Needles, CA 92363

February 23, 2015

California Energy Commission
Dockets Office, MS-4
Docket No. 09-RENEW EO-01
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
Email: docket@energy.ca.gov

Subject: DRECP NEPA/CEQA – FATALLY FLAWED

TO INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES WITHIN THE DRECP FOOTPRINT
WILLING TO PROVIDE THEIR PRIVATE PROPERTY AND SPACE
IN ALREADY DEVELOPED AND, OR, DISTURBED AREAS

I am taking a stand for the 36,000 people who voted for me for Senate District 16 which includes a major portion of the CDCA and DRECP...all of whom are victim residents or nearby neighbors of the CDCA which includes the 22.5 million acre area being targeted by corporate interests represented by a government plan to heist pristine California desert land and underground water aquifers.

I object to the name of that plan as being purposefully misleadingly...it is misnamed "Desert Renewable Energy CONSERVATION Plan" to cause people who live, work and recreate in the area not to pay attention to it or review it carefully. CONSERVATION when used in this manner is a misnomer and should be replaced with DEVELOPMENT.

I object to the plan’s name and to the plan itself because it enables corporations to heist water and grab desert land for development under the guise of "conservation". This is a proposed amendment to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan and moreover it is a development plan that would significantly change the character and feeling of the CDCA’s landscape from pristine and wild to industrial and corporate.

Please, at least eliminate development designations for all areas within the boundaries of Senate District 16 including Newberry Springs and Cadiz, Apple Valley,
unincorporated Apple Valley, Helendale, Lucerne Valley, Johnson Valley, and along historically sensitive sections of California Highway 66.

I object to the misleading title that causes people who live, work and recreate in the area not to review it carefully. This plan is massive and there has been no public hearings on the plan in the area where I live. The on line sessions to supposedly inform the public were actually designed to confuse and obfuscate the public with acronyms constantly used and often times speech that was too rapid.

There is no way that a team of government agents and contractors in the short amount of time that was allowed, has fulfilled their obligation to the people of California to scope the public comment and concern about this massive plan to lasso up the desert for solar and wind farms.

SCRATCH the misnamed Desert Renewable Energy "CONSERVATION" Plan. That plan is flawed because it did not include an alternative that would provide what we need:

FREE POINT OF USE SOLAR PANELS FOR INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES WITHIN THE DRECP FOOTPRINT WILLING TO PROVIDE THEIR PRIVATE PROPERTY AND SPACE IN ALREADY DEVELOPED AND, OR, DISTURBED AREAS

Further, please encourage the Department of the Interior and the Obama Administration to do the job that is already laid out for them:

* Protect Mojave National Preserve, adjacent Wilderness Study Areas, and key desert bighorn sheep habitat by not allowing the Soda Mountain Solar project to be sited next door to Mojave NP, as better locations for solar in already disturbed areas abound.

* Protect the remarkable Siurian Valley adjacent to Death Valley National Park by designating the landscape as National Conservation Lands instead of harassing the people of this state with continued outrageous plans to develop this precious area thrown at them.

* Better protect Joshua Tree National Park by preventing development in the Eagle Mountain region. We must safeguard public lands in this region from further threats and protect important habitat for desert bighorn sheep, golden eagles, and desert tortoise.

* Do not allow for renewable energy Development Focus Areas (DFA) to be designated in sensitive lands. The Lucerne region, the desert tortoise research natural area, Cadiz Dunes area, and the Mountain Pass area should not be considered for DFAs.

* Protect wildlife routes and bird migration areas by supporting the protection of Sonoran Desert Thorn Woodlands, Sand Movement corridors, and important wetlands like the Wild and Scenic Amargosa River, Salt Creek, and Bonanza Spring.

The DRECP fails to analyze how the various schemes that impact the National Park Service. Despite the significant acreage of our National parks in the plan area, the draft does not include discussion of how renewable energy projects will impact their view sheds, clear night skies, and wildlife-rich neighboring lands.
Please see my further comments posted on behalf of the River Archaeological Heritage Association (RiverAHA). Thank you in advance for your courage in defending our magnificent California Desert!

Respectfully Submitted,

Ruth Musser-Lopez
Ruth@RuthMusserLopez.com
INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
Response to Comment Letter F136

Ruth Musser-Lopez
February 23, 2015

F136-1 Thank you for your comment. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has taken it into consideration in developing the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP) Proposed Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). As described in Chapter I.1, Phase I of the DRECP is the BLM Proposed LUPA and Final EIS that addresses activities on BLM-administered lands only. See also Volume II, which includes revised descriptions and mapping for the range of alternatives considered for the BLM LUPA and Chapter II.8 for alternatives considered but not carried forward.

F136-2 This comment has not resulted in a change to the document but the BLM has taken it into consideration.

F136-3 Your objection to “conservation” in the DRECP name is noted. The DRECP identifies both Development Focus Areas (DFAs) where renewable energy development may occur as well as areas designated for conservation.

F136-4 The BLM has taken this comment into consideration in developing the DRECP Proposed LUPA and Final EIS. As described in Chapter I.1, Phase I of the DRECP is the BLM Proposed LUPA and Final EIS that addresses activities on BLM-administered lands only. See also Volume II, which includes revised descriptions and mapping for the range of alternatives considered for the BLM LUPA, including substantial reductions in DFAs as compared to that proposed for the Plan-wide Draft DRECP alternatives.

F136-5 See response F136-3 regarding the DRECP name. Public meetings were held at multiple locations throughout the DRECP area over several weeks. These occurred at various times and locations and were geographically distributed to allow for public participation in various parts of the area. In addition to being able to provide comments at public meetings, people were able to comment in writing. The Draft DRECP and Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/EIS had a 5-month comment period (9/23/14 through 2/23/15).

F136-6 See response F136-4.

F136-7 See response F136-4.

F136-8 See response F136-4.

F136-9 See response F136-4.

F136-10 See response F136-4.
The value of National Park lands is acknowledged in the DRECP Proposed LUPA and Final EIS, and there has been substantial coordination between the National Park Service and BLM during EIS preparation. Viewsheds, potential noise impacts, and recreational opportunities of National Park units are considered in the Final EIS. Please see the analysis in Chapters IV.20 (Visual Resources), IV.21 (Noise), and IV.18 (Outdoor Recreation).

This comment has not resulted in a change to the document but the BLM has taken it into consideration.