



Reply to
Attention of:

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

CESWD-PDS-P

01 OCT 2007

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Galveston District

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for the Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay Shoreline Erosion 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 Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay Shoreline Erosion 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 Hurricane Storm Damage Reduction Planning Center of Expertise of the North Atlantic 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 read "Kendall P. Cox".

KENDALL P. COX
Colonel, EN
Commanding

Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay, 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 Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay feasibility study. These processes are essential to improving the quality of the products that we produce.

2. APPLICABILITY

The document provides the PRP for the Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay Hurricane Storm Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study. It identifies the ITR and EPR process for all work conducted as part of the study, 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 purpose of the Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay Shoreline Erosion Study is to address the severe shoreline erosion occurring along the upper Gulf Coast of Texas between the Sabine-Neches Waterway (Sabine Pass) and the Galveston Entrance Channel (Galveston Bay) and the entire Gulf shoreline of Galveston Island. The study area encompasses

approximately 90 miles of shoreline. Three counties are included in the study area (Jefferson, Chambers, and Galveston Counties), but only Jefferson and Galveston Counties have joined the project as local sponsors. Chambers County only has a 0.8-mile long beach in the project area.

The feasibility study is a multiple purpose project consisting of two project purposes: a storm damage reduction project in Galveston County which will protect a rapidly developing coastal area and an ecosystem restoration project in Jefferson County which will protect the largest remaining coastal marsh area along the upper Texas coast. The feasibility study phase began in October 2001, after the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) was executed and Federal and sponsor's funds for Fiscal Year (FY) 2001 were made available to the District. This Project Management Plan (PMP) presents the activities required to accomplish the feasibility study and submit a feasibility report to Congress for authorization. The cost of the feasibility study will be shared equally between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the non-Federal sponsors, Galveston County and Jefferson County.

5. REVIEW REQUIREMENTS (Independent Technical Review)

As part of the Quality Control Plan for the Sabine to Galveston 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 Hurricane Storm Damage Reduction Planning Center of Expertise (North Atlantic Division) to organize a team to perform the ITR at various stages throughout the study. The ITR point-of-contact is J Smith (CENAP).

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 analysis and design of the alternatives and recommended plan,
- Review of real estate requirements necessary for project construction,

- Review of the methods of evaluation and modeling performed for economic analysis,
- 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 \$60,000.

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	August 2007
Review of Models	TBD
ITR review of FSM documents	N/A
ITR review of draft documents (before AFB)	September 2009
Participation in AFB meeting	October 2009

9. PROJECT RISK

The project has the potential to generate some controversy due to the extensive nature and high public use of the study area, and there is some uncertainty associated with the predictions and outcomes being analyzed for the study. Based on these issues, the project risk could be categorized as moderate.

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>
XXXXXX Project Manager CESWG-PM	XXX-XXX-XXXX	
XXXXXXX Planning Study Lead CESWG-PE-PL	XXX-XXX-XXXX	
XXXXXXX Design Project Engineer CESWG-EC-C	XXX-XXX-XXXX	
XXXXXXX Environmental Lead CESWG-PE-PR	XXX-XXX-XXXX	
XXXXXXX Archeologist CESWG-PE-PR	XXX-XXX-XXXX	
XXXXXXX Economist CESWG-PE-PL	XXX-XXX-XXXX	

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

XXXXXX XXX-XXX-XXXX
Operations
CESWG-OD-N

XXXXXX XXX-XXX-XXXX
Center of Expertise
CENAP-PL-PC

XXXXXX XXX-XXX-XXXX
Engineering Research and
Development Center
ERDC-CHL-MS

XXXXXX XXX-XXX-XXXX
Engineering Research and
Development Center
ERDC-CHL-MS

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 be necessary for this project based on the expected scope and risk associated with the project. The HSDR Center of Expertise (CX) will be responsible for the process. Through their continued involvement in the study, the CX will be able to make a clear determination as to the necessity of EPR. If necessary, it would be conducted concurrently with ITR of the draft report prior to the AFB.

E. Public Comment

A Public Scoping Meeting was held in June 10, 2003. An Interagency Coordination Team (ICT) 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 ICT will participate 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	10 June 2003	N/A
ICT Meetings	20 July 2007	TBD

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 hurricane storm damage reduction/ecosystem restoration study, anticipated disciplines of ITR reviewers are:

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

6. Operations

H. Review Disciplines

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

1. Geotechnical and Wave Modeling – the reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge of the nature of different grain sizes and the impact they have when placed in a littoral system, as well as an understanding of the changes to wave runup after construction.
2. Economics – the reviewer(s) should have a strong understanding of economic models or studies relative to storm surge impacts to coastal structures.
3. Environmental – the review(s) should have a strong background in coastal ecosystems and Texas environmental laws and regulations.
4. Real Estate – The reviewer(s) should have knowledge in reviewing RE Plans for feasibility studies (e.g. Texas coastal issues, including Open Beaches Act).
5. Planning – The reviewer(s) should have a strong knowledge in current planning policies related to hurricane storm damage reduction and ecosystem restoration.