Indian Trust Assets</td>
<td>• Most protection for Native American cultural resources and interest; least amount of area would be open to leasing</td>
<td>• Reduce indirect visual, noise, and vibration impacts that could diminish aspects of historic integrity, such as setting or feeling.</td>
<td>• Offers the least protection out of the action alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impacts greatest in areas managed as open to leasing, as surface disturbance would be unrestricted.</td>
<td>• BLM would consult with Tribes with cultural affinity for CIMPPs to avoid or minimize impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development in certain areas could diminish ability of Tribes to conduct ceremonies or use CIMPPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands and Realty</td>
<td>• ROWs continue to be managed by a case-by-case basis with few limitations</td>
<td>• ROWs would be excluded in certain areas. ROWs would be subject to special siting criteria, design requirements, or other constraints to minimize impacts</td>
<td>• Fewer areas would be available for ROW development and infrastructure placement</td>
<td>• ROW placement would be excluded or avoided in fewer areas than Alternatives A and B; thus impacts similar to No Action Alternative</td>
<td>• Same as Alternative C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets demand for new ROWs associated with energy and mineral development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands with Wilderness Characteristics</td>
<td>• Emphasize other multiple uses as a priority over protecting wilderness characteristics, which would diminish natural setting</td>
<td>• Four lands with wilderness characteristics units managed to protect wilderness characteristics as a priority over other multiple uses</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A</td>
<td>Same as the No Action Alternative</td>
<td>Same as the No Action Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Economic Uses</td>
<td>• Supports employment, income, and economic contributions</td>
<td>• May see a positive non-quantitative social / economic effect from restricting oil and gas leasing</td>
<td>• May see a positive non-quantitative social / economic effect from restricting oil and gas leasing</td>
<td>• Similar to Alternative B with less preservation of local setting</td>
<td>• Prioritize development of traditional market resources while sustaining land health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic output expected to be around $461,660,882 at year one</td>
<td>• Economic output expected to be around $409,713,062 at year one</td>
<td>• Traditional local setting preserved</td>
<td>• Economic output expected to range between $461,377,202 and $461,456,280 at year one depending on the sub-alternative</td>
<td>• Economic output expected around $465,939,968 at year one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic output focused around Oil and gas industry</td>
<td>• Economic output expected to range between $369,794,770 and $409,306,729 at year one</td>
<td>• Economic output expected to range between $369,794,770 and $409,306,729 at year one</td>
<td>• Sub-Alternative C5 brings in the least economic output while Sub-Alternative C4 brings in the most</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health and Safety</td>
<td>• Risk to public health and safety greatest</td>
<td>• Generalized risk to public health and safety from air emissions, noise, light, pollution, and traffic would decrease</td>
<td>• Lowest generalized risk to public health and safety from air emissions, noise, light, pollution, and traffic</td>
<td>• Similar to Alternative A</td>
<td>• Same as Alternative C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fewest acres closed, increased traffic, and water pollution are expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Aims to minimize impacts on surrounding communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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