

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) Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) on BLM-managed lands with designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics. Designations, classifications, and allocations consist of lands designated as wilderness, wilderness study areas (WSAs), national wild and scenic rivers, national scenic and historic trails (NSHTs), 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-managed lands are affected by or intersect with the proposed LUPA Development Focus Areas (DFAs) 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 manages for conservation purposes is to be included within the National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS). The Proposed LUPA 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 Proposed LUPA alternatives also include management objectives for national wild and scenic rivers and NSHTs, which are components of the NLCS. 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 Proposed LUPA 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

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

The DFAs exclude land with special designations including wilderness, WSAs, and national wild and scenic rivers. However, renewable energy development in DFAs and approved transmission corridors may indirectly affect these lands through reduced air quality and reduction in the values of solitude. 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 a trail would impact some of the NSHT national trail corridors. Development would also more directly impact viewsheds and associated trail settings where they traverse DFAs. For some segments of NSHTs, it would be necessary to mitigate or moderate, to the greatest extent possible, the adverse impacts on the resources, qualities, values, and associated settings of the NSHTs from incompatible multiple-use activities.

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 DRECP Proposed LUPA, BLM would designate ACECs or National Conservation Lands to address the special management needs for natural and cultural resources. Under the LUPA, BLM would manage 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-managed lands in the LUPA Decision Area.

The analysis area for BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics includes BLM-managed lands in the LUPA Decision Area. Impact

analysis will focus on the impacts to these BLM-managed lands from renewable energy and transmission DFAs and changes to the existing land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics under the Proposed LUPA. Impacts of the proposed NLCS designations on other land use decisions or allocations such as land tenure, rights-of-way (ROWs), 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 LUPA. 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 ACECs by alternative; existing and proposed SRMAs by alternative; and, BLM Multiple-Use Class crosswalk with proposed designations and allocations by alternative.

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 DRECP BLM Proposed LUPA and supporting facilities necessary to transmit energy from these technologies on existing and planned BLM-managed land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics. Renewable energy technologies that could be built within the proposed DFAs near BLM-managed existing or planned designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics could impact the conservation and protection purposes. However, the specific locations in which energy and transmission development is allowed would be driven by LUPA decisions, which may encourage or restrict development in some areas.

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 local 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 resulting 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 on visual resources and Chapter IV.2 addresses impacts on 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 in 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 Ecological, Cultural, and Recreation Designations

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 in these areas, other uses must be compatible with the resources and values that the land designation is intended to protect.

Where the Proposed LUPA designates SRMAs, impacts on 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 Proposed LUPA worksheets in Appendix L present details on the goals, objectives, allowable uses, and management actions for each ACEC and SRMA unit.

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. Table IV.14-1 shows the total acres of BLM designations, classifications, allocations, and lands inventoried with wilderness characteristics within the LUPA Decision Area by alternative. See Table R2.14-1 for existing ACECs (names and acres) by alternative and Table R2.14-2 for existing SRMAs (names and acres) by alternative.

IV.14.3.1 No Action Alternative

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

IV.14.3.1.1 Impacts of Renewable Energy and Transmission Development – No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, any areas currently excluded from development by statute, regulation, or proclamation would retain those exclusions. Renewable energy and transmission development is not allowed, by policy, within wilderness, WSAs, national wild and scenic rivers, and NSHT lands under the No Action Alternative. Areas that are administratively excluded from development would continue to be assessed based on management guidance in BLM local field office land use plans.

Table IV.14-1
BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands with
Wilderness Characteristics in the LUPA Decision Area by Alternative

BLM Lands [†]	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>CDCA</i>						
Existing Legally and Legislatively Protected Areas*	3,920,000	3,920,000	3,920,000	3,920,000	3,920,000	3,920,000

Table IV.14-1
BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands with
Wilderness Characteristics in the LUPA Decision Area by Alternative

BLM Lands[†]	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Proposed NLCS Lands	0	3,856,000 ³	1,626,000	5,538,000	3,551,000	2,804,000
Trail Management Corridors (acres)	0	158,000	92,000	2,399,000	1,323,000	324,000
Existing and Proposed ACECs	2,452,000	1,351,000 ¹	2,875,000 ¹	100,000 ¹	1,755,000 ¹	1,677,000 ¹
Existing and Proposed SRMAs	258,000	572,000 ²	752,000 ²	560,000 ²	661,000 ²	697,000 ²
Wildlife Allocations	0 ²	0 ²	585,000 ²	0 ²	0 ²	255,000 ²
Managed Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	0	546,000	0	316,000	373,000	255,000
<i>Bakersfield Resource Management Plan</i>						
Proposed NLCS Lands	0	200	300	300	300	300
Trail Management Corridors	0	0	1,000	20,000	10,000	2,000
Existing and Proposed ACECs	2,000	2,000 ¹	2,000	20,000	7,000	2,000
Existing and Proposed SRMAs	0	0 ²	0	0	0	0
Wildlife Allocations	0	18,000 ²	18,000 ²	100 ²	13,000 ²	18,000 ²
Managed Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Bishop Resource Management Plan</i>						
Proposed NLCS Lands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trail Management Corridors	0	0	0	60,000	400	0
Existing and Proposed ACECs	0	11,000 ¹	11,000	9,000	10,000	1,000
Existing and Proposed SRMAs	29,000	29,000	29,000	29,000	29,000	29,000

Table IV.14-1
BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands with
Wilderness Characteristics in the LUPA Decision Area by Alternative

BLM Lands [†]	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Wildlife Allocations	0 ²	0 ²	0 ²	0 ²	0 ²	0 ²
Managed Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	0	0	0	0	0	0

[†] These designations may overlap, except where noted below.

* Wilderness, WSAs, wild and scenic rivers, NSHTs, and other special areas identified through acts of Congress (Legally and Legislatively Protected Areas).

‡ These lands have been inventoried and have been found to possess wilderness characteristics, but are not currently managed to protect wilderness characteristics.

¹ Only ACEC acres that do not overlap with NLCS and Legally and Legislatively Protected Areas are reported.

² Only acres that do not overlap with NLCS, Legally and Legislatively Protected Areas and ACECs are reported.

³ Excludes Legally and Legislatively Protected Areas.

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to the 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 in the table.

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

BLM-managed lands available for renewable energy and transmission development (available development areas, with approximated distribution of technology types) under the No Action Alternative are shown in Table IV.14-2. Lands available for development under this alternative would be scattered throughout the LUPA Decision Area based on existing policy and land classifications. Renewable energy development would likely continue to be patchy and fragmented, resulting in the increased likelihood of fragmentation of BLM-managed land designations, classifications, and allocations.

ACECs. Development of approximately 45,000 acres of renewable energy technology may impact existing ACECs (Table IV.14-2). Potential disturbance may occur in approximately 1.3% of existing ACECs in the LUPA Decision Area, primarily in the Cadiz Valley and Chocolate Mountains and West Mojave and Eastern Slopes ecoregion subareas. Approximately 300 acres of ACECs in the Bakersfield Resource Management Plan (RMP) area, all in the West Mojave and Eastern Slopes ecoregion subarea, may be affected. 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. Overall, the potential impacts on existing BLM ACECs would be minimal under the No Action Alternative.

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 Solar Energy Zones and Variance Lands in the Solar Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) could be considered for utility-scale solar development, as other areas have already been determined as unsuitable. Under the No Action Alternative, Solar PEIS mitigation measures would be required. Smaller scale, non-utility scale, solar is an allowable use in ACECs under the No Action Alternative.

Wind and geothermal development, unless specifically excluded, would continue to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Mitigation measures to avoid and minimize impacts would continue to be incorporated on a project-by-project basis under the No Action Alternative.

SRMAs. Solar Energy Zones and Variance Lands do not overlap existing SRMAs, but renewable energy development, wind, geothermal, and non-utility scale solar, are allowable uses within existing SRMAs under the No Action Alternative.

Table IV.14-2
Potential Acres of Impacts on BLM Designations 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	Geothermal ³	Transmission
CDCA	—	—	—	—	—
Existing ACECs	2,452,000	15,000	25,000	100	5,000
Existing SRMAs	258,000	0	0	0	0
Bakersfield 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 LUPA Decision Area

* BLM-administered lands only in the LUPA Decision Area

‡ These lands have been inventoried, but are not currently managed to protect wilderness characteristics

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to the 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 in the table.

Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. Under the No Action Alternative, approximately 1,213,000 acres have been inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics; however, these lands would not be managed to protect wilderness characteristics (see Table IV.14-1). Renewable energy and transmission development would be an allowable use within these areas. Inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics would be impacted in areas where renewable energy development occurs. Approximately 100,000 acres of lands inventoried for wilderness characteristics (not managed) would be impacted by renewable energy development. Under the No Action Alternative, no management or measures would be included to protect wilderness characteristics where these lands occur.

BLM Land Designations within 5 Miles of Available Development Areas. Under the No Action Alternative, wilderness, WSAs, national wild and scenic rivers, and NSHTs 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, WSAs, national wild and scenic rivers, and NSHTs. These types of impacts would reduce the quality of the lands with special designation and change the nature of the area (Table IV.14-3). Under the No Action Alternative, indirect impacts on special designations from available development areas within 5 miles would likely be minor to moderate. Mitigation measures to avoid and minimize impacts would continue to be incorporated on a project-by-project basis.

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 (Table IV.14-3, alternatives comparison table).

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

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, among other things. 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.

Table IV.14-3

BLM Special Designations within 5 miles of Available Development Areas (No Action Alternative) or DFAs in the LUPA Decision Area by Alternative

BLM Special Designations	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative [†]	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Wilderness ^{1,2}	44 areas 1,670,000 acres	20 areas 320,000 acres	13 areas 115,300 acres	33 areas 561,000 acres	16 areas 161,000 acres	19 areas 300,000 acres
WSAs ^{1,2}	6 areas 158,000 acres	2 areas 11,000 acres	4 areas 30,900 acres	8 areas 93,000 acres	5 areas 32,000 acres	5 areas 32,000 acres
National Wild and Scenic Rivers	21.9 miles	None	None	None	None	None
NSHTs ^{1,2}	3 trails 757 miles	3 trails 240 miles ³	3 trails 167 miles	3 trails 395 miles	3 trails 295 miles	3 trails 329 miles
National Trail Management Corridors	No management corridors	18,000 acres ⁴	17,000 acres	1,586,000 acres	525,000 acres	193,000 acres

¹ Includes all federally designated lands

² Does not include designated lands outside the LUPA Decision Area

³ Does not include Proposed Butterfield Trail, but includes recreational portions of the Juan Batista de Anza Trail in Imperial County

⁴ Preferred Alternative totals BLM managed lands only

[†] Only DFAs on BLM Land were buffered 5 miles for the Preferred Alternative Analysis

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to the 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 in the table.

Design Features of the Solar PEIS

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 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 on 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.14.3.1.2 Impacts of Ecological and Cultural Conservation and Recreation Designations – No Action Alternative

Volume III, Chapter III.14 describes the existing BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations. Below is a summary of potential impacts by ecological and cultural conservation area and recreation designation.

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 changes to goals, objectives, management, or acreage of these lands. Under the No Action Alternative, NSHTs would continue to be managed on a case-by-case basis.

Wild and Scenic Rivers. Under the No Action Alternative, the Amargosa River, Mojave River (Afton Canyon), Surprise Canyon Creek, and Cottonwood Creek would be managed to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, 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 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 and SRMAs. Table R2.14-1 presents existing ACECs (name and acres). The following Table IV.14-4 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.14-4
Existing BLM ACECs and SRMAs Within the
LUPA Decision Area – No Action Alternative**

BLM Existing ACECs and SRMAs¹	LUPA Decision Area (approximate acres)	Number of Units Within the LUPA Decision Area
Existing ACECs (including wildlife management areas)	2,454,000	92
Existing SRMAs	287,000	3

¹ These designations may overlap

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to the 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 in the table.

Source: BLM 2013

Lands With Inventoried Wilderness Characteristics. A portion of the LUPA Decision Area has been inventoried for lands with wilderness characteristics. Approximately 1,213,000 acres were found to have wilderness characteristics. 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 LUPA Decision Area (based on CDCA Plan Multiple-Use Class allocations) are shown in Table IV.14-5. The Bakersfield and Bishop RMPs did not classify multiple-use classes.

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

Class C	Class L	Class M	Class I	Unclassified
3,353,000	4,241,000	2,380,000	559,000	293,000

Class C (Controlled Use): These lands are to be managed and preserved in a natural state, and access generally is limited to nonmotorized, no mechanized means.

Class L (Limited Use): These lands are managed to protect sensitive, natural, scenic, ecological, and cultural resource values.

Class M (Moderate Use): These lands are managed in a controlled balance between higher intensity use and protection.

Class I (Intensive Use): These lands are managed for concentrated human use.

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to the 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 in the table.

No changes to goals, objectives, management, or acreage of multiple-use class lands would occur under the No Action Alternative.

IV.14.3.1.3 Impacts of Transmission Outside the DRECP 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 DRECP area. New transmission lines outside the DRECP area would likely use existing transmission corridors between the DRECP area and existing substations in the more heavily populated areas of the state. The areas outside the DRECP 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-managed lands, these areas are described in Section III.14.5.

Except for the North Palm Springs–Riverside area and San Diego area, relatively few BLM-managed lands are outside the DRECP area transmission corridors. In the North Palm Springs–Riverside Area, BLM-managed 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 would not require a BLM LUPA. Another Section 368 BLM-designated corridor (number 115-238) includes land southeast of Ocotillo, near Interstate 8.

For BLM-managed lands without designated transmission corridors, NEPA review and a BLM LUPA would be needed. BLM land use plan designations or uses may exclude ROWs, such as ACECs, Desert Wildlife Management Areas (DWMAs), NLCS units, wilderness and WSAs, grazing allotments, mineral lease areas, withdrawal areas, and recreation lands. BLM determines if an area is excluded from development within 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 DRECP 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 BLM 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 the DRECP area could conflict with management goals, depending on the location of the line. Transmission line development outside the DRECP area would impact natural and cultural resources through ground disturbance and the industrial nature of the development. Relatively little BLM-managed land is within transmission corridors outside the DRECP area, and those areas are largely designated as being within Section 368 transmission corridors.

IV.14.3.2 Preferred Alternative

IV.14.3.2.1 Impacts of Renewable Energy and Transmission Development – Preferred Alternative

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

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

Table IV.14-6 summarizes potential impacts on BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics 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.

Under the Preferred Alternative, approximately 81,000 acres of BLM-managed lands in the LUPA Decision Area may be developed for renewable energy (Table IV.14-6). DFAs would be excluded from the following BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations: wilderness, WSAs, national wild and scenic rivers, NSHTs, NLCS lands, ACECs, wildlife allocations, SRMAs, and open off-highway vehicle (OHV) areas. No direct impacts on these areas would occur under the Preferred Alternative. Under this alternative, geothermal development would be allowed within some specific SRMAs, but with a no surface occupancy stipulation.

**Table IV.14-6
Potential Acres of Impacts on BLM Designations in
Development Focus Areas by Technology Type – Preferred Alternative**

Land Category	Acres of BLM Land in Development Focus Areas	Potential Impacts by Technology Type (acres)			
		Solar ¹	Wind ²	Geothermal ³	Transmission
CDCA	388,000	38,000	3,000	7,000	14,000
Bakersfield 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 the 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 in the table.

Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. Under the Preferred Alternative approximately 546,000 acres would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics (see Table IV.14-1). This includes a portion of the approximately 1,213,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics. No DFAs or renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands.

Approximately 666,000 acres of the lands inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics would not be managed to protect these characteristics under the Preferred Alternative; other uses, including renewable energy and transmission development, would be allowed in these areas. Under this alternative, inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would be reduced in size where the lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development within DFAs. Inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics, but not managed, would be reprioritized for development within DFAs of approximately 4,000 acres of solar, 9,000 acres of wind, 50 acres of geothermal, and 800 acres of transmission corridors (approximately 14,000 acres total, about 5%). Mitigation/compensation, as prescribed by Conservation Management Actions (CMAs), would be employed where inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics may be impacted by new transmission development. Overall, the potential reduction in scenic value and impacts on characteristics would be about 3% of the inventoried lands and impacts would be minimal.

BLM Land Designations within 5 Miles of DFAs. Under the Preferred Alternative, there would be 20 wilderness areas (320,000 acres), 2 WSAs (11,000 acres), 3 NSHTs (240 miles), and 18,000 acres of national trail management corridors within 5 miles of DFAs (see Table IV.14-3). 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, or other features of scenic value. These types of impacts would reduce the quality of the lands with special designation and change the nature of the location. Impacts would be minor to moderate, depending on the technology and distance from special designation areas. CMAs for BLM land designations 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 energy development could occur on approximately 14,000 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, whichever is more restrictive (see Appendix L ACEC worksheets).

Impacts of Variance Process Lands

Variance Process Lands represent the BLM Solar PEIS Variance Lands as screened for the Proposed LUPA based on BLM screening criteria, and Future Assessment Areas as presented in the Draft DRECP EIR/EIS. Development of renewable energy on Variance Process Lands would not require a BLM plan amendment; the environmental review process would be simpler than if the location were unallocated. However, all solar, wind, and geothermal energy development applications would have to follow a variance process before the BLM would determine whether to continue with processing them (see Volume II, Section II.3.3.3.2 for details of the variance process).

Development of the Variance Process Lands may impact BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, or lands inventoried or managed for wilderness characteristics, specifically existing and proposed SRMAs. BLM land designations, classifications, allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics within Variance Process Lands are shown in Table IV.14-7.

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

BLM Land Designations [†]	Variance Process Lands (acres)
<i>CDCA</i>	
Existing [†] and proposed NLCS Lands	-
Existing and proposed ACEC	0
Existing and proposed SRMAs	10,000
Wildlife allocation	-
Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics	0
Trail management corridors (acres/miles)	0

[†] These designations may overlap

* Wilderness, WSAs, wild and scenic rivers, NSHTs, and other special areas identified through acts of Congress (Legally and Legislatively Protected Areas).

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to the 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 in the table.

Conservation and Management Actions

The conservation strategy for the Preferred Alternative (presented in Volume II, Section II.3.4) defines specific actions that would reduce the impacts of this alternative. The conservation strategy includes specific CMAs for the Preferred Alternative.

Although Public Law 111-11 provides for lands within the CDCA to become components of the National Conservation Lands, it does not include or define a process for developing specific management direction to conserve, protect, and restore resource values on the identified conservation lands. In addition to the identifications of National Conservation Lands, each alternative of the Proposed LUPA provides management direction to meet the objectives of Public Law 111-11. This management direction has been developed at two levels—planning area-wide and unit- or zone-specific. The CMAs apply to all National Conservation Lands identified under P.L. 111-11 in the LUPA Decision Area. Site-specific management is outlined in the Special Unit Management Plans in Appendix L.

All LUPA-wide and ecological and cultural conservation area CMAs also apply to the National Conservation Lands. CMAs for BLM Land Designations and lands with wilderness characteristics are found in Volume II.3.4.2.

IV.14.3.2.2 Impacts of Ecological and Cultural Conservation and Recreation Designations – Preferred Alternative

The ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations would result in over 8 million acres of BLM-managed lands in conservation or recreation, 3.9 million acres of which already exist. The ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations would only affect other BLM designations if the purpose of the designations were contrary to the mandates of the other designations. For many BLM designations, classifications, and allocations, including wilderness, WSAs, national wild and scenic rivers, ACECs, wildlife management areas, and lands with wilderness characteristics identified for management, the proposed ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations would have limited or no adverse effects to their management and purpose.

Designations, allocations, and classifications of NLCS lands, ACECs, SRMAs, wildlife allocations, and inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics would

benefit sensitive ecological and cultural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values. Any reductions in acres of designations, such as ACECs, could result in adverse effects to ecological and cultural resource values.

Management guidance and CMAs have been incorporated in the ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations elements to ensure BLM continues to allow mining, linear features, and other more intensive uses while still meeting the purpose of the designations.

NLCS Lands. The Preferred Alternative proposed NLCS land designations emphasize 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 IV.14-1 by alternative. Under the Preferred Alternative, there would be approximately 3,856,000 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. Designations of NLCS lands would benefit sensitive ecological and cultural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values. ROWs would be limited as described in Volume II, Section II.3.2.1 CMAs.

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 158,000 acres of national trail management corridors would be proposed for designation as this alternative would establish a corridor width generally 1 mile from the centerline of NSHTs (Table IV.14-1). This designation would provide additional protection for the management corridor that would be defined and would contain explicit management direction, resulting in beneficial impacts on NSHTs. Designation of NSHT Management Corridors would benefit sensitive ecological and cultural resource areas, other sensitive resources (e.g., paleontological, geologic), scenic values, and recreational values.

Wild and Scenic Rivers. Under the Preferred Alternative, the Amargosa River, Mojave River (Afton Canyon), Surprise Canyon Creek, and Cottonwood Creek would be managed to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, the free-flowing condition, and water quality in the existing designated or eligible segments. All proposed actions or projects 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 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. The Preferred Alternative would propose to designate 38 new ACECs for the purpose of wildlife, plant, and cultural resource protection (see Appendix R2, Table R2.14-1 ACECs by Alternative), for a total of 130 existing and proposed ACECs. Management of existing and proposed ACECs would include a disturbance cap, as detailed in Appendix L. Two existing ACECs, Calico Early Man and Lake Cahuilla, would not have a disturbance cap for varying reasons (refer to Appendix L). 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>0.5%</i>	<i>1.0%</i>	<i>Wildlife Allocations</i>
215,000	398,000	2,964,000	2,619,000	18,000

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to the 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 in the table.

Twenty-one ACECs would increase in size (acres) under the Preferred Alternative and four ACECs would be reduced in size (acres), as shown in Table R2.14-1 (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.

Wildlife Allocations. The Preferred Alternative proposes designation of approximately 18,000 acres in the Bakersfield RMP area as wildlife allocations to emphasize protection and enhancement of important plant and animal habitats.

SRMAs. The Preferred Alternative would propose to designate 32 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 R2.14-2 (Appendix R2).

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.

Lands with wilderness characteristics. Under the Preferred Alternative approximately 546,000 acres would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics (see Table IV.14-1). This includes a portion of the 1,213,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics. No renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands. Of the approximately 546,000 acres managed for wilderness characteristics, approximately 445,000 acres overlap with NLCS lands, 66,000 acres overlap with ACECs, and 18,000 acres overlap with SRMAs.

If a project were to be proposed in an area that has not been inventoried but that BLM field offices feel may need to be inventoried in the future, an inventory would be completed prior to any development. 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 R2.14-3 (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 ERMAs, new renewable development would not be allowed except for in very limited instances in SRMAs and ERMAs. Maintenance, retrofitting projects, and operation of existing or previously approved facilities would be allowed. Under DFAs, technology development would be allowed with implementation of appropriate 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 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 lands would occur within DFAs.

Moderate: The majority of lands would be within proposed NLCS 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 Transmission Outside the DRECP Area

The impacts of transmission outside the DRECP area on BLM-managed 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.14.3.1.5.

IV.14.3.2.4 Comparison of the Preferred Alternative With No Action Alternative

A comparison of renewable energy development areas and ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations between the Preferred Alternative and the No Action Alternative is summarized in Table IV.14-9.

**Table IV.14-9
Preferred Alternative Compared With
No Action Alternative for the Proposed LUPA**

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	No Action Alternative (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Available Development Areas/DFAs	2,804,000 available for development	388,000 (DFAs) 81,000 Disturbance Area acres	The Preferred Alternative would designate 388,000 acres of DFAs (81,000 acres of disturbance area within DFAs), approximately 2,416,000 fewer acres than the No Action Alternative.
Wilderness, WSAs, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers	3,920,000	3,920,000	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.14-9
Preferred Alternative Compared With
No Action Alternative for the Proposed LUPA**

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	No Action Alternative (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
National Conservation Lands	Not an existing designation	3,856,000	The Preferred Alternative would designate an additional 3,856,000 acres of National Conservation Lands.
NSHT Management Corridors	Not an existing designation	158,000 (1-mile buffer within NLCS)	The Preferred Alternative would have 158,000 acres of NSHT management corridors (2-mile buffer). The No Action Alternative would not establish a trail management corridor.
ACECs	2,452,000 92 Units	1,364,000 ² 130 Units	Under the Preferred Alternative, many ACECs would overlap with NLCS. The Preferred Alternative would increase 21 ACECs, reduce 4 ACECs, and propose 38 new ACECs.
Wildlife allocations	Not an existing designation	18,000	The Preferred Alternative would have 18,000 more acres of wildlife allocations than the No Action Alternative.
SRMAs	287,000 3 Units	601,000 40 Units	The Preferred Alternative would have 314,000 more acres of SRMAs than the No Action Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would propose 37 new SRMAs.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	No managed lands	546,000	The No Action Alternative would not result in management of inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. The Preferred Alternative would manage 546,000 acres for protection of wilderness characteristics.

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

² Only ACEC acres that do not overlap with NLCS and Legally and Legislatively Protected Areas are reported

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to the 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 in the table.

Within the LUPA Decision 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. Under the Preferred Alternative, many SRMAs and ACECs would be overlapped by

National Conservation Lands. Additionally the Preferred Alternative eliminates the use of multiple-use classes.

IV.14.3.3 Alternative 1

IV.14.3.3.1 Impacts from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development – Alternative 1

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

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

Table IV.14-10 summarizes potential impacts on BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics resulting from renewable energy and approved transmission facility development within DFAs under Alternative 1. DFA configurations include the lowest biological conflict areas and certain additional areas with both high value renewable energy resources and biological resource values.

**Table IV.14-10
Potential Acres of Impacts on BLM Designations in
Development Focus Areas by Technology Type – Alternative 1**

Land Category	Acres of BLM Land in Development Focus Areas	Potential Impacts by Technology Type (acres)			
		Solar ¹	Wind ²	Geothermal ³	Transmission
CDCA	81,000	14,000	2,400	5,000	12,000
Bakersfield RMP	0	0	0	0	0
Bishop RMP	10	0	0	0	300

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 the 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 in the table.

Under Alternative 1, approximately 52,000 acres of BLM-managed 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 on these areas would occur under Alternative 1. Under this alternative, geothermal development would be allowed within SRMAs, but with a no surface occupancy stipulation.

Potential direct impacts on NSHT management corridors and inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics may occur, as described below.

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 92,000 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, approximately 1,213,000 acres of inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would not be managed to protect these characteristics and other uses, including renewable energy and transmission development, would be allowed. Under this alternative, inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would be reduced in size where the lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development within DFAs. Inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics, but not managed, would be reprioritized within DFAs for development of approximately 8,000 acres of solar, 950 acres of wind, 4,300 acres of geothermal, and 7,400 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.

BLM Land Designations within 5 Miles of DFAs. 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 (see Table IV.14-3). 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. These types of impacts would reduce the quality of the lands with special designation and change the nature of the location. Impacts would be minor to moderate, depending on the technology and distance from 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.

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.

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.

Impacts on Variance Process Lands

Variance Process Lands represent the BLM Solar PEIS Variance Lands as screened for the Proposed LUPA based on BLM screening criteria. Development of renewable energy on Variance Process Lands would not require a BLM LUPA; the environmental review process would be somewhat simpler than if the location were left undesignated. However, all solar, wind, and geothermal energy development applications would have to follow a variance process before the BLM would determine whether to continue with processing them (see Volume II, Section II.3.3.3.2 for details of the variance process).

Under Alternative 1, there are 35,000 acres of Variance Process Lands in the LUPA Decision Area. Development of Variance Process lands may impact BLM Land Designations; however, CMAs would avoid or minimize impacts. These lands are found in the following areas:

- East of Highway 395, north of Independence in Inyo County
- South of Sandy Valley along the California/Nevada border
- West of Needles
- Near State Route 62, west of Parker, Arizona, near the California/Arizona border
- North of Blythe, immediately south of the Big Maria Mountains Wilderness
- South of State Route 98, east of Imperial Valley, along the California/Mexico border
- Near Hidden Hills
- South of Historic Route 66, east of Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center (MCAGCC) Twentynine Palms, and both east and west of the City of Twentynine Palms
- Near the Big Maria Mountain Wilderness

Conservation and Management Actions

The implementation of the Proposed LUPA 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 Proposed LUPA would be lessened because the Proposed LUPA incorporates CMAs for each alternative. Also, the implementation of existing laws, orders, regulations, and standards would reduce the impacts of renewable energy development.

The conservation strategy for Alternative 1 (presented in Volume II, Section II.4.4) defines specific actions that would reduce the impacts of this alternative. The conservation strategy includes specific CMAs for Alternative 1. No lands would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics under this alternative. For NLCS lands and ACECs, no renewable energy development would be allowed.

Conservation and Management Actions in NLCS

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

NLCS – Lands and Realty

Preferred: NLCS-LANDS-1: Renewable energy projects and related ancillary facilities are not allowed. Transmission would be allowed in existing corridors only. National Conservation Lands would be avoidance areas for all other land use authorizations. ROW avoidance areas are defined as areas to be avoided, but may be available for location of ROWs with special stipulations.

Alternative 1: 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.

NLCS – Recreation and Visitor Services

Preferred Alternative: NLCS-REC-1: Commercial and competitive SRPs are a discretionary action and would be issued on a case-by-case basis, for activities that do not diminish the values of the National Conservation Lands unit and would be prohibited if the proposed activities would adversely impact the nationally significant ecological, cultural, or scientific values for which the area was designated.

Alternative 1: Competitive and Commercial SRPs would be permitted.

NLCS – National Scenic and Historic Trails

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

NLCS-NSHT-6: All lands within National Conservation Lands would be identified for retention. If the BLM determines that disposal through exchange would result in a net benefit to the values of the National Conservation Lands, it may consider that exchange through a land use plan amendment.

- **Land tenure:** Exchange or disposal must result in net benefit to trail values through acquisition or other compensation. Disposal of lands containing NSHTs would not occur.

IV.14.3.3.2 Impacts of Ecological and Cultural Conservation and Recreation Designations – Preferred Alternative

The ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations under Alternative 1 would designate over 2 million fewer acres of NLCS lands than the Preferred Alternative. As with the Preferred Alternative, ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations would affect other BLM designations if the purpose were contrary to the mandates of the other designations. For many BLM designations, classifications, and allocations, including wilderness, WSAs, national wild and scenic rivers, ACECs, wildlife management areas, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics, ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations would have limited or no adverse effects to their management and purpose.

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. Management guidance and CMAs have been incorporated to ensure BLM continues to allow mining, linear features, and other more intensive uses while still meeting the purpose of the ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations.

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 IV.14-1. This alternative allows for a variety of uses as long as they can be managed to be compatible with protecting National Conservation Lands values. ROWs would be limited as described

in Volume II, Section II.4.2.1 and would be similar to the Preferred Alternative, except that Alternative 1 would exclude all existing transmission corridors, but would allow competitive and commercial SRPs 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 (see Table IV.14-1). This designation would provide additional protection for the management corridor that would be defined and would contain explicit management direction, resulting in beneficial impacts on NSHTs.

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 0.25 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, 26 new ACECs would be proposed for designation for the purpose of wildlife, plant, and cultural resource protection, for a total of 118 ACECs (see Appendix R2, Table R2.14-1 by Alternative). Management of existing and proposed ACECs would include a disturbance cap. Existing and proposed ACECs and associated disturbance caps, as detailed in Appendix L, ACEC Worksheets. Total acres of ACECs within each disturbance cap category under Alternative 1 are summarized in Table IV.14-11.

Table IV.14-11
Acres of ACECs Within Each Disturbance Cap Category Under Alternative 1

Disturbance Cap		
<i>0.10%</i>	<i>0.25%</i>	<i>1.0%</i>
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 the 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 in 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. Three ACECs would be reduced in size. All other existing ACECs would remain the same or increase in size (acres), as shown in Table R2.14-1 (Appendix R2).

Wildlife Allocations. Alternative 1 would propose to designate approximately 585,000 acres as wildlife allocations to emphasize protection and enhancement of important plant and animal habitats.

SRMAs. Under Alternative 1, 31 new SRMAs would be proposed. Existing and proposed SRMAs are shown in Table R2.14-2 (Appendix R2). Alternative 1 would allow some uses on SRMAs, such as SRPs, thus reducing effects to the other uses.

Lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 1, the Proposed LUPA would not manage the approximately 1,213,000 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 R2.14-3 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 ERMAs, 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.

IV.14.3.3.3 Impacts of Transmission Outside the DRECP Area

The impacts of transmission outside the DRECP 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.14.3.1.5.

IV.14.3.3.4 Comparison of Alternative 1 With the Preferred Alternative

This section summarizes the comparison of Alternative 1 with the Preferred Alternative (Table IV.14-12).

Table IV.14-12
Alternative 1 Compared With the Preferred Alternative for the Proposed LUPA*

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 1 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
DFAs	81,000 (DFAs) 52,000 Disturbance Area acres	388,000 (DFAs) 81,000 Disturbance Area acres	Alternative 1 would designate 307,000 fewer acres of DFAs than the Preferred Alternative.
Wilderness, WSAs, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers	3,920,000	3,920,000	Alternative 1 would be the same as the Preferred Alternative. These lands would be managed as National Conservation Lands under both alternatives.
National Conservation Lands	1,626,000	3,856,000	Alternative 1 would designate 2,230,000 fewer acres of NLCS lands than the Preferred Alternative.
NSHT Management Corridors	92,000 (0.25-mile buffer)	158,000 (1-mile buffer within NLCS)	Alternative 1 would have 66,000 fewer acres of NSHT management corridors than the Preferred Alternative.
ACECs	2,888,000 118 Units	1,370,000 ² 130 Units	Alternative 1 would designate 12 fewer ACECs than the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 1 would reduce 3 ACECs, and the Preferred Alternative would reduce 4 ACECs.
Wildlife allocations	585,000	18,000	Alternative 1 would allocate 571,000 more acres of wildlife allocations than the Preferred Alternative.
SRMAs	781,000 34 Units	601,000 35 Units	Alternative 1 would designate 1 fewer SRMA than the Preferred Alternative.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	0	546,000	The Preferred Alternative would manage 615,000 more acres of lands with wilderness characteristics than Alternative 1.

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

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to the 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 in the table.

Alternative 1 would designate fewer acres of BLM land as 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 ROWs. Alternative 1 would designate fewer acres of NLCS lands, with more acres of ACECs and wildlife allocations.

IV.14.3.4 Alternative 2

IV.14.3.4.1 Impacts from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development – Alternative 2

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

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

Table IV.14-13 summarizes potential impacts on BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics 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.14-13
Potential Acres of Impacts on BLM Designations in
Development Focus Areas 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	Geothermal ³	Transmission
CDCA	718,000	38,000	144,000	7,000	13,000
Bakersfield RMP	0	0	0	0	0
Bishop RMP	1,000	50	0	100	100

¹ Includes ground-mounted distributed generation

² Disturbance area

³ LUPA Decision Area

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to the 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 in the table.

Under Alternative 2, approximately 88,000 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 on these areas would occur under Alternative 2.

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, surface-occupancy geothermal development would be allowed within a small portion of the Ocotillo Wells East SRMA. 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 of the SRMA, such as existing utility corridors and near industrial areas, would reduce potential impacts.

Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 2, of the approximately 1,213,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 316,000 acres would be managed to protect these characteristics. No DFAs or renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands.

The remaining approximately 902,000 inventoried acres would not be managed to protect these characteristics and other uses, including renewable energy and transmission development, would be allowed. Under this alternative, inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would be reduced in size where the lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development within DFAs. 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.

BLM Land Designations within 5 Miles of DFAs. 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 (see Table IV.14-3). 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. These types of impacts would reduce the quality of the lands with special designation and change the nature of the location. Impacts would be minor to moderate, depending on the technology and distance from 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.

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

Impacts on Variance Process Lands

Variance Process Lands represent the BLM Solar PEIS Variance Lands as screened for the Proposed LUPA based on BLM screening criteria. Development of renewable energy on Variance Process Lands would not require a BLM LUPA; the environmental review process would be somewhat simpler than if the location were left undesignated. However, all solar, wind, and geothermal energy development applications would have to follow a variance process before the BLM would determine whether to continue with processing them (see Volume II, Section II.3.3.3.2 for details of the variance process).

Under Alternative 2, there are 29,000 acres of Variance Process Lands in the LUPA Decision Area. These lands are found in the following areas:

- Immediately south of MCAGCC Twentynine Palms both east and west of the City of Twentynine Palms
- North of Victorville

Conservation and Management Actions

The implementation of the Proposed LUPA 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 would be lessened because the Proposed LUPA incorporates CMAs for each alternative. Also, the implementation of existing laws, orders, regulations, and standards would reduce the impacts of project development.

The conservation strategy for Alternative 2 (presented in Volume II, Section II.5.4) defines specific actions that would reduce the impacts of this alternative. The conservation strategy includes specific CMAs for Alternative 2. For NLCS lands and ACECs, no renewable energy development would be allowed.

Conservation and Management Actions in NLCS

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

- **Site ROWS (Nonrenewable Energy, Nonlinear ROWs)**– National Conservation Lands would be exclusion areas.¹ 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 ROWs** – 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 SRPs would be permitted.

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

- **Wildlife Habitat Disturbance caps** - Development in National Conservation Lands would be limited to 0.25% of total authorized disturbance.

NLCS – National Scenic and Historic Trails

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

- **Site ROWs:** NSHT management corridors would be exclusion areas.
- **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.

IV.14.3.4.2 Impacts of Ecological and Cultural Conservation and Recreation Designations – Alternative 2

The ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations under Alternative 2 would designate approximately 1.7 million more acres of NLCS lands than the Preferred Alternative. As with the Preferred Alternative, the ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations would affect other BLM designations if the purpose were contrary to the mandates of the other designations. For many BLM designations, classifications, and allocations, including wilderness, WSAs, national wild and scenic rivers, ACECs, wildlife management areas, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics the ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations would have limited or no adverse effects to their management and purpose.

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 LUPA Decision Area 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 IV.14-1. The allowable uses proposed in this alternative would be the most restrictive of all alternatives in response to a larger

renewable energy development footprint. As such, site ROWs and linear ROWs would be exclusion areas except for existing corridors. Mineral ROWs would be limited, and some areas would be targeted for potential withdrawal from use. Competitive and Commercial SRPs 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 2,479,000 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 NSHTs (see Table IV.14-1). This designation would provide additional protection for the management corridor that would be defined and would contain explicit management direction, resulting in beneficial impacts on NSHTs. Alternative 2 would limit saleable minerals on all NLCS lands to parcels under 2,000 acres.

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 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 2, 29 new ACECs would be proposed for the purpose of wildlife, plant, and cultural resource protection, for a total of 121 ACECs (see Appendix R2, Table R2.14-1 ACECs by Alternative). Management of existing and proposed ACECs would include a disturbance cap, as detailed in Appendix L, ACEC Worksheets. Total acres of ACECs within each disturbance cap category under Alternative 2 are summarized in Table IV.14-14.

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

Disturbance Cap		
0.10%	0.25%	1.0%
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 the 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 in the table.

Under Alternative 2, five ACECs would be reduced in size, as shown in Table R2.14-1. All other existing ACECs would remain the same or increase in size (acres) as shown in Table R2.14-1 (Appendix R2).

Wildlife Allocations. Alternative 2 would propose to designate approximately 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 39 existing and proposed SRMAs. Existing and proposed SRMAs are shown in Table R2.14-2 (Appendix R2). 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 allow some uses on SRMAs, such as SRPs.

Lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 2, of the approximately 1,213,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 316,000 acres would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics. Of the approximately 316,000 acres managed for wilderness characteristics, approximately 308,000 acres overlap with NLCS lands, 3,000 acres overlap with ACECs, and 3,000 acres overlap with SRMAs.

Multiple-use Classes. Under Alternative 2, multiple-use classes would be replaced by BLM designations, classifications, and allocations. Table R2.14-3 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 ERMAs, 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) except that more acres would be designated as DFAs and NLCS lands or other conservation designations.

IV.14.3.4.3 Impacts of Transmission Outside the DRECP Area

The impacts of transmission outside the DRECP 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.14.3.1.5.

IV.14.3.4.4 Comparison of Alternative 2 With Preferred Alternative

This section summarizes the comparison of Alternative 2 with the Preferred Alternative (Table IV.14-15).

**Table IV.14-15
Alternative 2 Compared With the Preferred Alternative for the Proposed LUPA***

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 2 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
DFAs	718,000 (DFAs) 88,000 Disturbance Area acres	388,000 (DFAs) 81,000 Disturbance Area acres	Alternative 2 would designate 330,000 acres more of DFAs as compared to the Preferred Alternative.
Wilderness, WSAs, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers	3,920,000	3,920,000	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	5,538,000	3,856,000	Alternative 2 would designate 1,682,000 acres more of NLCS lands as compared to the Preferred Alternative.
NSHT Management Corridors	2,479,000 (10-mile buffer)	158,000 (1-mile buffer within NLCS)	Alternative 2 would designate 1,110,000 more acres of NSHT management corridors than the Preferred Alternative.
ACECs	149,000 121 Units	1,370,000 ² 130 Units	Alternative 2 would have 515,000 fewer acres of ACECs than the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 2 would reduce 5 ACECs, and the Preferred Alternative would reduce 4 ACECs. Alternative 2 would have 9 fewer new or existing ACECs than the Preferred Alternative.

Table IV.14-15
Alternative 2 Compared With the Preferred Alternative for the Proposed LUPA*

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 2 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
Wildlife allocations	100	18,000	Alternative 2 would have 17,900 fewer acres of wildlife allocations than the Preferred Alternative.
SRMAs	589,000 34 Units	601,000 35 Units	Alternative 2 would have 12,000 fewer acres of SRMAs than the Preferred Alternative and 1 fewer SRMAs.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	316,000	546,000	The Preferred Alternative would manage 230,000 more acres of lands with wilderness characteristics than Alternative 2.

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

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to the 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 in the table.

Alternative 2 has more acres of BLM land that would be designated for conservation and protection than the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 2 would have more acres of NLCS lands and trail management corridors, compared with the Preferred Alternative. Overall, Alternative 2 would result in greater conservation and protection of these lands compared with the Preferred Alternative. Because of the limited use allowed in the conservation designations, Alternative 2 would restrict nonconservation and nonrenewable energy use more so than the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 2 would have more DFA acres than the Preferred Alternative.

IV.14.3.5 Alternative 3

IV.14.3.5.1 Impacts from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development – Alternative 3

This section addresses two components of effects of the Proposed 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.

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

Table IV.14-16 summarizes potential impacts on BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics 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.14-16
Potential Acres of Impacts on BLM Designations in
Development Focus Areas 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	Geothermal ³	Transmission
CDCA	211,000	29,000	14,000	7,000	12,000
Bakersfield RMP	0	0	0	0	0
Bishop RMP	10	0	0	0	100

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 the 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 in the table.

Under Alternative 3, approximately 69,000 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 on these areas would occur under Alternative 3. DFAs for renewable energy and transmission development would not overlap with proposed national trail management corridors under this alternative.

Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 3, of the approximately 1,213,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 373,000 acres would be managed to protect these characteristics. No renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands.

The remaining approximately 844,000 inventoried acres would not be managed to protect these characteristics and other uses including renewable energy and transmission development would be allowed. Under this alternative, inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would be reduced in size where the lands would be reprioritized for

renewable energy development within DFAs. Inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics, but not managed, would be reprioritized for development within DFAs 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.

BLM Land Designations within 5 Miles of DFAs. 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 (see Table IV.14-3). 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. 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. 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.

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.

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 on Variance Process Lands

Variance Process Lands represent the BLM Solar PEIS Variance Lands as screened for the Proposed LUPA based on BLM screening criteria. Development of renewable energy on

Variance Process Lands would not require a BLM LUPA; the environmental review process would be somewhat simpler than if the location were left undesignated. However, all solar, wind, and geothermal energy development applications would have to follow a variance process before the BLM would determine whether to continue with processing them (see Volume II, Section II.3.3.3.2 for details of the variance process).

Under Alternative 3, there are 2,000 acres of Variance Process Lands in the LUPA Decision Area. These lands are found in the Lucerne Valley, both east and west of State Route 247.

Conservation and Management Actions

The implementation of the Proposed LUPA 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 Proposed LUPA would be lessened because the Proposed LUPA incorporates CMAs for each alternative. Also, the implementation of existing laws, orders, regulations, and standards would reduce the impacts of project development.

The conservation strategy for Alternative 3 (presented in Volume II, Section II.6.4) defines specific actions that would reduce the impacts of this alternative. The conservation strategy includes specific CMAs for Alternative 3. For NLCS lands and ACECs, no renewable energy development would be allowed.

Conservation and Management Actions in NLCS

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

NLCS – Lands and Realty

Site ROWs (Nonrenewable Energy, Nonlinear ROWs) – 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 ROWs – Transmission would only be permitted in existing transmission corridors. National Conservation Lands would be avoidance areas for all other linear ROWs.

NLCS – Recreation and Visitor Services

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.

NLCS – Disturbance caps

Wildlife Habitat Disturbance caps - Development in National Conservation Lands would be limited to 0.25% of total authorized disturbance.

NLCS – National Scenic and Historic Trails

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

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.

Conservation and Management Actions for Lands with Wilderness Characteristics Identified for Management

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.

IV.14.3.5.2 Impacts of Ecological and Cultural Conservation and Recreation Designations – Alternative 3

The ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations under Alternative 3 would have fewer acres of NLCS lands than the Preferred Alternative. As with

the Preferred Alternative, the ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations would affect other BLM designations if the purpose were contrary to the mandates of the other designations. For many BLM designations, classifications, and allocations, including wilderness, WSAs, national wild and scenic rivers, NSHTs, ACECs, wildlife management areas, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics the ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations would have limited or no adverse effects to their management and purpose.

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

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 IV.14-1 by alternative. Use allocations would be more limiting than the Preferred Alternative. Site ROWs would be exclusion areas and linear ROWs would be avoidance areas except for transmission, which would be permitted in existing corridors. Mineral ROWs would be limited, and some areas would be targeted for potential withdrawal from use. BLM would not permit competitive SRPs, and commercial SRPs 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. This designation would provide additional protection for the management corridor that would be defined and would contain explicit management direction, resulting in beneficial impacts on NSHTs.

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 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 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, Table R2.14-1 ACECs by Alternative). Management of existing and proposed ACECs would include a disturbance cap, as detailed in Appendix L. Total acres of ACECs within each disturbance cap category under Alternative 3 are summarized in Table IV.14-17.

Table IV.14-17
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 the 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 in the table.

Under Alternative 3, two ACECs would be reduced as shown in Table R2.14-1 (Appendix R2). All other existing ACECs would remain the same or increase in size (acres), as shown in Table R2.14-1 (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.

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, 30 new SRMAs would be proposed, for a total of 33 existing and proposed SRMAs. Existing and proposed SRMAs are shown in Table R2.14-2 (Appendix R2). 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.

Lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 3, of the approximately 1,213,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 373,000 acres would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics. No renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands. Of the approximately 373,000 acres managed for wilderness characteristics, approximately 354,000 acres overlap with NLCS lands, 17,000 acres overlap with ACECs, and 1,000 acres overlap with SRMAs.

Multiple-use Classes. Under Alternative 3, multiple-use classes would be replaced by BLM designations, classifications, and allocations. Table R2.14-3 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 ERMAs, 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) except that NLCS lands would focus on larger landscape connecting corridors.

IV.14.3.5.3 Impacts of Transmission Outside the DRECP Area

The impacts of transmission outside the DRECP area on BLM-managed 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.14.3.1.5.

IV.14.3.5.4 Comparison of Alternative 3 With Preferred Alternative

This section summarizes the comparison of Alternative 3 with the Preferred Alternative (Table IV.14-18).

Table IV.14-18
Alternative 3 Compared With the Preferred Alternative for the Proposed LUPA*

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 3 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
DFAs	211,000 (DFAs) 69,000 Disturbance Area acres	388,000 (DFAs) 81,000 Disturbance Area acres	Alternative 3 would have 177,000 fewer acres of DFAs than the Preferred Alternative, and 12,000 fewer acres of potential disturbance area.
Wilderness, WSAs, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers	3,920,000	3,920,000	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	3,551,000	3,856,000	Alternative 3 would have 305,000 fewer acres of NLCS designations than the Preferred Alternative.
NSHT Management Corridors	1,333,000 (5-mile buffer)	158,000 (1-mile buffer within NLCS)	Alternative 3 would have 1,175,000 more acres of NSHT management corridors as the Preferred Alternative.
ACECs	1,772,000 123 Units	1,370,000 ² 130 Units	Alternative 3 would have 402,000 more acres of ACECs than the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 3 would reduce 4 ACECs, and the Preferred Alternative would reduce 4 ACECs. Alternative 3 would have 7 fewer new or existing ACECs than the Preferred Alternative.
Wildlife allocations	13,000	18,000	Alternative 3 would have 5,000 fewer acres of wildlife allocations than the Preferred Alternative.
SRMAs	690,000 33 Units	601,000 35 Units	Alternative 3 would have 89,000 more acres of SRMAs than the Preferred Alternative and 2 fewer SRMAs overall.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	373,000	546,000	Alternative 3 would manage 173,000 fewer acres of lands with wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative.

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

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to the 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 in the table.

Within the LUPA Decision Area, Alternative 3 has fewer acres of BLM land that would be designated for conservation and protection (NLCS), but more acres of ACECs and SRMAs. Because of the limited use allowed in the conservation lands, Alternative 3 would restrict non-conservation and non-renewable energy use more than the Preferred Alternative.

IV.14.3.6 Alternative 4

IV.14.3.6.1 Impacts from Renewable Energy and Transmission Development – Alternative 4

This section addresses two components of effects of the Proposed 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.

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

Table IV.14-19 summarizes potential impacts on BLM land designations, classifications, and allocations, and lands with wilderness characteristics resulting from renewable energy and approved transmission facility development within DFAs under Alternative 4. DFA configurations include the lowest biological conflict areas and certain additional areas with both high value renewable energy resources and biological resource values.

**Table IV.14-19
Potential Acres of Impacts on BLM Designations in
Development Focus Areas by Technology Type – Alternative 4**

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>Geothermal</i> ³	<i>Transmission</i>
CDCA	258,000	33,000	47,000	5,000	15,000
Bakersfield RMP	0	0	0	0	0
Bishop RMP	0	0	0	0	100

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 the 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 in the table.

Under Alternative 4, approximately 71,000 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 on these areas would occur under Alternative 4.

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 proposed national trail management corridors under this alternative.

Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 4, of the approximately 1,213,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 255,000 acres would be managed to protect these characteristics. No renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands.

The remaining approximately 937,000 inventoried acres would not be managed to protect these characteristics and other uses including renewable energy and transmission development would be allowed. Under this alternative, inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics would be reduced in size where the lands would be reprioritized for renewable energy development within DFAs. Inventoried lands found to have wilderness characteristics, but not managed, would be reprioritized for development within DFAs 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.

BLM Land Designations within 5 Miles of DFAs. 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 (see Table IV.14-3). 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. 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. 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.

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 on Variance Process Lands

Under Alternative 4, Variance Process Lands have not been additionally modified for the DRECP and appear as they do in the BLM Solar PEIS. Variance Process Lands represent the BLM Solar PEIS Variance Lands as screened for the Proposed LUPA based on BLM screening criteria. Development of renewable energy on Variance Process Lands would not require a BLM LUPA; the environmental review process would be somewhat simpler than if the location were left undesignated. However, all solar, wind, and geothermal energy development applications would have to follow a variance process before the BLM would determine whether to continue with processing them (see Volume II, Section II.3.3.3.2 for details of the variance process).

Under Alternative 4, there are 579,000 acres of Variance Process Lands in the LUPA Decision Area. These lands are found in the following areas:

- East of Highway 395, north of Independence in Inyo County
- South of Sandy Valley along the California/Nevada border
- West of Needles
- Near State Route 62, west of Parker, Arizona, near the California/Arizona border
- North of Blythe, immediately south of the Big Maria Mountains Wilderness

- South of State Route 98, east of Imperial Valley, along the California/Mexico border
- North of Hidden Hills along the California/Nevada border
- North of Interstate 15 east of Fort Irwin
- Surrounding the Owens Dry Lake
- East of California City north of Edward Air Force Base
- Surrounding Barstow
- Scattered around Adelanto, Victorville, and in Lucerne Valley
- East and West of the City of Twentynine Palms
- South of Interstate 40 near Ludlow
- South of Historic Route 66 east of MCAGCC Twentynine Palms
- North of the Rice Valley Wilderness and Big Maria Mountains Wilderness along State Route 62
- South of Interstate 10 east of the Chuckwalla Mountains Wilderness
- South of Interstate 10, immediately north of the Palo Verde Mountains Wilderness
- Scattered west and south of the Chocolate Mountains east of the Imperial Sand Dunes including east of Holtville and south of State Route 98

Conservation and Management Actions

The implementation of the Proposed LUPA 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 Proposed LUPA would be lessened because the Proposed LUPA incorporates CMAs for each alternative. Also, the implementation of existing laws, orders, regulations, and standards would reduce the impacts of project development.

The conservation strategy for Alternative 4 (presented in Volume II, Section II.7.4) defines specific actions that would reduce the impacts of this alternative. The conservation strategy includes specific CMAs for Alternative 4. For NLCS lands and ACECs, no renewable energy development would be allowed.

NLCS – National Scenic and Historic Trails

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

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

IV.14.3.6.2 Impacts of Ecological and Cultural Conservation and Recreation Designations – Alternative 4

The ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations under Alternative 4 would designate almost 1 million fewer acres of NLCS lands than the Preferred Alternative. As with the Preferred Alternative, the ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations would affect other BLM designations if the purpose of the designations were contrary to the mandates of the other designations. For many BLM designations, classifications, and allocations including wilderness, WSAs, national wild and scenic rivers, NSHTs, ACECs, wildlife management areas, and inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics, the proposed ecological and cultural conservation designations and recreation designations would have limited or no adverse effects to their management and purpose.

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

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 IV.14-1 by alternative. Site and linear ROWs would be avoidance areas. Mineral ROWs would be limited and some areas would be targeted for potential withdrawal from use. Competitive and commercial SRPs 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. This designation would provide additional

protection for the management corridor that would be defined and would contain explicit management direction, resulting in beneficial impacts on NSHTs.

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 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 4, 28 new ACECs would be proposed for designation for the purpose of wildlife, plant, and cultural resource protection, for a total of 120 ACECs (see Appendix R2, Table R2.14-1 ACECs by Alternative). Management of existing and proposed ACECs would include a disturbance cap, as detailed in Appendix L. Total acres of ACECs within each disturbance cap category under Alternative 4 are summarized in Table IV.14-20.

Table IV.14-20
Acres of ACECs Within Each Disturbance Cap Category Under Alternative 4

Disturbance Cap		
0.10%	0.25%	1.0%
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 the 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 in the table.

Under Alternative 4, six ACECs would be reduced in size 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 R2.14-1 (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.

Wildlife Allocations. Alternative 4 would propose to designate approximately 273,000 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 38 existing and proposed SRMAs. Existing and proposed SRMAs are shown in Table R2.14-2 (Appendix R2). 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, such as SRPs, thus reducing effects to the other uses.

Lands with wilderness characteristics. Under Alternative 4, of the approximately 1,213,000 acres inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics, approximately 255,000 acres would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics. No renewable energy development would be allowed within these managed lands. Of the approximately 255,000 acres managed for wilderness characteristics, approximately 233,000 acres overlap with NLCS lands, 10,000 acres overlap with ACECs, and 1,000 acres overlap with SRMAs.

Multiple-Use Classes. Under Alternative 4, multiple-use classes would be replaced by BLM designations, classifications, and allocations. Table R2.14-3 (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 ERMAs, 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) 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 Transmission Outside the DRECP Area

The impacts of transmission outside the DRECP area on BLM-managed 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.14.3.1.5.

IV.14.3.6.4 Comparison of Alternative 4 With Preferred Alternative

This section summarizes the comparison of Alternative 4 with the Preferred Alternative (Table IV.14-21).

Table IV.14-21
Alternative 4 Compared With the Preferred Alternative for the Proposed LUPA*

BLM Designations, Classifications, Allocations, and Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Alternative 4 (acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Comparison
DFAs	258,000 (DFAs) 71,000 Disturbance Area acres	388,000 (DFAs) 81,000 Disturbance Area acres	Alternative 4 would have 130,000 fewer acres of DFAs than the Preferred Alternative, but 10,000 more disturbance area acres.
Wilderness, WSAs, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers	3,920,000	3,920,000	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	2,804,000	3,856,000	Alternative 4 would have 1,052,000 fewer acres of these designations than the Preferred Alternative.
NSHT Management Corridors	326,000 (1-mile buffer)	158,000 (1-mile buffer within NLCS)	Alternative 4 would have 168,000 more acres of NSHT management corridors than the Preferred Alternative.
ACECs	1,680,000 120 Units	1,370,000 ² 130 Units	Alternative 4 would have 310,000 more acres of ACECs than the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4 would reduce 6 ACECs, and the Preferred Alternative would reduce 4 ACECs. Alternative 4 would have 10 fewer new or existing ACECs than the Preferred Alternative.
Wildlife allocations	273,000	18,000	Alternative 4 would have 255,000 more acres of wildlife allocations than the Preferred Alternative.
SRMAs	726,000 37 Units	601,000 35 Units	Alternative 4 would have 125,000 more acres of SRMAs than the Preferred Alternative.
Managed lands with wilderness characteristics	255,000	546,000	Alternative 4 would manage 291,000 fewer acres of lands with wilderness characteristics than the Preferred Alternative.

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

Note: The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to the 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 in the table.

Within the LUPA Decision Area, Alternative 4 has fewer acres of NLCS lands and trail management corridors, but more acres of ACECs and SRMAs. Alternative 4 would have more acres of potential disturbance within DFAs than the Preferred Alternative.