

Revised Draft

Advantages to Rewriting Main Draft Document:

- Meets expectations of the public and CALFED agencies
- More readable
- More defensible legally
 - Full disclosure and accountability of impacts and changes as required by CEQA and NEPA
 - Easier to explain what the Revised Draft is, without having to cross-reference numerous documents
- Can use even if new significant impacts as a result of further information or analysis since the draft.

Disadvantages of Rewriting Main Draft Document:

- Timing—very difficult to accomplish by the end of the year with existing resources
 - -Program managers will be drafting new/revised technical documents at same time they are responding to comments.(June and July of 1998)
- Can't use if impacts have changed as a result of further analysis or new/revised technical documents

If we still determine not to rewrite the draft, we would improve the compliance with "full disclosure" requirements of CEQA/NEPA, if we include:

- a new document labeled "Revised Draft",
- an Errata that includes all the changes and corrections to the 1st draft with a reference to where in the Draft they would be included,
- all the new and revised documents as appendices,
- and clearly states that it should be read with the first Draft.
- We will also need to make it clear that copies of the first draft are still available upon request.

It is still very awkward, and makes it even harder to explain an already complex programmatic project.

RE: Level of detail for 3 refined alternatives.

We need to confirm that the more detailed modeling and data analysis does not disclose new, significant impacts, OR change the assessment of an impact from less than significant to significant.

Revised draft-options