

## ATTACHMENT 1

### Document Review and Meeting to Improve the Document

#### Reviewing the Document

The review period ends **February 8, 1998**. Remember that we are preparing a programmatic rather than a site/project specific document. Accordingly, consequences discussed give you more of a sense of direction of the change rather than the specific magnitude of the change.

This review is a bit different than what you may be use to in a couple of ways:

- We are asking you not only to identify items which need to be improved but also, offer specific advice on how to make the improvements; and
- We are asking each agency to consolidate their comments and reconcile internal differences before submitting its comments.

This last effort will be made easier if all agency reviewers use the enclosed diskette. Its use will eventually allow your consolidator to easily locate and pull together your agency's comments for a given page/section/paragraph/sentence. Having the comments together will then make it easy for your consolidator to determine if there are conflicts, repetition or even a need for the comment.

The following is a description of what you will find in the document and several questions to help focus your review. We do not want you to edit the report. However, we do ask questions such as; are certain chapters readable or are the sections in a chapter in the right order. If you feel compelled to edit, focus on items which you believe are not clearly explained and what you would do to improve the explanation or on items that seem to be repetitive and how you might minimize the repetition or the big errors.

Guide to the Programmatic EIS/EIR - You will not find this in the Table of Contents as it was a late addition. Given that the Programmatic EIS/EIR consists of several documents, we thought it important to help the reader understand how all the pieces fit together. Our sense is that we probably need to add some information about the Phase II Appendix.

- Do you think this section will be helpful?
- Do we need to add more information?
- Is there a more reader friendly approach to arraying this information? What would you suggest?

Introduction - We have tried to blend a variety of topics into this section to give the reader a sense of CALFED and the Program.

- Do we need to add more information?
- Do we need to delete some information?
- Is there a more reader friendly approach to arraying this information? What would you suggest? Are there red flag concerns with the way we have characterized the information? What specific changes do you recommend?
- Are there technical errors or omissions? What specific changes do you recommend?

Alternatives - This section describes the process followed by the Program in identifying alternatives and presents the alternatives in summary form. It goes on to describe the study area, relationships with other programs, outlines the process we are involved in to define the preferred alternative (this will be completed and described in the Public draft at least up to the Alternative with technical and resource management advantages). The chapter finishes with a description of the institutional and regulatory climate and alternatives considered but discarded. There is a lot of information here.

- Do we have it in the best order?
- Do we have more than what we need?
- Do we need to add more information?
- Is there a more reader friendly approach to arraying this information? What would you suggest? Are there red flag concerns with the way we have characterized the information? What specific changes do you recommend?
- Are there technical errors or omissions? What specific changes do you recommend?

Summary Comparison of Consequences - Significant unavoidable impacts are supposed to be identified in bold type in the table. They will be for the Public draft This table provides a narrative summary of the significant consequences, by resource, associated with the implementation of the three over-arching alternatives as well as a description of consequences that will occur in all alternatives as a result of the common programs.

- Is our explanation of what is in this chapter clear?
- Should we present this information differently?
- Are there red flag concerns with the way we characterized any of the information? What specific changes do you recommend?
- Are there technical errors or omissions? What specific changes do you recommend?

Preferred Program - Placeholder

Introduction to Environmental Analysis -The impact analysis in particular gets difficult to follow at times given the number of regions and alternative parts. Accordingly, this is another effort to help the reader understand what they will be reading.

- Do you think this section will be helpful?
- Do we need to add more information?
- Is there a more reader friendly approach to arraying this information? What would you suggest?

This section is also being used to put the potential land use changes (acres), as a result of alternative implementation, in perspective. We are trying to indicate that yes we are going to change existing land uses, but, we don't know where or how many acres. We have identified maximum acres that could potentially be affected but will do everything we can to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts.

- Do we get these points across?
- What might we add to do so?
- Are there red flag concerns with the way we have characterized the information? What specific changes do you recommend?

Affected Environment/Impact Analysis Sections - This is where the rubber hits the road. There is a great deal made of third party impacts associated with groundwater and water transfers. We are on our way to laying out that information but are looking for some help. The document identifies significant unmitigatable impacts in several areas, agricultural resources and urban resources are just two of them. We believe the consultants have overstated this and will work with them to remove these designations. Certainly, there are potentially significant impacts in both areas but, until we get to site specific actions, it is a bit premature to be saying that the impacts are unmitigatable.

- Do you have any documents that describe, in general terms, these third party impacts?
- Do you think our thoughts about unmitigatable impacts is correct particularly at this programmatic level?
- Have we described the existing situation or analyzed impacts correctly for any or all of the resources?
- Have we analyzed all the consequences? What specific additions do you recommend?
- Are there technical errors or omissions? What specific changes do you recommend?
- Have we adequately described mitigation measures? What specific additions would you recommend?
- What do you think about our summary tables? Should we continue to use the characters or should we switch to a narrative?
- Is there a more reader friendly approach to arraying this information? What would you suggest? Are there red flag concerns with the way we have characterized the information? What specific changes do you recommend?

Cumulative Impacts - We have tried to be complete without going to great depth.

- Is our approach OK?
- Is our evaluation OK?
- Are there red flag concerns with the way we have characterized the information? What specific changes do you recommend?
- Are there technical errors or omissions? What specific changes do you recommend?

Other NEPA/CEQA Topics - This is the NEPA/CEQA "cats and dogs" section. Growth Inducing Impacts, Relationship Between Short-term Uses of the Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity and Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources.

- Is our approach OK?
- Is our evaluation OK?
- Are there red flag concerns with the way we have characterized the information? What specific changes do you recommend?
- Are there technical errors or omissions? What specific changes do you recommend?

Compliance with Applicable Laws, Policies and Plans - Doing these evaluations at a programmatic level has been interesting. We have some work to do but, most are complete. I would like to thank those of you responsible for providing some of the information in this chapter and look forward to hearing from some of you so we can fill the holes.

- Have we hit the mark?
- What additional information do we need to have here?
- Are there red flag concerns with the way we have characterized the information? What specific changes do you recommend?
- Are there technical errors or omissions? What specific changes do you recommend?

Public Involvement - This is fairly straight forward.

- Have we missed anything?
- Do we need emphasis added in some areas?
- Are there red flag concerns with the way we have characterized the information? What specific changes do you recommend?

#### Meeting to Improve the Document

We will meet February 9, 10 and 11, 1998, from 9 am to 5 pm in the Resources Building to receive and discuss your comments. You should come with your diskette and a printout of your comments and suggested improvements. The intent of the meeting will be to improve the

document. The meeting will be facilitated and the consultants that drafted the document will be present to note your comments and provide immediate feedback.

Room 1412 has been reserved for February 9 and Room 1131 has been reserved for February 10 and 11. Please check signs posted by the elevator, at our office and the reserved room because rooms may change. Depending on our progress, we may not need all three days but you should plan for them.

Agencies should limit attendance to two people. However, those people can change depending on the topic being discussed. We have only one request, if you do switch people, please bring the new person up to speed with what we are doing so that we do not have to take meeting time.

We are considering having a pre-meeting on February 6; at which time we can layout what we will do on February 9,10 and 11 as well as get a sense of your ideas about the document. We would expect that only the agency consolidator would attend this meeting and it would last for about an hour. We had originally thought about using time on February 9 to highlight each agency's concerns but it may be more prudent to jump right in and get to your ideas chapter by chapter. We will provide a meeting agenda as soon as it is developed but we are considering discussing Chapters in the following order: Guide to EIS/EIR, Chapter 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 6, 7, 8 and 3.