To Chris Beale and James Ramos,

I have been a resident of the Mojave Desert for about six years. I was first introduced to the desert as an intern for the Student Conservation Association for the Desert Restoration Corps. Coming from Tennessee, I was blown away with the beauty of this area, so much so that I decided to build a life here. I care deeply about this issue because I don't want to see some of these precious places disturbed unnecessarily.

While I understand and support the need for targeted development focus areas, I feel strongly that aspects of the DRECP are misguided. I feel that it is important for distributed generation to be further reviewed. There is such a large rooftop area that is not being looked at that should be. The California Solar Initiative was extremely successful. *Rooftop solar* alternatives should be considered as a viable alternative. Re-emphasizing of current infrastructure should also be considered. Palm Springs area is outside of the planned area, but contains windmills that are built but out of service. Wouldn't it be more cost effective to better use what is already available?

The DRECP also needs to re-evaluate the planning assumptions of 25,000 MW to be sited in the desert. Already three solar projects that produce 11,000 MW—are those being consulted in that number? I also strongly oppose "ground-based" projects that pose a serious risk to threatened wildlife such as the endangered desert tortoise and/or of habitat areas of Bighorn sheep. The Salin Mountain area Solar Project is highly misjudged as well as the project in Silverado Valley. I do support landscape-scale planning for the future of the California Desert with an emphasis on conservation designation that are durable and adequately funded and enforceable.

As a resident of Joshua Tree, I realize that our economy and other small desert community economies depend on tourism. Visitors do not want to visit a desert with large transmission lines.
and unsightly solar farms. I am thankful that the Morongo Basin was saved from Development Focused Iran and I would like for you to consider durable conservation designations for all of the pristine areas listed in the attachment.

I appreciate the opportunity to have my voice heard and hope that you make the right choices to support the well-being of desert communities and the citizens that call the desert home.

Sincerely,
Lesley Hughes

Joshua Tree, CA 92252
Attachment 2. Places that require conservation in the Preferred Alternative of the DRECP

Active sand dunes
Avawatz Mountains (including “Bowling Alley”)
Big Maria Mountains and surrounding flats
Bristol Lake (excluding mineral leasing and salt mining areas)
Cady Valley/Iron Mountains
Chuckwalla Bench
Coso Range area (including Olancha Dunes - not including OHV area)
Danby Lake
Desert Tortoise Natural Area (ACEC)
Eagle Mountain
Existing critical habitat
Joshua tree woodland habitat
Lower Centennial Flat
Lucerne Valley wildlife linkages
Malpais Mesa (including northwestern Talc City Hills, Santa Rosa Flat & Conglomerate Mesa)
Microphyll woodlands
Morongo Basin wildlife linkages
Mule Mountains
Orocopia Mountains area
Palen Lake
Pinto Mountains area
Pisgah Valley (ACEC)
Red Mountain
Riparian areas
Riverside Mountains area
Rodman Mountains area (lands abutting existing Wilderness)
Rose Valley/MeCloud Flat (area in DFA)
Sacramento Mountains
Silurian Valley (including BLM Special Analysis Area and additional acreage)
Slate Range
Soda Mountains - south slope
Sperry Hills/Kingston Range
Tehachapi Mountains and Southern Sierras – areas of conservation interest
Valley Mountain
Vidal
Wildlife Linkages
Whipple Mountains area
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Response to Comment Letter F216

Lesley Hughes
February 17, 2015

F216-1 Thank you for your comment. While it has not resulted in a change in the document, the BLM has taken it into consideration.

F216-2 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.

F216-3 The BLM has taken this comment into consideration in developing the BLM LUPA and Final EIS. As described in Volume I, Chapter I.0, Phase I of the DRECP is the BLM LUPA and Final EIS that addresses activities on BLM-administered lands only. See Volume I, 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 response F216-2.

F216-4 See response F216-3.

F216-5 The BLM has taken this comment into consideration in developing the BLM LUPA and Final EIS. See response F216-3. See also Section II.3.7 for a description of LUPA implementation.

F216-6 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 the BLM will consider during its LUPA decision process.

F216-7 The BLM has taken this comment into consideration in developing the BLM LUPA and Final EIS. BLM acknowledges your support of conservation in the Morongo Basin.
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