ISETR preliminary consideration of HC models and analysis to date

Omaha, NE

November 16, 2016

Presentation today…

- **ISETR is only going to address the 5 Human Consideration (HC) questions for which we have sufficient information to respond at this time.**

1a. What kind of information have you received from the USACE regarding the models for the 13 interest areas?

- 5 models with results applied to alternatives
  - Cultural
  - Thermal Power
  - Water supply
  - Irrigation
  - Navigation

1b. What kind of information are you still waiting for?

- **8 more sets of models with results**
- **DEIS and accompanying Technical Reports**

2a. Is there sufficient documentation of the HC models and how they are used?

- **For 4 of the 5 models applied to EIS alternatives we have sufficient information**

2b. Should MRRIC members be able to understand how the models were used?

- **ISETR was able to follow information provided**

2c. Should MRRIC members feel confident in the accuracy of the results of the HC analysis?

- **Mostly yes, if define accuracy as ability to differentiate between or to rank alternatives**

3a. Is it clear from the HC model documentation whether the district quality control process with the national centers of expertise discovered any significant issues with the models?

- A system of internal review was developed, followed and documented

3b. How were any significant issues with the models addressed?

- **Comment and response between reviewer and author**

4a. Based on the information you have so far, what is your overall assessment of the HC model inputs (e.g., data used, how data gaps were filled, etc.)?

- **The model inputs appear adequate for the purpose of ranking alternatives**

4b. Is there sufficient documentation regarding the inputs?

- **Yes, including aggregation to protect confidential information about sites**

4c. What deficiencies, if any, have you noticed?

- **Over-reliance on averages when more detailed information is available in the model documentation**

- **Need improved documentation on why sites (e.g., some water intakes, etc.) were included versus excluded from analysis in the four models**

5. Is there sufficient documentation of these assumptions?

- **Yes, in 4 of the 5 models reviewed**

Thank you

- **Questions?**