

# ISETR Thoughts for MRRIC regarding EIS/MP and AMP v4

Kansas City

February 25, 2016

# MP/EIS 1: MRRIC Understanding of Process and Opportunities for Engagement

- Graham described (in Nov) use of proxy results into definition of alternatives to be considered in EIS.
- The Corps has presented a diagram leading to selection of an MRRMP alternative and ROD, given EIS results, ESA consultation, EA results, PrOACT process with MRRIC, AM Plan development, and other considerations.
- It describes the process and interactions that will occur leading to these decisions, and extensive discussion has allowed members to see where they have opportunity for further input.

AMP 1: Is chapter 5 (HC Chapter) being developed with appropriate guiding principles in mind?

- In general, yes.

# AMP 2: How to Prioritize What HC Metrics to be Monitored?

- Use the maximum harm as a way to prioritize (ideally in monetary terms to reflect the magnitude of the harm—total effects versus large harm to one small group).
  - Life, property, # of people affected, \$'s
- Monitor metrics of perceived harm to empirically demonstrate actual or no harm.
- When a metric cannot be monetized, it may be treated as a constraint, or qualitatively or semi-quantitatively. (Four accounts).
- As applicable, monitoring should include impacts on the Mississippi.

# AMP 3: How Members Could be Included in the Monitoring Process?

- Leverage monitoring that members already do for their own purposes.
- Use an online system for members to report effects on them. (Would need validation means).
- Members access monitoring results (real time flow/stage) and review assessment/interpretation of monitoring results.

# AMP 4: Monitor Actions Other Than Flows?

- Construction – could affect other uses of the river.
- Land purchase – could affect tax base and other local neighborhood/government interests.

# AMP 5: Techniques to compare risk to the listed species with risk of adjusted or new management actions to member interests?

- Species must be saved regardless of costs – the real tradeoffs are among the alternative means of saving the species.
- Information for tradeoffs may be revealed from results to be reported in Chapter 4 of the EIS.
- Risk of HC actions can be measured by multiplying the expected harm (\$ if possible) associated by an event by the relevant probability.

AMP 6: How can AM Plan provide space for flexibility in implementing actions despite highly constrained decision making processes internally within the USACE?

- Agree on thresholds/decision criteria that trigger wider consultation.

# Timing/Solutions?

- Share model results (data used, assumptions, interpretations) with MRRIC and ISETR at November meeting (or February, or January?) including opportunity for interaction with modelers.
- Provide results confidentially to ISETR to review as they become available?
- Adequacy of 60-day review period – extend to 90?