

April 27, 1998

**List of Organizations/Individuals Requesting Extension of
Programmatic EIS/EIR Comment Period**

<u>Commentor</u>	<u>Date Rec'd</u>	<u>Extension Requested</u>	<u>Reason for Request*</u>
Cal. Assemblyman Tom Woods (2 nd District)	3/26/98	None defined	1
State Senator Maurice Johannessen	3/31/98	None defined	2
Steve Worthley (Cottonwood, CA)	4/2/98	None defined	3
Patricia Clarke (Chair, Shasta Co. Water Agency)	4/10/98	None defined	4
Marcia Basque (Regional Council of Rural Cos.)	4/13/98	120 days	5
Congressman Wally Herger (2 nd District)	4/13/98	None defined	6
Environmental Water Caucus	4/13/98	75 days	7
Harrison Phipps (Water Resources Association of Yolo County)	4/15/98	60 days	8
Mark Pisano (Southern Calif. Association of Governments)	4/24/98	90 days	9
James Fryer	4/27/98	90 days	10
Requests at Oakland Public Hearing	4/23/98	varied	11

Reasons for Requests *

1) "We are about to make one of the most important policy decisions of this decade. We should not act hastily. Simply put, seventy-five days is not enough time to make this monumental decision."

2) "Lester, there is far too much information circulating simultaneously which the public has to read, comprehend, and makes comments. CALFED's selected Alternative will impact the state's economy, the water supply of millions, the lifeblood of agribusiness, as well as the largest estuary on the American continent. And, given your expressed desire for total public involvement, I call upon you, the Executive Director of CALFED, to suspend – not just extend – the public comment deadline of June 1."

3) "I am writing to protest the extremely short time allowed for public review of CALFED's Draft Programmatic EIS/EIR. 75 days is not sufficient time to read and study such a lengthy document, even if I had one in hand. Combine the amount of reading necessary with having to travel to the documents and you can see that it's an impossible task."

4) "Shasta County finds that this document is, in effect, a new California Water Plan. It touches on virtually every water issue in California and, in many cases, proposes solutions. The existing 75-day public review period for the subject document, concluding on June 1, 1998, is insufficient for the review of such a massive document."

5) "CALFED's final decision could literally change the physical and socio-economic landscape of the state for generations to come. Due to potential significant economic, environmental and community impacts on rural California, RCRC requests that the time period for public comment on CALFED's DEIR/EIS, be extended . . . We believe that without adequate time for review and comment, the CALFED Program may be put into jeopardy. The imposition of a 75-day public comment period on this document is not adequate to achieve greater public awareness, involvement and support."

6) "Because of the size of this document and its potential for negative impact on California communities I respectfully request an extension of time for comment on the draft EIS and its accompanying three alternatives."

7) "Given the breadth and complexity of the issues addressed in the CALFED process, the other demands of the CALFED process, as well as the length of the document, we believe that the current comment period is unrealistic. Further, the ongoing discussions regarding inclusion of surface storage in the proposed water bond act are diverting key staff resources from the review of the CALFED draft environmental document."

8) "Given the large size of the DEIR, additional time is required to adequately review and prepare comments. . . A 60-day extension to the comment period does not seem unreasonable considering implementation of the proposed program is expected to take 30-years. . .Additional time for review and comment is justified given the multi-billion dollar costs associated with implementation of the proposed program."

9) "In order to allow sufficient time for our elected officials to review the Bay-Delta Program Draft EIS/EIR, we respectfully request a three month extension of the comment period to September 1, 1998."

10)"Furthermore, the comment period of 75 days is much to (sic) short for readers to assess the document as thoroughly as is appropriate in this circumstance, and develop productive comments. The unrealistically short comment period is further aggravated by the fact that it took tow weeks for the document to arrive, though ordered within a few days of its release. In light of these facts, I respectfully request that you extend the comment period for an additional 90 days and schedule."

11) At the Oakland Public Hearing at least 16 speakers requested an extension of the comment period. Transcripts will be available and reviewed by first week of May to identify the names and reasons for the requests for extension.