

## Organization and Review of the 2<sup>nd</sup> RTC

### Introduction:

Attached is the Response to Comment 2<sup>nd</sup> Administrative Draft for the CALFED Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. New responses that have been added since the release of the 1<sup>st</sup> Administrative Draft RTC are noted with an asterisk in the upper left hand corner of the response. Responses that have been altered since the 1<sup>st</sup> Administrative Draft RTC as a result of internal reviews and/or agency comments are indicated by underlined or strike out text.

### Organization:

The organization of this document is similar to the Draft Programmatic EIS/EIR (Draft). The Draft contained the EIS/EIR and fourteen separate appendices. Response to comments that specifically addressed an impact analysis issue can be found in Volume I of the RTC. Comments that specifically addressed a program issue are located in Volume II.

Each section of the RTC is organized by the original table of contents in the corresponding document in the Draft. For example, if a comment referred to the CALFED approach to a solution for trace metals, which appeared in Chapter 9.5 of the Water Quality Program Plan Technical Appendix, the response to that comment would be located in Chapter 9.5 of the Water Quality Program Plan Technical Appendix Section of the RTC. The beginning of each RTC section has a general comments segment which addresses comments specific to that section but not specific to any chapter of the section. Letter and comment numbers that generated a response are located below each of the responses. Example: 1209.2 would indicate letter 1209, comment 2.

Formats of the various sections are not entirely consistent. Due to the rapid turnaround to release this draft, no editing has been performed. We apologize for any inconvenience this may cause.

### Review and Comments:

Please do not take the time to make editorial comments. We will have professional editors put the final RTC together. Your review should focus on the following listed items.

- technical errors or omissions
- inconsistencies between programs or between the impact analysis and program plans
- unclear ideas
- inaccurate information

When you identify one of these items, please offer specific advice on how to make improvements. Please identify the response to which you are providing comments by writing the final response code, found in the upper right hand corner of each response, above your comment.

Several chapters of the Impact Analysis section of the Draft address NEPA/CEQA compliance issues. Please have your agency NEPA/CEQA practitioners closely review responses to comments on Chapters 1, 2, 8, 9 and 10 of the Impact Analysis section of the RTC.

If you wish to view a comment letter, go to the chronological list of letters on the web page, <http://calfed.ca.gov>, and click on the letter you wish to view.

#### **Common Responses:**

Several comments voiced support or opposition to CALFED Program elements in broad, nonspecific ways. For example, several comments suggested that CALFED not consider any storage options until all water conservation efforts have been implemented; other comments simply stated "no new dams" or "build more storage." In response to these types of comments, CALFED drafted a series of "common responses" which explain in general terms the concepts and understanding of Program elements behind these common topics. All of the common responses that are presented in this package have been given to the small group and agency liaisons, some of whom have submitted revisions.

Agency comments were received and reviewed for all but three common responses (CR 7, CR8, and CR9). The revised common responses, with the exception of CR 14, Water Quality, are printed in this package. CR 14 will be revised and is attached to this cover. There are two new common responses as well: CR 19, Assurances and CR 23, Public Trust Doctrine.

The following common responses are included in this package:

- CR 1, Programmatic nature of the document
- CR 2, Water Conservation
- CR 3, Restoration efforts
- CR 4, Water Storage
- CR 5, Alternatives
- CR 6, Groundwater is the best alternative
- CR 10, Baselines
- CR 11, Current agricultural practices
- CR 12, No adverse effects to agricultural land
- CR 13, Protect water rights and area of origin
- CR 14, Water Quality
- CR 15, Stop sending water to L.A.
- CR 16, Isolated Facility and Peripheral Canal
- CR 17, Growth and planning restriction
- CR 18, Desalinization
- CR 19, Assurances
- CR 20, Not Following Solution Principles
- CR 21, Nonstructural Solutions
- CR 22, Will CALFED solve California's water problems
- CR 23, Public trust doctrine

**Questions:**

If you have questions regarding the format of the RTC, please call Campbell Ingram at (916) 654-2733. If you have difficulty locating a comment letter on the CALFED website, please call Thien Nguyen at (916) 654-9834. Thank you in advance for your participation in this review.