DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
1100 COMMERCE STREET
DALLAS, TEXAS 75242-0216

Reply to
Attention of:

CESWD-PDS-P

26 OCT 2007

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Little Rock District

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for the Springfield, Missouri Feasibility Study

1. References:

a. EC 1105-2-408, 31 May 2005, subject: Peer Review of Decision Documents.

b. Memorandum, CECW-CP, 30 March 2007, subject: Peer Review Process.

2. The enclosed Review Plan for the Springfield, Missouri Feasibility Study has been prepared in accordance with referenced guidance.

3. This plan has been made available for public comment, and the comments received have been incorporated. It has been coordinated with the Flood Damage Reduction Planning Center of Expertise of the South Pacific Division which is the lead office to execute the plan. The Review Plan does not include External Peer Review.

4. I hereby approve this Review Plan, which is subject to change as study circumstances require, consistent with study development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this plan or its execution will require new written approval from this office. For further information on this issue please contact Brent Hyden, CESWD-PDF at (469) 487-7033.

Encl

KENDALL P. COX
Colonel, EN
Commanding

October 2007

Springfield , Missouri
Feasibility Study
Project Review Plan

1. PURPOSE
The Project Review Plan (PRP) is being developed pursuant to Engineering Circular (EC) 1105-2-408, "Peer Review of Decision Documents," Office of Management and Budget's "Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review," and the May 30, 2007, memorandum from Major General Don Riley, USACE Director of Civil Works.

The PRP presents the process for independent technical review (ITR) and external peer review (EPR) for the Springfield, Missouri, feasibility study. These processes are essential to improving the quality of our products.

2. APPLICABILITY
The PRP applies to all studies and reports needing authorization to include the Springfield Feasibility Study. The PRP identifies the ITR and EPR process for all work conducted as part of the study, including in-house, non-Federal sponsor in kind, and contract work efforts.

3. REFERENCES
-EC 1105-2-408 "Peer Review of Decision Documents' dated May 31, 2005
-ER 1105-2-100 "Planning Guidance Notebook" dated April 2000
-Major General Riley Memorandum on Peer Review Process dated May 30, 2007
-Sec. 2034. INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW, Drafted Conference Report, WRDA 2008

4. GENERAL
Springfield is in southwestern Missouri. The study area encompasses approximately six miles along Jordan Creek, generally centered on the Chestnut Expressway between U.S. Highway 65 to the east and State Highway 13 to the west in the northern half of the city of Springfield. The area is urban, with commercial, industrial, and residential development and some open spaces. Springfield is developing the civic Jordan Valley Park in the central portion of the area. A flood on July 20, 2000, caused more than $2 million in damages in the Springfield watershed.

The study was authorized by the White River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri Comprehensive Study Resolution passed by the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate on 11 May 1962 sponsored by Senator John L. McClellan.

5. REVIEW REQUIREMENTS (Independent Technical Review)
As part of the Quality Control Plan for the Springfield Project, an ITR team will be formed to perform periodic reviews of the re-evaluation study efforts, including the project assumptions, analyses, and calculations, as needed, throughout the planning study process. The ITR is best conducted by experienced peers within the same discipline who are not directly involved with the development of the study or project being reviewed. Pursuant to EC 1105-2-408, the District will coordinate with the Flood Damage Reduction Center of Expertise (South Pacific Division) to organize a team to perform the ITR at various stages throughout the study. The ITR team will meet with the project delivery team (PDT) members as needed. The meetings will be documented as required by ER 1165-2-203. More detailed ITR information is found in the Project Management Plan (PMP), Chapter VI – Quality Control Plan.

Coordination throughout the study will be accomplished through individual contact between the PDT and the ITR team. The ITR will focus on the following:

- Review of the planning study process,
- Review of the methods of analysis and design of the alternatives and recommended plan,
- Compliance with program and NEPA requirements, and
- Completeness of study and support documentation

6. REVIEW PROCESS

The ITR process will be conducted throughout the study process. ITR involvement is anticipated between major project milestones such as the FSM and AFB. Once the ITR team has been identified, copies of PDT meeting notes will be provided to ITR team for information.

7. REVIEW COST

The cost for ITR is estimated at $80,000.

8. REVIEW SCHEDULE

Develop Project Review Plan - October 2007
Coordinate with MSC and post on website - November 2007
PCX identifies ITR team - November 2007
Review of Models - TBD
ITR review of FSM documents - April 2008
ITR review of draft documents (before AFB) - March 2010
Participation in AFB meeting - June 2010

9. PROJECT RISK

Anticipate minimal risk involved with the project.

10. PROJECT REVIEW PLAN

The components of the PRP were developed pursuant to the requirements of EC 1105-2-408. The Feasibility Report with Environmental Assessment, Economic Appendix, Real Estate Plan, and Engineering Appendix is the decision document to undergo the peer review.

A. Scientific Information

The final report (and supporting documentation) is anticipated to contain standard engineering, environmental and economic analyses and information; therefore no influential scientific information is likely to be contained in any of the documentation.

B. Schedule

The peer review process is projected to start as disciplines complete milestone tasks. Contact will be made with the Planning Centers of Expertise in flood risk management and environmental restoration. The lead PCX has not been named but it is presumed that the FRM PCX would lead. The ITR would be completed in FY2010.

C. External Peer Review (EPR)

EPR is not currently anticipated for this project although the reconnaissance report estimated that the project could cost $76 million. It is anticipated that the study will not be controversial, precedent setting, nor have significant impact to the environment, fish and wildlife, endangered species, cultural, historical, or tribal resources. If controversy or significant impacts develop, the

need for an independent peer review panel to review those components which are controversial, are in disagreement, or are of concern would be assessed. External review costs are not included in the PMP's estimated study costs. Additional Federal funding would have to be provided to conduct external peer review.

D. Public Comment

A Public Scoping Meeting was held October 26, 2004. An Interagency Planning Team (IPT) comprised of representatives from the District, non-Federal sponsors, state and Federal resources agencies, and interested groups has been formed as part of the study. The IPT will participate in identifying potential sensitive resources and environmental issues and developing ways to address those issues. Public comments will be made available on the project website. Public comments on the study and project can be e-mailed to: ceswl-pm-smfs@usace.army.mil .

Public Scoping Meeting - 26 October 2004
IPT Meetings – Conducted by sponsor generally in June
Public Open House – September 2010

E. Dissemination of Public Comments

Proceedings from all public meetings, minutes from ICT meetings or any other public involvement meetings will be posted on the project website.

F. Reviewers

The feasibility is a flood risk management study with environmental restoration, anticipated disciplines of ITR reviewers are:

1. Engineering
2. Economics
3. Environmental
4. Real Estate
5. Planning

G. Review Disciplines

Descriptions of the disciplines required for the ITR team are briefly identified below:

1. Hydrology and Hydraulics – the reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge of urban creek H&H analysis and models for the Ozark region.

2. Economics – the reviewer(s) should have a extensive knowledge of the principles and guidelines of economic analysis and models for urban creek flooding.

3. Environmental – the review(s) should have a strong background in urban restoration as well as extensive knowledge of the environmental laws and regulations.

4. Real Estate – The reviewer(s) should have knowledge in reviewing RE Plans for flood risk management studies.

5. Planning – The reviewer(s) should have a strong knowledge in current planning policies related to flood risk management.

6. Engineering - The reviewer(s) should be Professional Engineers with a strong knowledge in civil, geotechnical, HTRW, structural, and cost estimating for the design of flood risk management and environmental restoration measures.