

Addendum to the Final Independent External Peer Review Report Moose Creek Dam, Alaska, Dam Safety Modification Report (DSMR)

Prepared by
Battelle Memorial Institute

Prepared for
Department of the Army
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Risk Management Center
Huntington District

Contract No. W912HQ-15-D-0001
Task Order: W912HQ17F1016

November 9, 2018

BATTELLE
It can be done

This page is intentionally left blank.

CONTRACT NO. W912HQ-15-D-0001
Task Order: W912HQ17F1016

Addendum to the Final Independent External Peer Review Report for the Moose Creek Dam, Alaska, Dam Safety Modification Report (DSMR)

Prepared by

Battelle
505 King Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

for

Department of the Army
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Risk Management Center
Huntington District

November 9, 2018

This page is intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. METHODS	1
2. CONCLUSION	2

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ADEC	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
DSMR	Dam Safety Modification Report
EC	Engineer Circular
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers

1. INTRODUCTION

This is an addendum to the Final Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) Report for the Moose Creek Dam, Alaska, Dam Safety Modification Report (DSMR) (hereinafter: Moose Creek Dam IEPR) submitted on October 16, 2017, by Battelle. It was prepared to document activities associated with the IEPR Panel's review of the public comments on the Moose Creek Dam.

2. METHODS

This section summarizes the activities associated with the review of the public and agency comments conducted for this project.

Battelle received an electronic version of the public comments from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) on October 24, 2018. The single PDF supplied by USACE consisted of a summary table of the public comments and USACE's response, along with copies of the eight comment letters received from various state agencies and members of the general public. No letters were received from Federal agencies or non-governmental organizations. Battelle provided the PDF to the panel members. In accordance with procedures described in the Department of the Army, USACE, Engineer Circular (EC) *Review Policy for Civil Works* (EC 1165-2-217),¹ Battelle focused the IEPR Panel's public comment review on assessing scientific and technical issues pertaining to the assumptions, data, methods, and models used in the project.

Each panel member was asked to independently determine whether the public comments raised any scientific or technical concerns about the project that were not previously identified and that should be addressed by USACE in the Moose Creek Dam project documents. The Panel was charged with focusing on discipline-specific scientific and technical issues and not policy-related comments, per EC 1165-2-217.

Comments submitted by state agencies were provided to the Panel "For Information Only." Battelle understands that under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), USACE must address state agency comments as part of the consultation process; therefore, issues brought up by these agencies, and USACE's subsequent responses, are considered policy-related.

The Moose Creek Dam IEPR panel members received the public and agency comments from Battelle on November 1, 2018. The panel members reviewed emails from both state agencies and members of the general public. No emails, letters, or comment cards from companies, non-profit organizations, or Federal agencies were provided by USACE.

The panel members were required to answer one charge question about the public comments.

1. Do the public comments raise any additional discipline-specific technical concerns with regard to the overall report?

The panel members submitted responses to this charge question, and Battelle reviewed those responses to identify any issues, areas of potential conflict, and other overall impressions. Each panel member's

¹ USACE (2018). *Water Resources Policies and Authorities: Review Policy for Civil Works*. Engineer Circular (EC) 1165-2-217. Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C. February 20.

individual comments were shared with the full Panel. Battelle then discussed and confirmed via email whether any of their identified issues should be carried forward as Final Panel Comments.

Battelle prepared this addendum based on the Panel's review. There was no direct communication between the Panel and USACE during the review of the public comments and preparation of this Addendum.

2. CONCLUSION

Based on the Panel's review, most of the public comments were general questions, statements, or concerns about various aspects of the project. Two issues related to the Panel's review were raised in the general public comments: (1) potential groundwater issues and (2) the location and costs associated with obtaining borrow and protecting the borrow area from access during flooding. Since USACE provided their responses to these comments, the Panel took these responses into account, agreeing with the responses provided by the USACE to these comments. Therefore, a new Final Panel Comment was not warranted for these issues.

The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) (Comment Number: ADEC_AQ_1) expressed concern about a lack of information supporting the determination of air quality conformity. The Panel noted that they agree with ADEC's comment that the analysis of potential impacts on air quality associated with construction equipment is incomplete. However, the Panel also noted USACE responded that they will update the assessment. Because the Panel agreed with USACE's response and because concerns raised by agencies are deemed policy-related, a new Final Panel Comment was not warranted.

Therefore, no additional scientific or technical concerns were identified that should be carried forward as Final Panel Comments.

This page is intentionally left blank.

BATTELLE

It can be done