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To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express the four following comments regarding the DRECP document:

1. A document of this length (8000 pages) and complexity cannot be adequately reviewed and evaluated by the public within the standard 90-day timeframe. This is an extraordinarily complex document that demands an extended period for public review—360 days—if the public process is to remain credible and not just a pro forma charade with a foregone conclusion.

2. There are 10 public hearings scheduled between October 20th and November 13th. San Diego’s hearing occurred on October 21st, less than 30 days after the publication of the 8000-page document. There should be another round of public hearings beginning 180 days after the publication of the Plan, i.e., the end of March 2015. This would give communities throughout the state time to digest and evaluate what the Plan means for them.

3. Borrego Springs is the largest community, and only community of any size, in San Diego County that is actually within the boundaries of the Plan. There should be a public hearing in Borrego Springs!

4. Rooftop solar technology has progressed significantly during the five years since the Plan was initiated. Given these advances, rooftop solar should be “brought forward for detailed analysis” on its technological and economic merits, rather than being dismissed because it is not utility-scale production in the desert.

Sincerely,

Daniel Winkler

PhD Student
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
University of California, Irvine
Response to Comment Letter F24

Daniel Winkler
November 9, 2014

F24-1 through F24-3  Thank you for your comments. While they have not resulted in a change in the document, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has taken them into consideration. The Draft Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP) and Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) had a 5-month comment period (9/23/14 through 2/23/15), which included one extension. Public meetings were held at multiple locations throughout the DRECP area over several weeks. These occurred at various times and locations and were geographically distributed to allow for public participation in various parts of the area. In addition to being able to provide comments at public meetings, people were able to comment in writing.

F24-4  This comment has not resulted in a change in the document, but the BLM has taken it into consideration. 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.
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