February 20, 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: Request for a new Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan Alternative

The Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP) as it has evolved has become so voluminous and incomprehensible that any attempt to implement it - in actuality (in the real world) - will simply entangle it in conflict of, by, and within itself. The entire idea of a comprehensive plan is to clearly define roles and establish concise lines and realms of responsibility. The DRECP draft fails in every aspect.

The first point in which the DRECP draft fails is presumptively imposing a higher governmental authority - the EPA - upon State of California authority. This presumptive action tramples State, County and local governmental rights and authority, which is a violation of the limits on Federal power - as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. While one may argue that ‘precedent’ has established such authority, that does not negate the fact that those limitation still exist; that Federal authority has been exceeded; and that such excesses are challengeable.

How so? In pushing the DRECP to the forefront of the process for meeting the State of California’s own very aggressive goals for carbon emissions reduction, the EPA, along with the California Energy Commission (CEPC) violates prior State legislation on the matter - The California Energy Efficiency Plan (CEESP) - that has the issue well in hand.

The current Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP) includes no alternative that accurately reflects existing California state energy priorities that require energy efficiency measures of all types, including rooftop solar (classified by the state as an energy efficiency measure), be fully implemented prior to developing large, remote power generation projects of any type, nor one that incorporates the US-EPAs Re-Powering America’s Lands program when siting the latter.

The DRECP draft EIR/EIS states: “Multiple commenters noted that distributed generation, energy efficiency, and the siting of renewable energy on brownfield sites should be considered as components of an alternative rather than as independent alternatives…” (Section II.B-3).

California law establishes energy efficiency as the highest priority resource in meeting California’s energy needs. The CEESP presents a ‘single roadmap to achieve maximum energy savings across all major groups and sectors in California,” by implementing rooftop solar, and bold appliance and building efficiency standards. (http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/energy/LC/Energy-Efficiency-ceesp).
In disregarding established California law, the CEC and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) find themselves in conflict.

The CPUC CEESP rightly places consumer choice-based solutions to power generation - such as Distributed Generation (DG) - at the forefront of energy generation methodologies. The CEC's support of the DRECP does exactly the opposite by chaining the consumer to privately held public utilities and with that, commandeering massive geographic swaths of public and private lands for the protection of industrial/utility scale R, development. In point of fact, the DRECP totally disregards and dismisses the overall interests of the individual consumer, community environments, cultures and interests. It is authoritarian government at its worst.

If nothing else, the fact that 53% of the land subject to seizure by the DRECP is within the County of San Bernardino should demonstrate the social injustice of the plan. Because of that issue, the County of San Bernardino Board of Supervisors has submitted a strongly worded 56 page position statement.

We fully support the County of San Bernardino's position as submitted and urge that this entire process come under comprehensive and continued review.

Respectfully,

John Smith
Barbara Smith

Apple Valley, CA
Response to Comment Letter F163

John Smith and Barbara Smith
February 20, 2015

F163-1 Thank you for your comment. While it has not resulted in a change in the document, the BLM has taken it into consideration.

F163-2 This comment has not resulted in a change to the document but the BLM has taken it into consideration. As described in Chapter I.1, Phase I of the DRECP is the BLM LUPA and Final EIS that addresses activities on BLM-administered lands only.

F163-3 As described in Chapter I.1, Phase I of the DRECP is the BLM LUPA and Final EIS that addresses activities on BLM-administered lands only. See Section I.3.3 for a description of the renewable energy planning process used for the DRECP, which sets the renewable energy and transmission planning context for developing the BLM LUPA and Final EIS for BLM-administered lands. See also Volume II which includes revised descriptions and mapping for the range of alternatives considered for the BLM LUPA. See also Chapter II.8 for a discussion of alternatives considered but not carried forward.

F163-4 See response F163-3.

F163-5 See response F163-3. BLM will continue to work with local governments as it implements the LUPA.

F163-6 This comment has not resulted in a change to the document but the BLM has taken it into consideration.