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DRECP NEPA/CEQA Comments by Dr. Linda DeLuca, PO Box 82, Newberry Springs, CA, 92355 760-780-8741
Please exclude Newberry Springs, CA from amongst the 22.5 Million Acres of Reclamation Energy Project, as it is absolutely not compatible with our neighborhood.
#1 - Newberry Springs, CA, as stated in San Bernardino County Position on DRECP Compatibility with County Priorities, Page 4, last paragraph as follows:
*SBCC Position on DRECP Compatibility with County Priorities
The County recommends that the DRECP consider eliminating DFA designations in Apple Valley, unincorporated Apple Valley, Phelan (south of SR 18 between US 395 and the Los Angeles County line), Stoddard Valley, Helendale, Lucerne Valley, Johnson Valley, Newberry Springs and along historically sensitive sections of California Highway 66. The County also recommends that the DRECP consider additional DFA designations along the “395 Corridor”, which is west of U.S. Route 395 and north of El Mirage, and along and four miles north of California State Route 58. The County recognizes that there may be potential land ownership limitations (e.g. U.S. Department of Defense land) with this approach.* Please listen, and please pay attention to this plea.
#2 - Examine and look to Disaster Monster Projects of IVANPAH for wildlife disturbances, productivity results, and financial drain for request for additional millions of taxpayer money.
#3 - Take all the billions of taxpayer money that will be required to make massive alternative projects a possibility and consider supplying each and every electrical connection in California with point of delivery with rooftop and backyard alternative equipment and you would be acting in a far more fiscally responsible behavior while saving billions of taxpayer dollars.
#4 - Has anyone kept track of the total lobbying money that has been spent in the past five years of the DRECP proposal? And who benefits from that wall positioned spent money. Guessing large corporations have been and are hoping to benefit huge money coffers.
#5 - DRECP appears to be technologically pre-mature. There has to be a technology solution to alternative energy that does not denigrate 22.5 million acres. This seems to be nothing more than pure insanity. By forcing the incorrect solution, the consequences will guarantee disaster. If you wait five or ten years for a viable technologically visible solution, prudence will prevail. Doing the incorrect massive projects, if not the correct solution benefit not California, but huge corporations. Doesn’t Solyndra prove anything? Doesn’t Ivanpah prove anything?
#6 - We truly hope that the DRECP would look out for the citizens of California, not the benefit of a few large industrial entities, with what appears to be money generating, not best solutions for the future.
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F146-1 The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) component of the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP) would only designate Development Focus Areas (DFAs) on public lands, and would not apply to the West Mojave communities mentioned.

F146-2 BLM has considered the impact of large renewable energy projects in the DRECP Proposed Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

F146-3 The distributed generation alternative does not meet BLM’s purpose and need. Distributed generation was considered but not carried forward, as discussed in Volume II, Section II.8.2.1.

F146-4 This comment has not resulted in a change to the document but the BLM has taken it into consideration.

F146-5 This comment has not resulted in a change to the document but the BLM has taken it into consideration. The DRECP is a plan that anticipates future renewable energy project needs and attempts to accommodate them while conserving valued resources.

F146-6 This comment has not resulted in a change to the document but the BLM has taken it into consideration.
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