Every day is a great day when I hear from you.

There are a lot of right conclusions in the DRECP, but please make some basic changes. Include Distributed Generation in the tally of the target generation output. With the rising cost of electricity, the cost of living is driving citizens to install rooftop and parking lot solar to be able to keep up with inflation. I, for one, am going net zero at home and at our shopping center this year. I can no longer afford to pay Edison the steeper rates they’re charging us. People everywhere are starting to do this. They’re no fools! We’re also yanking out all incandescent, fluorescent, and CFL bulbs and going LED. Then we’re performing energy audits and lowering our demand. LOTS of people I know are already doing this.

The DRECP should not encourage tax subsidized industrial renewable projects that disrupt humans and wildlife, and destroy large swaths of our ecosystems. Instead, set up the DRECP to encourage this grassroots, economy-driven distributed generation.

Industrial renewable projects are wasting tax dollars, plus raising the rates we all must pay, while enriching wealthy investors. This is robbing the poor and giving to the rich. Property values drop dramatically around these renewable projects which is taking people’s life savings and giving them to the rich. This is horrible!

Industrial renewable projects use up to 400% more water than that for which they are permitted, and that in a state where we are in severe drought. This MUST stop!

On top of all this wasteful expense and destruction, the DRECP encourages the construction of more invasive transmission lines. These are bad for the economy, for our environment, and our quality of life. With the flood of citizens installing private solar on their properties, the demand for power from the grid will shrink. Plus, nearly all transmission lines and corridors can be upgraded to carry heavier loads, at a MUCH lower price than new routes and lines. Richard M Peck, Lucerne Valley CA. 92356
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**F177-1** 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. BLM lands are largely devoid of buildings and distributed generation is applicable in locations with both electrical demand and areas or surfaces available for installation of distributed generation technology.

**F177-2** 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.

**F177-3** While this comment has not resulted in a change in the document, the BLM has taken it into consideration. Water use by renewable energy is addressed in Chapters III.6 and IV.6.

**F177-4** The BLM has taken this comment 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.
INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK