



Reply to  
Attention of:

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

CESWD-PDS-P

12 SEP 2007

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Galveston District

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for the Raymondville Drain, 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 Raymondville Drain, 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 Flood Risk Management 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 Lanora Wright, CESWD-PDS at (469) 487-7032.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. Cox", is positioned above the typed name.

KENDALL P. Cox  
Colonel, EN  
Commanding

Encl

# **Raymondville Drain, Texas**

## **Project Review Plan**

Independent Technical Review and External Peer Review

### **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.

The PRP presents the process for independent technical review (ITR) and external peer review (EPR) that will be implemented as part of the Raymondville Drain General Reevaluation Report. These processes are essential to improving the quality of the products that we produce.

### **2. APPLICABILITY**

The document provides the PRP for the Raymondville Drain General Reevaluation Report. It identifies the ITR and EPR process for all work conducted as part of the reevaluation report, including in-house, non-Federal sponsor, 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

### **4. GENERAL**

The Raymondville Drain flood damage reduction project provides drainage for a large area in western Hidalgo and northern Willacy Counties. This is one of three separable elements of the Lower Rio Grande Basin that was authorized for construction by the Water Resources Development Act of 1986. The authorized plan provides for enlarging existing and constructing new channels - a total of 43.8 miles of channel work. The City

of Raymondville would receive flood protection against a 100-year storm. The Hidalgo County Drainage District (HCDD) #1, non-Federal sponsor, has requested the project be reformulated to provide protection to portions of Hidalgo County, in the vicinity of Edinburgh, Texas. The revised project will be formulated to incorporate locally constructed flood damage reduction measures in Hidalgo County. In addition, we are also providing oversight, coordination and review to the HCDD #1 for project features they are developing for the Hidalgo County portion of the project to ensure they are in accordance with Corps of Engineers regulations and criteria.

## **5. REVIEW REQUIREMENTS (Independent Technical Review)**

As part of the Quality Control Plan for the Raymondville Drain Project, an ITR team will be formed to perform periodic reviews of the feasibility 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 Risk Management Planning 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 on a quarterly basis or as needed. These quarterly meetings will be documented as required by ER 1165-2-203. 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 evaluation and modeling performed for economic analysis,
- Review of real estate requirements necessary for project construction,
- Review of H&H model,
- 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

More detailed ITR information is found in the Plan Formulation and Evaluation Section of the Project Management Plan (PMP).

## **6. REVIEW PROCESS**

The ITR process will be conducted throughout the study process. ITR involvement is anticipated between major project milestones (FSM, IPR, and AFB). Once the ITR team has been identified, copies of PDT meeting notes will be provided to ITR team for information. ITR participation in PDT meetings on a quarterly basis (at a minimum) will be recommended.

## **7. REVIEW COST**

The cost for ITR is estimated at \$50,000.

## **8. REVIEW SCHEDULE**

<u>TASK</u>	<u>Proposed Date</u>
Develop Project Review Plan	July 2007
Coordinate with MSC and post on website	August 2007
PCX identifies ITR team	September 2007
Review of Models	TBD
ITR review of draft documents (before AFB)	TBD
Participation in AFB meeting	TBD

## **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.

### **A. General Information**

The decision documents that will undergo peer review are the Feasibility Report (including Economic Appendix), Environmental Impact Statement, and Engineering Appendix. The District PDT is listed below:

#### **1. District Project Delivery Team**

<u>NAME/ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>	<u>EMAIL</u>
Ricky Villagomez Project Manager CESWG-PM	409-766-3173	<a href="mailto:enrique.villagomez@usace.army.mil">enrique.villagomez@usace.army.mil</a>
Jake Walsdorf Planning Study Lead CESWG-PE-PL	409-766-3817	<a href="mailto:jacob.c.walsdorf@usace.army.mil">jacob.c.walsdorf@usace.army.mil</a>
Brenda Hayden General Engineering CESWG-EC-EG	409-766-3902	<a href="mailto:brenda.r.hayden@usace.army.mil">brenda.r.hayden@usace.army.mil</a>
Kristy Morten Environmental Lead CESWG-PE-PR	409-766-3195	<a href="mailto:kristy.l.morten@usace.army.mil">kristy.l.morten@usace.army.mil</a>
Nicole Minnichbach Archeologist CESWG-PE-PR	409-766-3878	<a href="mailto:nicole.c.minnichbach@usace.army.mil">nicole.c.minnichbach@usace.army.mil</a>
Christy Sorrells Economist CESWG-PE-PL	409-766-3853	<a href="mailto:christy.a.sorrells@usace.army.mil">christy.a.sorrells@usace.army.mil</a>
Randy Richardson Real Estate CESWG-RE-A	409-766-6356	<a href="mailto:randolph.e.richardson@usace.army.mil">randolph.e.richardson@usace.army.mil</a>
Gerald Dunaway H&H CESWG-EC	409-766-3107	<a href="mailto:gerald.m.dunaway@usace.army.mil">gerald.m.dunaway@usace.army.mil</a>

## **2. ITR Team – TBD**

### **B. Scientific Information**

The final feasibility 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.

### **C. Timing**

The peer review process is projected to being completed by the end of FY09 with the initiation of the ITR team and assessment of key models during this initial plan formulation phase of the study.

### **D. EPR Process**

It is anticipated that an External Peer Review will not be necessary for this project based on the performance of work under previous authorization.

### **E. Public Comment**

Public Scoping Meetings was held in July 21 & 22, 2004. An Interagency Coordination Team (ICT) comprised of representatives from the District, non-Federal sponsors, state and Federal resources agencies, and interested groups was informally developed as part of the study. The group participated in identifying potential sensitive resources and environmental issues and developing ways to address those issues. A Public Involvement Plan will be formulated to ensure public involvement throughout the feasibility study process. Public comments will be made available on the project website.

<u>TASK</u>	<u>START DATE</u>	<u>FINISH DATE</u>
Public Scoping Meeting	21 July 2004	22 July 2004

### **F. 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.

### **G. Reviewers**

Since the feasibility study is a flood risk management study, anticipated disciplines of ITR reviewers are:

1. General Engineering
2. H&H Modeling
3. Economics
4. Environmental
5. Real Estate
6. Planning
7. Operations

## **H. Review Disciplines**

A brief description of the disciplines required for the ITR team are identified below:

1. Hydrology and Hydraulics – the reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge of the nature of H&H model preparation and runs to insure accuracy and suitability of models utilized to determine changes in flood surface elevations.
2. Economics – the reviewer(s) should have a strong understanding of economic models or studies relative to the effect of riverine flooding of structures.
3. Environmental – the review(s) should have a strong background in prairie habitat as well as current environmental laws and regulations.
4. Real Estate – The reviewer(s) should have knowledge in reviewing RE Plans for feasibility studies.
5. Planning – The reviewer(s) should have a strong knowledge in current planning policies related to flood risk management.