Comment Report: All Comments
Project: Puerto Rico_Rio Grande de Manati
Review: FY20 Final Feasibility Report DQC Review
Displaying 29 comments for the criteria specified in this report.

Id	Discipline	DocType	Spec	Sheet	Detail
8613516	Cultural Resources	Feasibility Study	Section 3.6.8 page 86	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Cultural Resources

Portions of the cultural resources sections in 2.2.9 were deleted. Therefore acronym APE has not been previously defined. Recommend reinserting language in 2.2.9 or defining APE in Section 3.6.8.

Submitted By: Meredith Moreno (904-232-1577). Submitted On: Jun 01 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Added it to the first instance

Submitted By: Christopher Altes (904-2321694) Submitted On: Jun 02 2020
Backcheck not conducted

2-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Much of the information in this section as removed per a comment received during the policy review. However, I agree that the definition of the APE is necessary to define where we looked for existing cultural resources. Therefore, I also added the definition/description of the APE back into section 2.2.9.

Submitted By: Eric Merriam (412-395-7185) Submitted On: Jun 03 2020

2-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Meredith Moreno (904-232-1577) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8613529	Cultural Resources	Feasibility Study	Section 3.6.8 page 86	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Cultural Resources

First line of analysis references Section 2.2.12. This is not a correct reference

Submitted By: Meredith Moreno (904-232-1577). Submitted On: Jun 01 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Reference to 2.2.12 was removed. Updating the reference was not necessary given that the terms 'direct effects' and 'indirect effects' are subsequently defined in this section.

Submitted By: Eric Merriam (412-395-7185) Submitted On: Jun 03 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Meredith Moreno (904-232-1577) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8613535 Cultural Resources Feasibility Study Section 3.6.8 page 87 n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Cultural Resources

Finalized programmatic agreement will need to be referenced in Alternative 3 before finalization of EA. Current language will need to be changed to reference executed PA and date

Submitted By: Meredith Moreno (904-232-1577). Submitted On: Jun 01 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
PA is routing in GEARS. 4JUN20 it is with Milan Mora.

Submitted By: Christopher Altes (904-2321694) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Meredith Moreno (904-232-1577) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8613540 Cultural Resources Feasibility Study Section 5.1.8 page 104 n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Cultural Resources

Highlighted date must be updated with execution of PA date prior to finalization of EA

Submitted By: Meredith Moreno (904-232-1577). Submitted On: Jun 01 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
PA routing in GEARS. Will update when signed.

Submitted By: Eric Merriam (412-395-7185) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Meredith Moreno (904-232-1577) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8613542	Cultural Resources	Feasibility Study	Section 5.4 page 104	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Cultural Resources

highlighted date of executed PA must be added before finalization of EA

Submitted By: Meredith Moreno (904-232-1577). Submitted On: Jun 01 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
PA routing in GEARS. Will update when signed.

Submitted By: Christopher Altes (904-2321694) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Meredith Moreno (904-232-1577) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8613548	Cultural Resources	Feasibility Study	FONSI pg. 124	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Cultural Resources

Update date of agreement prior to finalization of EA

Submitted By: Meredith Moreno (904-232-1577). Submitted On: Jun 01 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
PA routing in GEARS. Will update when date is available.

Submitted By: Christopher Altes (904-2321694) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Meredith Moreno (904-232-1577) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8613850	Civil	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Comments for the Integrated Feasibility Report and Appendix A were provided to the team leader through email.

Submitted By: William O'Shea (4123957604). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**

Comments provided via email were addressed thusly:
1. Those comments related to Appendix A - Attachment 3 (H&H Info) were addressed. Paragraph numbering was corrected.

2. Feas Report comments were passed on to the PM for response and if required the referenced Paragraph items will be revised relative to how Policy guidance was provided to the PDT / PM team.

Submitted By: John Rusnak (412-395-7239) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: William O'Shea (4123957604) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8613863	Hydraulics	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Hydraulics

Appendix A - Attachment 3 H&H Information

From Section 1.3 to 1.6 (pages 5 to 8), and Section 3 (page 16) update the sections referenced in the text. Most of the sections in the text consist of the format 1.x.x.x.x, whereas the section headings are 1.x.x.x.

Submitted By: William O'Shea (4123957604). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**

The sections referenced will be updated to match the corresponding headings.

Submitted By: Christina Urbanczyk (4123957202) Submitted On: Jun 03 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: William O'Shea (4123957604) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8613865	Hydraulics	Design Memorandum or Report	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Hydraulics

Appendix A - Attachment 3 H&H Information

In Section 1.6.1.1 Geometry:
"The baseline geometry for this alternative was copied from the geometry for Alternative 0 (No Action), as described in section 1.3.1.1.1, and then the following adjustment was made: 1) modification to the channel geometry and Manning's n roughness coefficient from cross section 33704 to 30753, as described in section 2.1.3.5 above." It is unclear what section 2.1.3.5 is referring to.

Submitted By: William O'Shea (4123957604). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Reference to section 2.1.3.5 will be removed.

Submitted By: Christina Urbanczyk (4123957202) Submitted On: Jun 03 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: William O'Shea (4123957604) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8614378	Geotechnical	Engineering Appendix	Appendix A- Section 2.1.4.1	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**

The channel dimension as stated in the second sentence of Section 2.1.4.1 does not match with Figure 15. Please resolve the inconsistency and revise as needed.

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Channel dimensions in both locations were revised to match.

Submitted By: John Rusnak (412-395-7239) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8614385	Biology-Ecology	Feasibility Study	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**

The BCR is different in a number of places (1.3, 1.73, 1.75). Section 4 of the exec summary states "Non-structural relocations have a ... benefit cost ratio of 1.73." but Section 3.5.1 and the table 3-3 states the BCR for Alt 3 is 1.3. Table 3-7 and the 2 paragraphs following the table say 1.75. Section 4.2.2 and Table 4-2 say 1.73. Please clarify or make these consistent.

Submitted By: Bobbi McClain (412-395-7220). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**

These BCRs are actually correct. Alternative 3 includes both the relocations and floodwall, whereas alternative 3B (optimized/recommended plan) only includes the relocations. That accounts for the much lower BCR for Alt. 3 (1.3 in Table 3-3) as compared to 3B.

The original Alternative 3 had a contingency of 39%, which was based on an abbreviated risk analysis. With this 39% contingency, the BCR for only the non-structural relocations is 1.75 (Table 3-7). An updated abbreviated risk analysis was completed for the recommended plan after optimization, which resulted in a contingency of 44% being applied. This accounts for the slightly lower BCR (1.73) and higher total project costs for the relocations in Table 4-2.

To clarify, I included contingencies for all alternatives in Tables 3-3, 3-7 and 4-2. Thus, the difference in BCR between the tables is now reflected in the differing contingencies.

Submitted By: Eric Merriam (412-395-7185) Submitted On: Jun 03 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Bobbi McClain (412-395-7220) Submitted On: Jun 03 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8614390	Geotechnical	Engineering Appendix	Appendix A- Section 1.4	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**

Shall we revise the second paragraph of Section 1.4 to remove streambed stabilization and scour protection?

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**

Every attempt has been made to revise language in all Appendix A (and related geotechnical Attachment) removing reference to streambank stabilization and scour protection as these items relate to the prior recommended plan.
However, These two items are still included as items identified as problems. However, they have been removed from consideration as Flood Risk Management Measures and

references removed from the revised recommended plan..

Submitted By: John Rusnak (412-395-7239) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8614391 Biology-Ecology Feasibility Study n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**

Table 3-5, Alt 4 shows a positive environmental effect – but under 3.5.2.3 EQ we stated that Alt 4 would have significant negative effects. I understand that it would help with water quality (in that the WTP would be protected), but this is confusing. Can we add clarity? Maybe break Environmental improvement into two rows – one specific to water quality and the other to aquatic/riparian habitats or other resources noted as impacted in the EQ section?

Submitted By: Bobbi McClain (412-395-7220). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
I took your recommendation and split the environmental improvements opportunity into two separate sections – water quality and habitat. Alternative 4 was changed to have a negative impact on habitat, as well as on water quality. Discussions with the environmental lead indicated that channelization would impact water quality potentially through changes in groundwater inputs, as well as through warming along the concrete channel. Alternatives 1 (floodwall/levee) and 2 (channel modification) were also noted as having negative impacts on habitat.

Submitted By: Eric Merriam (412-395-7185) Submitted On: Jun 03 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Bobbi McClain (412-395-7220) Submitted On: Jun 03 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8614393 Biology-Ecology Feasibility Study n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**

Minor editorial comments provided to the study lead via email.

Submitted By: Bobbi McClain (412-395-7220). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Detailed responses to all comments were provided to the reviewer for backcheck.

Submitted By: Eric Merriam (412-395-7185) Submitted On: Jun 03 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Bobbi McClain (412-395-7220) Submitted On: Jun 03 2020
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8614394	Geotechnical	Engineering Appendix	Appendix A- Section 1.5	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**

Shall we revise the second paragraph of Section 1.5 to remove stream bank stabilization and scour protection?

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
See prior comment response related to these measures. They are removed from the recommended plan.

Submitted By: John Rusnak (412-395-7239) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8614430	Geotechnical	Engineering Appendix	Appendix A- Section 3.1.1	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**

Please confirm if additional site specific exploration/investigation will be needed for the recommended plan as described in Section 4 of Integrated Feasibility Study Report.

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
No additional geotechnical site investigation / exploration will be needed to implement the revised Recommended Plan.

Submitted By: John Rusnak (412-395-7239) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8614435	Geotechnical	Engineering Appendix	Appendix A, Attachment 2- Section 2.2	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**

Please confirm if additional site specific exploration/investigation will be needed for the recommended plan as described in Section 4 of Integrated Feasibility Study Report.

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
No additional geotechnical site investigation / exploration will be needed to implement the Recommended Plan.

Submitted By: John Rusnak (412-395-7239) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8614444	Geotechnical	Engineering Appendix	Appendix A, Attachment 2- Section 2.2	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**

Revise Section 2.2.1, particularly the third paragraph in order to remove stream bank protection (Riprap/Rock Buttress) alternative.

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Deleted last sentence related to scour protection of bridge abutments / piers.

Submitted By: John Rusnak (412-395-7239) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8614471	Geotechnical	Engineering Appendix	Appendix A, Attachment 2- Section 2.3	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**

Revise Section 2.3 to remove any river bank riprap protection/buttress. Delete or reword second paragraph.

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Revised Section 2.3 / deleted reference related to buttressing and designs for slope failure.

Submitted By: John Rusnak (412-395-7239) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Prem Itani (4123597532) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8614946	Real Estate	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
(Document Reference: Appendix E)

Real Estate Plan Appendix Comments consolidated here:

Page 2: "Table 1 Federal Cost" is on Page 13, not page 11. Title used "Federal Cost" is not consistent with the "Summary of Project Real Estate Costs". Use one or the other.

Page 5: The last sentence refers to a "Non-Structural Relocation Map below", there is no map anywhere in the next pages following that sentence.

Page 6: Overview map is of poor quality and resolution. The previous versions of the REP corrected this. Further, no Non-Structural Relocation Map attached.

Page 7: Correct the term "Structure Buyout List" as it does not match with the table or vice versa.

Page 8: Use a high quality image and resolution of the table with correct titles. The table attached is of poor quality and resolution. The previous versions of the REP corrected this. Since this table is not right above or below the visual map, recommend that the map in the appendix refer to this page for easier reference.

Page 9: Correct grammar per comments provided previously: Recommendation: The fee simple estate is the standard estate that will be acquired in accordance with EC 405-1-11; there is no anticipation of using a non-standard estate.

Page 11: last sentence in Section 17.0: a cultural resource compliance memo will be obtained.

Page 14: Acquisition Schedule. According to the schedule, it takes over 4 years to acquire with

condemnation and 3 years without. How did we determine that an additional year was added to the timeline since our last review of the REP? Is this unique to the Puerto Rico territory or based on the previous work with USACE?

Page 17: Use better resolution and not a screen shot paste of PDF.

Page 19: An overall map of the structures need to be included to see where they are in relation to the project boundaries.

Page 20: Sentence on bottom: Not property boundaries are shown? Reword?

Page 21 and Page 23: No descriptions of photos attached. Also, include high resolution and same sized photos.

Submitted By: Ken Lieu (412-395-7535). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

Revised Jun 02 2020.

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**

Page 2,5,7,9,11 was changed in the REP.
Page 14 - The schedule was changed based on conversations the PM had with Division and Headquarters and they thought three years for the acquisitions was more realistic and if needed another year for condemnation.
The maps were updated and will added to the REP for 6,8,17,19,and 20. Text was added for 21 and 23 but the photo size could be changed without losing resolution.

Submitted By: James Kelly (412-395-7135) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**

2nd and 3rd rounds of corrections completed and correction made on 6/5/2020. Final copy submitted. Close comments.

Submitted By: Ken Lieu (412-395-7535) Submitted On: Jun 05 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8615090 Economics Feasibility Study n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
(Document Reference: Appendix C – Economic Analysis, Section 1.1 Project Area, Page 3, Figure 2)

It should be annotated that this figure shows reach B only, and not the entire project reach.

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**

Concur; Figure 2 shows Reaches A, B, and C. A statement has been added as to why Reach D is not shown (0 structures inundated by a 25-year event) and the figure title was updated for clarification.

Submitted By: Susannah Byrd (412-395-7164) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8615095 Economics Feasibility Study n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**

(Document Reference: Appendix C – Economic Analysis, Section 3.3.3.1 Depth of Flooding, Page 24, Paragraph 1, Sentence 6)

The report states, "Alternative 2 (Figure 8) does not reduce inundation boundary, but depths are significantly reduced." However, when comparing Figure 2 with Figure 8, it appears that the inundation boundary does change as some structure appear no longer to be inundated.

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**

Concur; this sentence was revised to state the boundary does not significantly change.

Submitted By: Susannah Byrd (412-395-7164) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**

Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8615096 Economics Feasibility Study n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**

(Document Reference: Appendix C – Economic Analysis, Section 3.3.3.1 Depth of Flooding, Page 24 & 25, Figures 7, 8, and 9)

It should be annotated that these figures show reach B only, and not the entire project reach.

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**

Concur; this was made more clear in the paragraph and the figure titles were updated to state they only include Reaches A, B, and C.

Submitted By: Susannah Byrd (412-395-7164) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8615097 Economics Feasibility Study n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
(Document Reference: Appendix C – Economic Analysis, Section 6.1 Hazard, Page 42, Table 39)

The 0.01 Annual Chance Exceedance at River Station 30282.54 is incorrect. It is listed as 18.52. Maybe it should be 128.52 in order to track correctly. Additionally the 0.2 Annual Chance Exceedance at River Station 31444.64 should be 102.87 (it is missing the decimal point).

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Both of these values were corrected.

Submitted By: Susannah Byrd (412-395-7164) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8615098 Economics Feasibility Study n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
(Document Reference: Appendix C – Economic Analysis, Page 42 Table 42, Page 46 Table 49, and Page 47 Table 50)

What is the difference between the total 1st cost of the NS Relocations of $13,691 for the NS Relocations in Table 42, and the Total First Cost of $13,777 for Alt. 3B in Table 49 and Table 50? What makes up that difference of $86? Is there anywhere to verify that additional $86?

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
The 1st NS relocations cost (Table 42) is part of Alternative 3; Tables 49 & 50 represent Alternative 3B. Although they have the same management measure, they have a slightly different cost due to the amount of contingency included in the estimated costs. Footnotes were added to these tables that show each alternatives' cost contingency percentage.

Submitted By: Susannah Byrd (412-395-7164) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8615105 Economics Feasibility Study n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
(Document Reference: Main Report, Section 2.2.3.2 Flood Damages, Page 15, Table 2-1)

The Main Report identifies 159 structures for the Total structure inventory, while in the Economic Appendix C the total structure inventory is listed as 158. The one structure difference is in the commercial structure category. Please correct the appropriate table or identify why there is a difference. (Table 2-6 on Page 35 also has structure inventory as 159).

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
The economic appendix, and the economic modeling, includes 158 structures. The main report includes 159 because the gross appraisal (May 2020) found that what was thought to be a single structure is actually two structures on one parcel. The structure values do not change because the same amount of square footage was accounted for when developing the depreciated replacement values. Essentially, the two inventories are the same, but account for the structures slightly differently.

A description of this difference was added below Table 4 in the economic appendix.

Submitted By: Susannah Byrd (412-395-7164) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020
Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8615110 Economics Feasibility Study n/a n/a n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
(Document Reference: Main Report, Section 3.4.3 Summary of Alternatives, Page 53)

Total structure inventory for Alternative 3 Non-structural relocations is identified as 59 structures. Page 35 of Economic Appendix C identifies 58 structures. Please correct where necessary or identify why there is a difference. (Page 64, Page 68, & Page 91 also lists 59 structures).

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204). Submitted On: Jun 02 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
See response to previous comment regarding the discrepancy between 158 and 159 structures in the study area.

Submitted By: Susannah Byrd (412-395-7164) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Joe DeLucia (412-395-7204) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8616215	Civil	Engineering Appendix	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**
Coordinating Discipline(s): Civil

Comments on final Appendix emailed to lead engineer for incorporation.

Submitted By: Tim Sturm (4123957560). Submitted On: Jun 03 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Comments received via email have been reviewed and revisions will be made to the Engineering Appendix as appropriate.

Submitted By: John Rusnak (412-395-7239) Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Matthew Rother (412-395-7287) Submitted On: Jun 05 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

8620544	Civil	Cost Estimate	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comment Classification: **Unclassified\\For Official Use Only (U\\FOUO)**

Cost Appendix, Risk Register, TPCS, Risk Analysis, Schedule were reviewed, no comments were provided, all looked reasonable.

Submitted By: Witold Kluza (312-846-5425). Submitted On: Jun 04 2020

1-0 Evaluation **Concurred**
Concur.

Submitted By: David Druzbicki (312-846-5433) Submitted On: Jun 05 2020

1-1 Backcheck Recommendation **Close Comment**
Closed without comment.

Submitted By: Witold Kluza (312-846-5425) Submitted On: Jun 05 2020

Current Comment Status: **Comment Closed**

UNCLASSIFIED\\FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Patent 11/892,984 ProjNet property of ERDC since 2004.