

IV.27 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

This chapter summarizes the characteristics of the alternatives considered in this EIR/EIS and compares them in the context of the decisions that each agency needs to make. Comparisons are based on a number of elements:

- The environmental impacts of the Plan-wide No Action Alternative and the five action alternatives, as presented in Chapters IV.2 through IV. 24.
- The environmental impacts of the BLM Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA), as presented in Chapters IV.2 through IV.24.
- The environmental impacts of the Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) alternatives, relying heavily on the Plan-wide Alternatives analysis and the NCCP-specific information presented in Chapter IV.7 (Biological Resources).
- The environmental impacts of the General Conservation Plan (GCP) alternatives based on the GCP-specific information presented in Chapters IV.2 through IV.24.
- The extent to which the Plan-wide No Action Alternative and the five action alternatives meet the DRECP planning goals.

The data supporting the comparison of alternatives is presented in 11 tables, all presented at the end of this chapter.

This chapter first summarizes the regulatory requirements for comparing alternatives.

IV.27.1 Regulatory Guidance on Comparison of Alternatives

IV.27.1.1 CEQA Considerations

CEQA requires the following for alternatives analysis and comparison:

The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the Proposed Project. A matrix displaying the major characteristics and significant environmental effects of each alternative may be used to summarize the comparison. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed. Guidelines Section 15126.6(d).

If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, CEQA requires identification of an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA

Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)). The determination of which alternative is superior or preferred is based solely on the impacts identified, and does not consider whether an alternative meets an agencies purpose and need.

The environmental impacts of the Preferred Alternative are compared to those of each alternative to determine the environmentally superior alternative under CEQA. Because the No Action Alternative was not determined to be environmentally superior, it was not necessary to compare it to the Preferred Alternative under CEQA. However, under NEPA, the No Action alternative is required as a baseline for comparison of the action alternatives.

Determining an environmentally superior alternative for CEQA purposes with multiple objectives requires balancing many environmental factors. Each resource chapter presents CEQA impact conclusions at the end of the chapter. In order to identify the environmentally superior alternative, the most important impacts in each resource topic that distinguished between alternatives are identified and compared.

While this EIR/EIS identifies an environmentally superior alternative for CEQA purposes, it is possible that the decision makers could balance the importance of each impact area differently and reach different conclusions. No attempt was made to give any resource topic more weight than another.

IV.27.1.2 NEPA Considerations

The Council on Environmental Quality 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 may also be pieced together in the Final EIS using components of other alternatives.

IV.27.2 Plan-wide Alternatives Descriptions and Comparisons

IV.27.2.1 Description of Plan-wide Alternatives

This section describes attributes of the No Action Alternative, the Preferred Alternative, and Alternatives 1 through 4. The Preferred Alternative and the four other action alternatives balance the conservation values in the desert with renewable energy generation objectives.

Table IV.27-1 presents the major characteristics of each alternative, including DFA acres, the technology mix scenario, and miles of new transmission line needed (note that all tables are presented at the end of this chapter).

Table IV.27-2 presents the conservation components of each alternative, showing the Reserve Design Lands represented by three DRECP-proposed conservation land categories—Existing Conservation Areas, BLM LUPA Conservation Designation lands, and Conservation Planning Areas.

Table IV.27-2 also shows the BLM LUPA changes that would occur under each alternative. Acres of conservation-designated land for LUPAs include National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS) lands, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), Wildlife Allocation lands, Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs,) and Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs).

IV.27.2.2 Comparison of Plan-wide Alternatives

IV.27.2.2.1 Biological Resources

Table IV.27-3 compares impacts of the Plan-wide alternatives for biological resources. It presents the following important biological comparison factors:

- Percent of Plan Area in DFAs
- Impacts to Desert Linkage Network habitat
- Impacts to wetland natural communities and wetland Covered Species
- Impacts to desert tortoise important areas
- Golden eagle territories within 1 mile of DFAs
- Operational impacts to migratory birds and migratory pathways
- Estimated compensation for footprint impacts
- Percent of DFAs with low terrestrial intactness
- Impacts to riparian natural communities and riparian Covered Species
- Impacts to dune natural communities and dune Covered Species
- Impacts to Mohave ground squirrel important areas
- Impacts to agricultural land–dependent Covered Species
- Siting, construction, decommissioning, and operational effects resulting in vegetation and species habitat degradation

Table IV.27-4 compares Covered Species habitat effects of the Plan-wide alternatives.

IV.27.2.2.2 Nonbiological Resources

Table IV.27-5 compares impacts of the Plan-wide alternatives for all topics except biology. This comprehensive table presents data for each of the disciplines evaluated in Volumes III and IV of this EIR/EIS.

IV.27.2.3 Conclusion Regarding Environmentally Superior Alternative for the California Energy Commission

The CEC has identified the Environmentally Superior Alternative, as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d) and (e)(2). The CEC has selected the Preferred Alternative as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

IV.27.3 BLM LUPA Alternatives Descriptions and Comparisons

IV.27.3.1 Description of BLM LUPA Alternatives

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 within the Plan Area, as well as portions of the CDCA outside of the Plan Area. The BLM LUPA alternatives each contain some or all of the following components: DFAs, Study Area Lands, NLCS lands, ACECs, and wildlife allocations (see Table IV.27-1). Additionally, each LUPA alternative includes SRMAs and ERMAs, establishes Visual Resource Management (VRM) classes, establishes National Trail Corridors, nominates National Recreational Trails, and closes some grazing allotments.

Table IV.27-6 summarizes the National Conservation Lands designated under PL 111-11, pursuant to the proposed BLM LUPA for each alternative.

IV.27.3.2 Comparison of BLM LUPA Alternatives

IV.27.3.2.1 Biological Resources

Table IV.27-7 summarizes the BLM LUPA differences among alternatives for biological resources.

IV.27.3.2.2 Nonbiological Resources

The effects of BLM LUPA Land Designations and Management Actions are reflected in the individual nonbiological resource areas, with data presented in Table IV.27-5.

IV.27.3.2.3 BLM Agency Preferred Alternative

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

IV.27.4 NCCP Alternatives Descriptions and Comparisons

IV.27.4.1 Description of NCCP Alternatives

The NCCP itself would be issued by the CDFW, after consideration of the potential impacts of the Plan alternatives. The NCCP alternatives include the full range of Covered Activities (renewable energy generation and transmission facilities) anticipated under the DRECP for each of the interagency Plan-wide alternatives (see Table IV.27-1).

Each alternative has an NCCP Conceptual Plan-wide Reserve Design, which defines the areas that are high priority for biological conservation. Reserve design features and other conservation actions within the NCCP alternatives differ from the reserve design in the interagency Plan-wide alternatives. The differences among the NCCP alternatives are summarized in Table IV.27-8.

IV.27.4.2 Comparison of NCCP Alternatives

IV.27.4.2.1 Biological Resources

Comparison of biological resource effects among alternatives for the NCCP is the same as the Plan-wide information presented in Tables IV.27-3 and IV.27-4.

IV.27.4.2.2 Nonbiological Resources

Comparison of the effects on nonbiological resources is the same as the Plan-wide information presented in Table IV.27-5.

IV.27.5 GCP Alternatives Descriptions and Comparisons

IV.27.5.1 Description of GCP Alternatives

If a Plan alternative is approved, the USFWS will issue a GCP for Covered Activities that occur on nonfederal lands. The conservation strategy and Covered Activities under the GCP consist of the DRECP strategy and Covered Activities that apply to nonfederal lands. Table IV.27-9 describes GCP alternatives by showing the development and conservation that would be on private lands.

IV.27.5.2 Comparison of GCP Alternatives

IV.27.5.2.1 Biological Resources

Table IV.27-10 compares the biological effects of GCP alternatives for biological resources.

IV.27.5.2.2 Nonbiological Resources

Comparison impacts for nonbiological resources for the GCP are largely the same as the information presented in Table IV.27-5 (Comparison of Plan-wide Alternatives). Although the total area of developable land in Alternative 1 is less than the area included in the other alternatives, those acres represent 83% of the total Plan-wide DFA acres. This is the highest percent development on nonfederal land among all the alternatives. While the location of DFAs varies by alternative, nonbiological resource effects described in Table IV.27-5 for Alternative 1 provide a relative sense of likely nonbiological resource effects on nonfederal land.

IV.27.5.2.3 Agency Preferred Alternative of the USFWS

For the USFWS proposed action (issuing incidental take permits under the proposed General Conservation Plan), the Agency Preferred Alternative is the Preferred Alternative.

IV.27.6 Planning Goals

An element of the evaluation of the Draft DRECP during the public review process is consideration of the proposed action and alternatives in the context of the overall DRECP planning goals and agency-specific goals for the LUPA, GCP and NCCP. Table IV.27-11 summarizes the relationship of the Preferred Alternative, the four other action alternatives, and the No Action alternative to those planning goals based on the information and analysis assembled in the Draft DRECP.

**Table IV.27-1
Plan-wide Renewable Energy Development/Analysis Assumptions by Alternative**

Alternative Components	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Approximate megawatts	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Acres of permanent disturbance from renewable energy development	123,000	145,000	148,000	134,000	150,000	148,000
BLM Solar Energy Zone acres	149,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
BLM Solar Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) variance land acres	729,000	13,000	35,000	n/a	n/a	588,000
BLM DFA acres	n/a	367,000	81,000	718,000	211,000	258,000
NCCP DFA acres ¹	n/a	2,024,000	1,070,000	2,473,000	1,406,000	1,608,000
GCP DFA acres	3,434,000	1,632,000	971,000	1,730,000	1,175,000	1,332,000
No Action Alternative acres available for development	9,788,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Acres of Future Assessment Areas (FAAs)	n/a	128,000	0	109,000	11,000	0
Acres of Special Analysis Areas (SAAs)	n/a	42,000	0	0	0	0
Acres of DRECP Variance Land	n/a	13,000	37,000	0	0	588,000
Technology mix scenario (for NCCP only)	14,000 MW solar	12,000 MW solar	15,000 MW solar	9,000 MW solar	14,000 MW solar	13,000 MW solar
	5,400 MW wind	3,000 MW wind	400 MW wind	5,800 MW wind	1,200 MW wind	2,200 MW wind

**Table IV.27-1
Plan-wide Renewable Energy Development/Analysis Assumptions by Alternative**

Alternative Components	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
	300 MW geothermal	2,800 MW geothermal	2,800 MW geothermal	2,800 MW geothermal	2,800 MW geothermal	2,800 MW geothermal
Transmission lines (Right-of-Way acres)	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)

¹ The acres of DFA for the NCCP and GCP overlap, and are not additive.

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
Plan-wide Conservation Assumptions by Alternative¹**

Conservation Land (acres)	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
DRECP Plan-wide Reserve Design Envelope	N/A	14,921,000	15,039,000	15,087,000	15,161,000	14,478,000
Existing conservation areas ²	7,662,000	7,662,000	7,662,000	7,662,000	7,662,000	7,662,000
Conservation Planning Areas	N/A	1,142,000	1,287,000	1,183,000	1,238,000	1,210,000
BLM/LUPA Conservation Designations	2,966,000 ¹	6,177,000	6,090,000	6,242,000	6,261,000	5,606,000
Proposed National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS) Lands	0	3,984,000	1,682,000	5,124,000	3,845,000	3,012,000

**Table IV.27-2
 Plan-wide Conservation Assumptions by Alternative¹**

Conservation Land (acres)	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Proposed Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)	2,966,000	1,976,000 ³	3,609,000 ³	1,104,000 ³	2,272,000 ³	2,148,000 ³
Wildlife Allocations	0	157,000	799,000	14,000	144,000	446,000
Areas managed for recreation emphasis	1,465,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMA)	193,000 ³	2,724,000 ⁴	2,730,000 ⁴	2,656,000 ⁴	2,724,000 ⁴	2,691,000 ⁴
Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMA)	0	879,000	0	0	0	0

¹ These acres are existing and are part of the existing conservation areas.

² Existing conservation areas include Legislatively and Legally Protected Areas and Military Expansion Mitigation Lands

³ Only ACEC acres that do not overlap with existing conservation areas or NLCS.

⁴ Includes 164,000 acres that are part of the Imperial Sand Dunes Recreation Area; however, the DRECP would not change any management actions regarding this SRMA.

N/A= Not Applicable

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

**Table IV.27-3
Comparison of Plan-wide Alternatives – Key Biological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Percent of Plan Area in DFAs Excludes military lands, BLM Open OHV lands, and tribal lands	DFAs do not exist under No Action. For the No Action Alternative, approximately 28% of the Plan Area could be available for the development of renewable energy	11%	6%	13%	7%	8%
Percent of DFAs with low terrestrial intactness	DFAs do not exist under No Action. For the No Action Alternative, approximately 60% of the Plan Area that could be available for the development of renewable energy are characterized by low terrestrial intactness	87%	93%	78%	89%	87%
Covered Activities Impacts to Desert Linkage Network habitat related to Covered Species	43,000 acres	28,000 acres	19,000 acres	35,000 acres	22,000 acres	33,000 acres
Impacts to riparian natural communities and riparian Covered Species	8,000 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
Impacts to wetland natural communities and wetland Covered Species	7,000 acres	10,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types	11,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types	9,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types	12,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types	11,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types
Impacts to dune natural communities and dune Covered Species	2,000 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
Impacts to desert tortoise important areas	62,000 acres	27,000 acres	13,000 acres	29,000 acres	19,000 acres	26,000 acres
Impacts to Mohave ground squirrel important areas	9,000 acres	7,000 acres	9,000 acres	17,000 acres	10,000 acres	8,000 acres
Golden eagle territories within 1 mile of DFAs	63 territories	32 territories	26 territories	42 territories	33 territories	32 territories
Impacts to agricultural land-related Covered Species	23,000 acres	53,000 acres	68,000 acres	46,000 acres	55,000 acres	48,000 acres

**Table IV.27-3
 Comparison of Plan-wide Alternatives – Key Biological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Operational impacts to migratory birds and migratory pathways	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
Siting, construction, decommissioning, and operational effects resulting in vegetation and species habitat degradation	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
Estimated Compensation for footprint impacts¹	Project-by-Project	255,000	216,000	485,000	240,000	237,000

¹ Estimated compensation includes compensation for footprint impacts and terrestrial operational impacts for all technologies; compensation for the effects of operations on bird and bats is addressed separately. This is an acquisition-based estimate. Equivalent non-acquisition-based compensation that employs accepted management actions may be used as compensation. This compensation estimate may be used to establish a fee-based program for implementing the DRECP compensation program, and criteria have been established for directing compensation actions
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 Plan-wide Alternatives – Covered Species Habitat Effects**

	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	67,000 Critical Habitat: 26,000	47,000 Critical Habitat: 8,000	50,000 Critical Habitat: 6,000	55,000 Critical Habitat: 10,000	51,000 Critical Habitat: 6,000	45,000 Critical Habitat: 11,000
Flat-tailed horned lizard	15,000	22,000	22,000	19,000	26,000	14,000
Mojave fringe-toed lizard	18,000	15,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	21,000
Tehachapi slender salamander	400	100	-	90	-	200
<i>Bird</i>						
Bendire’s thrasher	7,000	6,000	10,000	8,000	8,000	6,000
Burrowing owl	72,000	123,000	137,000	114,000	136,000	113,000
California black rail	4,000	4,000	5,000	4,000	4,000	3,000
California condor	14,000 Critical Habitat: -	20,000 Critical Habitat: -	14,000 Critical Habitat: -	17,000 Critical Habitat: -	20,000 Critical Habitat: -	23,000 Critical Habitat: -
Gila woodpecker	1,000	1,000	1,000	2,000	900	600
Golden eagle–foraging	43,000	33,000	21,000	39,000	26,000	36,000
Golden eagle–nesting	16,000	4,000	3,000	6,000	3,000	4,000
Greater sandhill crane	21,000	49,000	63,000	42,000	50,000	43,000
Least Bell’s vireo	1,000	200	400	400	300	300
Mountain plover	25,000	56,000	70,000	48,000	59,000	53,000
Southwestern willow flycatcher	5,000 Critical Habitat: 30	7,000 Critical Habitat: -	11,000 Critical Habitat: -	7,000 Critical Habitat: -	8,000 Critical Habitat: -	7,000 Critical Habitat: -
Swainson’s hawk	20,000	46,000	52,000	38,000	50,000	45,000
Tricolored blackbird	5,000	8,000	8,000	6,000	10,000	10,000
Western yellow-billed cuckoo	1,000	200	500	200	400	300
Yuma clapper rail	700	80	70	80	80	50
<i>Fish</i>						
Desert pupfish	300 Critical Habitat: 5	200 Critical Habitat: -	300 Critical Habitat: -	100 Critical Habitat: -	200 Critical Habitat: -	200 Critical Habitat: -
Mohave tui chub	-	-	-	-	-	-
Owens pupfish	-	10	100	50	70	70
Owens tui chub	-	10	100	50	70	70
<i>Mammal</i>						
Bighorn sheep – inter-mountain habitat	20,000	4,000	4,000	7,000	6,000	6,000
Bighorn sheep – mountain habitat	21,000	6,000	7,000	13,000	7,000	6,000
California leaf-nosed bat	64,000	41,000	27,000	39,000	34,000	46,000
Mohave ground squirrel	17,000	26,000	33,000	30,000	33,000	27,000

**Table IV.27-4
Comparison of Plan-wide Alternatives – Covered Species Habitat Effects**

	No Action Alternative(acres)	Preferred Alternative (acres)	Alternative 1 (acres)	Alternative 2 (acres)	Alternative 3 (acres)	Alternative 4 (acres)
Pallid bat	116,000	101,000	93,000	102,000	101,000	103,000
Townsend’s big-eared bat	110,000	98,000	90,000	97,000	99,000	102,000
<i>Plant</i>						
Alkali mariposa-lily	2,000	3,000	3,000	2,000	4,000	3,000
Bakersfield cactus	3,000	4,000	800	3,000	1,000	5,000
Barstow woolly sunflower	2,000	600	700	2,000	700	600
Desert cymopterus	2,000	900	500	900	1,000	900
Little San Bernardino Mountains linanthus	400	700	1,000	2,000	1,000	600
Mojave monkeyflower	500	1,000	300	1,000	700	900
Mojave tarplant	2,000	1,000	600	1,000	300	700
Owens Valley checkerbloom	10	100	1,000	500	600	600
Parish’s daisy	200 Critical Habitat: -	1,000 Critical Habitat: -	3,000 Critical Habitat: -	2,000 Critical Habitat: -	2,000 Critical Habitat: -	1,000 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.27-5
Comparison of Plan-wide Alternatives – Key Nonbiological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>Air Quality</i>						
<i>Construction emissions (NOx, VOC, PM10, and PM2.5)</i>	Similar under all alternatives.	Similar under all alternatives.	Similar under all alternatives.	Similar under all alternatives.	Similar under all alternatives.	Similar under all alternatives.
<i>Sensitive receptor exposure (residences, hospitals, schools) due to location of development activities</i>	Potential renewable energy development areas are near 14 developed communities: Tehachapi, California City, Lancaster, Barstow, Adelanto, Victorville, Twentynine Palms, Blythe, Calipatria, Brawley, Imperial, Holtville, El Centro and Calexico.	DFAs are near 13 developed communities. No DFAs are near Twentynine Palms.	DFAs are near 7 developed communities. No DFAs are near California City, Barstow, Brawley, Imperial, El Centro and Holtville	DFAs are near 13 developed communities. No DFAs are near Twentynine Palms.	DFAs are near 13 developed communities. No DFAs are near Twentynine Palms.	DFAs are near 13 developed communities. No DFAs are near Twentynine Palms.
<i>Locational differences – Areas of more emissions from ground disturbance and other development activities in ecoregion subareas</i>	Less consolidation of development in particular areas, so emission dispersed throughout available development areas.	Compared to the No Action Alternative, the Preferred Alternative would create more emissions in ecoregion subareas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Imperial and Borrego Valley ▪ Mojave and Silurian Valley ▪ Owens River Valley ▪ Pinto Lucerne Valley and Eastern Slopes ▪ West Mojave and Eastern Slopes 	More emissions compared to Preferred Alternative in ecoregion subareas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Imperial and Borrego Valley, ▪ Mojave and Silurian Valley, ▪ Owens River Valley, ▪ Pinto Lucerne Valley & Eastern Slopes, and ▪ Providence and Bullion Mountains 	More emissions compared to Preferred Alternative in ecoregion subareas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mojave and Silurian Valley, ▪ Owens River Valley, ▪ Panamint Death Valley, ▪ Pinto Lucerne Valley & Eastern Slopes, ▪ Providence and Bullion Mountains, ▪ West Mojave Eastern Slopes 	More emissions compared to Preferred Alternative in ecoregion subareas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Imperial and Borrego Valley, ▪ Mojave and Silurian Valley, ▪ Owens River Valley, ▪ Panamint Death Valley, ▪ Pinto Lucerne Valley & Eastern Slopes, ▪ Providence and Bullion Mountains, ▪ West Mojave Eastern Slopes 	More emissions compared to Preferred Alternative in ecoregion subareas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cadiz Valley and Chocolate Mountains, ▪ Mojave and Silurian Valley, ▪ Owens River Valley, ▪ Panamint Death Valley, ▪ West Mojave Eastern Slopes
<i>Meteorology and Climate Change</i>						
<i>Annual GHG emissions reductions through use of renewables: Metric tons CO2 equivalent) (MTCO2E) values rounded</i>	18.2 million	18.5 million	17.7 million	19.3 million	17.9 million	18.2 million
<i>Compliance with policy goals of California Executive Order S-14-08 establishing RPS goal of 33% while conserving resources</i>	Would contribute to renewable generation goal, but would fail to conserve desert natural resources.	Would facilitate implementation of the renewable generation and conservation goals of EO S-14-08	Would facilitate implementation of the renewable generation and conservation goals of EO S-14-08	Would facilitate implementation of the renewable generation and conservation goals of EO S-14-08	Would facilitate implementation of the renewable generation and conservation goals of EO S-14-08	Would facilitate implementation of the renewable generation and conservation goals of EO S-14-08

**Table IV.27-5
Comparison of Plan-wide Alternatives – Key Nonbiological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>Geology and Soils</i>						
<i>Length of active faults (1) in developable areas or DFAs (2) within 25 miles of developable areas or DFAs Earthquake risk considered in facility design</i>	(1) 410 miles (2) 202 miles	(1) 70 miles (2) 247 miles Active faults concentrated in DFAs in Imperial Valley and Lucerne Valley	(1) 41 miles (2) 266 miles Active faults concentrated in DFAs in Barstow, Imperial Valley, and Lucerne Valley	(1) 60 miles (2) 282 miles Active faults concentrated in DFAs in Imperial Valley, Lucerne Valley, Lower Owens Valley, and east of Barstow.	(1) 57 miles (2) 267 miles Active faults concentrated in DFAs in Imperial Valley and east and west of Barstow.	(1) 63 miles (2) 263 miles Active faults concentrated in DFAs in Imperial Valley, Lucerne Valley, and east and west of Barstow.
<i>Soil in DFAs with moderate-to-high wind erosion potential (acres)</i>	576,000	516,000	563,000	1,463,000	846,000	956,000
<i>Soil with moderate-to-high water erosion potential (acres)</i>	54,000	23,000	561,000	1,166,000	661,000	749,000
<i>Extent of dune systems and sand transport corridors in development areas and DFAs (acres)</i>	429,000 Significant dune systems and sand transport corridors in East Riverside, Imperial Valley, Central Mojave.	127,000 Significant dune systems and sand transport corridors in East Riverside along I-10	46,000 Less developable land in East Riverside as compared to Preferred Alternative	150,000 Similar extent of developable land in East Riverside as compared to Preferred Alternative	67,000 Less developable land in East Riverside as compared to Preferred Alternative	98,000 Similar extent of developable land in East Riverside as Preferred Alternative
<i>Flood Hazard, Hydrology, and Drainage</i>						
<i>Percent of total water features that could be developed (data limitations) 1) 100-year flood area 2) Linear water features 3) Areal water features</i>	1) 0.2 2) 0.7 3) 0.3	1) 1.7 2) 0.7 3) 1.2	1) 2.0 2) 0.7 3) 1.4	1) 1.4 2) 0.7 3) 1.0	1) 2.0 2) 0.7 3) 1.7	1) 2.0 2) 0.7 3) 1.4
<i>Percent of total water features that could be conserved (data limitations) 1) 100-year flood area 2) Linear water features 3) Areal Water Features</i>	1) 22.7 2) 44.5 3) 43.0	1) 37.2 2) 60.0 3) 35.8	1) 37.0 2) 60.0 3) 38.0	1) 36.9 2) 61.9 3) 41.6	1) 37.1 2) 61.2 3) 38.5	1) 36.0 2) 58.2 3) 37.0
<i>Groundwater, Water Supply, and Water Quality</i>						
<i>Solar thermal and geothermal water use (acre-feet per year) (AFY)</i>	54,000	91,000	91,000	90,000	92,000	91,000
<i>Status of groundwater basins in development areas or DFAs with potential solar or geothermal development</i>	25 basins in overdraft or stressed	14 basins in overdraft or stressed	14 basins in overdraft or stressed	18 basins in overdraft or stressed	17 basins in overdraft or stressed	18 basins in overdraft or stressed
<i>Number of overdraft or stressed basins included in Reserve Design lands</i>	33 basins	34 basins	31 basins	35 basins	34 basins	31 basins
<i>Geographic Differences</i>	N/A	DFA in Pahrump Valley	No development in Pahrump Valley	DFA in Pahrump Valley	No development in Pahrump Valley	Part DFA/Part DRECP Variance Lands in Pahrump Valley

**Table IV.27-5
Comparison of Plan-wide Alternatives – Key Nonbiological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>Cultural Resources</i>						
<i>Number of resources in development areas or DFAs (same for Native American Interest effects)</i>	11,689	12,543	18,928	19,925	13,265	15,787
<i>Number of resources conserved in reserve design or BLM protected lands (same for Native American Interest effects)</i>	543,265	576,735	724,357	750,227	737,263	698,487
<i>Effect of cultural resources CMAs (same for Native American Interest effects)</i>	Adverse effects to historic properties addressed through Section 106.	With exception of research, no adverse effects to historic properties authorized.	Adverse effects will be addressed through Section 106.	No adverse effects to historic properties authorized.	Adverse effects to historic properties resolved through Section 106 and regional synthesis and interpretation.	Adverse effects to historic resources resolved through Section 106 and compensatory mitigation.
<i>Effect of National Historic Trail (NHT) CMAs (same for Native American Interest effects)</i>	Adverse effects to NHT addressed through NEPA or Section 106 process as appropriate.	No adverse effects to NHT and NHT/historic properties authorized. All NHT segments assumed to be eligible for NRHP pending evaluation.	Adverse effects to historic properties resolved through Section 106.	No adverse effects to historic properties authorized.	Adverse effects to historic properties resolved through Section 106.	Adverse effects to historic resources resolved through Section 106
<i>Effect of NHT corridor width on number of resources conserved (same for Native American Interests effects)</i> 1) <i>Corridor Width</i> 2) <i>Number of Resources Conserved</i>	1) None 2) 0	1) 5 miles either side of centerline 2) 28,437	1) ¼ mile either side of centerline 2) 2,019	1) 10 miles either side of centerline 2) 215,632	1) 5 miles either side of centerline 2) 18,052	1) 1 mile either side of centerline 2) 7,164
<i>SAA/FAA/DRECAP Variance Lands designation for known sensitive cultural areas</i> 1) <i>Pahrump Valley (Area known to be very culturally sensitive, e.g., Salt Song Trail, Route 66, and a NHT)</i> 2) <i>Owens Valley Dry Lake (Dry lakes known to be very culturally sensitive. Owens Valley Ecoregion subarea has highest density of cultural resources of all DRECP subareas)</i>	1) Might be conserved 2) Undesignated	1) DFA 2) Conservation allocation	1) Conservation Planning Area and Variance Lands 2) Conservation allocation	1) DFA 2) Conservation allocation	1) Conservation Planning Area 2) Conservation allocation	1) DFA and Variance Lands 2) Variance Lands
<i>Native American Interests (See Also Cultural Resources Above)</i>						
<i>Acres of Native American Elements (NAEs) within development areas or DFAs</i>	8,131	1,994	12,543	3,267	1,255	2,226
<i>Acres of NAEs within the reserve design</i>	1,310,098	1,655,877	576,735	1,715,346	1,576,357	1,538,012
<i>Paleontological Resources</i>						
<i>Acres of geologic units with a High to Very High Potential Fossil Yield Classification (HVH PFYC) in development areas or DFAs (acres)</i>	23,000	14,400	8,000	21,000	10,000	16,000

**Table IV.27-5
Comparison of Plan-wide Alternatives – Key Nonbiological Resource Effects**

		No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>Land Use and Policies</i>							
<i>Area disturbed by renewable energy activities (acres) (Potential land use conflicts increase with more acreage disturbed)</i>		123,000	145,000	148,000	134,000	150,000	148,000
<i>Development or Conservation on Nonfederal land in Plan Area counties:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Nonfederal land available for development</i> • <i>Conservation Planning Area acreage</i> 	Imperial Co.	712,000 n/a	602,000 20,000	379,000 21,000	610,000 20,000	383,000 19,000	381,000 22,000
	Inyo Co.	45,000 n/a	19,000 35,000	10,000 39,000	33,000 42,000	11,000 34,000	20,000 34,000
	Kern Co.	720,000 n/a	333,000 85,000	119,000 105,000	361,000 91,000	208,000 96,000	288,000 88,000
	Los Angeles Co.	522,000 n/a	218,000 58,000	112,000 56,000	224,000 56,000	159,000 63,000	218,000 58,000
	Riverside Co.	260,000 n/a	96,000 15,000	87,000 12,000	96,000 18,000	96,000 11,000	96,000 20,000
	San Bernardino Co.	1,115,000 n/a	364,000 98,000	265,000 104,000	405,000 148,000	318,000 104,000	329,000 105,000
	San Diego Co.	57,000 n/a	0 1,000	0 1,000	0 1,000	0 1,000	0 1,000
	<i>Agriculture</i>						
<i>Important Farmland converted to nonagriculture for renewable energy and transmission and Conservation Planning Areas (acres) Applies only to non-BLM lands</i>		25,000	59,000	75,000	50,000	61,000	57,000
<i>Williamson Act land in renewable energy and transmission development areas (acres) Applies only to non-BLM lands</i>		2,000	2,000	4,000	2,000	3,000	3,000
<i>BLM Lands and Realty – Rows and Land Tenure</i>							
<i>Potential conflicts to existing BLM ROWs from renewable development within DFAs (acres)</i>		28,000	39,000	11,000	60,000	18,000	35,000
<i>Extent of</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>DFAs on BLM lands (acres)</i> 2) <i>Reserve design involving BLM lands (acres)</i> 3) <i>Ecoregion subareas with majority of potential impacts to BLM lands and realty</i> 		N/A	1) 360,000 2) 8.6 million 3) Cadiz Valley and Chocolate Mountains	1) 80,200 2) 8.9 million 3) Cadiz Valley and Chocolate Mountains, Mojave and Silurian Valley, Pinto Lucerne Valley and Eastern Slopes	1) 708,000 2) 8.6 million 3) Cadiz Valley and Chocolate Mountains, Pinto Lucerne Valley and Eastern Slopes, and West Mojave and Eastern Slopes.	1) 207,000 2) 8.8 million 3) Cadiz Valley and Chocolate Mountains and the Pinto Lucerne Valley and Eastern Slopes	1) 258,000 2) 7.7 million 3) Cadiz Valley Chocolate Mountains

**Table IV.27-5
Comparison of Plan-wide Alternatives – Key Nonbiological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>BLM Land Designations, Classification, Allocations, and Lands with Wilderness Characteristics</i>						
1) <i>Managed lands with wilderness characteristics Plan-wide (acres) – Note: No managed lands are within DFAs</i>	1) None	1) 350,000	1) 0	1) 317,000	1) 317,000	1) 256,000
2) <i>Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics found in development areas or DFAs: (acres)</i>	2) 11,000	2) 18,000	2) 20,000	2) 32,000	2) 32,000	2) 20,000
<i>Mineral Resources</i>						
Impacts to mineral resource from renewable energy development would be minor. Potential reduced access to economic mineral resources from conservation on BLM land or loss of economic mineral resources on Conservation Priority Area acquired lands would be as follows:						
Geothermal Mineral Resources Affected	9.0% in conservation	7.4% in conservation	8.0% in conservation	8.5% in conservation	8.6% in conservation	7.7% in conservation
High Potential Mineral Areas Affected	51.6% in conservation	65.5% in conservation	69.2% in conservation	72.3% in conservation	71.7% in conservation	66.7% in conservation
High Priority Mineral & Energy Locations Affected	0.1% in conservation	12.4% in conservation	13.6% in conservation	33.4% in conservation	14.2% in conservation	13.6% in conservation
Rare Earth Element Areas Affected	56.8% in conservation	75.7% in conservation	76.0% in conservation	89.0% in conservation	75.9% in conservation	75.9% in conservation
Locatable Mineral Areas Affected	30.4% in conservation	67.1% in conservation	68.0% in conservation	67.1% in conservation	68.9% in conservation	48.5% in conservation
Leasable Mineral Areas Affected	0.0% in conservation	13.9% in conservation	57.2% in conservation	79.6% in conservation	57.6% in conservation	57.2% in conservation
Mineral Material Areas Affected	23.4% in conservation	37.2% in conservation	37.4% in conservation	70.0% in conservation	38.7% in conservation	32.8% in conservation
<i>Livestock Grazing</i>						
<i>BLM grazing allotments converted to nonagricultural use by development (acres)</i>	19,000	15,000	11,000	16,000	12,000	10,000
<i>Non-BLM grazing land converted to nonagricultural use by development (acres)</i>	10,000	23,000	26,000	18,000	24,000	25,000
<i>Wild Horses and Burros</i>						
<i>Herd Management Areas in development areas or DFAs (acres)</i>	3,000	0	100	2,000	100	100
<i>Herd Areas in development areas or DFAs (acres)</i>	9,000	3,000	3,000	4,000	2,000	4,000
<i>Outdoor Recreation</i>						
<i>Recreation Designations (acres)</i> Acres of SRMAs and Open OHV SRMAs similar for all action alternatives. Only Preferred Alternative has ERMAs	1,961,000 (1.5 million acres managed for rec emphasis but not officially designated)	3,602,000 (ERMAs 879,000 acres)	2,729,000	2,656,000	2,724,000	2,682,000
<i>Transportation and Public Access</i>						
<i>General transportation issues.</i>	Similar across all alternatives.	Similar across all alternatives.	Similar across all alternatives.	Similar across all alternatives.	Similar across all alternatives.	Similar across all alternatives.

**Table IV.27-5
Comparison of Plan-wide Alternatives – Key Nonbiological Resource Effects**

		No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>Visual Resources</i>							
<i>Visual resource elements occurring within development areas or DFAs (acres)</i>		VRI lands [VRI class] 36,000 [II]	VRI lands [VRI class] 17,000 [II]	VRI lands [VRI class] 4,000 [II]	VRI lands [VRI class] 39,000 [II]	VRI lands [VRI class] 5,000 [II]	VRI lands [VRI class] 200 [II]
<i>Note: BLM VRI Class I or VRM Class I lands are not available for development</i>		41,000 [III]	61,000 [III]	8,000 [III]	89,000 [III]	20,000 [III]	3,000 [III]
<i>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 Plan Area</i>		35,000 [IV]	27,000 [IV]	7,000 [IV]	66,000 [IV]	25,000 [IV]	2,000 [IV]
		VRM lands [VRM class] 10 [II]	VRM lands [VRM class] 0 [II]	VRM lands [VRM class] 0 [II]	VRM lands [VRM class] 0 [II]	VRM lands [VRM class] 0 [II]	VRM lands [VRM class] 0 [II]
		3,000 [III]	0 [III]	0 [III]	0 [III]	0 [III]	0 [III]
		0 [IV]	106,000 [IV]	19,000 [IV]	191,000 [IV]	50,000 [IV]	5,000 [IV]
		Available development areas widely distributed.					
<i>National Scenic Byways (miles)</i>		1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>National Trails (miles)</i>		20	1	2	6	2	1
<i>California State Parks (acres)</i>		1,000	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Extent of development areas or DFAs within 5 Miles of Legally and Legislatively Protected Areas [LLPAs] (acres)</i>		3,697,008	883,227	426,579	1,230,287	581,328	690,426
<i>Visual resource elements within 5 miles of development areas or DFAs:</i>	<i>VRI lands [VRI class] (acres)</i>	1,847,000 [I]	366,000 [I]	160,000 [I]	686,000 [I]	206,000 [I]	346,000 [I]
		965,000 [II]	389,000 [II]	303,000 [II]	691,000 [II]	406,000 [II]	386,000 [II]
		1,549,000 [III]	731,000 [III]	509,000 [III]	1,133,000 [III]	715,000 [III]	711,000 [III]
		1,607,000 [IV]	709,000 [IV]	478,000 [IV]	941,000 [IV]	701,000 [IV]	706,000 [IV]
	<i>VRM lands [VRM class] (acres)</i>	1,827,000 [I]	351,000 [I]	160,000 [I]	686,000 [I]	191,000 [I]	330,000 [I]
		71,000 [II]	515,000 [II]	285,000 [II]	1,088,000 [II]	652,000 [II]	396,000 [II]
		64,000 [III]	555,000 [III]	516,000 [III]	859,000 [III]	696,000 [III]	808,000 [III]
		10,000 [IV]	694,000 [IV]	466,000 [IV]	759,000 [IV]	434,000 [IV]	585,000 [IV]
<i>National Scenic Byways (miles)</i>		83	13	7	13	7	13
<i>National Parks and Preserves (acres)</i>		1,670,000	15,000	15,000	33,000	15,000	16,000
<i>National Scenic and Historic Trails (miles)</i>		757 mi.	350 mi.	212 mi.	395 mi.	295 mi.	329 mi.
<i>Trail Management Corridors (acres)</i>		N.A.	659,000	40,000	1,586,000	525,000	193,000
<i>California State Parks (acres)</i>		323,000	108,000	104,000	121,000	108,000	108,000
<i>State Scenic Highways (miles)</i>		34 mi.	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Geographic Differences SAAs in Silurian Valley and Highway 395 1) FAA in northeast corner of Mojave National Preserve</i>		1) n/a 2) n/a	1) Designated as SAA. 35,000 acres of VRI Class II, III, and IV lands; 35,000 acres of VRM Class III and IV lands. 2) FAA; potential visual impact	1) Becomes conservation. 2) Becomes undesignated	1) Becomes a DFA. Same as Preferred. 2) Becomes undesignated	1) Becomes conservation. 2) Becomes undesignated	1) Becomes conservation. 2) Becomes undesignated

**Table IV.27-5
Comparison of Plan-wide Alternatives – Key Nonbiological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>Noise and Vibration</i>						
<i>Acres of Permanent Disturbance</i> <i>Noise and vibration are localized to the vicinity of construction and operation.</i>	123,000 acres	145,000 acres	148,000 acres	134,000 acres	150,000 acres	148,000 acres
<i>Public Health, Safety, and Services</i>						
Comparison of risk factors associated with renewable development types and locations 1) Proximity to fire and emergency services. Dispersed development reduces response time. 2) Amount of wildland fire hazard interface. More dispersed development increases fire hazard. 3) Number of Airports within Development Areas or DFAs	1) Dispersed sites. 2) Same 3) n/a	1) Mostly concentrated in a few locations but some DFAs throughout Plan Area 2) Mostly concentrated in a few locations but some DFAs throughout Plan Area 3) 12	1) Clustered in fewer locations 2) Clustered in fewer locations 3) 10	1) Dispersed development 2) Dispersed development 3) 13	1) Dispersed development 2) Dispersed development 3) 12	1) Mostly concentrated in a few locations 2) Mostly concentrated in a few locations 3) 13
<i>Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice</i>						
<i>Land disturbed by renewable energy development (acres)</i> (Less land disturbed decreases the potential for impacts)	123,000	145,000	148,000	134,000	150,000	148,000
<i>Number of census tracts where DFA acreage is disproportionately borne by minority/low income populations</i>	n/a	30/17	Similar to Preferred Alternative	Similar to Preferred Alternative	Similar to Preferred Alternative	Similar to Preferred Alternative

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

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**Table IV.27-6
 BLM National Conservation Lands Attributes by Alternative**

Alternatives	Preferred Alt.	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Approximate Acres	3,813,000	1,650,000	5,753,000	3,528,000	2,848,000
National Significance Criteria	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>					
Ecological Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Important wildlife linkages ▪ Threatened and Endangered critical habitat, and BLM sensitive status species habitat ▪ Smaller, highly significant botanical sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only the most scenic, intact desert landscapes and habitat ▪ Wildlife linkages, but at a smaller scale, only where lands meet scenic criteria and are not in a transmission corridor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional Threatened and Endangered critical habitat, and BLM sensitive status species habitat ▪ Additional wildlife linkages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focus on larger landscapes ▪ Includes most of the wildlife linkages and Threatened and Endangered critical habitat, and BLM sensitive status species habitat ▪ Smaller, more isolated units, including some unique and rare plant habitats, are not included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similar to but smaller than Preferred Alternative where there is overlap with DFAs, Transmission Corridors, and Variance Lands ▪ Threatened and Endangered critical habitat, and BLM sensitive status species habitat, and important wildlife linkages ▪ Some connectivity and habitat is interrupted by scattered variance lands and transmission corridors

**Table IV.27-6
 BLM National Conservation Lands Attributes by Alternative**

Alternatives	Preferred Alt.	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Cultural Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Large cultural landscapes important to Native Americans, local communities, and that assist in understanding human habitation of the CDCA ▪ Historic trails and roads ▪ Smaller, highly significant cultural sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reflects cultural importance of highly scenic, intact landscape ▪ Large cultural landscapes and smaller sites that meet scenic and intactness criteria ▪ Highly scenic portions of historic trails and roads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional lands that may contain undiscovered sites ▪ Larger cultural landscapes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Large cultural landscapes important to Native Americans, local communities, and that assist in understanding human habitation of the CDCA ▪ Historic trails and roads ▪ Smaller sites isolated from larger landscapes not included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similar to but smaller than Preferred Alternative where there is overlap with DFAs, Transmission Corridors, and Variance Lands ▪ Some landscapes interrupted by variance lands or transmission corridors
Scientific Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Large landscapes offer opportunities for large-scale research on: ecological response to climate change, cultural resources, biological resources, hydrology, paleontology, and geology ▪ Smaller sites with opportunities for focused research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similar to the Preferred Alternative but with the addition of more disturbed lands and the opportunity for habitat restoration research ▪ Larger intact landscapes provide opportunities for landscape level studies of prehistoric and historic lifeways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Large landscapes offer opportunities for large-scale research on: ecological response to climate change, cultural resources, biological resources, hydrology, paleontology, and geology ▪ Smaller sites would not be included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similar to but smaller than Preferred Alternative where there is overlap with DFAs, Transmission Corridors, and Variance Lands ▪ Opportunities for landscape research, but reduced due to a more fragmented landscape

Table IV.27-6
BLM National Conservation Lands Attributes by Alternative

Alternatives	Preferred Alt.	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>Management Approach</i>					
Management Approach	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
Allowable Uses	Variety of uses if management is compatible with NLCS values	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

**Table IV.27-7
Comparison of BLM LUPA Alternatives – Key Biological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Percent of BLM LUPA lands in DFAs Excludes military lands, BLM Open OHV lands, and tribal lands	DFAs do not exist under No Action.	4%	1%	8%	2%	3%
Percent of DFAs on BLM LUPA lands with low terrestrial intactness	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	52%	63%	44%	59%	46%
Impacts to Desert Linkage Network habitat linkages on BLM LUPA lands	29,000 acres	18,000 acres	7,000 acres	25,000 acres	9,000 acres	21,000 acres
Impacts to riparian natural communities and riparian Covered Species	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
Impacts to wetland natural communities and wetland Covered Species	3,000 acres	4,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types	200 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	4,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types	3,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types
Impacts to dune natural communities and dune Covered Species	2,000 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
Impacts to desert tortoise important areas	48,000 acres	14,000 acres	6,000 acres	18,000 acres	9,000 acres	14,000 acres
Impacts to Mohave ground squirrel important areas	4,000 acres	3,000 acres	5,000 acres	12,000 acres	4,000 acres	4,000 acres
Golden eagle territories within 1 mile of DFAs	52 territories	29 territories	27 territories	46 territories	30 territories	30 territories
Impacts to agriculture used by agricultural Covered Species	300 acres	53,000 acres	68,000 acres	46,000 acres	55,000 acres	48,000 acres
Operational impacts to migratory birds and migratory pathways	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.27-7
 Comparison of BLM LUPA Alternatives – Key Biological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Siting, construction, decommissioning, and operational effects resulting in vegetation and species habitat degradation	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.

**Table IV.27-8
NCCP Assumptions by Alternative**

Alternative	(1) NCCP Conceptual Plan-wide Reserve Design		(2) Other Conservation Actions
	<i>Within the DRECP NCCP Reserve Design</i>	<i>Outside the DRECP NCCP Reserve Design</i>	
No Action Alternative	Not Applicable		
Preferred Alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 314,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land ▪ 111,000 acres of non-BLM lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 868,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land ▪ 554,000 acres of non-BLM lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3,727,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land
Alternative 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 186,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land ▪ 93,000 acres of non-BLM lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 940,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land ▪ 514,000 acres of non-BLM lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3,743,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land
Alternative 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 507,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land ▪ 303,000 acres of non-BLM lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1,448,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land ▪ 472,000 acres of non-BLM lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3,233,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land
Alternative 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 320,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land ▪ 109,000 acres of non-BLM lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 973,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land ▪ 476,000 acres of non-BLM lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3,737,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land
Alternative 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 291,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land ▪ 109,000 acres of non-BLM lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1,108,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land ▪ 545,000 acres of non-BLM lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3,038,000 acres of BLM LUPA Conservation Designations on BLM land

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.27-9
Characteristics of GCP Alternatives**

Alternative	Total Acres Available in CPAs on Nonfederal Lands	Total Acres Available for Non-Acquisition Mitigation*	Total Acres of DFAs on Nonfederal Lands
No Action Alternative	434,000	N/A	3,434,000
Preferred Alternative	312,000	1,182,000	1,632,000
Alternative 1	338,000	1,126,000	971,000
Alternative 2	375,000	1,955,000	1,730,000
Alternative 3	330,000	1,293,000	1,175,000
Alternative 4	328,000	1,399,000	1,332,000

* BLM-administered lands corresponding to the DRECP NCCP Reserve Design where GCP permittees' non-acquisition mitigation measures may be implemented.

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.27-10
Comparison of GCP Alternatives – Key Biological Resource Effects**

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Percent of nonfederal GCP lands in DFAs Excludes military lands, BLM Open OHV lands, and tribal lands	DFAs do not exist under No Action.	30%	18%	32%	22%	25%
Percent of DFAs on GCP lands with low terrestrial intactness	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 nonfederal lands are characterized by low terrestrial intactness	95%	95%	93%	95%	95%
Impacts to Desert Linkage Network habitat on GCP lands	13,000 acres	10,000 acres	12,000 acres	10,000 acres	12,000 acres	12,000 acres
Impacts to riparian natural communities and riparian Covered Species	3,000 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
Impacts to wetland natural communities and wetland Covered Species	4,000 acres	5,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types	8,000 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	7,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types	6,000 acres Playas and open water areas only; Conservation and Management Actions would prohibit all but unavoidable impacts in other wetland types
Impacts to dune natural communities and dune Covered Species	700 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
Impacts to desert tortoise important areas	14,000 acres	12,000 acres	7,000 acres	10,000 acres	11,000 acres	12,000 acres
Impacts to Mohave ground squirrel important areas	5,000 acres	4,000 acres	3,000 acres	5,000 acres	6,000 acres	4,000 acres
Golden eagle territories within 1 mile of DFAs	44 territories	31 territories	21 territories	33 territories	27 territories	23 territories
Impacts to agriculture used by agricultural Covered Species	23,000 acres	52,000 acres	68,000 acres	45,000 acres	55,000 acres	48,000 acres
Operational impacts to migratory birds and migratory pathways	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.27-10
Comparison of GCP Alternatives – Key Biological Resource Effects

	No Action Alternative	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Siting, construction, decommissioning, and operational effects resulting in vegetation and species habitat degradation	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.

**Table IV.27-11
Planning Goals by Alternative**

Planning Goal	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	No Action
<i>Broad Planning Goals</i>						
<i>Biological Goals</i>						
Identify renewable energy DFAs on disturbed lands in areas with low biological conflict to the extent feasible	Confines renewable energy development to DFAs; 87% of DFAs in low terrestrial intactness areas	Confines renewable energy development to DFAs; 93% of DFAs in low terrestrial intactness areas	Confines renewable energy development to DFAs; 78% of DFAs in low terrestrial intactness areas	Confines renewable energy development to DFAs; 89% of DFAs in low terrestrial intactness areas	Confines renewable energy development to DFAs; 87% of DFAs in low terrestrial intactness areas	No DFAs; 57% of the projected development would occur in low terrestrial intactness areas
Identify Plan-wide Biological Goals and Objectives and apply them to DRECP alternatives	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No Biological Goals and Objectives
Identify a Plan-wide biological reserve design envelope and apply it to DRECP alternatives	Yes; DRECP Plan-wide Reserve Design Envelope for this alternative includes 93% of the conceptual reserve design envelope	Yes; DRECP Plan-wide Reserve Design Envelope for this alternative includes 94% of the conceptual reserve design envelope	Yes; DRECP Plan-wide Reserve Design Envelope for this alternative includes 94% of the conceptual reserve design envelope	Yes; DRECP Plan-wide Reserve Design Envelope for this alternative includes 95% of the conceptual reserve design envelope	Yes; DRECP Plan-wide Reserve Design Envelope for this alternative includes 90% of the conceptual reserve design envelope	No reserve design
Contribute to the long-term conservation and management of Covered Species within the Plan Area	Yes, as part of comprehensive conservation strategy with funded and managed reserve; Reserve Design Lands conserve 85% of desert tortoise (DT) important areas, 67% of Mohave ground squirrel (MGS) important areas, and 82% of big horn sheep (BHS) habitat	Yes, as part of comprehensive conservation strategy with funded and managed reserve; Reserve Design Lands conserve 85% of DT important areas, 68% of MGS important areas, and 82% of BHS habitat	Yes, as part of comprehensive conservation strategy with funded and managed reserve; Reserve Design Lands conserve 85% of DT important areas, 63% of MGS important areas, and 84% of BHS habitat	Yes, as part of comprehensive conservation strategy with funded and managed reserve; Reserve Design Lands conserve 85% of DT important areas, 68% of MGS important areas, and 82% of BHS habitat	Yes, as part of comprehensive conservation strategy with funded and managed reserve; Reserve Design Lands conserve 83% of DT important areas, 67% of MGS important areas, and 80% of BHS habitat	No comprehensive conservation strategy; project-specific mitigation set asides would occur
<i>Legal/Regulatory Goals</i>						
As part of the BLM land use planning process, identify biological and nonbiological resource values for consideration in BLM LUPA alternatives	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Ensure that the LUPA complies with FLPMA	Part of purpose and need for proposed LUPA	Part of purpose and need for proposed LUPA	Part of purpose and need for proposed LUPA	Part of purpose and need for proposed LUPA	Part of purpose and need for proposed LUPA	No LUPA
Ensure that the GCP complies with the ESA	Part of purpose and need for proposed GCP	Part of purpose and need for proposed GCP	Part of purpose and need for proposed GCP	Part of purpose and need for proposed GCP	Part of purpose and need for proposed GCP	No GCP
Ensure that the NCCP complies with the NCCPA	Part of proposed and need for proposed NCCP	Part of purpose and need for proposed NCCP	Part of purpose and need for proposed NCCP	Part of purpose and need for proposed NCCP	Part of purpose and need for proposed NCCP	No NCCP

**Table IV.27-11
Planning Goals by Alternative**

Planning Goal	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	No Action
Provide a means to implement Covered Activities in a manner that complies with the NCCPA, ESA, NEPA, CEQA, and other relevant laws	Part of purpose and need for DRECP	Part of purpose and need for DRECP	Part of purpose and need for DRECP	Part of purpose and need for DRECP	Part of purpose and need for DRECP	No DRECP
Provide a basis for the issuance of take authorizations and exemptions allowing the lawful take of Covered Species incidental to Covered Activities	Part of purpose and need for DRECP	Part of purpose and need for DRECP	Part of purpose and need for DRECP	Part of purpose and need for DRECP	Part of purpose and need for DRECP	No DRECP
Provide a comprehensive means to coordinate and standardize mitigation and compensation requirements for Covered Activities within the Plan Area	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<i>BLM LUPA Planning Goals</i>						
Promote renewable energy and transmission development, consistent with federal renewable energy and transmission goals and policies, in consideration of state renewable energy targets	Expanded incentives in LUPA	Expanded incentives in LUPA	Expanded incentives in LUPA	Expanded incentives in LUPA	Expanded incentives in LUPA	Existing incentives
“Preserve the unique and irreplaceable resources, including archaeological values, and conserve the use of the economic resources” of the CDCA (FLPMA 601[a][6])	Yes, 80% of lands with Native American Elements conserved Increases SRMAs by over 2.5 million acres and ERMAs by 879,000 acres Conserves exploration and access of economic mineral resources following area-specific management plans on BLM conservation lands; access to CPA acquired lands would be restricted resources	Yes, 76% of lands with Native American Elements conserved Increases SRMAs by over 2.5 million acres Conserves exploration and access of economic mineral resources following area-specific management plans on BLM conservation lands; access to CPA acquired lands would be restricted	Yes for some resources, 83% of lands with Native American Elements conserved Increases SRMAs by over 2.4 million acres Conserves exploration and access of economic mineral resources following area-specific management plans on BLM conservation lands; access to CPA acquired lands would be restricted	Yes, 76% of lands with Native American Elements conserved Increases SRMAs by over 2.5 million acres Conserves exploration and access of economic mineral resources following area-specific management plans on BLM conservation lands; access to CPA acquired lands would be restricted	Yes, 74% of lands with Native American Elements conserved Increases SRMAs by over 2.4 million acres Conserves exploration and access of economic mineral resources following area-specific management plans on BLM conservation lands; access to CPA acquired lands would be restricted	Yes, 63% of lands with Native American Elements conserved Retains existing recreation lands including over 1.4 million acres managed for recreation emphasis but does not provide additional protection. Conserves existing use of economic mineral resources
Identify and incorporate public lands managed for conservation purposes within the CDCA as components of the National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS), consistent with the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (PL 111-11)	NLCS designated lands (excluding existing LLPAs) — 3,984,000 acres (full designation acreage)	NLCS designated lands (excluding existing LLPAs)— 1,682,000 acres (full designation acreage)	NLCS designated lands (excluding existing LLPAs)—5,124,000 acres (full designation acreage)	NLCS designated lands (excluding existing LLPAs)— 3,845,000 acres (full designation acreage)	NLCS designated lands (excluding existing LLPAs)—3,012,000 acres (full designation acreage)	No NLCS lands are designated outside of existing LLPAs
Make some land use allocation decisions outside the Plan Area but within the CDCA, including VRM classes, land use allocations to replace multiple-use classes, and NLCS designations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

**Table IV.27-11
Planning Goals by Alternative**

Planning Goal	Preferred Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	No Action
<i>USFWS GCP Planning Goals</i>						
Develop a GCP that meets ESA Section 10(a)(1)(B) requirements for providing the framework for a streamlined permitting process for renewable energy development by nonfederal project proponents in DFAs in the Plan Area	Part of purpose and need for GCP	Part of purpose and need for GCP	Part of purpose and need for GCP	Part of purpose and need for GCP	Part of purpose and need for GCP	No GCP
Base the GCP on the DRECP's comprehensive conservation strategy for 37 proposed Covered Species, including Biological Goals and Objectives, Conservation and Management Actions and a Plan-wide reserve design	GCP nested within draft conservation strategy for Preferred Alternative and analyzed in EIR/EIS	GCP nested within draft conservation strategy for Alternative 1 and analyzed in EIR/EIS	GCP nested within draft conservation strategy for Alternative 2 and analyzed in EIR/EIS	GCP nested within draft conservation strategy for Alternative 3 and analyzed in EIR/EIS	GCP nested within draft conservation strategy for Alternative 4 and analyzed in EIR/EIS	No GCP
Structure the GCP such that any permits issued under the GCP "umbrella" would authorize incidental take of Covered Species in conjunction with DRECP Covered Activities on nonfederal lands. Applicants may be state agencies, local governments, or individual landowners and project proponents	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No GCP
<i>State of California NCCP Planning Goals</i>						
Contribute to California's Renewables Portfolio Standard and the state's greenhouse gas reduction mandates and goals by planning for approximately 20,000 megawatts of renewable energy generation and associated transmission capacity in the Plan Area by 2040, including obtaining state and federal incidental take authorizations with regulatory assurances needed for covered renewable energy and transmission projects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No NCCP
Provide for the long-term conservation and management of Covered Species within the Plan Area and preserve, restore, and enhance natural communities and ecosystems in which those species are found by focusing utility-scale renewable energy development away from areas of greatest biological importance or sensitivity; coordinating and standardizing biological avoidance, minimization, mitigation, compensation, conservation, and management requirements for Covered Activities within the Plan Area; and taking other actions to meet conservation planning requirements in state and federal law	As described in conservation strategy for Preferred Alternative and analyzed in EIR/EIS	As described in conservation strategy for Alternative 1 and analyzed in EIR/EIS	As described in conservation strategy for Alternative 2 and analyzed in EIR/EIS	As described in conservation strategy for Alternative 3 and analyzed in EIR/EIS	As described in conservation strategy for Alternative 4 and analyzed in EIR/EIS	No NCCP

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