



## Summary of BLM Alternatives

### Alternative A: No Action

Alternative A meets the NEPA requirement in 40 CFR 1502.14 that the BLM consider a no action alternative. This alternative provides the baseline against which to compare the other alternatives. Under this alternative, the present management direction and practices would continue, based on existing RMPs and RMP amendments. Direction contained in existing laws, regulations, policies, and standards would also continue to be implemented, sometimes superseding provisions of the RMPs and subsequent RMP amendments. The current levels, methods, and mix of multiple-use management of BLM-administered lands in the Oklahoma Field Office decision area would continue; resource values would continue to receive attention at their present levels.

### Alternative B: Agency Preferred

Alternative B, Agency Preferred, represents a mix of management actions that resolve issues identified by assessing the need for changing management, concerns raised during public scoping, and future management considerations. This alternative would reflect a combination of goals and objectives for all values and programs. It emphasizes an intermediate level of protection, restoration, enhancement, and use of resources and services to meet ongoing programs and land uses.

The management strategy would be accomplished by using a variety of proactive and prescriptive measures to protect vegetation and habitat. Moreover, it would promote the continuation of multiple-use management. Vegetation and special status species habitat would be restored and enhanced to continue the presence of an ecologically healthy ecosystem. Restoration would make use of a suite of proactive and specific prescriptive management tools and implementation measures. Commodity and development-based resources, such as livestock grazing and minerals production, would be maintained on BLM-administered lands through specific actions to meet resource goals and protect ecosystem health.

Management strategies would continue to provide for recreation opportunities on and access to BLM-administered lands. Management would take into consideration the result of actions on regional community economies and the potential for user conflicts. The management strategy would emphasize the overarching goal to identify, protect, and preserve cultural properties that are considered significant and sacred to Federally recognized Indian tribes as established through consultation with THPOs and these tribes. Sustainable development concepts would be applied to preserve ecological functions and maintain economic productivity.

### Alternative C

Alternative C would develop management strategies to preserve and protect ecosystem health and resource values across the planning area, while providing for multiple uses. Resource development would be more constrained than under Alternatives B or D, and in some cases and some areas, uses would be excluded to protect sensitive resources. The management strategy for Alternative C would also emphasize the overarching goal to identify, protect, and preserve cultural properties that are considered significant and sacred to Federally recognized Indian tribes, as established through consultation with THPOs and these tribes. This alternative includes the most special designations, with specific measures to protect or enhance resource values in these areas. This alternative emphasizes active and specific measures to protect and enhance vegetation and habitat for special status species, fish, and wildlife. Likewise, this alternative would reflect a reduction in resource production goals for forage, renewable energy, and minerals. Resource production would generally be secondary to restoring and protecting important habitats, such as sagebrush and riparian areas. Sustainable development principles would focus on preserving ecological functions and environmental values.

### Alternative D

Alternative D emphasizes resource use and economic development in the planning area, such as for livestock grazing, energy and mineral development, and recreation. This alternative has the fewest restrictions on development and land use. Potential impacts on sensitive resources such as soils and sensitive plant habitat would be mitigated on a case-by-case basis. Sustainable development concepts are included to maintain economic productivity.



# OKLAHOMA, KANSAS, AND TEXAS DRAFT JOINT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

BLM RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND  
BIA INTEGRATED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

## COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF BLM ALTERNATIVES

	Alternative (Acres)			
	A	B	C	D
<b>Decision Areas</b>				
BLM surface	15,100*	15,100*	15,100*	15,100*
Coal mineral decision area	1,883,300	1,883,300	1,883,300	1,883,300
<i>BLM-administered surface land and split-estate</i>	<i>501,600</i>	<i>501,600</i>	<i>501,600</i>	<i>501,600</i>
<i>State and other federal Surface Management Agencies (SMAs)</i>	<i>1,381,700</i>	<i>1,381,700</i>	<i>1,381,700</i>	<i>1,381,700</i>
Mineral materials, nonenergy leasable, and fluids mineral decision area	4,438,100*	4,438,100*	4,438,100*	4,438,100*
<i>BLM-administered surface land and split-estate</i>	<i>447,000*</i>	<i>447,000*</i>	<i>447,000*</i>	<i>447,000*</i>
<i>Other federal SMAs</i>	<i>3,991,100</i>	<i>3,991,100</i>	<i>3,991,100</i>	<i>3,991,100</i>
<b>Resources</b>				
<b>Visual Resource Management (VRM)</b>	<b>Figure 2-1<sup>2,4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-2<sup>2,4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-3<sup>2,4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-2<sup>2,4</sup></b>
VRM Class I	0	0	200	0
VRM Class II	1,900*	2,500*	14,200	200
VRM Class III	9,800	12,000	700*	14,000
VRM Class IV	100	600	0	900*
Undesignated	3,300	0	0	0
<b>Resource Uses</b>				
<b>Coal Acceptable for further consideration for leasing - all federal minerals (with coal potential and subject to leasing)</b>	<b>Figure 2-4<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-5<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-4<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-5<sup>4</sup></b>
Acceptable: BLM-administered lands (BLM surface)	0	100	0	100
<i>surface and underground</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>only underground</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Acceptable: other state and federal SMAs	600	1,206,900	600	1,206,900
<i>surface and underground</i>	<i>600</i>	<i>2,400</i>	<i>600</i>	<i>2,400</i>
<i>only underground</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1,204,500</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1,204,500</i>
Acceptable: private surface estate overlying federal mineral estate	69,400	464,700	69,400	464,700
<i>surface and underground</i>	<i>69,400</i>	<i>464,700</i>	<i>69,400</i>	<i>464,700</i>
<i>only underground</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>Mineral Materials</b>	<b>Figure 2-6<sup>2,4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-7<sup>2,4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-8<sup>2,4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-7<sup>2,4</sup></b>
Open for consideration for mineral materials	4,438,100*	4,438,100*	4,427,600	4,438,100*
<i>BLM-administered surface land and split-estate</i>	<i>15,100*</i>	<i>15,100*</i>	<i>4,600</i>	<i>15,100*</i>
<i>Other federal SMAs</i>	<i>4,423,000</i>	<i>4,423,000</i>	<i>4,423,000</i>	<i>4,423,000</i>
<b>Nonenergy Solid Leasable Minerals</b>	<b>Figure 2-9<sup>2,4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-10<sup>2,4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-11<sup>2,4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-10<sup>2,4</sup></b>
Open for consideration for nonenergy solid leasable minerals	4,438,100*	4,438,100*	4,427,600*	4,438,100*
<i>BLM-administered surface land and split-estate</i>	<i>15,100*</i>	<i>15,100*</i>	<i>4,600*</i>	<i>15,100*</i>
<i>Other federal SMAs</i>	<i>4,423,000</i>	<i>4,423,000</i>	<i>4,423,000</i>	<i>4,423,000</i>



# OKLAHOMA, KANSAS, AND TEXAS DRAFT JOINT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

BLM RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND  
BIA INTEGRATED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

<b>COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF BLM ALTERNATIVES</b>				
	<b>Alternative (Acres)</b>			
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Fluid Mineral Leasing</b>	<b>Figures 2-12, 2-15, and 2-19<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Figures 2-13, 2-16, and 2-20<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Figures 2-14, 2-17, and 2-21<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Figures 2-13, 2-18, and 2-22<sup>4</sup></b>
Open to fluid mineral leasing, subject to existing laws, regulations, and formal orders	3,976,700*	4,393,300*	3,820,000*	4,393,300*
<i>BLM-administered surface land and split-estate</i>	396,400*	447,000*	396,400*	447,000*
<i>Other federal SMAs</i>	3,580,300	3,946,300	3,423,600	3,946,300
Open to leasing, subject to standard terms and conditions (i.e., not subject to major or moderate constraints)	2,615,100*	2,707,900*	2,174,400	2,709,700*
<i>BLM-administered surface land and split-estate</i>	335,700*	184,900*	147,600	186,700*
<i>Other federal SMAs</i>	2,279,400	2,523,000	2,026,800	2,523,000
Open to leasing, subject to major constraints (NSO) <sup>1</sup>	1,362,000*	1,550,600*	1,512,600*	1,550,600*
<i>BLM-administered surface land and split-estate</i>	60,800*	126,900*	115,400*	126,900*
<i>Other federal SMAs</i> <sup>3</sup>	1,301,200	1,423,700	1,397,200	1,423,700
Open to leasing, subject to moderate constraints (CSU) <sup>1</sup>	14,500	191,500*	202,300	179,800*
<i>BLM-administered surface land and split-estate</i>	14,500	191,500*	202,300	179,800*
<i>Other federal SMAs</i>	0	0	0	0
Closed to fluid mineral leasing	461,400	44,800	618,100	44,800
<i>BLM-administered surface land and split-estate</i>	50,600	0	50,600	0
<i>Other federal SMAs</i>	410,800	44,800	567,500	44,800
<b>Livestock Grazing</b>	<b>Figures 2-23<sup>2</sup>, 2-24<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Figures 2-25<sup>2</sup>, 2-24<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Figures 2-23<sup>2</sup>, 2-26<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Figures 2-25<sup>2</sup>, 2-24<sup>4</sup></b>
Available for all classes of livestock grazing	3,300*	15,100*	0	15,100*
Unavailable to all classes of livestock grazing	11,800	0	15,100*	0
<b>Recreation Management Areas (RMAs)</b>	<b>No Figure</b>	<b>Figure 2-27<sup>2, 4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-27<sup>2, 4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-27<sup>2, 4</sup></b>
Cross Bar SRMA (Alternative B) or ERMA (Alternatives C and D)	0	9,900	9,900	9,900
<b>Travel, Transportation Management, and Access</b>	<b>Figure 2-28<sup>2, 4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-29<sup>2, 4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-29<sup>2, 4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-29<sup>2, 4</sup></b>
Off-road vehicle use				
Open	15,100*	0	0	0
Closed	0	0	0*	0
Limited	0	15,100*	15,100	15,100*
<b>Lands and Realty</b>	<b>No Figure</b>	<b>Figure 2-30<sup>2, 4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-31<sup>2, 4</sup></b>	<b>Figure 2-30<sup>2, 4</sup></b>
Right-of-way exclusion areas	0	200	200	0
Right-of-way avoidance areas	0	12,700*	14,800*	9,900
Identified as meeting the disposal criteria listed in Section 203 of FLPMA	NA**	NA**	NA**	NA**



# OKLAHOMA, KANSAS, AND TEXAS DRAFT JOINT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

## BLM RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND BIA INTEGRATED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

### COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF BLM ALTERNATIVES

	Alternative (Acres)			
	A	B	C	D
<b>Special Designations</b>				
<b>ACECs</b>	No Figure	No Figure	Figure 2-32 <sup>2, 4</sup>	No Figure
Cross Bar Management Area	0	0	10,500	0
<b>Eligible (Alternative A) or Suitable (Alternatives B and C) Wild and Scenic River Study Segments</b>	Figure 2-33 <sup>4</sup>	Figure 2-33 <sup>4</sup>	Figure 2-33 <sup>4</sup>	No Figure
Canadian River	1,100	1,100	1,100	0

Source: BLM GIS 2016

<sup>1</sup> Acreages subject to fluid minerals NSO (No Surface Occupancy) and CSU (Controlled Surface Use) stipulations may overlap; therefore, acreages do not add up to the mineral estate decision area. Under Alternative A there are approximately 14,500 acres of overlap, under Alternative B there are approximately 69,600 acres of overlap, under Alternative C there are approximately 68,800 acres of overlap, and under Alternative D there are approximately 59,700 acres of overlap.

<sup>2</sup> Figure displays Cross Bar Management Area allocations only.

<sup>3</sup> NSO acreages for other SMAs are an estimate used for analysis purposes only; specific NSO stipulations will be determined by the SMA at the time of lease sale.

<sup>4</sup> See DEIS Appendix A.

\*Plus any applicable federal lands along the 116-mile stretch of the Red River between the North Fork of the Red River and the 98th Meridian that will be more specifically identified and mapped when they are surveyed. (No exact acreages of federal lands are available at this time because the full 116-mile stretch has not been surveyed.) Any such survey would be conducted in accordance with applicable law.

\*\*No acreage figures have been provided here. Refer to Appendix N for legal land descriptions of isolated tracts of public land, as well as certain lands in the Cross Bar Management Area, which the BLM has identified as meeting the disposal criteria in Section 203 of FLPMA. Prior to any decision to dispose of public land, the BLM would review the legal land description, and conduct a resurvey if necessary. For lands along the 116-mile stretch of the Red River between the North Fork of the Red River and the 98th Meridian, such lands would be more specifically identified and mapped when they are surveyed. (No exact acreages and no legal land descriptions of federal lands are available at this time because the full 116-mile stretch has not been surveyed). Any such survey would be conducted in accordance with applicable law.