February 23, 2015

California Energy Commission
Dockets Office, MS-4
Docket No. 09-RENEW-EO-01
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

RE: DRECP/NEPA/CEQA Comments

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing this letter as a very concerned citizen in the High Desert. I find the draft DRECP in its current form to be far too destructive to all species; plant, wild-life and human. I fully support the County of San Bernardino’s position letter in which they recommend elimination of the DRA’s in the Apple Valley, unincorporated Apple Valley, Phelan (south of SR 18 between US 395 and the LA County line), Stoddard Valley, Helendale, Lucerne Valley, Johnson Valley, Newberry Springs and along historically sensitive sections Route 66.

I fear rural communities and residents adjacent to these projects will be adversely impacted. Large-scale renewable energy projects cause a myriad of problems from air quality with PM-10 and 2.5 - the potential for Valley Fever is huge, but not mentioned in the current draft DRECP. De-valued property is very real and not fair to homeowners that spent their life savings on their home to be able to sell in the future for retirement.

There is a huge need to enforce a ground disturbance plan to control soil erosion, sand blow and weeds in and around the solar structures. Property owners should not have to put up with blowing sand and weeds due to these new structures.

As a concerned citizen, I also find the draft DRECP to be very difficult to understand. It is very complicated and has way too many acronyms for the lay-person to comprehend.

I hope you will go back to the drawing board and create a document that is much more workable and realistic for the residents of the High Desert.

Sincerely,

Jackie Lindgren
Hesperia, CA 92345
Response to Comment Letter F170

Jackie Lindgren
February 23, 2015

F170-1 Thank you for your comment. The BLM has taken it into consideration in developing the BLM LUPA and Final EIS. 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 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.

F170-2 Based on public comments related to Valley Fever, this topic has been expanded in Volume III, Chapter III.22, Public Health, Safety and Services, and in Volume IV, Chapter IV.22 impact analysis for public health.

F170-3 This comment is not directed toward any specific discussion or the analysis presented in Draft DRECP and EIR/EIS Chapters III.23 or IV.23 (Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice). This is a general comment or opinion that BLM will consider during its LUPA decision process.

F170-4 The importance of minimizing soil disturbance to control erosion is acknowledged in Volume III, Chapter III.4 and Volume IV, Chapter IV.4. The CMAs contain measures to prevent and minimize soil erosion.

F170-5 This comment has not resulted in a change to the document but the BLM has taken it into consideration. The Draft DRECP and EIR/EIS had a 5-month comment period (9/23/14 through 2/23/15), which included one extension, and no recirculation of the draft document will occur.
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