

# DRAFT

## **Timeline & Template Ideas for DCP EIR/EIS chapter and Document Review**

Delta Independent Science Board

12 July 2022

**Timeline** - Our 90-day review timeline probably needs some internal targets:

Day 30-40 – complete preliminary chapter reviews for further refinement and discussion

Day 40-50 – initial compilation of major themes

Day 60 – Initial draft of mail report and appendix containing chapter reviews

Day 90 – Approval of final DISB review document and appendix

Use a template for comments for each chapter reviewed and for the document overall.

### **A simple template**

Chapter (Chapter 5 – Water Supply Reliability, or overall document)

Delta ISB Reviewer(s) (Jay Lund)

Date of comments (June 27, 2022)

1. Overall Assessment (Keep concise, perhaps only a paragraph but < one page)
2. Major Comments
  - 2.1. The first major comment
3. Lesser comments
  - 3.1. The first lesser comment
4. References
5. Any appendix materials or calculations

Supplementary comments [Essentially a scratch pad for more detailed suggestions, calculations, diagrams, etc.]

### **A different template idea**

Chapter (X)

Delta ISB lead Reviewer(s)

Date of comments

1. Summary
2. Issues for construction impacts
3. Issues for operations impacts
4. Issues for comparative analyses of alternatives
5. Is the scientific approach robust?
6. How this Chapter helps inform adaptive management
7. Major points from the chapter review
8. References

# DRAFT

## Questions to consider

### ***I. Scope of Impacts Covered***

- a. Are the impacts addressed complete and have known omissions and uncertainties been acknowledged (including links to other chapters)?
- b. Is the level of analytic detail consistent with the importance of the impact being assessed?
- c. Is an adaptive management process proposed?

### ***II. Quality of Analysis***

- a. Is the literature cited appropriate?
- b. Are the models and reasoning employed the "best available"? Are the methods appropriate?
  - a. Has both the magnitude of change and the sensitivity of the receptor been evaluated?
  - b. Has the scarcity or the substitutability of the resource been incorporated in the impact assessment?
  - c. Has the likelihood of uncertain impacts been discussed?
- c. Are assumptions clear and well documented? Are the inputs (or other basic facts) to the models and reasoning appropriate and reflect current data and understanding?
- d. Where modeling and interpretive reasoning are employed, are they appropriate?
- e. Has climate change been appropriately considered and incorporated?
- f. Have the strengths and weaknesses of the alternatives considered been evaluated in a balanced way?
- g. Is the effectiveness of plans to avoid, minimize and mitigate negative impacts supported by the scientific analysis?