



Reply to
Attention of:

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

01 OCT 2007

CESWD-PDS-P

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Galveston District

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for the GIWW, High Island to Brazos River - Realignment, Texas Feasibility Report

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 GIWW, High Island to Brazos River - Realignment, Texas Feasibility Report 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 Inland Navigation Planning Center of Expertise of the Lakes and Rivers 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 Lanora Wright, CESWD-PDS at (469) 487-7032.

Encl

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "KC" followed by a long horizontal stroke.

KENDALL P. COX
Colonel, EN
Commanding

**Project Review Plan
Independent Technical Review and External Peer Review**

**Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Texas
High Island to Brazos River – Realignment
Section 216
USACE - Galveston District**

1. PURPOSE

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, a Project Review Plan (PRP) is being developed for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW), Texas, High Island to Brazos River Realignment, Section 216 Feasibility Study. This PRP analyzes the need for Independent Technical Review (ITR) and External Peer Review (EPR) plans and defines the responsibilities and roles of members of the study and technical review teams.

2. APPLICABILITY

This document provides the PRP for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW), Texas, High Island to Brazos River Realignment, Section 216 Feasibility Study. It identifies quality control processes and independent technical review for all work to be conducted under this study authority, including in-house, Sponsor and contract work.

3. REFERENCES

- EC 1105-2-408 "Peer Review of Decision Documents", dated May 31, 2005
- ER 1105-2-100 "Planning Guidance Notebook & Appendices," dated April 2000
- Galveston District Quality Management Plan, dated May 30, 2007

4. GENERAL

The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) is part of the Nation's inland waterway system and stretches from Brownsville, Texas, along the entire Gulf of Mexico to St. Marks, Florida. The High Island to Brazos River, Texas section of the GIWW is a 12-foot deep by 125-foot wide channel that spans 85 miles along the upper Texas coast through portions of Chambers, Galveston, and Brazoria Counties.

The High Island to Brazos River Section 216 Reconnaissance Report was completed in February 1995. This was the first phase of a two-phase planning investigation that addressed the existing, federally mandated Texas section of the GIWW between High Island and the Brazos River (85 miles). The Reconnaissance Report identified seven areas having Federal interest for navigation improvements which was subsequently increased to eleven areas after the completion of the August 1995 Project Study Plan. The recommended plan as detailed in the September 2003

Final Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment included the six following projects: 1) Rollover Pass; 2) Sievers Cove; 3) Texas City Wye; 4) Pelican Island Moorings; 5) Greens Lake Moorings; and 6) West Bay Washout. Three project reaches were studied but not selected as part of the 2003 Feasibility Report and make up the current High Island to Brazos River Realignment Study. These reaches include: 1) High Island Bends 2) Chocolate Bayou Wye; and 3) Freeport Wiggles. Bend easing of the channel for ease of navigation through each of the reaches will be considered along with placement area capacities.

5. ITR REQUIREMENTS

Pursuant to EC 1105-2-408, the District will coordinate the draft Feasibility Report with a Corps ITR team assigned by the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division, Huntington District, Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) for Inland Navigation located in Huntington, West Virginia. It is recommended that the ITR be handled within the Corps. An EPR is not anticipated at this time. The project magnitude of potential bend easing of existing channels and a reevaluation of placement areas and project risks (potential for failure or controversy and uncertainties of predictions and outcomes) are considered minimal. Routine ITR and policy reviews are expected at this time. If unforeseen issues arise the need for an EPR will be reconsidered. The ITR will focus on:

- Review of the planning process and criteria applied.
- Review of the methods of preliminary analysis and design.
- Compliance with client, program and NEPA requirements.
- Completeness of preliminary design and support documents.

The PCX shall furnish all personnel, equipment, materials, and supplies necessary to perform ITR for the on-going feasibility study being performed for the proposed High Island to Brazos River, Texas Realignments.

The PCX will provide technical and policy review and assistance to ensure successful execution of the quality control process for the products developed during the formulation study phase. The following disciplines will be required:

- Plan Formulator
- Economist
- Coastal Environmentalist
- Engineers – General, Cost Estimator, H&H, GeoTech
- Real Estate

The following tasks will be performed:

A. Team Leader and one to two team members will meet with District staff and local sponsor and their contractor to review project and discuss major assumptions, analyses, and calculations.

B. Team Leader and one to two members will attend one Project Delivery Team (PDT) meeting at the District. PDTs are developed for projects being evaluated during feasibility analysis and made up of a multi-disciplinary group. This group includes members from all

disciplines within the District, a representative of the project sponsor, and others, as necessary. It is the goal of this team to ensure expedient and open communication between all team members and disciplines to insure timely completion of the study. The PCX representative will attend one PDT meeting to discuss major assumptions, analyses, and calculations to avoid significant comments later that could adversely affect project schedules and costs. Subsequent attendance of PDT meetings can be by teleconference.

C. Review PDT meeting minutes. PDT meeting minutes will be provided electronically on a monthly basis. Review the minutes and provide comments citing appropriate Corps of Engineers regulations for issues that are not in compliance with established Corps policies and regulations. Identify any other potential errors, omissions, or issues of a technical or policy nature.

D. Conduct ITR ([Insert Date]) for advance draft Feasibility Report for Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) tentatively scheduled for [Insert Date]. Perform a review of the read-ahead information. Provide written comments citing appropriate Corps of Engineers regulations for issues that are not in compliance with established Corps policies and regulations. Identify any other potential errors, omissions, or issues of a technical or policy nature.

District will be responsible for all legal reviews of Feasibility Report.

Points of Contact: Planning Lead, Galveston District –
 PCX Representative, Huntington District –
 Project Manager, Galveston District –

6. REVIEW PROCESS

It is anticipated that the team review process will begin after the ITR Team has been assigned and will cover drafts of the Feasibility Report (including the Economic Appendix), Engineering Appendix, Cost Appendix, and Environmental Assessment.

7. REVIEW COST

The cost of the ITR is estimated to be approximately \$ 20,000.00

8. REVIEW SCHEDULE

The review schedule is as follows: **TBD**

<u>Task</u>	<u>Start Date</u>	<u>Finish Date</u>
Develop ITR Plan		
PCX Approves ITR Plan or Assigns ITR Team		
ITR Review of Documents		
Coordination of Comments		
ITR Certification		

Develop Project Review Plan
 Coordinate with MSC and post on website
 PCX identifies ITR team
 ITR review of documents
 Coordination of comments
 ITR review of draft documents prior to AFB
 Coordination of comments
 ITR Certification

9. PROJECT RISK

The project magnitude (costs and benefits, scale, complexity and long term cumulative effects) and projects risks (potential for failure or controversy and uncertainties of predictions and outcomes) are considered minimal. Routine ITR and policy reviews are expected at this time.

10. PROJECT REVIEW PLAN

The components of the PRP were developed pursuant to the requirements of EC 1105-2-408.

A. General Information

The decision documents that will undergo ITR are the Feasibility Report (including the Economic Appendix), Engineering Appendix, Cost Appendix and Environmental Assessment.

1. The District PDT will be comprised of:

<u>Name, Org, & Discipline</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>E-Mail</u>
XXXXXXXX Project Manager CESWG-PM-J	(XXX) XXX-XXXX	
XXXXXX Planning Lead CESWG-PE-PL	(XXX) XXX-XXXX	
XXXXXX Economist CESWG-PE-PL	(XXX) XXX-XXXX	
XXXXXX Environmental Lead CESWG-PE-PR	(XXX) XXX-XXXX	
XXXXXX Design Project Engineer CESWG-EC-EP	(XXX) XXX-XXXX	

XXXXXX (XXX) XXX-XXXX
General Engineer
CESWG-EC-EG

XXXXXX (XXX) XXX-XXXX
Cost Engineer
CESWG-EC-E

XXXXXX (XXX) XXX-XXXX
Hydraulic Engineer
CESWG-EC-EH

XXXXXX (XXX) XXX-XXXX
Geotechnical Engineer
CESWG-EC-ES

XXXXXX (XXX) XXX-XXXX
Real Estate
CESWG-RE-A

2. The ITR Team will be comprised of: TBD

<u>Name, Org. & Discipline</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>E-Mail</u>
Planning		
Economics		
Coastal Environmental		
General Engineering		
Cost Engineering		
H&H Engineering		
Geotechnical		
Real Estate		

B. Scientific Information

It is anticipated that the Feasibility Report will contain no influential scientific information.

C. Timing

The review process is envisioned to begin in [insert date] timeframe with the initiation of the ITR team and assessment of the feasibility study documents prepared for the Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM).

D. External Peer Review Process

An EPR is not anticipated at this time. The project magnitude of potential bend easing of existing

channels and a reevaluation of placement areas and project risks (potential for failure or controversy and uncertainties of predictions and outcomes) are considered minimal. Routine ITR and policy reviews are expected at this time. If unforeseen issues arise the need for an EPR will be reconsidered.

E. Public Comment

<u>Task</u>	<u>Start Date</u>	<u>Finish Date</u>
-------------	-------------------	--------------------

Public Scoping Meeting		
Interdisciplinary Team (ICT) Meetings		

A public involvement program has been established.

F. Dissemination of Public Comment

No significant public comments are anticipated.

G. Reviewers

Since the feasibility study is a Section 216 study, anticipated disciplines of ITR team members are:

- 1) Planning
- 2) Economics
- 3) Coastal Environment
- 4) General Engineering
- 5) Cost Engineering
- 6) Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering
- 7) Geotechnical
- 8) Real Estate

H. Review Disciplines

The expertise that should be brought to the review team includes the following:

- 1) Planning – The reviewer(s) should have recent experience in reviewing Plan Formulation processes for multi-objective studies and be able to draw on “lessons learned” in advising of best practices.
- 2) Economics – The reviewer(s) should have a solid understanding of Economic Models and their application to shallow draft navigation.
- 3) Coastal Environment – The reviewer(s) should have a solid background in coastal environmental ecology and issues.
- 4) General Engineering – The reviewer(s) should have solid knowledge of ship channel design.
- 5) Cost Engineering – The reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge of cost estimating and MII cost estimates.
- 6) Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering – The reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge of ship simulation modeling and coastal hydrology.

- 7) Geotechnical – The reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge of coastal geomorphology.
- 8) Real Estate – The reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge of real estate requirements for navigation projects.