

## **IV.27 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

This chapter summarizes the characteristics of the alternatives considered in this EIS and compares them. Comparisons are based on the amount of resources affected and environmental impacts of the No Action Alternative and the five action alternatives, as presented in Chapters IV.2 through IV. 24.

The data supporting the comparison of alternatives are shown in 5 tables, presented at the end of this chapter.

### **IV.27.1 NEPA Guidance on Comparison of Alternatives**

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations address the identification of the agency-preferred alternative, stating that the DEIS should “[i]dentify the agency’s preferred alternative or alternatives, if one or more exists, in the draft statement.” (40 CFR 1502.14(e)). The BLM Land Use Planning Regulations require identification of a preferred alternative in the DEIS for a land use revision or amendment (43 CFR 1610.4-7).

The determination of the preferred alternative may change in the Final EIS, based on public comment or additional analysis. The Preferred Alternative identified in the Final EIS also may incorporate components of other alternatives.

### **IV.27.2 Alternatives Descriptions and Comparisons**

The BLM LUPA decisions will alter management actions and allowable uses of BLM-administered lands within the California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) and within the portions of Resource Management Plan areas of Caliente/Bakersfield and Bishop occurring within the DRECP area. The BLM LUPA alternatives each contain some or all of the following components: DFAs, NLCS lands (NCLs, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and National Scenic and Historic Trails), ACECs, and wildlife allocations. Additionally, each LUPA alternative includes Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs and ERMAs), establishes Visual Resource Management (VRM) classes, establishes National Trail Corridors, nominates National Recreational Trails, and closes some grazing allotments.

Tables at the end of this chapter provide data on each alternative, including basic characteristics, biological and non-biological resource effects, and attributes of NCLs. Specifically:

- Table IV.27-1 summarizes renewable energy development and characteristics of each alternative.
- Table IV.27-2 compares key biological resource effects related to LUPA.

- Table IV.27-3 compares focus species habitat effects among the LUPA alternatives, focusing on amount of habitat affected for specific species.
- Table IV.27-4 compares key nonbiological resource effects by alternative. The key nonbiological resources are groundwater/water supply, cultural resources, Native American concerns, mineral resources, outdoor recreation, and visual resources. These all had unavoidable impacts.
- Table IV.27.5 summarizes BLM NCL attributes by alternative, focusing on the values and management approaches under each alternative.

### **IV.27.3 BLM Agency Preferred Alternative**

BLM planning regulations encourage identification of an agency preferred alternative in the EIS (BLM Manual 1790 1, Ch. V(B)(4)(c)). Based on the information provided in this EIS for the LUPA, the BLM's Agency Preferred Alternative is the Preferred Alternative described in Chapter II.3 of the EIS.

**Table IV.27-1  
Renewable Energy Development/Characteristics of Alternatives**

Alternative Components		No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Approximate megawatts on BLM-managed lands		9,792	8,175	3,042	10,726	6,376	7,094
Permanent disturbance from renewable energy and transmission development (acres)		100,000	81,000 (48,000 RE on BLM; 33,000 Transmission on BLM and non-BLM)	52,000 (18,000 from RE on BLM; 34,000 from Transmission on BLM and non-BLM)	88,000 (54,000 from RE on BLM; 34,000 from Transmission on BLM and non-BLM)	69,000 (37,000 from RE on BLM; 32,000 from Transmission on BLM and non-BLM)	71,000 (41,000 from RE on BLM; 30,000 from Transmission on BLM and non-BLM)
BLM Solar Energy Zones (SEZs) in DFAs		SEZ land is available	Yes, partial	Only a portion	Yes	Only a portion	Yes
BLM DFAs (acres)		n/a	388,000	81,000 (Unchanged from Draft LUPA)	718,000 (Unchanged from Draft LUPA)	211,000 (Unchanged from Draft LUPA)	258,000 (Unchanged from Draft LUPA)
Conservation Designations (acres) Excludes existing conservation areas; does not double count overlapping designations.	In the DRECP area	2,395,000	4,966,000	4,863,000	5,191,000	5,023,000	4,431,000
	In the CDCA outside the DRECP area	79,000	287,000	209,000	428,000	258,000	265,000
No Action Alternative, BLM land available for development (acres)		2,804,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

**Table IV.27-1  
 Renewable Energy Development/Characteristics of Alternatives**

<b>Alternative Components</b>	<b>No Action Alternative</b>	<b>Preferred Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4</b>
DRECP Variance Land (acres)	n/a	40,000	35,000	29,000	2,000	579,000
Transmission lines (Acres of Impact)	36,000 (Inside DRECP)	33,000 (Inside DRECP)	34,000 (Inside DRECP)	34,000 (Inside DRECP)	32,000 (Inside DRECP)	30,000 (Inside DRECP)
	32,000 (Outside DRECP)	30,000 (Outside DRECP)	32,000 (Outside DRECP)	32,000 (Outside DRECP)	32,000 (Outside DRECP)	32,000 (Outside DRECP)

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

**Table IV.27-2  
Comparison of BLM LUPA Alternatives – Key Biological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<b>Percent of BLM LUPA lands in DFAs</b> Excludes military lands, BLM Open OHV lands, and tribal lands	DFAs do not exist under No Action.	4%	1%	8%	2%	3%
<b>Percent of DFAs on BLM LUPA lands with low terrestrial intactness</b>	DFAs do not exist under No Action. For the No Action Alternative, approximately 40% of the Plan Area that could be available for the development of renewable energy on BLM lands are characterized by low terrestrial intactness	50%	63%	44%	59%	46%
<b>Impacts to Desert Linkage Network habitat linkages</b>	33,000 acres	21,000 acres	9,000 acres	27,000 acres	12,000 acres	24,000 acres
<b>Impacts to riparian vegetation and riparian Focus Species</b>	6,000 acres	Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in riparian	Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in riparian	Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in riparian	Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in riparian	Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in riparian
<b>Impacts to wetland vegetation and wetland Focus Species</b>	4,000 acres	7,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types	2,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types	5,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types	5,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types	4,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types
<b>Impacts to dune vegetation and dune Focus Species</b>	1,000 acres	Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in dunes	Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in dunes	Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in dunes	Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in dunes	Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in dunes
<b>Impacts to desert tortoise important areas</b>	51,000 acres	16,000 acres	9,000 acres	21,000 acres	10,000 acres	17,000 acres
<b>Impacts to Mohave ground squirrel important areas</b>	5,000 acres	6,000 acres	7,000 acres	13,000 acres	5,000 acres	4,000 acres
<b>Impacts within 1 mile of how many golden eagle territories</b>	69 territories	37 territories	28 territories	49 territories	35 territories	37 territories
<b>Impacts to agriculture used by agricultural Focus Species</b>	9,000 acres	8,000 acres	9,000 acres	9,000 acres	9,000 acres	6,000 acres
<b>Operational impacts to migratory birds and migratory pathways</b>	Impacts concentrated in West Mojave, Cadiz Valley, and Imperial; impact severity would be project-specific	Impacts concentrated in West Mojave, Cadiz Valley, and Imperial; impact severity would be project-specific	Impacts concentrated in West Mojave, Cadiz Valley, and Imperial; impact severity would be project-specific	Impacts concentrated in West Mojave, Cadiz Valley, and Imperial; impact severity would be project-specific	Impacts concentrated in West Mojave, Cadiz Valley, and Imperial; impact severity would be project-specific	Impacts concentrated in West Mojave, Cadiz Valley, and Imperial; impact severity would be project-specific

**Table IV.27-2  
Comparison of BLM LUPA Alternatives – Key Biological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<b>Siting, construction, decommissioning, and operational effects resulting in vegetation and species habitat degradation</b>	Impacts concentrated in West Mojave, Cadiz Valley, and Imperial; impact severity would be project-specific	Impacts concentrated in West Mojave, Cadiz Valley, and Imperial; impact severity would be project-specific	Impacts concentrated in West Mojave, Cadiz Valley, and Imperial; impact severity would be project-specific	Impacts concentrated in West Mojave, Cadiz Valley, and Imperial; impact severity would be project-specific	Impacts concentrated in West Mojave, Cadiz Valley, and Imperial; impact severity would be project-specific	Impacts concentrated in West Mojave, Cadiz Valley, and Imperial; impact severity would be project-specific

**Note:** The following general rounding rules were applied to calculated values: values greater than 1,000 were rounded to nearest 1,000; values less than 1,000 and greater than 100 were rounded to the nearest 100; values of 100 or less were rounded to the nearest 10, and therefore totals may not sum due to rounding. In cases where subtotals are provided, the subtotals and the totals are individually rounded. The totals are not a sum of the rounded subtotals; therefore, the subtotals may not sum to the total within the table. Estimated ground disturbance impacts from renewable energy development on BLM lands and transmission development on BLM and non-BLM lands.

**Table IV.27-3  
Comparison of BLM LUPA Alternatives – Focus Species Habitat Effects**

Focus Species	No Action Alternative(acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Alternative 1 (acres)	Alternative 2 (acres)	Alternative 3 (acres)	Alternative 4 (acres)
<i>Amphibian/Reptile</i>						
Agassiz’s desert tortoise	47,000 Critical Habitat: 21,000	20,000 Critical Habitat: 8,000	15,000 Critical Habitat: 6,000	32,000 Critical Habitat: 9,000	16,000 Critical Habitat: 6,000	16,000 Critical Habitat: 11,000
Flat-tailed horned lizard	11,000	17,000	12,000	14,000	19,000	8,000
Mojave fringe-toed lizard	14,000	11,000	5,000	8,000	5,000	17,000
Tehachapi slender salamander	80	10	-	10	-	20
<i>Bird</i>						
Bendire’s thrasher	5,000	3,000	3,000	4,000	3,000	1,000
Burrowing owl	35,000	40,000	29,000	45,000	40,000	25,000
California black rail	2,000	2,000	1,000	2,000	2,000	700
California condor	4,000 Critical Habitat: -	4,000 Critical Habitat: -	1,000 Critical Habitat: -	4,000 Critical Habitat: -	3,000 Critical Habitat: -	3,000 Critical Habitat: -
Gila woodpecker	500	300	300	1,000	400	100
Golden eagle–foraging	34,000	22,000	13,000	32,000	16,000	26,000
Golden eagle–nesting	11,000	3,000	3,000	4,000	2,000	3,000
Greater sandhill crane	9,000	7,000	9,000	9,000	7,000	5,000
Least Bell’s vireo	600	100	100	200	100	60
Mountain plover	9,000	8,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	5,000
Southwestern willow flycatcher	2,000 Critical Habitat: 30	2,000 Critical Habitat: -	4,000 Critical Habitat: -	3,000 Critical Habitat: -	3,000 Critical Habitat: -	2,000 Critical Habitat: -
Swainson’s hawk	7,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	9,000	6,000
Tricolored blackbird	1,000	500	200	500	400	300
Western yellow-billed cuckoo	300	50	50	100	70	50
Yuma Ridgway’s rail	300	20	10	40	20	10

**Table IV.27-3  
Comparison of BLM LUPA Alternatives – Focus Species Habitat Effects**

Focus Species	No Action Alternative(acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Alternative 1 (acres)	Alternative 2 (acres)	Alternative 3 (acres)	Alternative 4 (acres)
<i>Fish</i>						
Desert pupfish	100 Critical Habitat: 5	70 Critical Habitat: -	70 Critical Habitat: -	- Critical Habitat: -	- Critical Habitat: -	30 Critical Habitat: -
Mohave tui chub	-	-	-	-	-	-
Owens pupfish	-	10	60	20	20	30
Owens tui chub	-	10	60	20	20	30
<i>Mammal</i>						
Bighorn sheep – inter-mountain habitat	16,000	7,000	2,000	7,000	4,000	5,000
Bighorn sheep – mountain habitat	16,000	4,000	4,000	10,000	4,000	3,000
California leaf-nosed bat	53,000	35,000	17,000	35,000	25,000	39,000
Mohave ground squirrel	6,000	10,000	8,000	15,000	10,000	6,000
Pallid bat	82,000	59,000	37,000	67,000	50,000	54,000
Townsend’s big-eared bat	78,000	60,000	36,000	65,000	49,000	54,000
<i>Plant</i>						
Alkali mariposa-lily	300	200	200	100	200	100
Bakersfield cactus	1,000	2,000	40	500	100	700
Barstow woolly sunflower	1,000	900	10	2,000	50	30
Desert cymopterus	600	300	-	300	100	50
Little San Bernardino Mountains linanthus	100	400	200	900	400	100
Mojave monkeyflower	200	300	200	800	300	100
Mojave tarplant	800	1,000	500	700	300	400
Owens Valley checkerbloom	0	100	500	200	200	200
Parish’s daisy	100 Critical Habitat: -	600 Critical Habitat: -	1,000 Critical Habitat: -	1,000 Critical Habitat: -	1,000 Critical Habitat: -	400 Critical Habitat: -
Triple-ribbed milk-vetch	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table IV.27-4  
Comparison of Alternatives – Key Nonbiological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>Meteorology and Climate Change</i>						
<i>Annual GHG emissions from fossil-fuel generation avoided through use of renewables: Metric tons CO2 equivalent) (MTCO2E) values rounded</i> GHG emissions reductions are in proportion to the megawatts of renewable energy developed under each alternative. All alternatives are similar on a per MW basis.	8.3 million	7.6 million	2.8 million	10.3 million	5.8 million	6.5 million
<i>Groundwater, Water Supply, and Water Quality</i>						
<i>Solar thermal and geothermal water use (acre-feet per year) (AFY)</i>	30,000	44,000	29,000	44,000	44,000	35,000
<i>Status of groundwater basins in development areas or DFAs with potential solar or geothermal development</i>	25 basins in overdraft or stressed*	15 basins in overdraft or stressed	18 basins in overdraft or stressed	19 basins in overdraft or stressed	17 basins in overdraft or stressed	17 basins in overdraft or stressed
<i>Number of overdraft or stressed basins included in conservation designation</i>	33 basins	33 basins	32 basins	35 basins	33 basins	33 basins
<i>Cultural Resources</i>						
<i>Estimate number of resources in development areas or DFAs</i>	4,077	6,587	9,501	7,985	5,719	7,862
<i>Estimated number of resources in conservation designations</i>	62,487	224,673	221,980	227,005	226,319	195,263
<i>Effect of cultural resources CMAs</i>	Adverse effects to historic properties addressed through Section 106.	Adverse effects to historic properties addressed through the Section 106. Resolution via alternative mitigation that includes regional synthesis and interpretation of existing archaeological data in addition to mitigation measures determined through consultation.	Adverse effects to historic properties addressed through Section 106.	No adverse effects to historic properties will be authorized.	Adverse effects to historic properties addressed through the Section 106. Resolution via alternative mitigation that includes regional synthesis and interpretation of existing archaeological data in addition to mitigation measures determined through consultation.	Adverse effects to historic properties addressed through Section 106. Resolution via compensatory mitigation that includes either protection of resources of importance to tribes or acquisition of comparable sites into public ownership similar to those that are going to be destroyed.
<i>Effect of National Historic Trail (NHT) CMAs</i>	Adverse effects to NHT addressed through NEPA or Section 106 process as appropriate.	Adverse effects to historic properties addressed through the Section 106.	Adverse effects to historic properties addressed through the Section 106.	No adverse effects to historic properties will be authorized.	Adverse effects to historic properties addressed through the Section 106.	Adverse effects to historic properties addressed through the Section 106.



**Table IV.27-4  
Comparison of Alternatives – Key Nonbiological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>Effect of NHT corridor width on number of resources conserved</i> 1) Corridor width on each side of centerline 2) Estimated number of resources conserved	1) None 2) 0	1) Approximately 2 miles 2) 3,185	1) Approximately 0.25 miles 2) 2,015	1) Approximately 10 miles 2) 214,051	1) Approximately 5 miles 2) 18,055	1) Approximately 1 mile 2) 7,165
<i>Native American Interests</i>						
<i>Acres of Native American Elements (NAEs) within development areas or DFAs</i>	17,742	3,480	793	8,320	727	1,973
<i>Acres of NAEs within conservation designations</i>	1,310,098	1,274,665	1,560,399	1,686,182	1,558,590	1,520,397
<i>BLM Land Designations, Classification, Allocations, and Lands with Wilderness Characteristics</i>						
<i>Existing Legislatively and Legally Protected Areas</i>	3,909,000	3,909,000	3,909,000	3,909,000	3,909,000	3,909,000
<i>Proposed NLCS Lands</i>	0	3,857,000	1,550,000	5,431,000	3,634,000	2,765,000
<i>Trail Management Corridors [5-mile buffer](acres)</i>	0	1,379,000	93,000	2,479,000	1,333,000	326,000
<i>Existing and Proposed ACECs</i>	3,590,000	1,382,000	3,809,000	855,000	2,573,000	2,389,000
<i>Existing and Proposed SRMAs</i>	137,000	591,000	781,000	589,000	690,000	726,000
<i>Wildlife Allocations</i>	0	18,000	589,000	1,000	13,000	277,000
<i>Managed Lands with Wilderness Characteristics</i>	0	615,000	0	317,000	374,000	256,000
<i>Inventoried Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (not managed)</i>	700,000	420,000	700,000	383,000	326,000	444,000
<i>Mineral Resources</i>						
Impacts to mineral resource from renewable energy development in DFAs would be minor. Potential reduced access to mineral resources within BLM land designations could occur, including on lands designated as detailed below (Designated lands are for NLCS, ACECs, SRMAs, Lands Managed for Wilderness Characteristics, and National Trail Management Corridors.) The No Action Alternative includes only BLM land designations for ACECs, SRMAs, and Areas Managed for Recreation Emphasis. CMAs for mineral resource access would reduce impacts. Existing authorized operations would be allowable within conservation areas and unpatented mining claims would retain valid existing rights. Established authorized access routes to existing operations are likely to be unaffected due to specific measures requiring avoidance of these areas.						
<i>Geothermal Mineral Resources Affected (% in BLM Land Designations)</i>	34%	67%	65%	75%	79%	65%
<i>High Potential Mineral Areas Affected (% in BLM Land Designations)</i>	32%	67%	54%	81%	75%	65%
<i>High Priority Mineral &amp; Energy Locations Affected (% in BLM Land Designations)</i>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Rare Earth Element Areas Affected (% in BLM Land Designations)</i>	47%	60%	57%	72%	58%	89%
<i>Locatable Mineral Areas Affected (% in BLM Land Designations)</i>	36%	95%	82%	88%	92%	60%

**Table IV.27-4  
Comparison of Alternatives – Key Nonbiological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>Leasable Mineral Areas Affected (% in BLM Land Designations)</i>	0%	68%	69%	99%	69%	69%
<i>Mineral Material Areas Affected (% in BLM Land Designations)</i>	54%	78%	64%	96%	78%	58%
<i>Outdoor Recreation</i>						
<i>Recreation Designations (acres) Acres of SRMAs and Open OHV SRMAs similar for all action alternatives. Only Preferred Alternative has ERMAs. CDCA area outside DRECP boundary has adds 76,000 acres under all action alternatives.</i>	1,961,000 (1.5 million managed for recreation emphasis but not officially designated)	3,597,000 in DRECP (incl. 946,000 as ERMAs)	2,729,000 in DRECP	2,656,000 in DRECP	2,724,000 in DRECP	2,682,000 in DRECP
<i>Visual Resources</i>						
<i>Visual resource elements occurring within development areas or DFAs (acres) Note: BLM VRI Class I or VRM Class I lands are not available for development DFAs restrict distribution of development; concentrated in less environmentally sensitive areas. Concentration of projects may increase level of localized impacts, but lower overall impacts across the LUPA Decision Area. Available Development Areas and DFAs include potential solar, wind, and geothermal development, potential transmission development is exclude from these acres.</i>	<b><u>VRI lands [VRI class] acres</u></b> 36,000 [II] 41,000 [III] 35,000 [IV] <b><u>VRM lands [VRM class]</u></b> <b><u>acres</u></b> 10 [II] 3,000 [III] 0 [IV] Available development areas widely distributed.	<b><u>VRI lands [VRI class] acres</u></b> 19,000 [II] 53,000 [III] 28,000 [IV] <b><u>VRM lands [VRM class]</u></b> <b><u>acres</u></b> 2,000 [II] 5,000 [III] 93,000 [IV]	<b><u>VRI lands [VRI class] acres</u></b> 4,000 [II] 8,000 [III] 7,000 [IV] <b><u>VRM lands [VRM class]</u></b> <b><u>acres</u></b> 0 [II] 0 [III] 19,000 [IV]	<b><u>VRI lands [VRI class] acres</u></b> 39,400 [II] 89,000 [III] 66,000 [IV] <b><u>VRM lands [VRM class]</u></b> <b><u>acres</u></b> 0 [II] 0 [III] 191,000 [IV]	<b><u>VRI lands [VRI class] acres</u></b> 5,000 [II] 20,000 [III] 25,000 [IV] <b><u>VRM lands [VRM class]</u></b> <b><u>acres</u></b> 0 [II] 0 [III] 50,000 [IV]	<b><u>VRI lands [VRI class] acres</u></b> 200 [II] 3,000 [III] 2,000 [IV] <b><u>VRM lands [VRM class]</u></b> <b><u>acres</u></b> 0 [II] 0 [III] 5,000 [IV]

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

\* Includes all lands in DRECP, not BLM-administered lands only.

**Table IV.27-5  
BLM National Conservation Lands Attributes by Alternative**

Alternatives	Preferred Alt.	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<b>Approximate Acres</b>	3,856,000	1,626,000	5,538,000	3,551,000	2,804,000
<b>National Significance Criteria</b>	Habitat Connectivity; Cultural-Botanical Values	Intact Landscapes; High Scenic Value	Maximum National Conservation Lands	Habitat Connectivity; Scientific Uncertainty	DFA and Variance Integration
<i>Nationally Significant Values</i>					
<b>Ecological Values</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Important wildlife linkages</li> <li>▪ Threatened and Endangered critical habitat, and BLM sensitive status species habitat</li> <li>▪ Smaller, highly significant botanical sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Only the most scenic, intact desert landscapes and habitat</li> <li>▪ Wildlife linkages, but at a smaller scale, only where lands meet scenic criteria and are not in a transmission corridor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Additional Threatened and Endangered critical habitat, and BLM sensitive status species habitat</li> <li>▪ Additional wildlife linkages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Focus on larger landscapes</li> <li>▪ Includes most of the wildlife linkages and Threatened and Endangered critical habitat, and BLM sensitive status species habitat</li> <li>▪ Smaller, more isolated units, including some unique and rare plant habitats, are not included</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Similar to but smaller than Preferred Alternative where there is overlap with DFAs, Transmission Corridors, and Variance Lands</li> <li>▪ Threatened and Endangered critical habitat, and BLM sensitive status species habitat, and important wildlife linkages</li> <li>▪ Some connectivity and habitat is interrupted by scattered variance lands and transmission corridors</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural Values</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Large cultural landscapes important to Native Americans, local communities, and that assist in understanding human habitation of the CDCA</li> <li>▪ Historic trails and roads</li> <li>▪ Smaller, highly significant cultural sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reflects cultural importance of highly scenic, intact landscape</li> <li>▪ Large cultural landscapes and smaller sites that meet scenic and intactness criteria</li> <li>▪ Highly scenic portions of historic trails and roads</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Additional lands that may contain undiscovered sites</li> <li>▪ Larger cultural landscapes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Large cultural landscapes important to Native Americans, local communities, and that assist in understanding human habitation of the CDCA</li> <li>▪ Historic trails and roads</li> <li>▪ Smaller sites isolated from larger landscapes not included</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Similar to but smaller than Preferred Alternative where there is overlap with DFAs, Transmission Corridors, and Variance Lands</li> <li>▪ Some landscapes interrupted by variance lands or transmission corridors</li> </ul>
<b>Scientific Values</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Large landscapes offer opportunities for large-scale research on: ecological response to climate change, cultural resources, biological resources, hydrology, paleontology, and geology</li> <li>▪ Smaller sites with opportunities for focused research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Intact landscapes offer opportunities for research in areas largely undisturbed by modern human activity on: ecological response to climate change, cultural resources, biological resources, hydrology, paleontology, and geology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Similar to the Preferred Alternative but with the addition of more disturbed lands and the opportunity for habitat restoration research</li> <li>▪ Larger intact landscapes provide opportunities for landscape level studies of prehistoric and historic lifeways</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Large landscapes offer opportunities for large-scale research on: ecological response to climate change, cultural resources, biological resources, hydrology, paleontology, and geology</li> <li>▪ Smaller sites would not be included</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Similar to but smaller than Preferred Alternative where there is overlap with DFAs, Transmission Corridors, and Variance Lands</li> <li>▪ Opportunities for landscape research, but reduced due to a more fragmented landscape</li> </ul>
<i>Management Approach</i>					
<b>Management Approach</b>	Use allowed if no net loss of NLCS value and impacts are mitigated	Use allowed if no net loss of NLCS value and impacts are mitigated	Exclusive focus on conservation, development and use focused outside of NLCS	Exclusive focus on conservation, development is focused outside of NLCS	Use allowed if no net loss of NLCS value and impacts are mitigated
<b>Allowable Uses</b>	Variety of uses if management is compatible with NLCS values and if ground disturbance remains below threshold	Variety of uses if management is compatible with NLCS values	Most use-restrictive in response to larger renewable energy footprint	Use restrictive to reflect scientific uncertainty; only Alternative 2 is more restrictive.	Balance conservation and habitat connectivity with Solar PEIS direction; Variety of uses if management is compatible with NLCS values

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

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK