

From: FMICHNY-IBR21E@ibr2gw80.mp.usbr.gov
Date: 18 Apr 96
Subject: No Action Alternative Paper
To: rickb@honcho.water.ca.gov

Well better late than never. I did read the subject paper dated 4/3 and

basically have no problems with the approaches laid out. Two comments though:

- 1) Relative to "phasing" - I'm not really clear on the concept but I think I understand what its intent is. If the intent is to provide a "checkpoint(s)" I think it is a good idea but you don't really need another EIS/R or supplement to do that. I believe CEQA requires a mitigation monitoring plan. Can you not use that plan to set up a monitoring(reporting) mechanism to periodically state where the process is on achieving its goals, clarifying impacts, and also report on other aspects of the entire effort? I don't know that a phased impact analysis as a stand alone process really does anything for you.
- 2) I assume that once the ROD for the CVPIA is signed that the CVPIA actions "approved" by the ROD will be included in the No Action for Calfed. Therefore Calfed will then use the delta "with" CVPIA as defined by the ROD as the baseline and will simply (well maybe not simply) add actions onto CVPIA to achieve desired goals. If I'm incorrect in this please educate me sometime at your convenience.
- 3) Cheers