

IV.14 BLM LAND DESIGNATIONS, CLASSIFICATIONS, ALLOCATIONS, AND LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

This chapter addresses potential impacts from implementing the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP or Plan) alternatives on Bureau of Land Management (BLM)-administered lands with designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics. Designations, classifications, and allocations consist of lands designated as wilderness areas, wilderness study areas (WSAs), National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic and Historic Trails (NSHT), Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), wildlife management areas, Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs), and multiple-use classes as described in Volume III, Chapter III.14.

Management of lands with wilderness characteristics varies by alternative, and these lands are not considered special designations. A primary consideration in quantifying impacts is the extent to which these BLM-administered lands are affected by or intersect with the proposed Development Focus Areas (DFAs) (within BLM-administered lands only) and approved transmission corridors under each alternative.

Changes to the existing designations are also considered. Public Law 111-11 states that public land within the California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) that BLM administers for conservation purposes is to be included within the National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS). The DRECP would identify and describe which areas would be managed as National Conservation Lands as a component of the NLCS.

The alternatives described in Volume II offer a range of possible approaches to meet the requirements of Public Law 111-11 within the context of BLM management authority, responsibility to protect resources, and responsibility to balance conservation with renewable energy development and other multiple uses authorized on public lands. The DRECP alternatives also include management objectives for National Wild and Scenic Rivers and NSHTs, which are components of the NLCS within the DRECP. Congressional designation (through the BLM land use planning process) would establish National Trail Management Corridors and would incorporate management actions for National Trails according to applicable laws and policy. Decisions would be made in the DRECP to designate the National Trail Management Corridors; establish allowable uses, management actions, and necessary restrictions to achieve National Trail goals and objectives; and safeguard the nature and purposes for the national trail designation.

IV.14.1 Approach to Impact Analysis

IV.14.1.1 General Methods

This chapter discusses the impacts of BLM-administered conservation and renewable energy DFAs and approved transmission corridors to land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics for each alternative. This analysis is based on the description of Covered Activities and the overall conservation strategy within the Plan Area. Covered Activities are actions associated with renewable energy development permitted within DFAs under the DRECP. Transmission development may also occur outside the DFAs but would be subject to permitting and management conditions set by the Plan.

The DFAs exclude land with designations including wilderness areas, WSAs, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers. However, renewable energy development in DFAs and approved transmission corridors may indirectly affect these special designation lands through reduced air quality, reduction in the values of solitude, and impacts to primitive and unconfined types of recreation. Additionally, DFAs within 5 miles of a special designation area may affect people in the area because development would be within the visible foreground and middle ground distance. Impacts would occur, to a lesser degree, even beyond this 5-mile distance due to the scale of these developments.

Development within the viewshed of the trail would impact some of the NSHTs national trail corridors. Development would also more directly impact viewsheds and associated trail settings where they traverse DFAs. For some segments of NSHTs, it will be necessary to mitigate or moderate, to the greatest extent possible, the adverse impacts to the resources, qualities, values, and associated settings of the NSHTs from incompatible multiple-use activities. Priority for mitigation should occur on site first. Where on-site mitigation (along the National Trail Corridor) cannot adequately compensate for the adverse impact, off-site mitigation may include consideration of monetary compensation for public lands along the National Trail, and should be analyzed, incorporated, and carried out according to all applicable laws and policies.

Under some of the alternatives in this analysis, renewable energy and transmission development would be an allowable use within lands with wilderness characteristics (or in some alternatives inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics) resulting in direct impacts from the ground disturbance and industrial nature of the renewable energy development.

Under the BLM Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) component of each of the action alternatives, BLM would designate ACECs or National Conservation Lands to address the special management needs for natural and cultural resources. Under the LUPA, BLM would man-

age the ACECs and National Conservation Lands designations for conservation purposes. No DFAs would overlap with these areas. Additionally, BLM has identified land allocation and management decisions for BLM-administered lands in the DRECP boundaries.

The analysis area for BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics includes BLM-administered lands within the Plan Area. Impact analysis will focus on the impacts to these BLM-administered lands from renewable energy and transmission DFAs and changes to the existing land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics under the DRECP. Impacts of the proposed NLCS designations on other land use decisions or allocations such as land tenure, rights-of-way, minerals, and recreation permits are addressed in the corresponding resource use chapter (Chapters IV.11, IV.13, IV.15, and IV.18, respectively). The impact analysis for certain special designations such as wilderness, WSAs, and eligible and designated wild and scenic river segments will focus only on how the proposed management decisions would interact with the management decisions already in place for these lands, as no changes in management are proposed in the DRECP. The degree to which a proposed management decision would affect a particular area would depend largely on the extent of the area subject to those decisions and the extent of the management change.

Appendix R2.14 includes tables to support this chapter. Appendix R2.14 provides BLM Special Designations within 5 miles of available development areas (No Action Alternative) and DFAs (action alternatives); BLM designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics by alternative; Areas of Critical Environmental Concern by alternative; disturbance caps by alternative; existing and proposed SRMAs by alternative; and, BLM Multiple-Use Class crosswalk with proposed designations and allocations by alternative.

IV.14.1.2 CEQA Standards of Significance

BLM lands with conservation and renewable energy designations, classifications, allocations, and management of lands with wilderness characteristics consist of lands under the jurisdiction of BLM. There are no CEQA standards of significance for the lands, so a CEQA-level analysis does not apply.

IV.14.2 Typical Impacts Common to All Action Alternatives

IV.14.2.1 Impacts of Renewable Energy and Transmission Development

This section describes the potential impacts of the renewable energy technologies permitted under the Plan and supporting facilities necessary to transmit energy from these technologies to existing and planned BLM-administered land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics. Renewable energy technologies that

could be built within the proposed DFAs near BLM-administered existing or planned designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics could impact the conservation and protection purposes.

IV.14.2.1.1 Impacts of Site Characterization

The site characterization phase of renewable energy and transmission facility development would likely result in minimal effects to BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics. Activities required during site characterization—such as geotechnical testing, wind meteorological siting, and some minimal ground disturbance—would result in short-term and localized impacts.

IV.14.2.1.2 Impacts of Construction and Decommissioning

For areas of special designation adjacent to DFAs, construction and decommissioning of renewable energy projects, associated transmission, and infrastructure could result in the degradation or destruction of land values from changes to the topography, hydrologic patterns, removal or erosion of soils, and runoff into and sedimentation of adjacent areas. Visual and air quality impacts could result if construction impacts were substantial and required a large amount of earth movement on adjacent lands. Chapter IV.20 addresses impacts to visual resources and Chapter IV.2 addresses impacts to air quality.

Renewable energy development could also conflict with BLM management goals and objectives to categorize, protect, and manage special designation areas. For some alternatives, development could conflict with lands with wilderness characteristics and change the nature of these lands so they no longer are considered as such.

IV.14.2.1.3 Impacts of Operations and Maintenance

The operation and maintenance of renewable energy and transmission facilities within special designation areas could conflict with the management goals and conservation values of special designation areas. The long-term presence of facilities and related activities for operations and maintenance could result in degradation of the natural, cultural, and scenic values of special designation lands.

IV.14.2.2 Impacts of the Reserve Design

Conservation actions would result in increased protection of natural and cultural resource values within conservation lands. Conservation actions are expected to improve the relevant and important values for lands with special designations by protecting their natural states. An increase in land Conservation Designations, classifications, and allocations and protection

of lands with wilderness characteristics would improve habitat connectivity and landscape linkages.

IV.14.2.3 Impacts of BLM Land Use Plan Decisions

IV.14.2.3.1 Impacts of Renewable Energy Development and Transmission on BLM Lands

The typical impacts from the various renewable energy and transmission technologies on BLM lands would be the same as those described in Section IV.14.2.1. However, the specific locations in which energy and transmission development would be allowed will be driven by LUPA decisions, which may encourage or restrict development in some areas.

IV.14.2.3.2 Impacts of BLM Land Designations and Management Actions

Because BLM LUPA land designations would protect ecological, historic, cultural, scenic, scientific, and recreation resources and values, they would also confer general protection for sensitive cultural and natural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values. While other land uses are allowed within these areas, other uses must be compatible with the resources and values that the land designation is intended to protect.

Where the BLM LUPA designates SRMAs, impacts to sensitive cultural and natural resources may result from increased recreational use and access to nearby sensitive areas. If BLM manages the SRMAs to exclude nonsurface occupancy of renewable energy development and maintain or enhance recreational setting characteristics of remoteness and naturalness, the management may provide limited protections to the sensitive natural and cultural resources surrounding and adjacent to BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics.

The proposed LUPA description in Volume II presents allowable uses and management within NLCS lands. The LUPA worksheets in Appendix L present details on the goals, objectives, allowable uses, and management actions for each ACEC and SRMA unit.

IV.14.2.4 Impacts of Natural Community Conservation Plan and General Conservation Plan

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) would administer the Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), which would apply to the entire Plan Area. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would administer the General Conservation Plan (GCP), which would apply to nonfederal lands, a subset of the Plan Area.

IV.14.2.4.1 Natural Community Conservation Plan

The impacts of renewable energy development permitted under the NCCP would be the same as those defined for the Plan-wide impacts, including the typical impacts described in Section IV.14.2 and for each alternative described below.

IV.14.2.4.2 General Conservation Plan

As described in Appendix M, the GCP would apply to nonfederal lands in the Plan Area. BLM lands with conservation and renewable energy designations, classifications, allocations, and management of inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics are under federal jurisdiction administered by BLM. Therefore, the GCP does not apply to these lands.

IV.14.3 Impact Analysis by Alternative

The following sections present impact analysis for the No Action Alternative, the Preferred Alternative, and Alternatives 1 through 4.

IV.14.3.1 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative assumes that the state's renewable energy goals would be achieved without the DRECP and that renewable energy, transmission development, and mitigation for projects in the Plan Area would be developed on a project-by-project basis in a pattern consistent with past and ongoing renewable energy and transmission projects.

Any areas currently excluded from development by statute, regulation, or proclamation would retain those exclusions. Areas that are administratively excluded from development would continue to be assessed based on management guidance within BLM local field office land use plans. Without the DRECP, renewable energy development would likely continue to be patchy and fragmented, resulting in the increased likelihood of fragmentation of BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations.

IV.14.3.1.1 Impacts Within the Entire Plan Area in No Action Alternative

IV.14.3.1.1.1 Impacts and Mitigation for Renewable Energy and Transmission Development in No Action Alternative

Impact Assessment

Under the No Action Alternative, BLM-administered lands available for renewable energy and transmission development (available development areas, with approximated distribution of technology types) are shown in Table IV.14-1. Lands available for development

under this alternative would be scattered throughout the Plan Area based on existing policy and land classifications.

Table IV.14-1
Potential Acres of Impacts to BLM ACECs and SRMAs in Available Development Areas by Technology Type – No Action Alternative

Land Category	Acres of BLM Lands Available for Development*	Potential Impacts by Technology Type (acres)			
		Solar ¹	Wind ²	GT ³	Transmission
CDCA	—	—	—	—	—
Existing ACECs	3,206,000	15,000	25,000	100	5,000
Existing SRMAs	164,000	0	0	0	0
Caliente RMP	—	—	—	—	—
Existing ACECs	2,000	0	300	0	0
Existing SRMAs	—	—	—	—	—
Bishop RMP	—	—	—	—	—
Existing ACECs	—	—	—	—	—
Existing SRMAs	29,000	0	0	0	0

¹ Includes ground-mounted distributed generation

² Disturbance Area

³ Plan Area

* BLM-administered lands only

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Under the No Action Alternative, approximately 45,400 acres of BLM lands may be developed for renewable energy. Renewable energy and transmission development is not allowed, by policy, within wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, and NSHT lands under the No Action Alternative. These special designation areas may experience indirect impacts from renewable energy and transmission development on adjacent or nearby lands. Any renewable technology or transmission development within 5 miles of these areas may result in an indirect adverse effect on the viewshed, air quality, values of solitude, primitive and unconfined types of recreation, or other features of scenic value within wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, and NSHT lands.

Under the No Action Alternative, there are 44 wilderness areas (approximately 1,670,000 acres), 6 WSAs (approximately 158,000 acres), 3 NSHTs (698 miles), and almost 22 miles of National Wild and Scenic River within 5 miles of available development areas that may be impacted (see Appendix R2.14, Table R2.14-1, alternatives comparison table).

Under the No Action Alternative, renewable energy development could occur on existing BLM ACECs and SRMAs. The potential number of acres that could be directly impacted by renewable energy and transmission facility development under the No Action Alternative are summarized below. Overall, the potential impacts to existing BLM ACECs and SRMAs would be minimal. Table R2.14-2 shows the total acres of BLM designations, classifications, allocations, and lands inventoried with wilderness characteristics within the Plan Area. Also see Table R2.14-3 for existing ACECs (names and acres) by alternative and Table R2.14-4 for existing SRMAs (names and acres) by alternative.

ACECs. Development of approximately 45,000 acres of renewable energy technology may impact existing ACECs. Potential disturbance may occur within approximately 1.4% of existing ACECs in the Plan Area.

SRMAs. Renewable energy development within available development areas would not overlap existing SRMAs. Renewable energy development within available development areas would not overlap with existing SRMAs.

Potential impacts to BLM ACECs and SRMAs under the No Action Alternative are described in more detail in the impact analysis.

Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. Under the No Action Alternative, about 633,000 acres of lands inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics would not be managed to protect their wilderness characteristics (see Table R2.14-2). Renewable energy and transmission development would be an allowable use within these areas. Inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics would be reduced in size where the lands are being reprioritized for renewable energy development. Approximately 11,000 acres of lands inventoried for wilderness characteristics (not managed) would be reprioritized for development. Under the No Action Alternative, no management or measures would be included to protect wilderness characteristics where these lands occur.

Impact LD-1: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would reduce the value of designated conservation areas.

The No Action Alternative could reduce the value of more than 58,000 acres of lands designated as ACECs in the CDCA, primarily within the Cadiz Valley and Chocolate Mountains and West Mojave and Eastern Slopes ecoregion subareas. More than 1,000 acres of lands designated as ACECs in the Caliente Resource Management Plan (RMP) are all within the West Mojave and Eastern Slopes ecoregion subarea. ACECs are areas requiring special management to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values; fish and wildlife resources; or other natural systems or processes; or to protect life and provide safety from natural hazards. Renewable energy development on lands

designated as ACECs would change the existing setting and reduce the value of these areas. Under the No Action Alternative, minimal acres (approximately 2%) of existing ACECs would overlap with available development areas; therefore, impacts would be minimal and mitigation measures would further reduce impacts.

Within ACECs, BLM would review applications for renewable energy development to determine if they conform with the prescriptions outlined in the relevant land use plan. Before activity could occur, resources and values identified for protection under the designation would be analyzed for potential impacts. Only areas identified as Variance Lands within the Solar Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Solar PEIS) could be considered for solar development, as other areas have already been determined as unsuitable. Wind and geothermal development, unless specifically excluded, would continue to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

For all lands with special designations, the proximity of renewable energy development to these lands would result in indirect effects to their use, such as reduction in air quality, impacts to visual resources, and increased noise and traffic. These types of impacts would reduce the quality of the lands with special designation and change the nature of the area (see Table R2.14-1). Under the No Action Alternative, indirect impacts to special designations from available development areas within 5 miles would likely be minor to moderate. Mitigation measures to avoid and minimize impacts would be incorporated on a project-by-project basis.

Impact LD-2: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would conflict with the existing management goals and objectives of designated conservation areas.

Volume III, Sections III.14.2.2 and III.14.2.4 discuss the management goals and objectives of ACECs. BLM manages ACECs to protect significant natural and cultural resources. Within specific ACECs, BLM management may provide for other uses, such as leasing of geothermal resources in the Horse Canyon ACEC, subject to a no surface occupancy stipulation. Renewable energy development could impact natural and cultural resources through ground disturbance and the industrial nature of the development. Development of renewable energy adjacent to or near existing conservation areas would indirectly affect the existing management goals and objectives, in particular the protection of scenic value. Development on inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics would degrade those characteristics.

Laws and Regulations

Existing laws and regulations would reduce the impacts of renewable energy development projects under the No Action Alternative. Relevant regulations are presented in the Regulatory Setting in Volume III. Because this EIR/EIS addresses amendments to BLM's land use plans, these plans are addressed separately and not included in this section. The requirements of relevant regulations would reduce impacts through the following mechanisms:

- The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.
- The Wilderness Act of 1964 – The Wilderness Act also sets the accepted and prohibited uses of designated wilderness areas.
- The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 – The National Wild and Scenic Rivers System preserves certain rivers with outstanding natural, cultural, and recreational values in a free-flowing condition for the enjoyment of present and future generations.
- The National Trails System Act of 1968 - The Act created a series of National trails “to promote the preservation of, public access to, travel within, and enjoyment and appreciation of the open-air, outdoor areas and historic resources of the Nation.” Specifically, the Act authorized three types of trails: the National Scenic Trails, National Recreation Trails and connecting-and-side trails. In 1978, as a result of the study of trails that were most significant for their historic associations, a fourth category of trail was added: the National Historic Trails.
- The California Desert Protection Act of 1994 – This law established the Death Valley and Joshua Tree National Parks and the Mojave National Preserve in the California desert and designated new wilderness areas to protect targeted desert wildland resources that face increasing threats.
- The Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 – This landmark law protected millions of acres of federal land as wilderness, protected more than 1,000 miles of rivers through the National Wild and Scenic River System, and designated thousands of miles of trails for the National Trails System. It also authorized the National Landscape Conservation System. In the Plan Area, the law designated one new wilderness area, as well as additions to four wilderness areas. The act also expanded the boundary of the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument, as well as an addition to the Amargosa Wild and Scenic River.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures adopted for approved renewable energy and transmission development projects would likely be the same measures that would be applied in the future under the

No Action Alternative. The BLM Solar Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Solar PEIS) design features, as well as features for wind and geothermal development, that would likely be implemented to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate potential impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations include actions such as:

- Siting and designing renewable energy and transmission to minimize impacts on BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations.
- Protecting existing values of BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations.

IV.14.3.1.1.2 Impacts from Reserve Design in the No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative has no reserve design, but without approval of an action alternative, there would be continued protection of existing Legislatively and Legally Protected Areas (LLPAs), such as wilderness areas. In addition, under the No Action Alternative, renewable energy projects would continue to be evaluated and approved with project-specific mitigation requirements.

IV.14.3.1.2 Impacts on BLM Lands of Existing BLM Land Use Plans in the No Action Alternative

Volume III, Chapter III.14 describes the existing BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations.

Legislatively and Legally Protected Lands. BLM would continue to manage these land designations to protect ecological, historic, cultural, scenic, scientific, and recreation resources and values under the No Action Alternative. Under this alternative, there would be no BLM LUPA and no changes to goals, objectives, management, or acreage of these lands would occur.

Under the No Action Alternative, NSHTs would continue to be managed on a case-by-case basis. A National Trail Management Corridor would not be established to delineate a NSHT management area and improve overall protection of trail values and resources.

Wild and Scenic Rivers. Under the No Action Alternative, the Amargosa River, Mojave River (Afton Canyon), and Surprise Canyon Creek would be managed to protect the “outstandingly remarkable values (ORVs),” the free-flowing condition, and water quality in the designated or eligible segments. All actions would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure that these values are protected or enhanced. A boundary of 0.25 miles on either side of the river (above mean high water mark) will constitute the corridor. Renewable energy development would be prohibited in these segments.

ACECs and SRMAs. Table R2.14-3 presents existing ACECs (name and acres). The following Table IV.14-2 presents acres of existing BLM ACECs and SRMAs (acres and number of units) under the No Action Alternative. No changes to ACECs or SRMAs would occur under the No Action Alternative.

**Table IV.14-2
Existing BLM ACECs and SRMAs Within Plan Area – No Action Alternative**

BLM Lands ¹	Plan Area (approximate acres)	Number of Units Within Plan Area
Existing ACECs (including wildlife management areas)	3,393,000	89
Existing SRMAs	193,000	2

¹ These designations may overlap

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Source: BLM 2013

Lands With Inventoried Wilderness Characteristics. A portion of the Plan Area has been inventoried for lands with wilderness characteristics. Approximately 633,000 acres of lands found to have wilderness characteristics were inventoried within BLM-administered lands in the Plan Area. However, under the No Action Alternative, no management or measures would be included to protect wilderness characteristics where these lands occur. If a project were proposed in an area that has not been inventoried, an inventory would be completed. BLM would require mitigation/compensation for any inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics that would be impacted by development.

Multiple-Use Classes. Existing multiple-use classes within the CDCA Plan and DRECP are described in Table IV.14-3. The Caliente and Bishop RMPs did not classify multiple-use classes.

**Table IV.14-3
Multiple-Use Classes Within BLM-Administered Lands in the CDCA Plan (acres)**

Class C	Class L	Class M	Class I	Unclassified
2,772,000	3,919,000	2,284,000	554,000	244,000

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

No changes to goals, objectives, management, or acreage of multiple-use class lands would occur under the No Action Alternative (there would be no BLM LUPA under the No Action Alternative).

IV.14.3.1.3 Impacts of Natural Community Conservation Plan in No Action Alternative

In the absence of Plan implementation, the NCCP would not be approved and no incidental take permits would be issued under the NCCP. Projects would continue to be considered by the appropriate lead agency on an individual basis. The impacts that would occur in the absence of the NCCP would be the same as those described in Section IV.14.3.1.1.1 (Plan-wide analysis).

IV.14.3.1.4 Impacts of General Conservation Plan in No Action Alternative

In the absence of Plan implementation, the GCP would not be approved and no incidental take permits would be issued under the GCP. Projects would continue to be considered by the appropriate lead agency on an individual basis. The impacts that would occur in the absence of the GCP would be the same as those described in Section IV.14.3.1.1.1 (Plan-wide analysis), but would be specific to nonfederal lands.

IV.14.3.1.5 Impacts Outside the Plan Area in No Action Alternative

IV.14.3.1.5.1 Impacts of Transmission Outside the Plan Area

Under the No Action Alternative, additional transmission lines would be needed to deliver renewable energy to load centers (areas of high demand) outside the Plan Area. It is assumed that new transmission lines outside the Plan Area would use existing transmission corridors between the Plan Area and existing substations in the more heavily populated areas of the state. The areas outside the Plan Area through which new transmission lines might be constructed include the San Diego, Los Angeles, North Palm Springs–Riverside, and Central Valley areas. With regard to BLM lands, these areas are described in Volume III, Chapter III.14 (BLM Land Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands with Wilderness Characteristics), Section III.14.5.

Except for the North Palm Springs–Riverside area and San Diego area, relatively few BLM lands are Outside the Plan Area transmission corridors. In the North Palm Springs–Riverside Area, BLM lands are found along the transmission corridors east of Devers Substation as well as immediately west of the substation in the San Gorgonio Pass area along Interstate 10. A Section 368 BLM-designated corridor (number 30-52) with a width of 10,650 feet parallels Interstate 10. Any future transmission project in a 368 corridor would require National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review but not a LUPA. Another Section

368 BLM-designated corridor (number 115-238) includes land southeast of Ocotillo, in the vicinity of Interstate 8.

For BLM lands without designated transmission corridors, NEPA review and a LUPA would be needed. BLM land use plan designations or uses may exclude rights-of-way, ACECs, Desert Wildlife Management Areas (DWMAs), NLCS units, wilderness areas and WSAs, grazing allotments, mineral lease areas, withdrawal areas, and recreation lands. BLM determines if an area is excluded by one of these uses or designations on a case-by-case basis when an application is received.

Impact LD-1: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would reduce the value of designated conservation areas.

The only designated conservation areas in transmission corridors outside the Plan Area are desert tortoise habitat in the corridor between Desert Center and Devers Substation and Peninsular bighorn sheep habitat southwest of Ocotillo. Both are designated Section 368 transmission corridors. New transmission lines would be allowed without a LUPA, but would be subject to NEPA review and any restrictions and mitigation imposed for resource protection.

Impact LD-2: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would conflict with the existing management goals and objectives of special designations.

The development and operation of transmission facilities outside of the Plan Area could conflict with management goals, depending on the location of the line. Transmission line development Outside the Plan Area would impact natural and cultural resources through ground disturbance and the industrial nature of the development. Relatively little BLM land is within transmission corridors outside the Plan Area, and those areas are largely designated as being within Section 368 transmission corridors.

IV.14.3.1.5.2 Impacts of Existing BLM Land Use Plans Outside the Plan Area

Under the No Action Alternative, the existing BLM CDCA Plan would continue to be implemented on CDCA lands. Under the No Action Alternative, renewable energy projects would continue to be developed through BLM's existing policies. Impacts on BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations would be of the types described in Section IV.14.2.1, with similar mitigation measures being included on a case-by-case basis. No lands would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics.

BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations found Outside the Plan Area, but within the CDCA Plan, would continue to be managed to protect ecological, historic, cul-

tural, scenic, scientific, and recreation resources and values under the No Action Alternative. Acres of BLM ACECs and SRMAs found outside the Plan Area, but within the CDCA Plan, are presented in Table IV.14-4. Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no BLM LUPA and no changes to goals, objectives, management, or acreage of these lands would occur.

Table IV.14-4
Existing BLM ACECs and SRMAs Outside the Plan Area – No Action Alternative

BLM Lands ¹	Outside the Plan Area (acres)
Existing ACEC (including wildlife management areas)	196,000
Existing SRMAs	125,000

¹ These designations may overlap.

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Existing multiple-use classes found Outside the Plan Area, but within the CDCA Plan area, are described in Table IV.14-5. The Caliente and Bishop RMPs did not classify multiple-use classes.

Table IV.14-5
Multiple-Use Classes Within BLM-Administered Lands in the CDCA Plan (acres)

Class C	Class L	Class M	Class I	Unclassified
581,000	322,000	96,000	5,000	49,000

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

No changes to goals, objectives, management, or acreage of multiple-use class lands would occur under the No Action Alternative (there would be no BLM LUPA under the No Action Alternative).

IV.14.3.2 Preferred Alternative

IV.14.3.2.1 Plan-wide Impacts of Implementing the DRECP: Preferred Alternative

IV.14.3.2.1.1 Plan-wide Impacts and Mitigation Measures from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development

Impacts Assessment

Table IV.14-6 summarizes potential impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations resulting from renewable energy and transmission facility development within DFAs under the Preferred Alternative. DFA configurations include lowest biological conflict areas and certain additional areas with both high value renewable energy resources and biological resource values.

**Table IV.14-6
Acres of BLM Lands in Development Focus Areas and Impact by Technology Type –
Preferred Alternative**

Land Category	Acres of BLM Land in Development Focus Areas	Potential Impacts by Technology Type (acres)			
		<i>Solar</i> ¹	<i>Wind</i> ²	<i>GT</i> ³	<i>Trans- mission</i>
CDCA	367,000	37,000	64,000	7,000	14,000
Caliente RMP	0	0	0	0	0
Bishop RMP	0	0	0	0	0

¹ Includes ground-mounted distributed generation

² Disturbance Footprint

³ Project area

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Under the Preferred Alternative, approximately 122,000 acres of BLM-administered lands may be developed for renewable energy. DFAs would be excluded from the following BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations: wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, NSHTs, NLCS lands, ACECs, wildlife allocations, SRMAs, and open off-highway vehicle (OHV) areas. No direct impacts to these areas would likely occur under the Preferred Alternative. Under this alternative, geothermal development would be allowed within SRMAs but with a no surface occupancy stipulation.

Under the Preferred Alternative, there would be 20 wilderness areas (340,000 acres), 2 WSAs (13,000 acres), 3 NSHTs (350 miles), and 659,000 acres of National Trail Management Corridors within 5 miles of DFAs (Table R2.14-1, alternatives comparison table). There would be no wild and scenic rivers within 5 miles of DFAs under this alternative. Any renewable technology or transmission development within 5 miles of these areas may result in an indirect adverse effect on the viewshed, air quality, values of solitude, primitive and unconfined types of recreation, or other features of scenic value. Impacts would be minor to moderate, depending on the technology and distance from special designation areas. CMAs and mitigation measures would reduce impacts.

National Trail Management Corridors. Under the Preferred Alternative, a National Trail Management Corridor consisting of a 5-mile area from the trail centerline, would be proposed (approximately 1,333,000 acres). DFAs for renewable energy and transmission development would not overlap with this proposed corridor.

Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. Under the Preferred Alternative, of the approximately 633,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 350,000 acres would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics. No renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands. The remaining approximately 283,000 inventoried acres would not be managed to protect these characteristics and renewable energy and transmission development would be an allowable use.

Under this alternative, inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would be reduced in size where the lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development. Inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics, but not managed, would be reprioritized for development of approximately 5,000 acres of solar, 13,000 acres of wind, 50 acres of geothermal, and 800 acres of transmission corridors (approximately 18,000 acres total, about 5%). Mitigation/compensation, as prescribed by CMAs, would be employed where inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics may be impacted by new transmission development.

Impact LD-1: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would reduce the value of designated conservation areas.

Potential direct impacts to NSHT management corridors and inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics may occur. For areas where DFAs overlap with inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics, the inventoried lands would be reduced in size to reprioritized use for renewable energy development. Overall, potential reduction in scenic value and impacts to characteristics would be about 5% of the inventoried lands and impacts would be minimal. CMAs would further reduce impacts.

Indirect impacts to wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, NLCS lands, ACECs, wildlife allocations, SRMAs, and open OHV areas may also occur under the Preferred Alternative. The proximity of renewable energy development to these lands would result in indirect effects to the important values of these lands, such as reduction in air quality, impacts to visual resources, and increased noise and traffic. These types of impacts would reduce the quality of the lands with special designation and change the nature of the location (see impact assessment above and Table R2.14-1). Overall, impacts would be minor to moderate, depending on the technology used and distance from these special designation areas. CMAs would reduce impacts.

Impact LD-2: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would conflict with the existing management goals and objectives of designated conservation areas.

The Preferred Alternative would not directly conflict with the existing management goals and objectives of designated conservation areas. However, development on DFA lands adjacent to or near designated conservation areas would indirectly affect the existing management goals and objectives, in particular the protection of scenic value. Development on inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics would degrade those characteristics; however, these lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development and CMAs would be applied to reduce potential impacts. Renewable energy facilities would introduce structures and industrial features that would conflict with the natural area. Renewable development could occur on approximately 19,000 acres of inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics.

Under the Preferred Alternative, development within National Conservation Lands would be limited to 1% of total authorized disturbance, or to the level allowed by collocated ACEC/wildlife allocations, whichever is more restrictive (see Table R2.14-5). Wildlife habitat disturbance caps only apply to lands not already included under ACECs or wildlife allocation disturbance caps.

Impacts in Study Area Lands

“Study Area Lands” refers to three categories of lands shown on alternative maps: Future Assessment Areas (FAAs), Special Analysis Areas (SAAs) and DRECP Variance Lands.

Future Assessment Areas. Lands within FAAs are neither reserve lands nor DFAs; they are simply areas that are deferred for future assessment. The future assessment will determine their suitability for renewable energy development or for ecological conservation. If renewable energy development occurs on FAA lands, a Land Use Plan Amendment would not be required. FAAs for each alternative are included and located as shown in Table

IV.1-2 and Figure II.3-1 in Volume II. The FAAs represent areas where renewable energy development or inclusion to the reserve design could be implemented through an amendment to the DRECP but additional assessment would be needed.

Because most of the FAAs are presented as “undesigned areas” in the action alternatives, there would be no difference between the FAAs in the Preferred Alternative except that renewable development in an FAA would not require a BLM Land Use Plan Amendment so the environmental review process would be somewhat simpler than if the location were left undesignated. Development or Conservation Designation of the FAAs would not likely result in impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, or lands inventoried or managed for wilderness characteristics.

Special Analysis Areas. Two areas defined as SAAs represent areas subject to ongoing analysis. These areas (located in the Silurian Valley and just west of Highway 395 in Kern County) have high value for renewable energy development, ecological and cultural conservation, and recreation. SAA lands are expected to be designated in the Final EIR/EIS as either DFAs or included in the reserve design/Conservation Designation. BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics within Special Analysis Area lands are shown in Table IV.14-7.

Table IV.14-7
BLM Land Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands with Wilderness Characteristics Within Special Analysis Areas – Preferred Alternative

BLM Lands [†] in Special Analysis Areas	Special Analysis Areas (acres)
<i>CDCA</i>	
Existing* and proposed NLCS Lands	-
Existing and proposed ACEC	12,000
Existing and proposed SRMAs	15,000
Wildlife allocation	-
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	7,000
Trail management corridors (acres/miles)	9,000

† These designations may overlap

* Wilderness Areas, wilderness study areas, a Wild and Scenic River, National Scenic and Historic Trails, and other special areas identified through acts of Congress (LLPAs).

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

DRECP Variance Lands. DRECP Variance Lands represent the BLM Solar PEIS Variance Lands as screened for the DRECP and EIR/EIS based on BLM screening criteria. Covered

Activities could be permitted for NCCP purposes only through an NCCP Plan amendment. However, development of renewable energy on Variance Lands would not require a BLM Land Use Plan Amendment so the environmental review process would be somewhat simpler than if the location were left undesignated. Development or Conservation Designation of the DRECP Variance Lands would not likely impact BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, or lands inventoried or managed for wilderness characteristics.

Impact Reduction Strategies and Mitigation

The implementation of the Plan would result in conservation of some desert lands as well as the development of renewable energy generation and transmission facilities on other lands. The impacts of the renewable energy development covered by the Plan would be lessened in several ways. First, the Plan incorporates Conservation and Management Actions (CMAs) for each alternative, including specific biological reserve design components and LUPA components. Also, the implementation of existing laws, orders, regulations, and standards would reduce the impacts of project development. If significant impacts would still result after implementation of CMAs and compliance with applicable laws and regulations, then specific mitigation measures are recommended in this section.

Conservation and Management Actions

The conservation strategy for the Preferred Alternative (presented in Volume II, Section II.3.1.1) defines specific actions that would reduce the impacts of this alternative. The conservation strategy includes a definition of the reserve design and specific CMAs for the Preferred Alternative. While the CMAs were developed for BLM lands only, this analysis assumes that all CMAs would be applied also to nonfederal lands.

For NLCS, the following CMAs would apply (mineral resource CMAs are included in Chapter IV.15, Mineral Resources).

- Renewable energy projects and related ancillary facilities are not allowed.
- Use authorization applications that provide a benefit to the management area or serve public interests may be allowed, unless prohibited by statute.
- Public access will be designed to facilitate or enhance National Conservation Land values identified for the subregion.
- Make available for exchange, purchase, or donation in accordance with the CMAs outlined for National Conservation Lands.
- Make lands available for disposal through exchange if it results in a net benefit to the values of National Conservation Lands.

Conservation and Management Actions in Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

- Use authorization applications will be evaluated in accordance with allowable uses identified in the ACEC worksheets in this plan.
- Land use authorizations are not to exceed the disturbance cap, if such a cap has been established in the worksheets for the ACEC.
- Acquire lands through exchange, purchase, or donation.
- Make lands available for disposal through exchange if it results in a net benefit to the values of the ACEC.

Conservation and Management Actions in Wildlife Allocations

- Renewable energy projects and related ancillary facilities are not allowed.
- Applications for use authorizations that provide a benefit to the management area or serve public interests may be allowed, unless prohibited by statute.
- Acquire lands through exchange, purchase, or donation.
- Make lands unavailable for disposal.

Conservation and Management Actions in Special Recreation Management Areas

- Renewable energy projects and related ancillary facilities are not allowed.
- Land use authorizations must be consistent with the specific CMAs developed for each SRMA.
- Acquire lands through exchange, purchase, or donation.
- Lands are available for disposal to parties that will manage the land in accordance with the recreational values of the SRMA.
- **Lands and Realty**
 - Rights-of-Way
 - **Site Rights-of-Way (Nonrenewable Energy, Nonlinear Rights-of-Way)**– National Conservation Lands would be avoidance areas¹. Authorization for site rights-of-way that would impact the values for which National Conservation Lands are designated must include mitigation/compensation resulting in a net benefit to the National Conservation

¹ Defined as “areas to be avoided but may be available for location of rights-of-way with special stipulations.” (BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1), Appendix C, page 21.

Land unit so that the restoration intent of National Conservation Land management is met.

- **Renewable Energy Generation** – National Conservation Lands would be exclusion areas for renewable energy ROWs (development and testing).
- **Linear Rights-of-Way**
 - Transmission would be allowed in existing corridors only.
 - National Conservation Lands would be avoidance areas for all other linear ROWs.
 - Authorization for linear ROWs that impact the values for which the National Conservation Land unit is designated must include mitigation/compensation resulting in a net benefit to the National Conservation Land unit so that the restoration intent of National Conservation Land management is met.
- **Land Tenure**
 - Exchange would be permitted only to acquire non-BLM lands within the National Conservation Lands unit (no lands exchanged out or disposed of).
 - National Conservation Land inholdings would be a priority for acquisition from willing sellers. All inholdings would become part of the National Conservation Lands unit upon acquisition and be subject to associated management requirements.
- **Recreation and Visitor Services** – Commercial and competitive Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) would be prohibited except for those uses that would enhance the opportunity for visitors to experience and enjoy the ecological, cultural, and scientific values of the National Conservation Land unit and would not adversely impact the nationally significant ecological, cultural, or scientific values.
- **Wildlife Habitat Disturbance caps**² - Development in National Conservation Lands would be limited to 1% of total authorized disturbance, or to the level allowed by collocated ACEC/wildlife allocations, whichever is more restrictive.

For NLCS lands and ACECs, no renewable energy development would be allowed under this alternative.

² Wildlife habitat disturbance caps only apply to lands not already included under ACECs or wildlife allocation disturbance caps, as described in the Special Unit Management Plans in Appendix L.

SRMAs would be designated as exclusion areas for renewable energy development due to the incompatibility with the values of the SRMA. Two exceptions to this management action are (1) geothermal development would be an allowable use if a geothermal-only DFA overlays the SRMA designation and the lease includes a no surface occupancy stipulation, and (2) if a DRECP Variance Land designation overlays the SRMA, renewable energy may be allowed on a case-by-case basis if the proposed project is found to be compatible with the specific SRMA values.

For NSHT, the following CMAs would apply.

- **Management of Trail Corridors** – Manage National Trails as components of BLM’s National Landscape Conservation System. Where National Trails overlap other National Conservation Lands, the more protective CMAs or land use allocations will apply.
- **Lands and Realty**
 - Rights-of-Way
 - **Sites Rights-of-Way** – NSHT Management Corridors would be avoidance areas. Sites ROW would require mitigation/compensation resulting in net benefit to the NSHT.
 - **Linear Rights-of-Way** – NSHT Management Corridors would be avoidance areas except in designated transmission corridors. Exclude cultural landscapes, high potential historic sites, and high potential route segments identified along historic trails corridors from transmission except in approved transmission corridors. Where development affects trail management corridors, an analysis must be performed to ensure that it does not substantially interfere with the nature and purposes of the trail, and that mitigation/compensation results in a net benefit to the trail.
 - **Renewable Energy Rights-of-Way** – Exclude cultural landscapes, high potential historic sites, and high potential route segments identified along historic trails corridors from transmission except in approved DFAs. Where development affects trail management corridors, an analysis must be performed to ensure that it does not substantially interfere with the nature and purposes of the trail, and that mitigation/compensation results in a net benefit to the trail.
 - **Land tenure** – Exchange would be permitted if it results in net benefit to NSHT values.
- **Mitigation Requirements** – If a segment of a National Trail or proposed NHT traverses a DFA, it will be subject to mitigation for impacts to trail features, including,

but not limited to, and not in priority order: avoidance, the cost of trail relocation, on-site mitigation, and off-site mitigation. Compensation can include acquisition or restoration of corridor features, and landscapes will be at a minimum of 2:1, and must result in a net benefit to the overall trail corridor. Development of high potential route segments must not substantially interfere with the nature and purposes of the National Trail.

The following CMAs were defined and would apply for each of the potential uses of lands with wilderness characteristics.

Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics: CMAs for BLM land in the entire Plan Area:

- Complete an inventory of areas for proposed development that do not have an updated wilderness characteristics inventory.
- Employ avoidance measures as described under DFAs and approved transmission corridors.
- Compensation will be at a 2:1 ratio for impacts from DFAs and transmission.

CMAs for lands with wilderness characteristics identified for management to protect:

- Include a no surface occupancy stipulation for any mineral with no exceptions, waivers, or modifications.
- Exclude these areas from right-of-way development.
- Close areas to construction of new roads and routes. Vehicles would continue to be permitted on existing routes, but the routes would not be improved beyond current standards.
- Close areas to mineral material sales.
- Prohibit commercial or personal-use permits for extraction of materials (e.g., no wood-cutting permits).
- Manage the area as Visual Resource Management Class I or II.
- Require that new structures and facilities be related to the protection or enhancement of wilderness characteristics or necessary for the management of uses allowed under the land use plan.
- Make lands unavailable for disposal from federal ownership.
- Recommend withdrawal from mineral entry.

Wilderness characteristics CMAs for BLM land within DFAs and approved transmission corridors:

- Allow development in areas inventoried and identified as lands found to have wilderness characteristics.
- Require mitigation of inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics at a 1:1 mitigation. This would be accomplished through acquisition and donation to the federal government of (1) wilderness inholdings, (2) wilderness edge holdings that have inventoried wilderness characteristics, or (3) other areas within the Plan Area that are managed to protect wilderness characteristics. Restoration of wilderness area and wilderness study area impacts could be substituted for acquisition.

Laws and Regulations

Similar to the No Action Alternative, existing laws and regulations will reduce certain impacts of Plan implementation. Relevant regulations are presented in the Regulatory Setting in Volume III. The requirements of relevant laws and regulations are summarized for the No Action Alternative in Section IV.14.3.1.1.1.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of the CMAs and existing laws and regulations would reduce the effects to the extent feasible. No additional mitigation measures would be required.

IV.14.3.2.1.2 Impacts of the Reserve Design

The reserve design would result in over 8.2 million acres of BLM lands in conservation, 3.2 million acres of which already exist. The remaining lands would be made up of the proposed BLM LUPA Conservation Designations. The reserve design would only affect other BLM designations if the purpose of the reserve design were contrary to the mandates of the other designations. For many BLM designations, classifications, and allocations, including wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, ACECs, wildlife management areas, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics, the reserve design would have limited or no adverse effects to their management and purpose.

For NSHTs, the reserve design would provide additional protection from a 5-mile (from trail centerline) management corridor that would be defined and would contain explicit management direction, resulting in beneficial impacts to NSHTs (approximately 1,333,000 acres).

SRMAs would be managed for their targeted recreation activities, experiences, and benefits. SRMA recreation setting characteristics—physical components of remoteness, naturalness, and facilities; social components of contact, group size, and evidence of use; and

operational components of access, visitor services and management controls, would be maintained and enhanced where possible.

Management guidance and CMAs have been incorporated to the reserve design elements to ensure BLM continues to allow mining, linear features, and other more intensive uses while still meeting the purpose of the reserves.

IV.14.3.2.2 Impacts of DRECP Land Use Plan Amendment on BLM Land: Preferred Alternative

This section addresses two components of effects of the BLM LUPA: the streamlined development of renewable energy and transmission on BLM land under the LUPA, and the impacts of the amended land use plans themselves.

IV.14.3.2.2.1 Impacts from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development on BLM Land

The Plan-wide impacts to BLM designations discussed in Section IV.14.3.2.1.1 exclusively apply to BLM land. Therefore, the type of impacts related to BLM LUPA actions would be the same as in the Plan-wide impacts.

IV.14.3.2.2.2 Impacts of Changes to BLM Land Designations

Designations, allocations, and classifications of NLCS lands, ACECs, SRMAs, wildlife allocations, and inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics would benefit sensitive cultural and natural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values. Any reductions in acres of designations, such as ACECs or SRMAs, could result in adverse effects to cultural and natural resource values.

NLCS Lands. The Preferred Alternative proposed NLCS land designation emphasizes habitat connectivity and cultural–botanical resource locations. Existing and proposed acres of BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics are presented in Table R2.14-2 by alternative (Appendix R2). Under the Preferred Alternative, there would be approximately 3,827,000 acres of proposed NLCS lands. The NLCS lands allow for a variety of uses as long as they can be managed to be compatible with protecting National Conservation Land values. Rights-of-way would be limited as described in Volume II, Section II.3.2.2.1.1. Site rights-of-way would be avoidance areas; linear rights-of-way for transmission would be allowed in existing corridors only; other linear rights-of-way would be avoidance areas; minerals rights-of-way would be available with stipulations; and Competitive and Commercial Special Recreation Permits would be prohibited except for uses that enhance the values of the NLCS unit.

Under the Preferred Alternative, Sperry Wash Road, El Mirage Interpretive Trail East, and El Mirage Interpretive Trail West would be nominated for National Recreation Trail designation. In addition, the Nadeau Road National Recreation Trail Management Corridor of 0.5-mile (from trail centerline) would be proposed for designation.

National Trail Management Corridor. Under the Preferred Alternative, approximately 1,333,000 acres of National Trail Management Corridors would be proposed for designation as this alternative would establish a corridor width generally 5 miles from the centerline of NSHT trails (Appendix R2, Table R2.14-2).

Wild and Scenic Rivers. Under the Preferred Alternative, the Amargosa River, Mojave River (Afton Canyon), and Surprise Canyon Creek would be managed to protect the “outstandingly remarkable values,” the free-flowing condition, and water quality in the designated or eligible segments. All proposed actions or project affecting these rivers would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure that these values are protected or enhanced. A boundary of 0.25 miles on either side of the river (above mean high water mark) would constitute the corridor. Renewable energy development would be prohibited in these segments.

ACECs. The Preferred Alternative would propose to designate 43 new ACECs for the purpose of wildlife, plant, and cultural resource protection (see Appendix R2, Table R2.14-3 ACECs by Alternative). Management of existing and proposed ACECs would include a disturbance cap, presented in Table R2.14-5 by alternative. Total acres of ACECs within each disturbance cap category under the Preferred Alternative are summarized in Table IV.14-8.

Table IV.14-8
Acres of ACECs Within Each Disturbance Cap Category Under the Preferred Alternative

Disturbance Cap		
<i>0.10%</i>	<i>0.25%</i>	<i>1.0%</i>
131,000	40,000	5,313,000

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Twenty ACECs would increase in size (acres) under the Preferred Alternative, as shown in Table R2.14-3 (Appendix R2). Under the Preferred Alternative, three ACECs would be reduced in size (acres) or eliminated where the lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development instead of management for cultural or biological resources. These ACECs are listed in Table IV.14-9. The Mojave Monkey Flower ACEC would be renamed into

two ACECs, the Brisbane Valley Mojave Monkey Flower and Daggett Ridge Mojave Monkey Flower ACECs.

Wildlife Allocations. The Preferred Alternative would propose to designate approximately 19,000 acres, primarily within the Caliente RMP area, as wildlife allocations to emphasize protection and enhancement of important plant and animal habitats.

Table IV.14-9
ACECs With Reduced Acres Under the Preferred Alternative

ACEC Unit Name	Acreage Difference
Desert Tortoise Natural Area – Eliminated	-23,000
Fremont-Kramer DWMA – Reduced	-2,000
Western Rand Mountains – Reduced	-1,000

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

SRMAs. The Preferred Alternative would propose to designate 40 new SRMAs to direct recreation funding and personnel to provide specific structured recreation opportunities. Many of these proposed SRMAs are currently managed for recreation emphasis. Existing and proposed SRMAs are shown in Table R2.14-4 (Appendix R2).

Lands with wilderness characteristics. Under the Preferred Alternative, of the approximately 633,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 350,000 acres would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics. No renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands. The remaining approximately 283,000 inventoried acres would not be managed to protect these characteristics and renewable energy and transmission development would be an allowable use. If a project were to be proposed in an area that has not been inventoried, an inventory would be completed. BLM would require mitigation/compensation for any identified lands with wilderness characteristics that may be impacted by development.

Multiple-Use Classes. Under the Preferred Alternative, multiple-use classes would be replaced by BLM designations, classifications, and allocations. Table R2.14-6 (Appendix R2) shows the crosswalk between multiple-use classes and proposed BLM designations, classifications, and allocations by alternative.

The Preferred Alternative would amend the CDCA Plan to replace multiple-use classes with existing and proposed designations, classifications, and allocations that would allow for some development and some conservation. Under ACECs, NLCS lands, SRMAs, and Extensive Recreation Management Areas, new development would not be allowed. Maintenance, retrofitting projects, and operation of existing or previously approved facilities would be allowed. Under DFAs, technology development would be allowed with implementation of some CMAs.

The types of BLM land designations, allocations, and classifications that would replace multiple-use classes under the Preferred Alternative are described below.

Controlled: The majority of land in this designation would be within wilderness, proposed NLCS lands, and existing or proposed ACECs. Lands would continue to be managed to preserve the land in a natural state with motorized-vehicle use generally not allowed. No DFAs would occur within these lands.

Intensive: The majority of lands would be within existing or proposed SRMAs. Lands would generally continue to be managed for concentrated use of lands and resources to meet human needs, while providing reasonable protection for sensitive natural values. Less than 1% of lands would occur within DFAs.

Limited: The majority of lands would be within proposed NLCS lands and existing and proposed ACECs and SRMAs. Lands would continue to be managed to protect sensitive, natural, scenic, ecological, and cultural resource values. Approximately 3% of land would occur within DFAs.

Moderate: The majority of lands would be within proposed NLCS lands and existing and proposed ACECs and SRMAs. Generally, lands would continue to be managed for resource protection along with controlled higher intensity uses (e.g., DFAs, grazing, recreation). Approximately 5% of land would occur within DFAs.

IV.14.3.2.3 Impacts of Natural Community Conservation Plan: Preferred Alternative

The analysis of Covered Activities under the NCCP is equivalent to the Plan-wide analysis of the interagency alternatives. Reserve design features and other conservation actions under the NCCP alternatives represent more detailed categories of the reserve design under the interagency Plan-wide alternatives. These NCCP differences in reserve design features do not affect nonbiological resources analyzed in this document, and the analysis of reserve design and conservation and management actions under the NCCP is therefore equivalent to the Plan-wide analysis of the interagency alternatives, as described in Section IV.14.3.2.1.

IV.14.3.2.4 Impacts of General Conservation Plan

BLM lands with conservation and renewable energy designations, classifications, allocations, and management of lands with wilderness characteristics are under federal jurisdiction administered by BLM. Therefore, the GCP does not apply to these lands.

IV.14.3.2.5 Impacts Outside the Plan Area

IV.14.3.2.5.1 Impacts of Transmission Outside the Plan Area

The impacts of transmission outside the Plan Area on BLM land designations, classifications, and lands with wilderness characteristics would be the same under all alternatives. These impacts are as described for the No Action Alternative in Section IV.14.3.1.4.1, Impacts of Transmission Outside the Plan Area.

IV.14.3.2.5.2 Impacts of BLM LUPA Decisions Outside the Plan Area

As described above for the Plan Area, designations, allocations, and classifications of NLCS lands, ACECs, SRMAs, wildlife allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics would benefit sensitive cultural and natural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values. Any reductions in acres of designations, such as ACECs or SRMAs, could result in adverse effects to cultural and natural resource values Outside the Plan Area.

Existing and proposed BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics under the Preferred Alternative Outside the Plan Area are presented in Table IV.14-10.

**Table IV.14-10
Acres of BLM Land Designations, Classifications, Allocations
Outside the Plan Area - Preferred Alternative**

BLM Lands ¹	Outside the Plan Area (acres)
Existing ² and proposed NLCS Lands	221,000
Existing and proposed ACECs	269,000
Existing and proposed SRMAs	173,000
Wildlife allocations	0
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics (not managed)	76,000

¹ These designations may overlap.

² Wilderness Areas, wilderness study areas, a Wild and Scenic River, National Scenic and Historic Trails, and other special areas identified through acts of Congress (LLPAs).

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the

subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

IV.14.3.2.6 Comparison of the Preferred Alternative With No Action Alternative

Chapter IV.27 presents a comparison of all action alternatives and the No Action Alternative across all disciplines. This section summarizes the comparison of the Preferred Alternative with the No Action Alternative.

IV.14.3.2.6.1 Preferred Alternative Compared With No Action Alternative for Plan-wide DRECP

A comparison of renewable energy development areas between the Preferred Alternative and the No Action Alternative is summarized in Table IV.14-11.

**Table IV.14-11
No Action Alternative (Available Development Areas) Compared With the Preferred Alternative (DFAs) for the Plan-wide DRECP**

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	No Action Alternative (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Available Development Areas/DFAs	3,316,000 available for development	367,000 (DFAs) 54,000 (disturbance area)	The No Action Alternative has 2,949,000 more acres available for development than the Preferred Alternative.
Existing and proposed ACECs	45,400 within available development areas	0 DFAs	Renewable development could be developed within 15,028 acres in the No Action Alternative. There would be no DFAs within ACECs under the Preferred Alternative.
Existing and proposed SRMAs	0 available development areas	0 DFAs	Renewable development could be developed within 6,727 acres in the No Action Alternative. There would be no DFAs within SRMAs under the Preferred Alternative.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	No managed lands	350,000 managed 0 acres within DFAs	No lands managed for wilderness characteristics would occur within DFAs under the Preferred Alternative. The No Action Alternative would have no managed lands with wilderness characteristics (only inventoried).

Table IV.14-11
No Action Alternative (Available Development Areas) Compared With the Preferred Alternative (DFAs) for the Plan-wide DRECP

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	No Action Alternative (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	11,000 within available development areas	18,000 within DFAs	There would be 7,000 more acres of inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics that overlap with technology development than the Preferred Alternative.

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Overall, the No Action Alternative would likely result in greater impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative due to the greater number of acres available for renewable energy and transmission development.

IV.14.3.2.6.2 Preferred Alternative Compared With No Action Alternative for the BLM LUPA

A comparison between the Preferred Alternative and the No Action Alternative within existing and proposed conservation lands or Reserve Design Lands for the Plan-wide DRECP is summarized in Table IV.14-12.

Table IV.14-12
Preferred Alternative (Reserve Design) Compared With No Action Alternative (Existing Conservation) for Plan-wide DRECP¹

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	No Action Alternative (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Wilderness Areas, WSAs, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers	3,188,000	3,188,000	These designations would be the same under both the No Action and Preferred Alternative. These lands would be managed as National Conservation Lands under the Preferred Alternative.

Table IV.14-12
Preferred Alternative (Reserve Design) Compared With No Action Alternative
(Existing Conservation) for Plan-wide DRECP¹

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	No Action Alternative (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
National Conservation Lands	Not an existing designation	3,827,000	The Preferred Alternative would designate an additional 3,827,000 acres of National Conservation Lands.
NSHT Management Corridors	Not an existing designation	1,333,000 (5-mile buffer)	The Preferred Alternative would have 1,333,000 acres of NSHT management corridors (5-mile buffer). The No Action Alternative would not establish a trail management corridor.
ACECs	3,393,000 89 Units	2,277,000 126 Units	Under the Preferred Alternative, many ACECs would overlap with NLCS. The Preferred Alternative would eliminate or reduce 4 ACECs and propose 43 new ACECs.
Wildlife allocations	Not an existing designation	19,000	The Preferred Alternative would have 19,000 more acres of wildlife allocations than the No Action Alternative.
SRMAs	107,000 2 Units	673,000 40 Units	The Preferred Alternative would have 566,000 more acres of SRMAs than the No Action Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would propose 38 new SRMAs.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	No managed lands	350,000 managed	The No Action Alternative would not result in management of inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. The Preferred Alternative would manage 350,000 acres for protection of wilderness characteristics.
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	633,000	283,000	The No Action would have more acres of land with wilderness characteristics.

Table IV.14-12
Preferred Alternative (Reserve Design) Compared With No Action Alternative
(Existing Conservation) for Plan-wide DRECP¹

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	No Action Alternative (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Outside Plan Area			The Preferred Alternative would have more acres of National Conservation Lands, ACECs, and SRMAs. Under the Preferred Alternative, many SRMAs would be overlapped by National Conservation Lands.
LLPAs	710,000	710,000	
NLCS Lands	0	221,000	
ACECs	196,000	269,000	
SRMAs	125,000	173,000	
Wildlife allocation	0	0	
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	76,000	76,000	
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	0	0	

¹ Areas may have more than one BLM designation, classification or allocation; so the acres do not add up to the total DRECP acres.

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Within the Plan Area, the No Action Alternative has fewer acres of BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and managed lands with wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative, resulting in lower conservation and protection of these lands.

Outside the Plan Area, the Preferred Alternative would have more acres of National Conservation Lands, ACECs, and SRMAs than the No Action Alternative. Under the Preferred Alternative, many SRMAs would be overlapped by National Conservation Lands. Additionally the Preferred Alternative eliminates the use of multiple-use classes.

IV.14.3.2.6.3 Preferred Alternative Compared With No Action Alternative for NCCP

The impacts of the NCCP for the Preferred Alternative are the same as those defined in Section IV.14.3.2.1 for the Plan-wide analysis. As a result, the comparison of the Preferred Alternative with the No Action Alternative for the NCCP is the same as described above for Plan-wide DRECP.

IV.14.3.2.6.4 Preferred Alternative Compared With No Action Alternative for the GCP

The GCP would apply to nonfederal lands in the Plan Area. BLM lands with conservation and renewable energy designations, classifications, allocations, and management of lands with wilderness characteristics are under federal jurisdiction administered by BLM. Therefore, the GCP does not apply to these lands.

IV.14.3.3 Alternative 1

IV.14.3.3.1 Plan-wide Impacts of Implementing the DRECP: Alternative 1

IV.14.3.3.1.1 Plan-wide Impacts and Mitigation Measures from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development

Impact Assessment

Table IV.14-13 summarizes potential impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations resulting from renewable energy and approved transmission facility development within DFAs under Alternative 1. DFA configurations include lowest biological conflict areas and certain additional areas with both high value renewable energy resources and biological resource values.

**Table IV.14-13
Acres of BLM Lands in Development Focus Areas and
Impact by Technology Type – Alternative 1**

Land Category	Acres of BLM Land in Development Focus Areas	Potential Impacts by Technology Type (acres)			
		<i>Solar</i> ¹	<i>Wind</i> ²	<i>GT</i> ³	<i>Transmission</i>
CDCA	81,000	14,000	2,000	5,000	12,000
Caliente RMP	0	0	0	0	0
Bishop RMP	10	0	0	0	300

¹ Includes ground-mounted distributed generation

² Disturbance Footprint

³ Plan Area

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Under Alternative 1, approximately 33,300 acres of BLM-administered lands may be developed for renewable energy. DFAs would be excluded from the same BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations as the Preferred Alternative. No direct impacts to these

areas would occur under Alternative 1. Any renewable technology or transmission development within 5 miles of these areas may result in an indirect adverse effect on the viewshed, air quality, values of solitude, primitive and unconfined types of recreation, or other features of scenic value. Under this alternative, geothermal development would be allowed within SRMAs but with a no surface occupancy stipulation.

Under Alternative 1, there would be 13 wilderness areas (115,300 acres), 4 WSAs (30,900 acres), 3 NSHTs (167 miles), and 17,000 acres of National Trail Management Corridors within 5 miles of DFAs (Table R2.14-1, alternatives comparison table). There would be no wild and scenic rivers within 5 miles of DFAs under this alternative. Impacts would be minor to moderate, depending on the technology and distance from special designation areas. CMAs and mitigation measures would reduce impacts.

National Trail Management Corridors. Under Alternative 1, a National Trail Management Corridor consisting of a 0.25-mile corridor from the trail centerline, would be proposed (approximately 93,000 acres). DFAs for renewable energy and transmission development would overlap with this proposed corridor. Specifically, 12.5 miles of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail may occur within DFAs.

Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 1, the approximately 633,000 acres of inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would not be managed to protect these characteristics and renewable energy and transmission development would be an allowable use. Under this alternative, inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would be reduced in size where the lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development. Inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics, but not managed, would be reprioritized for development of approximately 8,000 acres of solar, 900 acres of wind, 4,000 acres of geothermal, and 7,000 acres of transmission corridors (approximately 20,000 acres total, about 3%). Mitigation/compensation, as prescribed by CMAs, would be employed where inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics may be impacted by new transmission development.

Impact LD-1: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would reduce the value of designated conservation areas.

Potential direct impacts to NSHT management corridors and inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics may occur. For areas where DFAs overlap with inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics, the inventoried lands would be reduced in size to reprioritized use for renewable energy development. Overall, potential reduction in scenic value and impacts to characteristics would be about 3% of the inventoried lands and impacts would be minimal. CMAs would further reduce impacts.

Indirect impacts to wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, NLCS lands, ACECs, wildlife allocations, SRMAs, and open OHV areas may also occur under Alternative 1. The proximity of renewable energy development to these lands would result in indirect effects to the important values of these lands, such as reduction in air quality, impacts to visual resources, and increased noise and traffic. These types of impacts would reduce the quality of the lands with special designation and change the nature of the location (see impact assessment above and Table R2.14-1). Overall, impacts would be minor to moderate, depending on the technology used and distance from these special designation areas. CMAs would reduce impacts.

Under Alternative 1, development within National Conservation Lands would be limited to 1% of total authorized disturbance, or to the level allowed by collocated ACEC/wildlife allocations, whichever is more restrictive. Wildlife habitat disturbance caps only apply to lands not already included under ACECs or wildlife allocation disturbance caps.

Impact LD-2: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would conflict with the existing management goals and objectives of designated conservation areas.

Alternative 1 would not directly conflict with the existing management goals and objectives of designated conservation areas. However, development on DFA lands adjacent to or near designated conservation areas would indirectly affect the existing management goals and objectives, in particular the protection of scenic value. Development on inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics would degrade those characteristics; however, these lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development and CMAs would be applied to reduce potential impacts. Renewable energy facilities would introduce structures and industrial features that would conflict with the natural area. Renewable development could occur on approximately 20,000 acres of inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics.

Impacts in Study Area Lands

Future Assessment Areas. There are no FAAs in this alternative.

Special Analysis Areas. Designating the SAAs as conservation may impact BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics within Special Analysis Area lands. Impacts would be the same as those explained for the Plan-wide reserve design in Section IV.14.3.3.1.2, Impacts of the Reserve Design, below.

DRECP Variance Lands. DRECP Variance Lands represent the BLM Solar PEIS Variance Lands as screened for the DRECP and EIR/EIS based on BLM screening criteria. Covered Activities could be permitted for NCCP purposes only through an NCCP Plan amendment.

However, development of renewable energy on Variance Lands would not require a BLM Land Use Plan Amendment so the environmental review process would be somewhat simpler than if the location were left undesignated. Development or Conservation Designation of the DRECP Variance Lands would not likely impact BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, or lands inventoried or managed for wilderness characteristics.

Impact Reduction Strategies and Mitigation

The implementation of the Plan would result in conservation of some desert lands as well as the development of renewable energy generation and transmission facilities on other lands. The impacts of the renewable energy development covered by the Plan would be lessened in several ways. First, the Plan incorporates CMAs for each alternative, including specific biological reserve design components and LUPA components. Also, the implementation of existing laws, orders, regulations, and standards would reduce the impacts of project development. If significant impacts would still result after implementation of CMAs and compliance with applicable laws and regulations, then specific mitigation measures are recommended in this section.

Conservation and Management Actions

The conservation strategy for Alternative 1 (presented in Volume II, Section II.3.1.1) defines specific actions that would reduce the impacts of this alternative. The conservation strategy includes a definition of the reserve design and specific CMAs for Alternative 1. No lands would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics under this alternative.

For NLCS, CMAs would be the same as the Preferred Alternative except for the following:

- **Lands and Realty**
 - Rights-of-Way
 - **Linear Rights-of-Way**
 - National Conservation Lands would be avoidance areas for all other linear ROWs unless the use is clearly compatible with the protection of National Conservation Lands values.
- **Recreation and Visitor Services** – Competitive and Commercial Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) would be permitted.
- **Wildlife Habitat Disturbance caps** - Development in National Conservation Lands would be limited to 1% of total authorized disturbance, or to the level allowed by collocated ACEC/wildlife allocations, whichever is more restrictive.

For NLCS lands and ACECs, no renewable energy development would be allowed. For SRMAs, geothermal development would be allowed but with no surface occupancy stipulation.

For NSHT, CMAs would be the same as described under the Preferred Alternative except as described below.

- **Lands and Realty**

- Rights-of-Way
 - **Linear ROWs:** NSHT Management Corridors would be avoidance areas. Exclude cultural landscapes, high potential historic sites, and high potential route segments identified along historic trails corridors from transmission. Where development affects trail management corridors, an analysis must be performed to ensure that it does not substantially interfere with the nature and purposes of the trail, and that mitigation/compensation results in a net benefit to the trail.
- **Land tenure:** Exchange or disposal must result in net benefit to trail values through acquisition or other compensation. Disposal of lands containing NSHT would not occur.

The CMAs applicable to inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics presented in Section IV.14.3.2.1.1 for the Preferred Alternative would be required for Alternative 1 as well. Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics within DFAs or approved transmission corridors would not be managed to protect those characteristics.

Laws and Regulations

Similar to the No Action Alternative, existing laws and regulations will reduce certain impacts of Plan implementation. Relevant regulations are presented in the Regulatory Setting in Volume III. The requirements of relevant laws and regulations are summarized for the No Action Alternative in Section IV.14.3.1.1.1.

Mitigation Measures

After implementation of the CMAs and existing laws and regulations, no additional mitigation measures would be required.

IV.14.3.3.1.2 Impacts of the Reserve Design

The reserve design would result in nearly 8.1 million acres of BLM lands in conservation, 3.2 million acres of which already exist. The Alternative 1 reserve design would designate

over 2 million fewer acres of NLCS lands than the Preferred Alternative. As with the Preferred Alternative, the reserve design would affect other BLM designations if the purpose of the reserve design were contrary to the mandates of the other designations. For many BLM designations, classifications, and allocations, including wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, ACECs, wildlife management areas, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics, the reserve design would have limited or no adverse effects to their management and purpose.

For NSHTs, the reserve design would provide additional protection from a 0.25-mile (from trail centerline) management corridor that would be defined and would contain explicit management direction, resulting in beneficial impacts to NSHTs (approximately 93,000 acres).

Alternative 1 would require all NLCS land to avoid all linear rights-of-way unless they were clearly compatible with the values of these lands. This would affect uses of BLM land such as transmission and pipelines. Management guidance and CMAs have been incorporated to the reserve design elements to ensure BLM continues to allow mining, linear features, and other more intensive uses while still meeting the purpose of the reserves. Alternative 1 would allow some uses on SRMAs within the reserve design such as Special Recreation Permits thus reducing effects to the other uses.

IV.14.3.3.2 Impacts of DRECP Land Use Plan Amendment on BLM Land: Alternative 1

This section addresses two components of effects of the BLM LUPA: the streamlined development of renewable energy and transmission on BLM land under the LUPA, and the impacts of the amended land use plans themselves.

IV.14.3.3.2.1 Impacts from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development on BLM Land

The Plan-wide impacts to BLM designations discussed in Section IV.14.3.3.1.1 exclusively apply to BLM land. Therefore, the type of impacts related to BLM LUPA actions would be the same as in the Plan-wide impacts.

IV.14.3.3.2.2 Impacts of Changes to BLM Land Designations

Designations, allocations, and classifications of NLCS lands, ACECs, SRMAs, wildlife allocations, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would benefit sensitive cultural and natural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values. Any reductions in acres of designations, such as ACECs or SRMAs, could result in adverse effects to cultural and natural resource values.

NLCS Lands. Alternative 1 would propose only the most scenic and intact desert landscapes as determined through a BLM Visual Resources Inventory in the NLCS category. Existing and proposed acres of BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics are presented in Table R2.14-2 (Appendix R2). This alternative allows for a variety of uses as long as they can be managed to be compatible with protecting National Conservation Land values. Rights-of-way would be limited as described in Volume II, Section II.4.2.2 and would be similar to the Preferred Alternative except that Alternative 1 excludes all existing transmission corridors but would allow competitive and commercial Special Recreation Permits on NLCS lands.

Under Alternative 1, Sperry Wash Road, El Mirage Interpretive Trail East, and El Mirage Interpretive Trail West would be nominated for National Recreation Trail designation. In addition, the Nadeau Road National Recreation Trail Management Corridor of 0.5-mile (from trail centerline) would be proposed for designation.

National Trail Management Corridor. Under Alternative 1, approximately 92,000 acres of National Trail Management Corridors would be proposed for designation as this alternative would establish a corridor width generally 0.25 mile from the centerline of NSHT trails (Appendix R2, Table R2.14-2).

Wild and Scenic Rivers. Under Alternative 1, the Amargosa River, Mojave River (Afton Canyon), and Surprise Canyon Creek would be managed to protect the “outstandingly remarkable values,” the free-flowing condition, and water quality in the designated or eligible segments. All proposed actions would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure that these values are protected or enhanced. A boundary of ¼ mile on either side of the river (above mean high water mark) would constitute the corridor. Renewable energy development would be prohibited in these segments.

ACECs. Under Alternative 1, 25 new ACECs would be proposed for designation for the purpose of wildlife, plant, and cultural resource protection, for a total of 108 ACECs (see Appendix R2, Tables R2.14-2 and R2.14-3 ACECs by Alternative). Management of existing and proposed ACECs would include a disturbance cap. Existing and proposed ACECs and associated disturbance caps are presented in Table R2.14-5 by alternative. Total acres of ACECs within each disturbance cap category under Alternative 1 are summarized in Table IV.14-14.

Table IV.14-14
Acres of ACECs Within Each Disturbance Cap Category Under Alternative 1

Disturbance Cap		
0.10%	0.25%	1.0%
119,000	40,000	4,894,000

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Under Alternative 1, the Mojave Monkey Flower ACEC would be renamed into two ACECs, the Brisbane Valley Mojave Monkey Flower and Daggett Ridge Mojave Monkey Flower ACECs. All other existing ACECs would remain the same or increase in size (acres), as shown in Table R2.14-3 (Appendix R2).

Wildlife Allocations. Alternative 1 would propose to designate approximately 589,000 acres as wildlife allocations to emphasize protection and enhancement of important plant and animal habitats.

SRMAs. Under Alternative 1, 37 new SRMAs would be proposed. Existing and proposed SRMAs are shown in Table R2.14-4 (Appendix R2).

Lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 1, the plan would not manage the approximately 633,000 acres of inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics to protect these characteristics. If a project were proposed in an area that has not been inventoried, an inventory would be completed. BLM would require mitigation/compensation for any identified lands with wilderness characteristics that would be impacted by development.

Multiple-Use Classes. Under Alternative 1, multiple-use classes would be replaced by BLM designations, classifications, and allocations. Table R2.14-6 shows the crosswalk between multiple-use classes and proposed BLM designations, classifications, and allocations by alternative.

Alternative 1 would amend the CDCA Plan to replace multiple-use classes with existing and proposed designations, classifications, and allocations that would allow for some development and some conservation. Under ACECs, NLCS lands, SRMAs, and Extensive Recreation Management Areas, new development would not be allowed. Maintenance, retrofitting projects, and operation of existing or previously approved facilities would be allowed. Under DFAs, technology development would be allowed with implementation of some CMAs.

The types of BLM land designations, allocations, and classifications that would replace multiple-use classes under Alternative 1 would be similar to the Preferred Alternative and described in Section IV.14.3.2.2.2.

IV.14.3.3.3 Impacts of Natural Community Conservation Plan: Alternative 1

The analysis of Covered Activities under the NCCP is equivalent to the Plan-wide analysis of the interagency alternatives. Reserve design features and other conservation actions under the NCCP alternatives represent more detailed categories of the reserve design under the interagency Plan-wide alternatives. These NCCP differences in reserve design features do not affect nonbiological resources analyzed in this document, and the analysis of reserve design and conservation and management actions under the NCCP is therefore equivalent to the Plan-wide analysis of the interagency alternatives, as described in Section IV.14.3.3.1.

IV.14.3.3.4 Impacts of General Conservation Plan

BLM lands with conservation and renewable energy designations, classifications, allocations, and management of lands with wilderness characteristics are under federal jurisdiction administered by BLM. Therefore, the GCP does not apply to these lands.

IV.14.3.3.5 Impacts Outside the Plan Area

IV.14.3.3.5.1 Impacts of Transmission Outside the Plan Area

The impacts of transmission Outside of the Plan Area on BLM land designations, classifications, and lands with wilderness characteristics would be the same under all alternatives. These impacts are as described for the No Action Alternative in Section IV.14.3.1.4.1. Impacts of Transmission Outside the Plan Area.

IV.14.3.3.5.2 Impacts of BLM LUPA Decisions Outside the Plan Area

As described above for the Plan Area, designations, allocations, and classifications of NLCS lands, ACECs, SRMAs, wildlife allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics would benefit sensitive cultural and natural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values. Any reductions in acres of designations, such as ACECs or SRMAs, could result in adverse effects to cultural and natural resource values Outside the Plan Area.

Existing and proposed BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative 1 Outside the Plan Area are presented in Table IV.14-15.

Table IV.14-15
Acres of BLM Land Designations, Classifications, Allocations Outside the Plan Area – Alternative 1

BLM Lands ¹	Outside the Plan Area (acres)
Existing ² and proposed NLCS Lands	136,000
Existing and proposed ACEC	189,000
Existing and proposed SRMAs	173,000
Wildlife allocations	24,000
Inventoried Lands with wilderness characteristics	76,000

¹ These designations may overlap

² Wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, NSHTs, and other special areas identified through acts of Congress (LLPAs).

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

IV.14.3.3.6 Comparison of Alternative 1 With Preferred Alternative

Chapter IV.27 presents a comparison of all action alternatives and the No Action Alternative across all disciplines. This section summarizes the comparison of Alternative 1 with the Preferred Alternative.

IV.14.3.3.6.1 Alternative 1 Compared With Preferred Alternative for Plan-wide DRECP

A comparison of renewable energy development areas between Alternative 1 and the Preferred Alternative is summarized in Table IV.14-16.

Table IV.14-16
Alternative 1 Compared With the Preferred Alternative in DFAs for Plan-wide DRECP

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 1 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Development Focus Areas	33,300	122,000	Alternative 1 would have 88,700 fewer acres within DFAs than the Preferred Alternative.
Existing and proposed ACECs	0 DFAs	0 DFAs	Alternative 1 and the Preferred Alternative would be the same for this parameter.

Table IV.14-16
Alternative 1 Compared With the Preferred Alternative in DFAs for Plan-wide DRECP

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 1 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Existing and proposed SRMAs	0 DFAs	0 DFAs	Alternative 1 and the Preferred Alternative would be the same for this parameter.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	0	350,000 managed 0 acres within DFAs	The Preferred Alternative would manage 350,000 more acres of lands with wilderness characteristics than Alternative 1.
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	20,000 within available development areas	18,000 within DFAs	The Preferred Alternative would have 2,000 fewer acres of inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics within DFAs than Alternative 1.

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Alternative 1 would likely result in lower impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations than the Preferred Alternative because it would have fewer acres designated as DFAs and fewer acres of disturbance from renewable energy development. Alternative 1 would not manage lands with wilderness characteristics to protect these characteristics; however, resources within inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics may be impacted.

IV.14.3.3.6.2 Alternative 1 Compared With Preferred Alternative for the BLM Land Use Plan Amendment

A comparison between Alternative 1 and the Preferred Alternative within existing and proposed conservation lands or Reserve Design Lands for the Plan-wide DRECP is summarized in Table IV.14-17.

Table IV.14-17
Alternative 1 Compared With the Preferred Alternative for Reserve Design Lands
Within the Plan-wide DRECP*

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 1 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Wilderness Areas, WSAs, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers	3,188,000	3,188,000	Alternative 1 would be the same as the Preferred Alternative. These lands would be managed as National Conservation Lands under both alternatives.
Proposed National Conservation Lands	1,550,000	3,827,000	Alternative 1 would designate 2,277,000 fewer acres of NLCS land than the Preferred Alternative.
NSHT Management Corridors	93,000 (0.25-mile buffer)	1,333,000 (5-mile buffer)	Alternative 1 would have 1,188,704 fewer acres of NSHT management corridors than the Preferred Alternative.
ACECs	5,807,000 108 Units	2,277,000 127 Units	Alternative 1 would designate 18 fewer ACECs than the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 1 would eliminate 1 ACEC, and the Preferred Alternative would reduce or eliminate 4 ACECs.
Wildlife allocations	589,000	19,000	Alternative 1 would allocate 570,000 more acres of wildlife allocations than the Preferred Alternative.
SRMAs	3,238,899 39 Units	673,000 40 Units	Alternative 1 would designate 1 fewer SRMA than the Preferred Alternative.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	0	350,000 managed	The Preferred Alternative would manage 350,000 more acres of lands with wilderness characteristics than Alternative 1.
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	633,000 (inventoried)	283,000	Alternative 1 would have 350,000 more acres of inventoried but not managed lands with wilderness characteristics.

Table IV.14-17
Alternative 1 Compared With the Preferred Alternative for Reserve Design Lands
Within the Plan-wide DRECP*

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 1 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Outside Plan Area			Alternative 1 would have fewer acres of NLCS lands and ACECs, Outside the Plan Area than the Preferred Alternative but more acres of wildlife allocations.
NLCS Lands	136,000	221,000	
ACECs	189,000	269,000	
SRMAs	173,000	173,000	
Wildlife allocation	24,000	0	
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	76,000	76,000	
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	0	0	

* Areas may have more than one BLM designation, classification or allocation; so the acres do not add up to the total DRECP acres.

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Alternative 1 would designate fewer acres of BLM land as reserve or conservation lands, resulting in reduced protection of these lands when compared with the Preferred Alternative. Additionally, Alternative 1 would allow for greater use of NLCS lands for recreation, but would also allow more limited use of NLCS lands for linear rights-of-way. Outside the Plan Area, Alternative 1 would designate fewer acres of NLCS lands and ACECs, with more acres of wildlife allocations. Overall, Alternative 1 would result in lower or reduced conservation and protection of these lands Outside the Plan Area than the Preferred Alternative.

IV.14.3.3.6.3 Alternative 1 Compared With Preferred Alternative for NCCP

The impacts of the NCCP for Alternative 1 are the same as those defined in Section IV.14.3.2.1 for the Plan-wide analysis. As a result, the comparison of Alternative 1 with the No Action Alternative for the NCCP is the same as described above for the Plan-wide DRECP.

IV.14.3.3.6.4 Alternative 1 Compared With Preferred Alternative for the GCP

BLM lands with conservation and renewable energy designations, classifications, allocations, and management of lands with wilderness characteristics are under federal jurisdiction administered by BLM. Therefore, the GCP does not apply to these lands.

IV.14.3.4 Alternative 2**IV.14.3.4.1 Plan-wide Impacts of Implementing the DRECP: Alternative 2****IV.14.3.4.1.1 Plan-wide Impacts and Mitigation Measures from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development****Impact Assessment**

Table IV.14-18 summarizes potential impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations resulting from renewable energy and approved transmission facility development within DFAs under Alternative 2. DFA configurations include lowest biological conflict areas and certain additional areas with both high value renewable energy resources and biological resource values.

**Table IV.14-18
Acres of BLM Lands in Development Focus Areas and Impact by Technology Type –
Alternative 2**

Land Category	Acres of BLM Land in Development Focus Areas	Potential Impacts by Technology Type (acres)			
		Solar ¹	Wind ²	GT ³	Transmission
CDCA	704,000	38,000	144,000	7,000	13,000
Caliente RMP	0	0	0	0	0
Bishop RMP	1,400	50	0	100	100

¹ Includes ground-mounted distributed generation

² Disturbance Area

³ Plan Area

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Under Alternative 2, approximately 33,300 acres of BLM-administered lands may be developed for renewable energy. DFAs would be excluded from the same BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations as the Preferred Alternative, with the exception that surface-occupancy geothermal development would be allowed within a small portion of the Ocotillo

Wells East SRMA. All other geothermal development would be allowed within SRMAs but with a no surface occupancy stipulation. No other direct impacts to these areas would occur under Alternative 2.

Any renewable technology or transmission development within 5 miles of these areas may result in an indirect adverse effect on the viewshed, air quality, values of solitude, primitive and unconfined types of recreation, or other features of scenic value. Under Alternative 2, there would be 33 wilderness areas (561,000 acres), 8 WSAs (93,000 acres), 3 NSHTs (342 miles), and 1,131,000 acres of National Trail Management Corridors within 5 miles of DFAs (Table R2.14-1, alternatives comparison table). There would be no wild and scenic rivers within 5 miles of DFAs under this alternative. Impacts would be minor to moderate, depending on the technology and distance from special designation areas. CMAs and mitigation measures would reduce impacts.

National Trail Management Corridors. Under Alternative 2, a National Trail Management Corridor, consisting of a 10-mile corridor from the trail centerline, would be proposed (approximately 2,479,000 acres). DFAs for renewable energy and transmission development would overlap with this proposed corridor. Specifically, 12.5 miles of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail may occur within DFAs.

SRMAs. Under Alternative 2, within a small portion of the Ocotillo Wells East SRMA surface-occupancy geothermal development would be allowed. The Ocotillo Wells East SRMA receives from 500,000 to 1,000,000 annual visitors. Geothermal surface occupancy and associated infrastructure would likely have an adverse impact on existing and future visitors to the SRMA. Visitors would likely need to change their recreational activities to a smaller area, increasing the concentration of use and increasing potential public safety issues. The Ocotillo Wells SRMA also has a wide range of wildlife habitat that could be affected by geothermal development, including natural gas seeps. Allowing surface occupancy within the least sensitive areas, such as existing utility corridors and near industrial areas, of the SRMA would reduce potential impacts.

Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 2, of the approximately 633,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 317,000 would be managed to protect these characteristics. No renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands. The remaining approximately 316,000 inventoried acres would not be managed to protect these characteristics and renewable energy and transmission development would be an allowable use.

Under this alternative, inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would be reduced in size where the lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development. Inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics, but not managed, would be reprioritized

for development of approximately 5,000 acres of solar, 27,000 acres of wind, 50 acres of geothermal, and 400 acres of transmission corridors (approximately 32,000 acres total, about 10%). Mitigation/compensation, as prescribed by CMAs, would be employed where inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics may be impacted by new transmission development.

Impact LD-1: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would reduce the value of designated conservation areas.

Potential direct impacts to NSHT management corridors and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics may occur. For areas where DFAs overlap with inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics, the inventoried lands would be reduced in size to reprioritized use for renewable energy development. Overall, potential reduction in scenic value and impacts to characteristics would be about 10% of the inventoried lands and impacts would be minimal. CMAs would further reduce impacts.

Indirect impacts to wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, NLCS lands, ACECs, wildlife allocations, SRMAs, and open OHV areas under Alternative 2 may also occur. The proximity of renewable energy development to these lands would result in indirect effects to the important values of these lands, such as reduction in air quality, impacts to visual resources, and increased noise and traffic. These types of impacts would reduce the quality of the lands with special designation and change the nature of the location (see Table R2.14-1 and impact assessment above). Overall, impacts would be minor to moderate, depending on the technology used and distance from these special designation areas.

Impact LD-2: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would conflict with the existing management goals and objectives of designated conservation areas.

Alternative 2 would not directly conflict with the existing management goals and objectives of designated conservation areas. Development on DFAs adjacent to or near designated conservation areas would indirectly affect the existing management goals and objectives, in particular the protection of scenic value. Development on lands inventoried with wilderness characteristics would degrade those characteristics. Renewable energy facilities would introduce industrial structures that would conflict with the natural area. Renewable development could occur on more than 32,000 acres of inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics.

Under Alternative 2, development within National Conservation Lands would be limited to 0.25% of total authorized disturbance, or to the level allowed by collocated ACEC/wildlife allocations, whichever is more restrictive (see Table R2.14-5). Wildlife habitat disturbance

caps only apply to lands not already included under ACECs or wildlife allocation disturbance caps.

Impacts in Study Area Lands

Future Assessment Areas. Lands within FAAs are neither reserve lands nor DFAs; they are simply areas that are deferred for future assessment. The future assessment will determine their suitability for renewable energy development or for ecological conservation. If renewable energy development occurs on FAA lands, a Land Use Plan Amendment would not be required. FAAs for each alternative are included and located as shown in Table IV.1-2 and Figure II.5-1 in Volume II. The FAAs represent areas where renewable energy development or inclusion to the reserve design could be implemented through an amendment to the DRECP but additional assessment would be needed.

Because most of the FAAs are presented as “undesigned areas” in the action alternatives, there would be no difference between the FAAs in Alternative 2 except that renewable development in an FAA would not require a BLM Land Use Plan Amendment so the environmental review process would be somewhat simpler than if the location were left undesignated. Development or Conservation Designation of the FAAs would not likely impact BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, or lands inventoried or managed for wilderness characteristics.

Special Analysis Areas. Designating the SAAs as development would result in impacts similar to those identified for the DFAs for the Plan-wide impacts. SAAs may impact BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, or lands inventoried or managed for wilderness characteristics; however, impacts would be minimal due to the overall limited size of SAA areas.

Impact Reduction Strategies and Mitigation

The implementation of the Plan would result in conservation of some desert lands as well as the development of renewable energy generation and transmission facilities on other lands. The impacts of the renewable energy development covered by the Plan would be lessened in several ways. First, the Plan incorporates CMAs for each alternative, including specific biological reserve design components and LUPA components. Also, the implementation of existing laws, orders, regulations, and standards would reduce the impacts of project development. If significant impacts would still result after implementation of CMAs and compliance with applicable laws and regulations, then specific mitigation measures are recommended in this section.

Conservation and Management Actions

The conservation strategy for Alternative 2 (presented in Volume II, Section II.3.1.1) defines specific actions that would reduce the impacts of this alternative. The conservation strategy includes a definition of the reserve design and specific CMAs for Alternative 2.

For NLCS, CMAs would be the same as the Preferred Alternative except for the following:

- **Lands and Realty**
 - Rights-of-Way
 - **Site Rights-of-Way (Nonrenewable Energy, Nonlinear Rights-of-Way)**– National Conservation Lands would be exclusion areas.³ Exceptions would only be considered where they clearly do not impact National Conservation Lands values.
 - **Renewable Energy Generation** – National Conservation Lands would be exclusion areas for renewable energy ROWs (development and testing).
 - **Linear Rights-of-Way** – Exclusion except for existing corridors. Exceptions only considered where they clearly do not impact National Conservation Lands values or require mitigation/compensation resulting in net benefit to National Conservation Lands unit
- **Recreation and Visitor Services** – Competitive and Commercial Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) would be permitted.
- **Wildlife Habitat Disturbance caps** - Development in National Conservation Lands would be limited to 0.25% of total authorized disturbance.

For NLCS lands and ACECs, no renewable energy development would be allowed. For SRMAs, geothermal development would be allowed but with no surface occupancy stipulation.

For NSHT, CMAs would be the same as described under the Preferred Alternative except as described below.

- **Lands and Realty**
 - Rights-of-Way
 - **Site ROWs:** NSHT Management Corridors would be exclusion areas.

³ Defined in the BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1) as “areas which are not available for location of rights-of-way under any conditions.

- **Linear ROWs:** NSHT Management Corridors would be exclusion areas except in designated transmission corridors. Where development in transmission corridors affects trail management corridors, an analysis must be performed to ensure that it does not substantially interfere with the nature and purposes of the trail, and that mitigation/compensation results in a net benefit to the trail.
- **Land tenure:** Lands within NSHT Management Corridors would be retained; no exchange or disposal would be permitted.

The CMAs applicable to managed and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics presented in Section IV.14.3.2.1.1 for the Preferred Alternative would be required for Alternative 2 as well. Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics within DFAs or transmission corridors would not be managed to protect those characteristics.

Laws and Regulations

Similar to the No Action Alternative, existing laws and regulations will reduce certain impacts of Plan implementation. Relevant regulations are presented in the Regulatory Setting in Volume III. The requirements of relevant laws and regulations are summarized for the No Action Alternative in Section IV.14.3.1.1.1.

Mitigation Measures

After implementation of the CMAs and existing laws and regulations, mitigation measures will be applied to further reduce identified adverse impacts described for Impacts LD-1 and LD-2. The two mitigation measures applicable to the Preferred Alternative, identified in Section IV.14.3.2.1.1, would be the same as those presented for Alternative 2.

IV.14.3.4.1.2 Impacts of the Reserve Design

The reserve design would result in over 8.6 million acres of BLM lands in conservation, 3.2 million acres of which already exist. Alternative 2 reserve design would designate over 1 million more acres of NLCS lands than the Preferred Alternative. As with the Preferred Alternative, the reserve design would affect other BLM designations if the purpose of the reserve design were contrary to the mandates of the other designations. For many BLM designations, classifications, and allocations, including wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, ACECs, wildlife management areas, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics the reserve design would have limited or no adverse effects to their management and purpose.

For NSHTs, the reserve design would provide additional protection from a 10-mile (from trail centerline) management corridor that would be defined and would contain explicit management direction, resulting in beneficial impacts to NSHTs.

SRMAs would be managed for their targeted recreation activities, experiences and benefits. SRMA recreation setting characteristics—physical components of remoteness, naturalness and facilities; social components of contact, group size and evidence of use; and operational components of access, visitor services and management controls, would be maintained, and enhanced where possible.

Alternative 2 would limit saleable minerals on all NLCS land to parcels under 2,000 acres. Management guidance and CMAs have been incorporated to the reserve design elements to ensure BLM continues to allow mining, linear features, and other more intensive uses while still meeting the purpose of the reserves. Alternative 2 would allow some uses on SRMAs within the reserve design, such as Special Recreation Permits.

IV.14.3.4.2 Impacts of DRECP Land Use Plan Amendment on BLM Land: Alternative 2

This section addresses two components of effects of the BLM LUPA: the streamlined development of renewable energy and transmission on BLM land under the LUPA, and the impacts of the amended land use plans themselves.

IV.14.3.4.2.1 Impacts from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development on BLM Land

The Plan-wide impacts to BLM designations discussed in Section IV.14.3.4.1.1 exclusively apply to BLM land. Therefore, the type of impacts related to BLM LUPA actions would be the same as in the Plan-wide impacts.

IV.14.3.4.2.2 Impacts of Changes to BLM Land Designations

Designations, allocations, and classifications of NLCS lands, ACECs, SRMAs, wildlife allocations, and managed lands with wilderness characteristics would benefit sensitive cultural and natural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values. Any reductions in acres of designations, such as ACECs or SRMAs, could result in adverse effects to cultural and natural resource values.

NLCS Lands. Alternative 2 would propose to designate all lands in the CDCA as NLCS lands except open OHV areas, DFAs, and active mine locations. Existing and proposed acres of BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics are presented in Table R2.14-2 by alternative (Appendix R2). The allowable uses proposed in this alternative would be the most restrictive of all alternatives in response to the

larger renewable energy development footprint. As such, site rights-of-way and linear rights-of-way would be exclusion areas except for existing corridors. Mineral rights-of-way would be limited, and some areas would be targeted for potential withdrawal from use. Competitive and Commercial Special Recreation Permits would be permitted.

Under Alternative 2, Sperry Wash Road, El Mirage Interpretive Trail East, and El Mirage Interpretive Trail West would be nominated for National Recreation Trail designation. In addition, the Nadeau Road National Recreation Trail Management Corridor of 0.5-mile (from trail centerline) would be designated.

National Trail Management Corridor. Under Alternative 2, approximately 2,478,000 acres of National Trail Management Corridors would be proposed for designation as this alternative would establish a corridor width generally 10 miles from the centerline of NSHT trails (Appendix R2, Table R2.14-2).

Wild and Scenic Rivers. Under Alternative 2, the Amargosa River, Mojave River (Afton Canyon), and Surprise Canyon Creek would be managed to protect the “outstandingly remarkable values,” the free-flowing condition, and water quality in the designated or eligible segments. All proposed actions would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure that these values are protected or enhanced. A boundary of 0.25 miles on either side of the river (above mean high water mark) would constitute the corridor. Renewable energy development would be prohibited in these segments.

ACECs. Under Alternative 2, 38 new ACECs would be proposed for the purpose of wildlife, plant, and cultural resource protection, for a total of 121 ACECs (see Appendix R2, Tables R2.14-2 and R2.14-3 ACECs by Alternative). Management of existing and proposed ACECs would include a disturbance cap, presented in Table R2.14-4 by alternative. Total acres of ACECs within each disturbance cap category under Alternative 2 are summarized in Table IV.14-19.

Table IV.14-19
Acres of ACECs Within Each Disturbance Cap Category Under Alternative 2

Disturbance Cap		
<i>0.10%</i>	<i>0.25%</i>	<i>1.0%</i>
116,000	4,339,000	651,000

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Under Alternative 2, five ACECs would be reduced in size, as shown in Table R2.14-3 and Table IV.14-20, and the lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development instead of management for cultural or biological resources. All other existing ACECs would remain the same or increase in size (acres) as shown in Table R2.14-3 (Appendix R2).

**Table IV.14-20
ACECs With Reduced Acres Under Alternative 2**

ACEC Unit Name	Acres Difference
Fremont-Kramer DWMA – Reduced	-72,000
Mojave Monkey Flower – Reduced (from the renamed Brisbane Valley Monkey Flower ACEC portion)	-2,000
Ord-Rodman DWMA – Reduced	-67,000
Superior-Cronese DWMA – Reduced	-115,000
Western Rand Mountains – Reduced	-13,000

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Wildlife Allocations. Alternative 2 would propose to designate approximately 1,100 acres as wildlife allocations to emphasize protection and enhancement of important plant and animal habitats.

SRMAs. Under Alternative 2, 36 new SRMAs would be proposed, for a total of 38 existing and proposed SRMAs. Existing and proposed SRMAs are shown in Table R2.14-4 (Appendix R2).

Lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 2, of the approximately 633,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 317,000 acres would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics. No renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands. The remaining approximately 316,000 inventoried acres would not be managed to protect these characteristics and renewable energy and transmission development would be an allowable use.

Multiple-Use Classes. Under Alternative 2, multiple-use classes would be replaced by BLM designations, classifications, and allocations. Table R2.14-6 shows the crosswalk between multiple-use classes and proposed BLM designations, classifications, and allocations by alternative.

Alternative 2 would amend the CDCA Plan to replace multiple-use classes with existing and proposed designations, classifications, and allocations that would allow for some development

and some conservation. Under ACECs, NLCS lands, SRMAs, and Extensive Recreation Management Areas, new development would not be allowed. Maintenance, retrofitting projects, and operation of existing or previously approved facilities would be allowed. Under DFAs, technology development would be allowed with implementation of some CMAs.

The types of BLM land designations, allocations, and classifications that would replace multiple-use classes under Alternative 2 would be similar to the Preferred Alternative (as described in Section IV.14.3.2.2.2.) except that more acres would be designated as DFAs and NLCS lands or other Conservation Designations.

IV.14.3.4.3 Impacts of Natural Community Conservation Plan: Alternative 2

The analysis of Covered Activities under the NCCP is equivalent to the Plan-wide analysis of the interagency alternatives. Reserve design features and other conservation actions under the NCCP alternatives represent more detailed categories of the reserve design under the interagency Plan-wide alternatives. These NCCP differences in reserve design features do not affect nonbiological resources analyzed in this document, and the analysis of reserve design and conservation and management actions under the NCCP is therefore equivalent to the Plan-wide analysis of the interagency alternatives, as described in Section IV.14.3.4.1.

IV.14.3.4.4 Impacts of General Conservation Plan

BLM lands with conservation and renewable energy designations, classifications, allocations, and management of lands with wilderness characteristics are under federal jurisdiction administered by BLM. Therefore, the GCP does not apply to these lands.

IV.14.3.4.5 Impacts Outside the Plan Area

IV.14.3.4.5.1 Impacts of Transmission Outside the Plan Area

The impacts of transmission outside the Plan Area on BLM land designations, classifications, and lands with wilderness characteristics would be the same under all alternatives. These impacts are as described for the No Action Alternative in Section IV.14.3.1.4.1, Impacts of Transmission Outside the Plan Area.

IV.14.3.4.5.2 Impacts of BLM LUPA Decisions Outside the Plan Area

As described above for the Plan Area, designations, allocations, and classifications of NLCS lands, ACECs, SRMAs, wildlife allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics would benefit sensitive cultural and natural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values. Any reductions in acres of

designations, such as ACECs or SRMAs, could result in adverse effects to cultural and natural resource values Outside the Plan Area.

Existing and proposed BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative 2 Outside the Plan Area are presented in Table IV.14-21.

Table IV.14-21
Acres of BLM Land Designations, Classifications, and
Allocations Outside the Plan Area – Alternative 2

BLM Lands ¹	Outside the Plan Area (acres)
Existing ² and proposed NLCS Lands	426,000
Existing and proposed ACEC	269,000
Existing and proposed SRMAs	173,000
Wildlife allocations	0
Inventoried Lands with wilderness characteristics	76,000

¹ These designations may overlap.

² Wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, NSHTs, and other special areas identified through acts of Congress (LLPAs).

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

IV.14.3.4.6 Comparison of Alternative 2 With Preferred Alternative

Chapter IV.27 presents a comparison of all action alternatives and the No Action Alternative across all disciplines. This section summarizes the comparison of Alternative 2 with the Preferred Alternative.

IV.14.3.4.6.1 Alternative 2 Compared With Preferred Alternative for Plan-wide DRECP

A comparison of renewable energy development areas between Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative is summarized in Table IV.14-22.

Table IV.14-22
Alternative 2 Compared With the Preferred Alternative in DFAs for Plan-wide DRECP

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 2 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Development Focus Areas	202,250	122,000	Alternative 2 would have 80,250 more acres within DFAs than the Preferred Alternative.
Existing and proposed ACECs	0 DFA	0 DFAs	Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative would be the same for this parameter.
Existing and proposed SRMAs	0 DFAs	0 DFAs	Alternative 2 would allow surface occupying geothermal development in portions of one SRMA, but would otherwise be the same as the Preferred Alternative.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	317,000 managed 0 acres within DFAs	350,000 managed 0 acres within DFAs	Alternative 2 would have 33,000 fewer acres of managed lands with wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative.
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	32,000 within DFAs	18,000 within DFAs	Alternative 2 would have 14,000 more acres within DFAs in inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative.

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Alternative 2 would likely result in greater impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations due to the development of renewable energy than the Preferred Alternative because it would have more areas designated as DFAs and more potential acres of disturbance due to development. Overall, Alternative 2 would have greater direct and indirect impacts on the values and protected resources of BLM land designations, classifications, allocations from potential renewable energy development than the Preferred Alternative.

IV.14.3.4.6.2 Alternative 2 Compared With Preferred Alternative for the BLM LUPA

A comparison between Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative within existing and proposed conservation lands or Reserve Design Lands for the Plan-wide DRECP is summarized in Table IV.14-23.

Table IV.14-23
Alternative 2 Compared With the Preferred Alternative for Reserve Design Lands
Within the Plan-wide DRECP¹

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 2 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Wilderness Areas, WSAs, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers	3,188,000	3,188,000	These designations would be the same under both the Preferred Alternative and Alternative 2. These lands would be managed as National Conservation Lands under both alternatives.
National Conservation Lands	5,431,000	3,827,000	Alternative 2 would designate 1,604,000 acres more of NLCS lands as compared to the Preferred Alternative.
NSHT Management Corridors	2,479,000 (10-mile buffer)	1,333,000 (5-mile buffer)	Alternative 2 would designate 1,146,000 more acres of NSHT management corridors than the Preferred Alternative.
ACECs	855,000 121 Units	2,277,000 127 Units	Alternative 2 would have 1,422,000 fewer acres of ACECs than the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 2 would reduce 4 ACECs, and the Preferred Alternative would reduce or eliminate 4 ACECs. Alternative 2 would have 6 fewer new or existing ACECs than the Preferred Alternative.
Wildlife allocations	1,100	19,000	Alternative 2 would have 17,900 fewer acres of wildlife allocations than the Preferred Alternative.
SRMAs	589,000 38 Units	673,000 40 Units	Alternative 2 would have 84,000 fewer acres of SRMAs than the Preferred Alternative and 2 fewer SRMAs.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	317,000	350,000	The Preferred Alternative would manage 33,000 more acres of lands with wilderness characteristics than Alternative 2.

Table IV.14-23
Alternative 2 Compared With the Preferred Alternative for Reserve Design Lands
Within the Plan-wide DRECP¹

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 2 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	316,000	283,000	Alternative 2 would have 33,000 more acres of inventoried but not managed lands with wilderness characteristics.
Outside Plan Area			Alternative 2 would have more acres of NLCS lands Outside the Plan Area than the Preferred Alternative but the same as the Preferred Alternative for ACECs, SRMAs, wildlife allocations, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics.
NLCS Lands	426,000	221,000	
ACECs	269,000	269,000	
SRMAs	173,000	173,000	
Wildlife Allocation	0	0	
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	76,000	76,000	
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	0	0	

¹ Areas may have more than one BLM designation, classification or allocation; so the acres do not add up to the total DRECP acres.

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Within the Plan Area, Alternative 2 has more acres of BLM land that would be designated for conservation and protection than the Preferred Alternative. Outside the Plan Area, Alternative 2 would have more acres of NLCS lands and ACECs, and the same or similar acres of SRMAs, wildlife allocations, lands with wilderness characteristics, compared with the Preferred Alternative. Overall, Alternative 2 would result in greater conservation and protection of these lands Outside the Plan Area compared with the Preferred Alternative. Because of the limited use allowed in the conservation lands, Alternative 2 would restrict nonconservation and nonrenewable energy use more so than the Preferred Alternative.

IV.14.3.4.6.3 Alternative 2 Compared With Preferred Alternative for NCCP

The impacts of the NCCP for Alternative 2 are the same as those defined in Section IV.14.3.2.1 for the Plan-wide analysis. As a result, the comparison of Alternative 2 with the Preferred Alternative for the NCCP is the same as described above for Plan-wide DRECP.

IV.14.3.4.6.4 Alternative 2 Compared With Preferred Alternative for the GCP

BLM lands with conservation and renewable energy designations, classifications, allocations, and management of lands with wilderness characteristics are under federal jurisdiction administered by BLM. Therefore, the GCP does not apply to these lands.

IV.14.3.5 Alternative 3

IV.14.3.5.1 Plan-wide Impacts of Implementing the DRECP: Alternative 3

IV.14.3.5.1.1 Plan-wide Impacts and Mitigation Measures from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development

Impact Assessment

Table IV.14-24 summarizes potential impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations resulting from renewable energy and approved transmission facility development within DFAs under Alternative 3. DFA configurations include lowest biological conflict areas and certain additional areas with both high value renewable energy resources and biological resource values.

Table IV.14-24
Acres of BLM Lands in Development Focus Areas and
Impact by Technology Type – Alternative 3

Land Category	Acres of BLM Land in Development Focus Areas	Potential Impacts by Technology Type (acres)			
		Solar ¹	Wind ²	GT ³	Transmission
CDCA	211,000	29,000	14,000	7,000	12,000
Caliente RMP	0	0	0	0	0
Bishop RMP	10	0	0	0	100

¹ Includes ground-mounted distributed generation

² Disturbance Footprint

³ Plan Area

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Under Alternative 3, approximately 62,100 acres of BLM-administered lands may be developed for renewable energy. DFAs would be excluded from the same BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations as the Preferred Alternative. No direct impacts to these areas would occur under Alternative 3. Any renewable technology or transmission devel-

opment within 5 miles of these areas may result in an indirect adverse effect on the viewshed, air quality, values of solitude, primitive and unconfined types of recreation, or other features of scenic value.

Under Alternative 3, there would be 16 wilderness areas (160,500 acres), 5 WSAs (32,000 acres), 3 NSHTs (247 miles), and approximately 330,000 acres of National Trail Management Corridors within 5 miles of DFAs (Table R2.14-1, alternatives comparison table). There would be no wild and scenic rivers within 5 miles of DFAs under this alternative. Any renewable technology or transmission development within 5 miles of these areas may result in an indirect adverse effect on the viewshed, air quality, values of solitude, primitive and unconfined types of recreation, or other features of scenic value. Impacts would be minor to moderate, depending on the technology and distance from special designation areas. CMAs and mitigation measures would reduce impacts.

National Trail Management Corridors. Under Alternative 3, a National Trail Management Corridor consisting of a 5-mile area from the trail centerline, would be proposed (approximately 1,333,000 acres). DFAs for renewable energy and transmission development would not overlap with this proposed corridor.

Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 3, of the approximately 633,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 374,000 would be managed to protect these characteristics. No renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands. The remaining approximately 259,000 inventoried acres would not be managed to protect these characteristics and renewable energy and transmission development would be an allowable use.

Under this alternative, inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would be reduced in size where the lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development. Inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics, but not managed, would be reprioritized for development of approximately 800 acres of solar, 500 acres of wind, 50 acres of geothermal, and 300 acres of transmission corridors (approximately 2,000 acres total, about 1%). Mitigation/compensation, as prescribed by CMAs, would be employed where inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics may be impacted by development.

Impact LD-1: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would reduce the value of designated conservation areas.

Potential direct impacts to NSHT management corridors and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics may occur. For areas where DFAs overlap with inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics, the inventoried lands would be reduced in size to reprioritized use for renewable energy development. Overall, potential reduction in scenic value and

impacts to characteristics would be about 1% of the inventoried lands and impacts would be minimal. CMAs would further reduce impacts.

Indirect impacts to wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, NLCS lands, ACECs, wildlife allocations, SRMAs, and open OHV areas under Alternative 3 may also occur. The proximity of renewable energy development to these lands would result in indirect effects to the important values of these lands, such as reduction in air quality, impacts to visual resources, and increased noise and traffic. These types of impacts would reduce the quality of the lands with special designation and change the nature of the location. Overall, impacts would be minor to moderate, depending on the technology used and distance from these special designation areas.

Impact LD-2: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would conflict with the existing management goals and objectives of designated conservation areas.

Alternative 3 would not directly conflict with the existing management goals and objectives of designated conservation areas. Development on DFAs adjacent to or near designated conservation areas would indirectly affect the existing management goals and objectives, in particular the protection of scenic value. Development on lands with wilderness characteristics would degrade those characteristics. Renewable energy facilities would introduce industrial structures that would conflict with the natural area. Renewable development could occur on more than 2,000 acres of inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. Development on inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would degrade those characteristics.

Under Alternative 3, development within National Conservation Lands would be limited to 0.25% of total authorized disturbance, or to the level allowed by collocated ACEC/wildlife allocations, whichever is more restrictive. Wildlife habitat disturbance caps would only apply to lands not already included under ACECs or wildlife allocation disturbance caps.

Impacts in Study Area Lands

Future Assessment Areas. Lands within FAAs are neither reserve lands nor DFAs; they are simply areas that are deferred for future assessment. The future assessment will determine their suitability for renewable energy development or for ecological conservation. If renewable energy development occurs on FAA lands, a Land Use Plan Amendment would not be required. FAAs for each alternative are included and located as shown in Table IV.1-2 and Figure II.6-1 in Volume II. The FAAs represent areas where renewable energy development or inclusion to the reserve design could be implemented through an amendment to the DRECP but additional assessment would be needed.

Because most of the FAAs are presented as “undesigned areas” in the action alternatives, there would be no difference between the FAAs in Alternative 3 except that renewable development in an FAA would not require a BLM Land Use Plan Amendment so the environmental review process would be somewhat simpler than if the location were left undesignated. Development or Conservation Designation of the FAAs would not likely impact BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, or lands inventoried or managed for wilderness characteristics.

Special Analysis Areas. Designating the SAAs as conservation would not result in adverse impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, or lands inventoried or managed for wilderness characteristics. Impacts would be the same as those explained for the Plan-wide reserve design in Section IV.14.3.5.1.2, Impacts of the Reserve Design, below.

DRECP Variance Lands. DRECP Variance Lands represent the BLM Solar PEIS Variance Lands as screened for the DRECP and EIR/EIS based on BLM screening criteria. Covered Activities could be permitted for NCCP purposes only through an NCCP Plan amendment. However, development of renewable energy on Variance Lands would not require a BLM Land Use Plan Amendment so the environmental review process would be somewhat simpler than if the location were left undesignated. Conservation Designation of the DRECP Variance Lands would result in beneficial effects to BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, or lands inventoried or managed for wilderness characteristics due to increased protection and conservation of these lands. Development of the DRECP Variance Lands could result in adverse effects to BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, or lands inventoried or managed for wilderness characteristics due to increased protection and conservation of these lands.

Impact Reduction Strategies and Mitigation

The implementation of the Plan would result in conservation of some desert lands as well as the development of renewable energy generation and transmission facilities on other lands. The impacts of the renewable energy development covered by the Plan would be lessened in several ways. First, the Plan incorporates CMAs for each alternative, including specific biological reserve design components and LUPA components. Also, the implementation of existing laws, orders, regulations, and standards would reduce the impacts of project development. If significant impacts would still result after implementation of CMAs and compliance with applicable laws and regulations, then specific mitigation measures are recommended in this section.

Conservation and Management Actions

The conservation strategy for Alternative 3 (presented in Volume II, Section II.3.1.1) defines specific actions that would reduce the impacts of this alternative. The conservation strategy includes a definition of the reserve design and specific CMAs for Alternative 3.

For NLCS, CMAs would be the same as described under the Preferred Alternative except as described below.

- **Lands and Realty**
 - Rights-of-Way
 - **Site Rights-of-Way (Nonrenewable Energy, Nonlinear Rights-of-Way)** – National Conservation Lands would be considered exclusion areas. Exceptions would only be considered where they clearly do not impact National Conservation Lands values.
 - **Renewable Energy Generation** – National Conservation Lands would be exclusion areas for renewable energy ROWs (development and testing).
 - **Linear Rights-of-Way** – Transmission would only be permitted in existing transmission corridors. National Conservation Lands would be avoidance areas for all other linear ROWs.
 - **Recreation and Visitor Services** – BLM would not permit competitive SRPs. Commercial SRPs would be limited to those uses that allow for enjoyment of National Conservation Lands values.
 - **Wildlife Habitat Disturbance caps** - Development in National Conservation Lands would be limited to 0.25% of total authorized disturbance.

For NLCS lands and ACECs, no renewable energy development would be allowed. For SRMAs, geothermal development would be allowed but with no surface occupancy stipulation.

For NSHT, CMAs would be the same as described under the Preferred Alternative except as described below.

- **Lands and Realty**
 - Rights-of-Way
 - **Site ROWs:** NSHT Management Corridors would be exclusion areas.
 - **Linear ROWs:** NSHT Management Corridors would be exclusion areas, except in designated transmission corridors. Exclude cultural landscapes,

high potential historic sites, and high potential route segments identified along historic trails corridors from transmission except in approved transmission corridors. Where development affects trail management corridors, an analysis must be performed to ensure that it does not substantially interfere with the nature and purposes of the trail, and that mitigation/compensation results in a net benefit to the trail.

- Lands in NSHT Management Corridors would be retained. Exchange or disposal would not be permitted.

There would be no mitigation requirements for NSHTs under Alternative 3.

For lands with wilderness characteristics, in addition to the CMAs listed in the Preferred Alternative, all lands identified for management to protect wilderness characteristics under Alternative 3 would be closed to all mechanized and motorized transport.

Laws and Regulations

Similar to the No Action Alternative, existing laws and regulations will reduce certain impacts of Plan implementation. Relevant regulations are presented in the Regulatory Setting in Volume III. The requirements of relevant laws and regulations are summarized for the No Action Alternative in Section IV.14.3.1.1.1.

Mitigation Measures

After implementation of the CMAs and existing laws and regulations, mitigation measures will be applied to further reduce identified adverse impacts described for Impacts LD-1 and LD-2. The two mitigation measures applicable to the Preferred Alternative, identified in Section IV.14.3.2.1.1, would be the same as those presented for Alternative 3.

IV.14.3.5.1.2 Impacts of the Reserve Design

The reserve design would result in over 8.3 million acres of BLM lands in conservation, 3.2 million acres of which already exist. The reserve design under Alternative 3 would have fewer acres of NLCS lands than the Preferred Alternative. As with the Preferred Alternative, the reserve design would affect other BLM designations if the purpose of the reserve design were contrary to the mandates of the other designations. For many BLM designations, classifications, and allocations, including wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, NSHT, ACECs, wildlife management areas, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics the reserve design would have limited or no adverse effects to their management and purpose.

For NSHTs, the reserve design would provide additional protection from a 5-mile (from trail centerline) management corridor that would be defined and would contain explicit management direction, resulting in beneficial impacts to NSHTs.

SRMAs would be managed for their targeted recreation activities, experiences and benefits. SRMA recreation setting characteristics – physical components of remoteness, naturalness and facilities; social components of contact, group size and evidence of use; and operational components of access, visitor services and management controls, would be maintained, and enhanced where possible.

Management guidance and CMAs have been incorporated to the reserve design elements to ensure BLM continues to allow mining, linear features, and other more intensive uses while still meeting the purpose of the reserves.

IV.14.3.5.2 Impacts of DRECP Land Use Plan Amendment on BLM Land: Alternative 3

This section addresses two components of effects of the BLM LUPA: the streamlined development of renewable energy and transmission on BLM land under the LUPA, and the impacts of the amended land use plans themselves.

IV.14.3.5.2.1 Impacts from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development on BLM Land

The Plan-wide impacts to BLM designations discussed in Section IV.14.3.5.1.1 exclusively apply to BLM land. Therefore, the type of impacts related to BLM LUPA actions would be the same as in the Plan-wide impacts.

IV.14.3.5.2.2 Impacts of Changes to BLM Land Designations

Designations, allocations, and classifications of NLCS lands, ACECs, SRMAs, wildlife allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics would benefit sensitive cultural and natural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values. Any reductions in acres of designations, such as ACECs or SRMAs, could result in adverse effects to cultural and natural resource values.

NLCS Lands. Alternative 3 would emphasize larger landscape connecting corridors. It would not include smaller cultural and botanic areas that are not components of a larger landscape. Existing and proposed acres of BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics are presented in Table R2.14-2 (Appendix R2). Use allocations would be more limiting than the Preferred Alternative. Site rights-of-way would be exclusion areas and linear rights-of-way would be avoidance areas except for transmission, which would be permitted in existing corridors. Mineral rights-of-way

would be limited, and some areas would be targeted for potential withdrawal from use. BLM would not permit Competitive Special Recreation Permits, and Commercial Special Recreation Permits would be limited.

This alternative would manage adverse effects to cultural resources via alternative mitigation that includes regional synthesis and interpretation of existing archaeological data.

Under Alternative 3, Sperry Wash Road, El Mirage Interpretive Trail East, and El Mirage Interpretive Trail West would be nominated for National Recreation Trail designation. In addition, the Nadeau Road National Recreation Trail Management Corridor of 0.5-mile (from trail centerline) would be designated.

National Trail Management Corridors. Under Alternative 3, a National Trail Management Corridor consisting of a 5-mile area from the trail centerline, would be proposed (approximately 1,333,000 acres). DFAs for renewable energy and transmission development would not overlap with this proposed corridor.

Wild and Scenic Rivers. Under Alternative 3, the Amargosa River, Mojave River (Afton Canyon), and Surprise Canyon Creek would be managed to protect the “outstandingly remarkable values,” the free-flowing condition, and water quality in the designated or eligible segments. All proposed actions would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure that these values are protected or enhanced. A boundary of 0.25 miles on either side of the river (above mean high water mark) would constitute the corridor. Renewable energy development would be prohibited in these segments.

ACECs. Under Alternative 3, 40 new ACECs would be proposed for designation for the purpose of wildlife, plant, and cultural resource protection, for a total of 123 ACECs (see Appendix R2, Tables R2.14-2 and R2.14-3 ACECs by Alternative). Management of existing and proposed ACECs would include a disturbance cap, presented in Table R2.14-4 by alternative. Total acres of ACECs within each disturbance cap category under Alternative 3 are summarized in Table IV.14-25.

Table IV.14-25
Acres of ACECs Within Each Disturbance Cap Category Under Alternative 3

Disturbance Cap		
<i>0.10%</i>	<i>0.25%</i>	<i>1.0%</i>
170,000	3,078,000	2,360,000

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Under Alternative 3, two ACECs would be reduced and one would be eliminated, including the Desert Tortoise Natural Area, as shown in Table R2.14-3 (Appendix R2) and Table IV.14-26, and the lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development instead of management for cultural or biological resources. All other existing ACECs would remain the same or increase in size (acres), as shown in Table R2.14-3 (Appendix R2). The Mojave Monkey Flower ACEC would be renamed into two ACECs, the Brisbane Valley Mojave Monkey Flower and Daggett Ridge Mojave Monkey Flower ACECs.

Table IV.14-26
ACECs With Reduced Acres Under Alternative 3

ACEC Unit Name	Acres Difference
Desert Tortoise Natural Area – Eliminated	-3,000
Fremont-Kramer DWMA – Reduced	-2,000
Western Rand Mountains – Reduced	-1,000

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Wildlife Allocations. Alternative 3 would not propose to designate wildlife allocations to emphasize protection and enhancement of important plant and animal habitats.

SRMAs. Under Alternative 3, 35 new SRMAs would be proposed, for a total of 37 existing and proposed SRMAs. Existing and proposed SRMAs are shown in Table R2.14-4 (Appendix R2).

Lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 3, of the approximately 633,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 374,000 acres would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics. No renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands. The remaining approximately 259,000 inventoried acres would not be managed to protect these characteristics and renewable energy and transmission development would be an allowable use.

Multiple-Use Classes. Under Alternative 3, multiple-use classes would be replaced by BLM designations, classifications, and allocations. Table R2.14-6 shows the crosswalk between multiple-use classes and proposed BLM designations, classifications, and allocations.

Alternative 3 would amend the CDCA Plan to replace multiple-use classes with existing and proposed designations, classifications, and allocations that would allow for some development and some conservation. Under ACECs, NLCS lands, SRMAs, and Extensive Recreation Management Areas, new development would not be allowed. Maintenance, retrofitting projects,

and operation of existing or previously approved facilities would be allowed. Under DFAs, technology development would be allowed with implementation of some CMAs.

The types of BLM land designations, allocations, and classifications that would replace multiple-use classes under Alternative 3 would be similar to the Preferred Alternative (as described in Section IV.14.3.2.2.2.) except that NLCS lands would focus on larger landscape connecting corridors.

IV.14.3.5.3 Impacts of Natural Community Conservation Plan: Alternative 3

The analysis of Covered Activities under the NCCP is equivalent to the Plan-wide analysis of the interagency alternatives. Reserve design features and other conservation actions under the NCCP alternatives represent more detailed categories of the reserve design under the interagency Plan-wide alternatives. These NCCP differences in reserve design features do not affect nonbiological resources analyzed in this document, and the analysis of reserve design and conservation and management actions under the NCCP is therefore equivalent to the Plan-wide analysis of the interagency alternatives, as described in Section IV.14.3.5.1.

IV.14.3.5.4 Impacts of General Conservation Plan: Alternative 3

BLM lands with conservation and renewable energy designations, classifications, allocations, and management of lands with wilderness characteristics are under federal jurisdiction administered by BLM. Therefore, the GCP does not apply to these lands.

IV.14.3.5.5 Impacts Outside the Plan Area

IV.14.3.5.5.1 Impacts of Transmission Outside the Plan Area

The impacts of transmission outside the Plan Area on BLM land designations, classifications, and lands with wilderness characteristics would be the same under all alternatives. These impacts are as described for the No Action Alternative in Section IV.14.3.1.4.1, Impacts of Transmission Outside the Plan Area.

IV.14.3.5.5.2 Impacts of BLM LUPA Decisions Outside the Plan Area

As described above for the Plan Area, designations, allocations, and classifications of NLCS lands, ACECs, SRMAs, wildlife allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics would benefit sensitive cultural and natural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values. Any reductions in acres of designations, such as ACECs or SRMAs, could result in adverse effects to cultural and natural resource values Outside the Plan Area.

Existing and proposed BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative 3 Outside the Plan Area are presented in Table IV.14-27.

Table IV.14-27
Acres of BLM Land Designations, Classifications, Allocations
Outside the Plan Area – Alternative 3

BLM Lands ¹	Outside the Plan Area (acres)
Existing ² and proposed NLCS Lands	172,000
Existing and proposed ACEC	269,000
Existing and proposed SRMAs	173,000
Wildlife allocation	0
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	76,000

¹ These designations may overlap

² Wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, NSHTs, and other special areas identified through acts of Congress (LLPAs).

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

IV.14.3.5.6 Comparison of Alternative 3 With Preferred Alternative

Chapter IV.27 presents a comparison of all action alternatives and the No Action Alternative across all disciplines. This section summarizes the comparison of Alternative 3 with the Preferred Alternative.

IV.14.3.5.6.1 Alternative 3 Compared With Preferred Alternative for Plan-wide DRECP

A comparison of renewable energy development areas between Alternative 3 and the Preferred Alternative is summarized in Table IV.14-28.

Alternative 3 would likely result in fewer impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics due to the development of renewable energy than the Preferred Alternative because it would have fewer areas designated as DFAs.

Table IV.14-28
Alternative 3 Compared With the Preferred Alternative in DFAs for Plan-wide DRECP

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 3 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Development Focus Areas	62,100	122,000	Alternative 3 would have 59,900 fewer acres within DFAs than the Preferred Alternative.
Existing and proposed NLCS	0 DFA	0 DFAs	Alternative 3 and the Preferred Alternative would be the same for this parameter.
Existing and proposed ACECs	0 DFA	0 DFAs	Alternative 3 and the Preferred Alternative would be the same for this parameter.
Existing and proposed SRMAs	0 DFAs	0 DFAs	Alternative 3 and the Preferred Alternative would be the same for this parameter.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	317,000 managed 0 acres within DFAs	350,000 managed 0 acres within DFAs	Alternative 3 would have 33,000 fewer acres of managed lands with wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative.
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	32,000 within DFAs	18,000 within DFAs	Alternative 3 would have 14,000 fewer acres within DFAs in inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative.

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Alternative 3 would likely result in fewer impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations due to the development of renewable energy than the Preferred Alternative because it would have fewer areas designated as DFAs and fewer potential acres of disturbance due to development. Overall, Alternative 3 would have lower direct and indirect impacts on the values and protected resources of BLM land designations, classifications, allocations from potential renewable energy development than the Preferred Alternative.

IV.14.3.5.6.2 Alternative 3 Compared With Preferred Alternative for the BLM Land Use Plan Amendment

A comparison between Alternative 3 and the Preferred Alternative within existing and proposed conservation lands or reserve design Lands for the Plan-wide DRECP is summarized in Table IV.14-29.

**Table IV.14-29
Alternative 3 Compared With the Preferred Alternative for Reserve Design Lands
Within the Plan-wide DRECP¹**

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 3 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Wilderness Areas, WSAs, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers	3,188,000	3,188,000	These designations would be the same under both the Preferred Alternative and Alternative 3. These lands would be managed as National Conservation Lands under both alternatives.
National Conservation Lands	3,634,000	3,827,000	Alternative 3 would have 193,000 fewer acres of NLCS designations than the Preferred Alternative.
NSHT Management Corridors	1,333,000 (5-mile buffer)	1,333,000 (5-mile buffer)	Alternative 3 would have the same acres of NSHT management corridors as the Preferred Alternative.
ACECs	2,573,000 123 Units	2,277,000 127 Units	Alternative 3 would have 296,000 more acres of ACECs than the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 3 would eliminate or reduce 4 ACECs, and the Preferred Alternative would reduce or eliminate 4 ACECs. Alternative 3 would have 4 fewer new or existing ACECs than the Preferred Alternative.
Wildlife allocations	13,000	19,000	Alternative 3 would have 6,000 fewer acres of wildlife allocations than the Preferred Alternative.
SRMAs	690,000 37 Units	673,000 40 Units	Alternative 3 would have 17,000 more acres of SRMAs than the Preferred Alternative and 3 fewer SRMAs overall.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	374,000	350,000	Alternative 3 would manage 24,000 more acres of lands with wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative.

Table IV.14-29
Alternative 3 Compared With the Preferred Alternative for Reserve Design Lands
Within the Plan-wide DRECP¹

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 3 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	259,000	283,000	Alternative 3 would have 24,000 fewer acres of inventoried but not managed lands with wilderness characteristics.
Outside Plan Area			Alternative 3 would have more acres of NLCS lands than the Preferred Alternative but the same or similar acres of ACECs, SRMAs, wildlife allocations, and inventoried and managed lands with wilderness characteristics.
NLCS Lands	426,000	172,000	
ACECs	269,000	269,000	
SRMAs	173,000	173,000	
Wildlife Allocation	0	0	
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	76,000	76,000	
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	0	0	

¹ Areas may have more than one BLM designation, classification or allocation; so the acres do not add up to the total DRECP acres.

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Within the Plan Area, Alternative 3 has fewer acres of BLM land that would be designated for conservation and protection (NLCS) but more acres of ACECs, SRMAs, and lands managed for wilderness characteristics. Outside the Plan Area, Alternative 3 would have fewer acres of NLCS lands, and the same or similar acres of ACECs, SRMAs, wildlife allocations, lands with wilderness characteristics (inventoried and managed), compared with the Preferred Alternative. Overall, Alternative 3 would result in increased conservation and protection of these lands Outside the Plan Area compared with the Preferred Alternative. Because of the limited use allowed in the conservation lands, Alternative 3 would restrict nonconservation and nonrenewable energy use more than the Preferred Alternative.

IV.14.3.5.6.3 Alternative 3 Compared With Preferred Alternative for NCCP

The impacts of the NCCP for Alternative 3 are the same as those defined in Section IV.14.3.2.1 for the Plan-wide analysis. As a result, the comparison of Alternative 3 with the Preferred Alternative for the NCCP is the same as described above for Plan-wide DRECP.

IV.14.3.5.6.4 Alternative 3 Compared With Preferred Alternative for the GCP

BLM lands with conservation and renewable energy designations, classifications, allocations, and management of lands with wilderness characteristics are under federal jurisdiction administered by BLM. Therefore, the GCP does not apply to these lands.

IV.14.3.6 Alternative 4

IV.14.3.6.1 Plan-wide Impacts of Implementing the DRECP: Alternative 4

IV.14.3.6.1.1 Plan-wide Impacts and Mitigation Measures from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development

Impact Assessment

Table IV.14-30 summarizes potential impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations resulting from renewable energy and approved transmission facility development within DFAs under Alternative 4. DFA configurations include lowest biological conflict areas and certain additional areas with both high value renewable energy resources and biological resource values.

Table IV.14-30
Acres of BLM Lands in Development Focus Areas and Impact by
Technology Type – Alternative 4

Land Category	Acres of BLM Land in Development Focus Areas	Potential Impacts by Technology Type (acres)			
		Solar ¹	Wind ²	GT ³	Transmission
CDCA	258,000	33,000	47,000	5,000	15,000
Caliente RMP	0	0	0	0	0
Bishop RMP	3	0	0	0	100

¹ Includes ground-mounted distributed generation

² Disturbance Footprint

³ Plan Area

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Under Alternative 4, approximately 100,100 acres of BLM-administered lands may be developed for renewable energy. DFAs would be excluded from the same BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations as the Preferred Alternative. No direct impacts to these areas would occur under Alternative 4.

Under Alternative 4, there would be 19 wilderness areas (300,000 acres), 5 WSAs (32,000 acres), 3 NSHTs (329 miles), and 193,000 acres of National Trail Management Corridors within 5 miles of DFAs (Table R2.14-1, alternatives comparison table). There would be no wild and scenic rivers within 5 miles of DFAs under this alternative. Any renewable technology or transmission development within 5 miles of these areas may result in an indirect adverse effect on the viewshed, air quality, values of solitude, primitive and unconfined types of recreation, or other features of scenic value.

National Trail Management Corridors. Under Alternative 4, a National Trail Management Corridor, consisting of a 1-mile corridor from the trail centerline, would be proposed (approximately 326,000 acres). DFAs for renewable energy and transmission development would not overlap with this proposed corridor.

Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 4, of the approximately 633,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 256,000 would be managed to protect these characteristics. No renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands. The remaining approximately 377,000 inventoried acres would not be managed to protect these characteristics and renewable energy and transmission development would be an allowable use. Under this alternative, inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would be reduced in size where the lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development. Inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics, but not managed, would be reprioritized for development of approximately 8,000 acres of solar, 11,000 acres of wind, 100 acres of geothermal, and 1,000 acres of transmission corridors (approximately 20,000 acres total, about 8%). Mitigation/compensation, as prescribed by CMAs, would be employed where inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics may be impacted by development.

Impact LD-1: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would reduce the value of designated conservation areas.

Potential direct impacts to NSHT management corridors and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics may occur. For areas where DFAs overlap with inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics, the inventoried lands would be reduced in size to reprioritized use for renewable energy development.

Indirect impacts to wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, NLCS lands, ACECs, wildlife allocations, SRMAs, and open OHV areas under Alternative 4 may also occur. The proximity of renewable energy development to these lands would result in indirect effects to the important values of these lands, such as reduction in air quality, impacts to visual resources, and increased noise and traffic. These types of impacts would reduce the quality of the lands with special designation and change the nature of the location. Overall, impacts would be minor to moderate, depending on the technology used and distance from these special designation areas.

Impact LD-2: Development and operation of renewable energy and transmission facilities would conflict with the existing management goals and objectives of designated conservation areas.

Alternative 4 would not directly conflict with the existing management goals and objectives of designated conservation areas. Development on DFAs adjacent to or near designated conservation areas would indirectly affect the existing management goals and objectives, in particular the protection of scenic value. Development on lands inventoried with wilderness characteristics would degrade those characteristics. Renewable energy facilities would introduce industrial structures that would conflict with the natural area. Renewable development could occur on approximately 20,000 acres of inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. Development on inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would degrade those characteristics.

Under Alternative 4, development within National Conservation Lands would be limited to 1% of total authorized disturbance, or to the level allowed by collocated ACEC/wildlife allocations, whichever is more restrictive. Wildlife habitat disturbance caps would only apply to lands not already included under ACECs or wildlife allocation disturbance caps.

Impacts in Study Area Lands

Future Assessment Areas. There are no FAAs in this alternative.

Special Analysis Areas. Designating the SAAs as conservation would result in beneficial impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, or lands inventoried or managed for wilderness characteristics by expanding conservation areas and further protecting sensitive natural and cultural resources. Overall, impacts would be the same as those explained for the Plan-wide reserve design in Section IV.14.3.6.1.2, Impacts of the Reserve Design.

DRECP Variance Lands. DRECP Variance Lands represent the BLM Solar PEIS Variance Lands as screened for the DRECP and EIR/EIS based on BLM screening criteria. Covered Activities could be permitted for NCCP purposes only through an NCCP Plan amendment.

However, development of renewable energy on Variance Lands would not require a BLM Land Use Plan Amendment so the environmental review process would be somewhat simpler than if the location were left undesignated. Development designation of the DRECP Variance Lands could result in adverse impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, or lands inventoried or managed for wilderness characteristics. Overall, impacts would be the same as those explained for the Plan-wide technology development in Section IV.14.3.6.1.1.

Impact Reduction Strategies and Mitigation

The implementation of the Plan would result in conservation of some desert lands as well as the development of renewable energy generation and transmission facilities on other lands. The impacts of the renewable energy development covered by the Plan would be lessened in several ways. First, the Plan incorporates CMAs for each alternative, including specific biological reserve design components and LUPA components. Also, the implementation of existing laws, orders, regulations, and standards would reduce the impacts of project development. If significant impacts would still result after implementation of CMAs and compliance with applicable laws and regulations, then specific mitigation measures are recommended in this section.

Conservation and Management Actions

The conservation strategy for Alternative 4 (presented in Volume II, Section II.3.1.1) defines specific actions that would reduce the impacts of this alternative. The conservation strategy includes definition of the reserve design and specific CMAs for Alternative 4.

For NLCS, CMAs would be the same as described under the Preferred Alternative except as described below.

- **Lands and Realty**
 - Rights-of-Way
 - **Linear Rights-of-Way** – National Conservation Lands would be avoidance areas for linear rights-of-way.
- **Recreation and Visitor Services** – Competitive and Commercial SRPs would be permitted in National Conservation Lands.

For NLCS lands and ACECs, no renewable energy development would be allowed. For SRMAs, geothermal development would be allowed but with no surface occupancy stipulation.

For NSHT, CMAs would be the same as described under the Preferred Alternative except as described below.

- **Lands and Realty**
 - **Land tenure:** Exchange or disposal would be permitted if it results in net benefit to trail values through acquisition or other compensation.

There would be no mitigation requirements for NSHTs under Alternative 4.

The CMAs applicable to inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics presented in Section IV.14.3.2.1.1 for the Preferred Alternative would be required for Alternative 4 as well. Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics within DFAs or transmission corridors would not be managed to protect those characteristics.

Laws and Regulations

Similar to the No Action Alternative, existing laws and regulations will reduce certain impacts of Plan implementation. Relevant regulations are presented in the Regulatory Setting in Volume III. The requirements of relevant laws and regulations are summarized for the No Action Alternative in Section IV.14.3.1.1.1.

Mitigation Measures

After implementation of the CMAs and existing laws and regulations, mitigation measures will be applied to further reduce identified adverse impacts described for Impacts LD-1 and LD-2. The two mitigation measures applicable to Preferred Alternative, identified in Section IV.14.3.2.1.1, would be the same as those presented for the Alternative 4.

IV.14.3.6.1.2 Impacts of the Reserve Design

The reserve design would result in over 7.7 million acres of BLM lands in conservation, 3.2 million acres of which already exist. The reserve design under Alternative 4 would designate almost 1 million fewer acres of NLCS lands than the Preferred Alternative. As with the Preferred Alternative, the reserve design would affect other BLM designations if the purpose of the reserve design were contrary to the mandate of the other designations. For many BLM designations, classifications, and allocations including wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, NSHT, ACECs, wildlife management areas, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics, the reserve design would have limited or no adverse effects to their management and purpose.

For NSHTs, the reserve design would provide additional protection from a 1-mile (from trail centerline) management corridor that would be defined and would contain explicit management direction, resulting in beneficial impacts to NSHTs.

SRMAs would be managed for their targeted recreation activities, experiences and benefits. SRMA recreation setting characteristics—physical components of remoteness, naturalness and facilities; social components of contact, group size and evidence of use; and operational components of access, visitor services and management controls, would be maintained, and enhanced where possible. Alternative 4 would allow some uses on SRMAs within the reserve design such as Special Recreation Permits, thus reducing effects to the other uses.

Management guidance and CMAs have been incorporated to the reserve design elements to ensure BLM continues to allow mining, linear features, and other more intensive uses while still meeting the purpose of the reserves.

IV.14.3.6.2 Impacts of DRECP Land Use Plan Amendment on BLM Land: Alternative 4

This section addresses two components of effects of the BLM LUPA: the streamlined development of renewable energy and transmission on BLM land under the LUPA, and the impacts of the amended land use plans themselves.

IV.14.3.6.2.1 Impacts from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development on BLM Land

The Plan-wide impacts to BLM designations discussed in Section IV.14.3.6.1.1 exclusively apply to BLM land. Therefore, the type of impacts related to BLM LUPA actions would be the same as in the Plan-wide impacts.

IV.14.3.6.2.2 Impacts of Changes to BLM Land Designations

Designations, allocations, and classifications of NLCS lands, ACECs, SRMAs, and wildlife allocations would benefit sensitive cultural and natural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values. Any reductions in acres of designations, such as ACECs or SRMAs, could result in adverse effects to cultural and natural resource values.

NLCS Lands. Alternative 4 responds to the direction of the Solar PEIS. No National Conservation Lands would be included within existing approved transmission corridors or Variance Lands identified in the Solar PEIS Record of Decision. Existing and proposed acres of BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations are presented in Table R2.14-2 (Appendix R2). Site and linear rights-of-way would be avoidance areas. Mineral rights-of-

way would be limited and some areas would be targeted for potential withdrawal from use. Competitive and Commercial Special Recreation Permits would be permitted.

Under Alternative 4, Sperry Wash Road, El Mirage Interpretive Trail East, and El Mirage Interpretive Trail West would be nominated for National Recreation Trail designation. In addition, the Nadeau Road National Recreation Trail Management Corridor of 0.5-mile (from trail centerline) would be designated.

National Trail Management Corridors. Under Alternative 4, a National Trail Management Corridor consisting of a 1-mile area from the trail centerline, would be proposed (approximately 326,000 acres). DFAs for renewable energy and transmission development would not overlap with this proposed corridor.

Wild and Scenic Rivers. Under Alternative 4, the Amargosa River, Mojave River (Afton Canyon), and Surprise Canyon Creek would be managed to protect the “outstandingly remarkable values,” the free-flowing condition, and water quality in the designated or eligible segments. All proposed actions would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to ensure that these values are protected or enhanced. A boundary of 0.25 miles on either side of the river (above mean high water mark) would constitute the corridor. Renewable energy development would be prohibited in these segments.

ACECs. Under Alternative 4, 36 new ACECs would be proposed for designation for the purpose of wildlife, plant, and cultural resource protection, for a total of 119 ACECs (see Appendix R2, Tables R2.14-2 and R2.14-3 ACECs by Alternative). Management of existing and proposed ACECs would include a disturbance cap, presented in Table R2.14-4 by alternative. Existing and proposed ACECs and associated disturbance caps are presented in Table R2.14-4. Total acres of ACECs within each disturbance cap category under Alternative 4 are summarized in Table IV.14-31.

Table IV.14-31
Acres of ACECs Within Each Disturbance Cap Category Under Alternative 4

Disturbance Cap		
<i>0.10%</i>	<i>0.25%</i>	<i>1.0%</i>
132,000	886,000	3,662,000

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Under Alternative 4, four ACECs would be reduced in size (Table IV.14-32) and the lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development instead of management for cul-

tural or biological resources. All other existing ACECs would remain the same or increase in size (acres), as shown in Table R2.14-3 (Appendix R2). The Mojave Monkey Flower ACEC would be renamed into two ACECs, the Brisbane Valley Mojave Monkey Flower and Daggett Ridge Mojave Monkey Flower ACECs.

Table IV.14-32
ACECs With Reduced Acres Under Alternative 4

ACEC Unit Name	Acreage Difference
Desert Tortoise Natural Area – Eliminated	-23,000
Fremont-Kramer – Reduced	-21,000
Superior-Cronese DWMA – Reduced	-115,000
Western Rand Mountains – Reduced	-1,000

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Wildlife Allocations. Alternative 4 would propose to designate approximately 277,000 acres of wildlife allocations to emphasize protection and enhancement of important plant and animal habitats.

SRMAs. Under Alternative 4, 35 new SRMAs would be proposed, for a total of 37 existing and proposed SRMAs. Existing and proposed SRMAs are shown in Table R2.14-4 (Appendix R2).

Lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 4, of the approximately 633,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 256,000 acres would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics. No renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands. The remaining approximately 377,000 inventoried acres would not be managed to protect these characteristics and renewable energy and transmission development would be an allowable use.

Multiple-Use Classes. Under Alternative 4, multiple-use classes would be replaced by BLM designations, classifications, and allocations. Table R2.14-6 (Appendix R) shows the crosswalk between multiple-use classes and proposed BLM designations, classifications, and allocations.

Alternative 4 would amend the CDCA Plan to replace multiple-use classes with existing and proposed designations, classifications, and allocations that would allow for some development and some conservation. Under ACECs, NLCS lands, SRMAs, and Extensive Recreation Management Areas, new development would not be allowed. Maintenance, retrofitting projects,

and operation of existing or previously approved facilities would be allowed. Under DFAs, technology development would be allowed with implementation of some CMAs.

The types of BLM land designations, allocations, and classifications that would replace multiple-use classes under Alternative 4 would be similar to the Preferred Alternative (as described in Section IV.14.3.2.2.2.) except no existing transmission corridors or Variance Lands identified in the Solar PEIS Record of Decision would be designated as NLCS areas.

IV.14.3.6.3 Impacts of Natural Community Conservation Plan: Alternative 4

The analysis of Covered Activities under the NCCP is equivalent to the Plan-wide analysis of the interagency alternatives. Reserve design features and other conservation actions under the NCCP alternatives represent more detailed categories of the reserve design under the interagency Plan-wide alternatives. These NCCP differences in reserve design features do not affect nonbiological resources analyzed in this document, and the analysis of reserve design and conservation and management actions under the NCCP is therefore equivalent to the Plan-wide analysis of the interagency alternatives, as described in Section IV.14.3.6.1.

IV.14.3.6.4 Impacts of General Conservation Plan

BLM lands with conservation and renewable energy designations, classifications, allocations, and management of lands with wilderness characteristics are under federal jurisdiction administered by BLM. Therefore, the GCP does not apply to these lands.

IV.14.3.6.5 Impacts Outside the Plan Area

IV.14.3.6.5.1 Impacts of Transmission Outside the Plan Area

The impacts of transmission Outside the Plan Area on BLM land designations, classifications, and lands with wilderness characteristics would be the same under all alternatives. These impacts are as described for the No Action Alternative in Section IV.14.3.1.4.1, Impacts of Transmission Outside the Plan Area.

IV.14.3.6.5.2 Impacts of BLM LUPA Decisions Outside the Plan Area

As described above for the Plan Area, designations, allocations, and classifications of NLCS lands, ACECs, SRMAs, wildlife allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics would benefit sensitive cultural and natural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values. Any reductions in acres of designations, such as ACECs or SRMAs, could result in adverse effects to cultural and natural resource values Outside the Plan Area.

Existing and proposed BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative 4 outside the Plan Area are presented in Table IV.14-33.

Table IV.14-33
Acres of BLM Land Designations, Classifications, and Allocations Outside the Plan Area – Alternative 4

BLM Lands ¹	Outside the Plan Area (acres)
Existing ² and proposed NLCS Lands	165,000
Existing and proposed ACECs	269,000
Existing and proposed SRMAs	173,000
Wildlife Allocation	0
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	21,000
Inventoried Lands with wilderness characteristics	56,000

¹ These designations may overlap.

² Wilderness areas, WSAs, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, NSHTs, and other special areas identified through acts of Congress (LLPAs).

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

IV.14.3.6.6 Comparison of Alternative 4 With Preferred Alternative

Chapter IV.27 presents a comparison of all action alternatives and the No Action Alternative across all disciplines. This section summarizes the comparison of Alternative 4 with the Preferred Alternative.

IV.14.3.6.6.1 Alternative 4 Compared With Preferred Alternative for Plan-wide DRECP

A comparison of renewable energy development areas between Alternative 4 and the Preferred Alternative is summarized in Table IV.14-34.

Table IV.14-34
Alternative 4 Compared With the Preferred Alternative in DFAs for Plan-wide DRECP

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 4 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Development Focus Areas	100,100	122,000	Alternative 4 would have 21,900 fewer acres within DFAs than the Preferred Alternative.
Existing and proposed ACECs	0 DFA	0 DFAs	Alternative 4 and the Preferred Alternative would be the same.
Existing and proposed SRMAs	0 DFAs	0 DFAs	Alternative 4 and the Preferred Alternative would be the same.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	256,000 managed 0 acres within DFAs	350,000 managed 0 acres within DFAs	Alternative 4 would have 94,000 fewer acres of lands managed for wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative.
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	20,000 within DFAs	18,000 within DFAs	Alternative 4 would have 2,000 more acres of inventoried lands, but not managed, for wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative.

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Alternative 4 would likely result in slightly lower impacts to BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative with approximately 22,000 more BLM acres within various technology footprints.

IV.14.3.6.6.2 Alternative 4 Compared With Preferred Alternative for the BLM Land Use Plan Amendment

A comparison between Alternative 4 and the Preferred Alternative within existing and proposed conservation lands or Reserve Design Lands for the Plan-wide DRECP is summarized in Table IV.14-35.

Table IV.14-35
Alternative 4 Compared With the Preferred Alternative for Reserve Design Lands
Within the Plan-wide DRECP*

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 4 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Wilderness Areas, WSAs, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers	3,188,000	3,188,000	These designations would be the same under both the Preferred Alternative and Alternative 4. These lands would be managed as National Conservation Lands under both alternatives.
National Conservation Lands	2,765,000	3,827,000	Alternative 4 would have 1,062,000 fewer acres of these designations than the Preferred Alternative.
NSHT Management Corridors	326,000 (1-mile buffer)	1,333,000 (5-mile buffer)	Alternative 4 would have 1,007,000 fewer acres of NSHT management corridors than the Preferred Alternative.
ACECs	2,389,000 119 Units	2,277,000 127 Units	Alternative 4 would have 112,000 more acres of ACECs than the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4 would reduce or eliminate 5 ACECs, and the Preferred Alternative would reduce or eliminate 4 ACECs. Alternative 4 would have 8 fewer new or existing ACECs than the Preferred Alternative.
Wildlife allocations	277,000	19,000	Alternative 4 would have 258,000 more acres of wildlife allocations than the Preferred Alternative.
SRMAs	726,000 37 Units	673,000 40 Units	Alternative 4 would have 53,000 more acres of SRMAs than the Preferred Alternative.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	256,000	350,000	Alternative 4 would manage 94,000 fewer acres of lands with wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative.
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	377,000	283,000	Alternative 4 would have 94,000 fewer acres of inventoried but not managed lands with wilderness characteristics.
Outside Plan Area NLCS Lands ACECs SRMAs	165,000 269,000 173,000	172,000 269,000 173,000	Alternative 4 would have fewer acres of NLCS lands than the Preferred Alternative but the same or similar acres of ACECs, SRMAs, and wildlife allocations.

Table IV.14-35
Alternative 4 Compared With the Preferred Alternative for Reserve Design Lands
Within the Plan-wide DRECP*

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 4 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Wildlife Allocation	0	0	Alternative 4 would have more acres of managed lands with wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative Outside the Plan Area.
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	56,000	76,000	
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	21,000	0	

* Areas may have more than one BLM designation, classification or allocation; so the acres do not add up to the total DRECP acres.

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table.

Within the Plan Area, Alternative 4 has fewer acres of BLM land that would be designated for conservation and protection. Outside the Plan Area, Alternative 4 would have fewer acres of NLCS lands, and the same or similar acres of ACECs, SRMAs, and wildlife allocations, compared with the Preferred Alternative. Overall, Alternative 4 would result in reduced conservation and protection of NLCS lands Outside the Plan Area compared with the Preferred Alternative.

IV.14.3.6.6.3 Alternative 4 Compared With Preferred Alternative for NCCP

The impacts of the NCCP for Alternative 4 are the same as those defined in Section IV.14.3.2.1 for the Plan-wide analysis. As a result, the comparison of Alternative 4 with the Preferred Alternative for the NCCP is the same as described above for the Plan-wide DRECP.

IV.14.3.6.6.4 Alternative 4 Compared With Preferred Alternative for the GCP

BLM lands with conservation and renewable energy designations, classifications, allocations, and management of lands with wilderness characteristics are under federal jurisdiction administered by BLM. Therefore, the GCP does not apply to these lands.