

**Draft Charge to the Delta ISB for the 2015 Review of the
RDEIR/SDEIS for BDCP/California WaterFix**

7-22-15

- Have previous concerns of the Delta ISB been addressed (or not) *and* are there new areas of concern given the change in focus on just the conveyance proposal and its alignment with a differing set of regulations?
 - How do scaling back the project time frame, changing the regulatory setting, and partitioning out most of the habitat restoration into California EcoRestore affects previous Delta ISB concerns?
 - Are there new issues stemming from replacement of Alternative 4 with 4A?
- Address the questions posed in the second (“Approach, Analysis, Tools and Modeling”) and third (“Monitoring and Adaptive Management”) sections of our original charge, although in less detail than before, guided by the question asked at the beginning of the earlier DISB review report: “Do the analyses use science that is good enough, and use it well enough, for a project that is so large, complex, expensive, long-lasting, and important?”
- Focus on Alternative 4A and comment on the other Alternatives if there are serious scientific problems not otherwise noted (or obvious advantages, scientifically). Address any differences between Alternative 4A and the previous Alternative 4 that would create new scientific concerns.
- Comment on the adequacy of considering flow and incorporating climate change and sea-level rise. Or briefly summarize whether the points we raised previously have been addressed or remain, based on a general scanning of the new documents.