Draft Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan and EIR/EIS Comments

Please hand in during the meeting or mail (address on back), email, or fax ((916) 654-4421) by January 9, 2015. Those submitting comments electronically should provide them by email in either Microsoft Word format or as a Portable Document Format (PDF) to docket@energy.state.ca.us. When submitting comments on the Draft DRECP and EIR/EIS, please include the name and means of contact for a person who would be available for later consultation if necessary. Please note that public comments and information submitted will be available for public review at www.drecp.org. Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, be aware that any information submitted as part of your comment will become part of the public record. Additionally, this information may become available via Google, Yahoo, and any other internet search engines. You may choose to withhold contact information, but the agencies will not be able to consult with you if clarification of your comment is needed. While you may request in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, agencies cannot guarantee the ability to do so.

Name: James Kenney
Organization (if any): Public (am a member of the JK group BLMD Desert District)
Address: [redacted]
City, State, Zip: Ridgecrest, CA 93555
E-mail: jakenney@verizon.net

Comments (Please print clearly and legibly)

1. I extend the comment period for a full 180 days. After a month, the people we talked to are just now getting up to speed on the document. The length and depth of this document deserve full exploration. For more of the public who have never seen such a document, it will take great deal of work to fully comprehend.
2. The extensive reliance on computer skills alone makes especially older ones like myself find reading these documents especially troubling.
3. I question all the additional DRECP’s being added. DRECP proposes to not influence existing routes but by creating more access, it can help to interact with present and traditional uses.

More space on back
It bothers me there is no provision for money to help BLM manage the additional needs proposed. The state and federal Fish & Wildlife agencies require significant amounts of water. The proposal for energy will require significant amounts of water. That has to come from somewhere, and will have an impact on existing water plans.

I don’t see adequate research on the impact on groundwater. The proposal for energy will require significant amounts of water. That has to come from somewhere, and will have an impact on existing water plans.

I don’t understand a plan for achieving use of mitigation banks. Or the existing existing mitigation has been so thoroughly filled with no general idea of present or historical areas.

Some questions: What is the document truly a NEPA document? For someone who is not familiar with NRC’s plans, the idea of a multi-thousand-page document regarding traffic and confuses them (including me at first). Having to go back and forth on a computer, or group reads the document as hard copy is daunting above and beyond.
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F2-1 Thank you for your comment. While it has not resulted in a change in the document, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has taken it into consideration. The Draft Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP) 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.

F2-2 This comment has not resulted in a change to the document, but the BLM has taken it into consideration.

F2-3 Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) are used to help guide planning and management of conservation areas. Route designation, travel planning, and restoration are implementation-level decisions that depend on the location of each individual ACEC. Implementation actions require analysis and public involvement through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) before the BLM can make a final, site-specific decision.

F2-4 The BLM has taken your comment into consideration in developing the BLM LUPA and Final EIS. As described in Volume I, Chapter I.1, Introduction, Phase I of the DRECP is the BLM Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) and Final EIS that addresses activities on BLM-administered lands only. See also Volume II, Section II.3.7, for a description of LUPA implementation.

F2-5 The effects of renewable energy development on groundwater are analyzed in Volume IV, Chapter IV.6, Groundwater, Water Supply, and Water Quality.

F2-6 The BLM has taken your comment into consideration in developing the BLM LUPA and Final EIS. As described in Chapter 1.1, Phase I of the DRECP is the BLM LUPA and Final EIS that addresses activities on BLM-administered lands only. See also Section II.3.4.2 for the revised Conservation and Management Actions (CMAs) for activities on BLM lands, including CMAs for the management of LUPA conservation designation lands. See also Section II.3.7 for a description of LUPA implementation, including a description of compensation and mitigation implementation.

F2-7 This comment has not resulted in a change to the document, but the BLM has taken it into consideration.
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