



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 Resacas at Brownsville, 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 Resacas at Brownsville, 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 Ecosystem Restoration Planning Center of Expertise of the Mississippi Valley 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", written over a horizontal line.

Encl

KENDALL P. Cox
Colonel, EN
Commanding

Resacas at Brownsville, 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 Resacas at Brownsville 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 Resacas 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

Resacas are former channels of the Rio Grande River that have been cut off from the river, having no inlet or outlet. Before land development and water control, floodwaters from the Rio Grande drained into resacas from the surrounding terrain. The primary hydrologic function of a resaca was diversion and dissipation of floodwater from the river. Over the years, portions of the resacas silted in and became bottomland. The

remaining stretches of channel formed into a series of unconnected horseshoe bends. The City of Brownsville alone is estimated to have a total of 3,500 acres of resaca habitat, ranging in size from less than 1 acre to several acres.

Construction of dams and levees has virtually eliminated the flooding of resacas from the Rio Grande. Today, resacas are typically filled by pumping Rio Grande water, rainfall, or input of irrigation return flows. Development of resacas as reservoirs and channels for irrigation water started in 1906 when a canal was excavated to connect Resaca de los Fresnos with a pumping station on the Rio Grande at Los Indios. It continues today, for resacas serve as conveyance channels for transportation of water from the Rio Grande: the water is used for drinking water and for irrigation by agricultural and residential users.

The carrying capacity of the resacas has been compromised by this modified flow into the system. Rainfall runoff carries a large amount of suspended solids that quickly settle out in the low flow resacas. This has created a shallow water environment throughout the resacas, and the condition of the resacas is deteriorating.

5. REVIEW REQUIREMENTS (Independent Technical Review)

As part of the Quality Control Plan for the Resacas 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 Ecosystem Restoration Planning Center of Expertise (Mississippi Valley 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 analysis and design of the alternatives and recommended plan,
- Review of real estate requirements necessary for project construction,

- 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)	June 2008
Participation in AFB meeting	December 2008

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 Assessment, and Engineering Appendix. The District PDT is listed below:

1. District Project Delivery Team

<u>NAME/ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>	<u>EMAIL</u>
Dennis Thomas Project Manager CESWG-PM	409-766-3140	dennis.m.thomas@usace.army.mil
Bob Heinly Planning Study Lead CESWG-PE-PL	409-766-3992	robert.w.heinly@usace.army.mil
Gail Stewart Design Project Engineer CESWG-EC-C	409-766-3837	gail.l.stewart@usace.army.mil
Andrea Catanzaro Environmental Lead CESWG-PE-PR	409-766-3035	andrea.catanzaro@usace.army.mil
Jerry Androy Archeologist CESWG-PE-PR	409-766-3878	jerry.l.androy@usace.army.mil
Randy Richardson Real Estate CESWG-RE-A	409-766-6356	randolph.e.richardson@usace.army.mil

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 early in 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 limited scope and minimal impacts expected.

E. Public Comment

A Public Scoping Meeting was held in June 26, 2002. 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	26 June 2002	N/A
ICT Meetings	25 June 2003	TBD
Public Meetings	12 January 2009	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 an 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. Environmental – the review(s) should have a strong background in assessment of habitat modeling as well as current environmental laws and regulations.
2. Engineering – The reviewer(s) should have an understanding of the types of engineering practices associated with constructing habitat/ecosystem restoration measures.
3. Real Estate – The reviewer(s) should have knowledge in reviewing RE Plans for feasibility studies.
4. Planning – The reviewer(s) should have a strong knowledge in current planning policies related to ecosystem restoration.