

Date: 1/6/2003 11:00 AM

Sender:
To:
cc:

(b)(6)(b)(7)(C)

Priority: Normal

Subject: Re[2]: RE: PEIS Tucson-Yuma

OK, after 25 exchanges on this issue, and it looks like I have at least that many more to go in my inbox, I am compelled to break in here and stop this vicious circle.

1) If we send something out that is part of the required NEPA process and requires feedback, we should keep a log of who we sent it to, when it was sent and how many copies were transmitted. That is just good business practice.

2) I do not want to get caught sending 25 paper copies of a huge document to environmental organizations - someone has already mentioned the tree issue. Send what is required by law for sure. In this day of modern technology, I am of the opinion that I am obligated to provide an easy and fairly universal outlet for the information to be displayed or downloaded. It is not my problem that the environmental organizations' equipment is one step above an abacus - they can go to the library or upgrade to Windows 98 and a Pentium III...!

3) Perhaps it would be prudent to consider CD ROMs for the larger documents - the technology is cheap, it is not hard to do and it would save on postal expenses.

4) While I appreciate being included in the traffic on this subject and understand the relevance it has to some important issues currently before us, I am not sure that I or (b)(6) need to be included in ALL of the detail. Include me when (b)(6) is not available or when (b)(6) and (b)(6) are not around. I want to be kept informed, but do not need to know that DOW has requested more copies of the PEIS, etc.

Keep up the good work. Thanks (b)(6)

Reply Separator

Subject: Re:RE: RE: PEIS Tucson-Yuma
Author: (b)(6)
Date: 1/2/2003 12:03 PM

I have one more suggestion that HQ would have to approve. That is to tell the requester how much it will cost to have the document prepared and mailed. Can you let me know what it costs to reproduce and ship?

Reply Separator

Subject: RE: RE: PEIS Tucson-Yuma
Author: (b)(6)
Date: 1/2/2003 2:41 PM

(b)(6)

Two more copies of the Draft PEIS will be sent to (b)(6). However, there are no more hard copies of the document available and therefore these two additional copies will have to be reproduced and can not be mailed out until sometime tomorrow. If additional request for copies are made I have three recommendations: 1) the DPEIS can be provided via cd (no more hard copies) 2) refer to section 9 of the DPEIS and see at what libraries DPEIS can be viewed or 3) go to the following web site:
<http://www.swf.usace.army.mil/ins/Pages/Publicreview.cfm>. In either case there are a number of alternatives available where the DPEIS can be read

Without requesting additional copies when one has already been provided.

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) (b)(6)
Sent: Thursday, January 02, 2003 9:27 AM
To: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: Re:RE: PEIS Tucson-Yuma

(b)(6)

Just got your message. One copy was sent by GSRC and recieved by (b)(6)

(b)(6)

(according to (b)(6) DOW) on 12/30/02. (b)(6) requested 2 additional copies on 12/30/02 which was the substance of my e-mail on that day. HQ-INS okayed the release of those copies to DOW. I am assuming that GSRC will be sending those copies.

Reply Separator

Subject: RE: PEIS Tucson-Yuma
Author: (b)(6)
Date: 1/2/2003 12:16 PM

(b)(6)

As a follow-up to this message, I believe that the DOW did receive the requested additional copy of the draft PEIS and wanted still more copies to review. Is this still the case and if so how many additional copies are they requesting? I hate to have the additional copies of this document sent only to find out that it was in their possession all along, as was the case with the EPA.

Please have (b)(6) go the following web site: (b)(6) to review the document.

Thanks

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) (b)(6)
Sent: Monday, December 30, 2002 1:22 PM
To: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: PEIS (b) (7)(E)

(b)(6)

I just received a call from (b)(6) at the Defenders of Wildlife (DOW). Apparently they have not received a copy of the PEIS for Tucson / Yuma Sectors. (b)(6) also indicated that several other organizations have not received the report. He was very interested in reviewing the Endangered Species List. He further indicated that he has been trying to download the report from the web site with much trouble. I suspect the document is a very big file and takes a lot of time to download. I spoke to

(b)(6) at Gulf South Research Corporation (GSRC). (b)(6) said that he mailed the document regular mail to (b)(6) on October 30, 2002 without a Return Receipt Requested.

On your behalf, I have requested GSRC (b)(6) to send the DOW a copy of the document with a Return Receipt Requested. He was going to send it FEDEX overnight. In addition, I have requested that GSRC change (b)(6) to (b)(6) on the stakeholders list for DOW. I have called (b)(6) back and informed him that we are having the report sent to him at DOW.

It is recommended that all future governmental or public submittals be sent Return Receipt Requested in order to ascertain whether the submittals are being received at their appropriate destinations.



TMP.HTM