Charge to Delta ISB for Review of the Draft BDCP EIR/S

Completeness, Structure and Effectiveness of Description

1. Are the project objectives and purpose clearly articulated, to enable the identification of a reasonable range of alternatives?
2. Are the alternatives clearly defined?
3. From a scientific perspective, does the EIR evaluate a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that would reduce or eliminate significant impacts of the project and obtain most of the basic project objectives and purpose? If potentially feasible alternatives are not fully evaluated, is a clear rationale provided as to why not? Are there potentially feasible alternatives that would reduce or eliminate significant impacts of the project and obtain most of the basic project objectives that should have been considered (and either rejected or fully evaluated) but were not?
4. Are the alternatives studied in adequate detail to differentiate outcomes among the alternatives?
5. Overall are the analyses reasonable and scientifically defensible? How clearly are the roll-up comparisons among alternatives conveyed in the text, figures and tables?

Approach, Analysis, Tools and Modeling

1. Does the environmental impact analysis utilize appropriate evaluation methods? Were tools/analyses appropriate and described adequately?
2. How well is uncertainty addressed and communicated?
3. Do the analyses describe sensitivity of conclusions to assumptions and uncertainty and how possible conflicting data and analyses are interpreted?
4. Is best available science employed in the environmental analysis of project alternatives and their effects?
5. Are assumptions used in modeling and for analytical purposes clearly articulated and reasonable considering the complexity and current scientific understanding?

Monitoring and Adaptive Management

1. How well is the overall adaptive management strategy described and are the goals of the adaptive management plan achievable?
2. Is the proposed monitoring adequate for evaluation of how well implementation is achieving goals and objectives, and are the data management, analysis, reporting and decision making processes also adequate to create a defensible and transparent implementation of adaptive management?

Statutory Questions

1. Comment on the scientific basis and clarity of the following:
   (a) the review and analysis of the range of flow criteria, rates of diversion, and other operational criteria required to satisfy the criteria for approval of a natural community conservation plan as provided in subdivision (a) of Section 2820 of the Fish and Game Code, and other operational requirements and flows necessary for recovering the Delta ecosystem and restoring fisheries under a reasonable range of hydrologic conditions, which will identify the remaining water available for export and other beneficial uses.
   (b) the potential effects of climate change (including possible sea level rise up to 55 inches), and possible changes in total precipitation and runoff patterns on the conveyance alternatives and habitat restoration activities considered in the EIR.
   (c) the potential effects on migratory fish and aquatic resources.
   (d) the potential effects of each Delta conveyance alternative on Delta water quality.