DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
US ARMY ENGINEER DIVISION, SOUTHWESTERN
1100 COMMERCE STREET, SUITE 831
DALLAS TX 75242-1317

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CESWD-PDS-P (1105)

JAN 22 2010

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Galveston District

SUBJECT: Review Plan for Sabine-Neches Waterway Channel Improvement Project Southeast Texas and Southwest Louisiana Feasibility Study

1. References:

a. EC 1105-2-410, 22 August 2008, Review of Decision Documents.

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

c. Addendum to Reference 1.b., CECW-CP, September 2008, subject: Supplemental Information for the Peer Review Process.

2. The review plan for the subject study, enclosed, has been reviewed and cleared for approval by the Deep Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise. It has been prepared in accordance with the referenced guidance, and public comments received will be incorporated into the plan as the study progresses. Independent External Peer Review is required for this study.

3. 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 substantial revisions to this plan or its execution will require new written approval from this office.

4. If you have questions or need further information, please contact Jo Ann M. Duman, CESWD-PDS-P, at (469) 487-7065.

Encl

for Chief of Staff
ANTHONY C. FUNKHOUSER
Colonel, EN
Commanding

CF:
CESWG-PE-PL (Laird)

PROJECT REVIEW PLAN

SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
SOUTHEAST TEXAS AND SOUTHWEST LOUISIANA
FEASIBILITY STUDY

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Galveston District

June 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE 1
2. APPLICABILITY 1
3. REFERENCES 1
4. GENERAL 1
A. Project Description 1
B. Project Delivery Team 2
C. Model Certification 2
5. REVIEW REQUIREMENTS 4
A. District Quality Control (DQC) 4
B. Agency Technical Review (ATR) 4
C. Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) 4
D. Policy and Legal Compliance Review 5
E. Safety Assurance Review 5
F. Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) Coordination 5
6. REVIEW PROCESS 6
A. Agency Technical Review (ATR) 6
1) General 6
2) ATR Team 7
3) Review Cost 8
4) Review Schedule 8
B. Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) 8
1) General 8
2) IEPR Panel 9
3) Review Cost 9
4) Timing and Sequencing 9
5) Project Risk 10
6) Products for Review 10
7. PROJECT REVIEW PLAN 10
A. General Information 11
B. Scientific Information 11
C. Timing 11
D. Public Comment 11
E. Dissemination of Public Comments 12
F. Points of Contact 12
APPENDIX A 13

SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY PROJECT
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
SOUTHEAST TEXAS AND SOUTHWEST LOUISIANA
FEASIBILITY STUDY
PROJECT REVIEW PLAN

1. PURPOSE

Pursuant to Engineering Circular (EC) 1105-2-410, "Review of Decision Documents, EC 1105-2-408, "Peer Review of Decision Documents," Office of Management and Budget's "Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review," and the 30 May 2007 memorandum from Major General Don Riley, USACE Director of Civil Works, a Project Review Plan (PRP) has been updated from the originally approved PRP dated April 2007.

This PRP presents the process for District Quality Control (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR) and Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) that will be implemented as part of the Sabine-Neches Waterway (SNWW) feasibility study. These processes are essential to improving the quality of the products that we produce. The Project Management Plan (PMP) for the SNWW Channel Improvement Project Feasibility Study will be amended to include this PRP since the PRP is considered a component of the PMP.

2. APPLICABILITY

The document provides the PRP for the SNWW Channel Improvement Feasibility Study. It identifies the ATR and IEPR process for all work conducted as part of the study, including in-house, non-Federal sponsor, and contract work efforts.

3. REFERENCES

EC 1105-2-410 "Review of Decisions Documents" dated 22 August 2008
EC 1105-2-408 "Peer Review of Decision Documents" dated 31 May 2005
EC 1105-2-407 "Planning Models Improvement Program: Model Certification" dated 31 May 2005
ER 1105-2-100 "Planning Guidance Notebook," dated April 2000
Major General Riley Memorandum on Peer Review Process, dated 30 May 2007

4. GENERAL

A. Project Description

The SNWW is an approximately 64-mile federally authorized and maintained waterway located in Jefferson and Orange Counties in southeast Texas and Cameron Parish, Louisiana. The Sabine Pass, Sabine Lake, and Sabine River together form part of the boundary between

the states of Texas and Louisiana. The SNWW serves the ports of Beaumont, Port Arthur, and Orange, Texas.

The Port of Beaumont is the Nation's 3rd largest port by total tonnage, with the Port of Port Arthur being the Nation's 29th largest by total tonnage. The SNWW is the Nation's number one crude oil arrival port, importing 13% of US crude oil in 1998-2002. The waterway produces 10% of Nation's petrochemical needs and 6% of US total refinery capacity, serves two DOE Strategic Petroleum Reserves, and is a Tier One Port by Department of Homeland Security. The Port of Beaumont is the Nation's busiest Strategic Port of Embarkation for military cargo.

In response to Congressional study authority, the reconnaissance phase of the study was initiated in September 1998. The reconnaissance investigations resulted in a finding that there was an interest in continuing the study into the feasibility phase.

The feasibility study was initiated on March 6, 2000 and investigated the need to deepen and widen the SNWW to improve navigational efficiencies and improve safety along the waterway. The SNWW study will result in a decision document that is a Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) requiring Congressional authorization. The Sabine-Neches Navigation District is the non-Federal Sponsor (Sponsor). The study costs are shared equally between the Corps of Engineers and the Sponsor.

B. Project Delivery Team

The Project Delivery Team (PDT) is comprised of those individuals directly involved in the development of the decision document. The individual contact information and disciplines of the District PDT are included in Appendix A of this document. It is planned that the non-Federal sponsor will contribute in-kind services for project management; public involvement, coordination and outreach; environmental studies; hydraulics and hydrology studies; data collection; geotechnical studies; engineering; and participate in reviews. Specifically, the non-Federal sponsor has aided in public meeting coordination and economic data collection. All work-in-kind products will undergo review by the PDT for adequacy and undergo DQC. All products will undergo ATR and IEPR.

C. Model Certification

EC 1105-2-407, Planning Models Improvement Program: Model Certification establishes the process and requirements for certification of planning models. This circular is specifically directed to software used in Corps' planning studies, to ensure that only high quality software is being used for key planning decisions. Planning models are defined as any models and analytical tools that planners use to define water resources management problems and opportunities, to formulate potential alternatives to address the problems and take advantage of the opportunities, to evaluate potential effects of alternatives and to support decision-making. It includes all models used for planning, regardless of their scope or source. This

Circular does not cover engineering models used in planning studies, which will be certified under a separate process to be established in the future.

The computational models to be used in the SNWW Feasibility Study have been developed by or for the USACE. Model certification and approval for all identified planning models will be coordinated through the PCX, as needed. Project schedules and resources will be adjusted to address this process for certification and PCX coordination. WVA is not a Corps corporate model and, as such, does not require certification. However, it must be assessed and approved for use. The WVA assessment has been completed and the final report has been produced which approves the WVA model's use for the SNWW project, specifically. Additionally, spreadsheet models developed for economic and environmental use may need approval for use. The planning models used are:

1) Hydrodynamic and Salinity Modeling – A three dimensional model which provides input to ship simulation, estimate storm surge, and predict potential changes with a deeper and/or wider channel. Helps to predict potential salinity changes to the Laguna Madre hyper-saline bay system.
2) Ship Simulation – This model will simulate ship movement through various alternative scenarios. A two dimensional hydrodynamic model will be applied to the vicinity of the ship channel to generate currents for the ship simulator. The results will be used for determining a final design channel plan which will be applied to the salinity models.
3) Sedimentation Transport and Shoaling Model - A model to predict sediment transport and changes in shoaling for the study area.
4) Vessel Effects – A two dimensional model to determine maximum vessel drawdown and return velocity at the shoreline for traffic in both the existing channel and in the proposed channel.
5) Gulf Shoreline Erosion – A model to assess the effect of channel modifications on local coastal wave conditions in the vicinity of the channel and at adjacent shores.
6) HarborSym Economics Model – A planning-level simulation model designed to assist in economic analyses of coastal harbors, calculating vessel interactions within the harbor, and capturing delays. The model output can be used to calculate the cost of these delays and any changes in overall transportation costs resulting from proposed modifications to the channel's physical dimensions or restrictions.
7) Wetland Valuation Assessment (WVA) analysis – a suite of ecological, habitat-based, community models which quantifies impacts to all affected habitat types in the study area and provides a means to establish the appropriate amount of compensating mitigation by habitat type. These include the WVA Emergent Marsh Community Model, Swamp Community Model, and Bottomland Hardwood Model.

The following are considered engineering models and undergo a different review and approval process for usage. Their certification is not addressed in this Review Plan. These models include:

1) Mii - cost estimating models
2) Crystal Ball Risk Based Analysis

5. REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

A. District Quality Control (DQC)

DQC is the review of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the SNWW Channel Improvement Feasibility Study PMP. It is managed by the Galveston District and may be conducted by staff in the home district as long as they are not doing the work involved in the study, including contracted work that is being reviewed. Basic quality control tools include a Quality Management Plan (QMP) providing for seamless review, quality checks and reviews, supervisory reviews, PDT reviews, etc. Additionally, the PDT is responsible for a complete reading of the report to assure the overall integrity of the report, technical appendices and the recommendations before approval by the District Commander. For the SNWW Feasibility Study, non-PDT members and/or supervisory staff will conduct this review for major draft and final products, including products provided by the non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services following review of those products by the PDT. It is expected that the Major Subordinate Command (MSC)/District QMP addresses the conduct and documentation of this fundamental level of review. A Quality Control Plan (QCP) is included in the PMP for this study and addresses DQC, which is required for this study. DQC is not addressed further in the Review Plan.

B. Agency Technical Review (ATR)

ATR (which replaces the level of review formerly known as Independent Technical Review [ITR]) is an in-depth review, managed within USACE, and conducted by a qualified team outside of the home district that is not involved in the day-today production of a project/product. The purpose of this review is to ensure the proper application of clearly established criteria, regulations, laws, codes, principles and professional practices. The ATR team review the various work products and assure that all the parts fit together in a coherent whole. ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel (Regional Technical Specialists (RTS), etc.), and may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate. To assure independence, the leader of the ATR team shall be from outside the home MSC. EC 1105-2-408 requires that DrChecks (https://www.projnet.org/projnet/) be used to document all ATR comments, responses, and associated resolution accomplished. This PRP outlines the planned approach for meeting this requirement for the SNWW Feasibility Study. ATR is required for this study.

C. Independent External Peer Review (IEPR)

This is the most independent level of review, and is applied in cases that meet certain criteria where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of USACE is warranted. IEPR is generally for feasibility and reevaluation studies and modification reports with EISs. IEPR is managed by an outside eligible organization (OEO) that is described in Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c) (3), is exempt from Federal tax under section 501(a), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; is independent; is free from conflicts of interest; does not carry out or advocate for or against

Federal water resources projects; and has experience in establishing and administering IEPR panels. The scope of review will address all the underlying planning, engineering, including safety assurance, economics, and environmental analyses performed, not just one aspect of the project. This PRP outlines the planned approach for meeting this requirement for the SNWW Feasibility Study. IEPR is required for this study.

D. Policy and Legal Compliance Review

In addition to the technical reviews described above, decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. These reviews culminate in Washington-level determinations that the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy, and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority by the Chief of Engineers. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed further in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. The technical review efforts addressed in this Circular are to augment and complement the policy review processes by addressing compliance with published Army policies pertinent to planning products, particularly policies on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents. DQC and ATR efforts are to include the necessary expertise to address compliance with published planning policy. Counsel will generally not participate on ATR teams, but may at the discretion of the district or as directed by higher authority. When policy and/or legal concerns arise during DQC or ATR efforts that are not readily and mutually resolved by the PDT and the reviewers, the district will seek issue resolution support from the MSC and HQUSACE in accordance with the procedures outlined in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. IEPR teams are not expected to be knowledgeable of Army and administration policies, nor are they expected to address such concerns. An IEPR team should be given the flexibility to bring important issues to the attention of decision makers. Legal reviews will be conducted concurrent with ATR of the preliminary, draft, and final feasibility report and environmental impact statement.

E. Safety Assurance Review

WRDA 2007, Section 2035, Safety Assurance Review, requires all projects addressing flooding or storm damage reduction to undergo a safety assurance review during design and construction activities. This safety assurance review will address the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities for the purpose of assuring public health, safety, and welfare. However, since this project is a channel improvement project and does not address flooding or storm damage reduction, the safety assurance review requirement is not applicable.

F. Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) Coordination

This project is a deep-draft navigation project. Pursuant to EC 1105-2-408, the District will coordinate with the Deep Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) in Mobile District as the lead PCX to organize teams to perform the reviews at various stages throughout the study. This PCX is responsible for the accomplishment and quality of ATR

and IEPR for this study. The PCX will also coordinate with Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise at Walla Walla for ATR of the Mii estimate, construction schedules, and contingencies.

6. REVIEW PROCESS

A. Agency Technical Review (ATR)

1) General

The ATR process will be conducted throughout the study process. ATR involvement was performed prior to the Feasibility Scoping Meeting by OA Systems (Dave Bastian). Mr. Bastian periodically participated in PDT meetings and Interagency Coordination Team (ICT) meetings. The ICT, comprised of Federal and state resource agency representatives from Louisiana and Texas, advises the District on matters related to the environmental impact review. Copies of Project Delivery Team (PDT) notes were provided to Mr. Bastian on a regular basis.

ATR of the draft Engineering Appendix was performed by the PCX for Deep Draft Navigation (Mobile District). Mr. Ken Claseman (ATR Point of Contact for the PCX) coordinated all ATR efforts. The ATR review was initiated in July 2006 using the Dr. Checks (Proj.Net) comment and response system. A conference call between the PCX ATR team and the PDT was conducted on September 6, 2006. ATR issues were resolved and the ATR completed in October 2006. ATR documentation will be posted on the Galveston District website, at http://www.swg.usace.army.mil/pe-p/SNWW.

The ATR of the draft documents (Draft Feasibility Report, Draft Environmental Impact Assessment, Engineering Appendix, and Economic Appendix) and was initiated in March 2007 with the Deep Draft Navigation PCX (Mr. Claseman was the ATR POC).

On March 21, 2007, the PDT presented an overview of the study and conducted breakout sessions with the ATR team to discuss technical details of the study. The ATR focused 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 all spreadsheet models used for economic and environmental purposes,
- Compliance with program and NEPA requirements, and
- Completeness of study and support documentation

All ATR comments and responses were formalized in Dr. Checks. The draft feasibility report was modified based on the ATR comments and responses and the revised report was reviewed again by the ATR for completeness. Additional ATR review will be needed prior to completion of the report. The PCX will provide a formal ATR certification. Upon

completion of the ATR process, ATR documentation will be posted on the Galveston District website, at http://www.swg.usace.army.mil/pe-p/SNWW.

Due to comments raised by USACE-HQ on the use of the Wetland Value Assessment (WVA) Model which was used to determine the environmental impacts of the proposed project, a separate review (model assessment) was conducted. An additional ATR effort will be performed prior to submission of the report for public comments and Washington-level review.

2) ATR Team

The ATR 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. Management of ATR reviews is conducted by professionals outside of the home district. For planning feasibility-level studies the ATR is managed by the appropriate Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) with appropriate consultation with the allied Communities of Practice such as engineering and real estate. The Deep Draft Navigation PCX is responsible for identifying the ATR team members. The Galveston District could make suggestions on possible reviewers. The ATR team members will reside outside the Galveston District with the ATR team leader from outside the Southwestern Division. The ATR team has been identified and the names and disciplines of the ATR team are included in Appendix A of this document.

The review team for the completed ATR has consisted of 13 reviewers, one or more from each of the following disciplines: engineering design, hydraulics and hydrology, geotechnical engineering, economics, environmental, real estate, plan formulation, operations and cost engineering. A brief description of the disciplines required for the ATR team are identified below:

a. Engineering Design – the reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge of channel design for navigation studies

b. Hydraulics and Hydrology – the reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge of hydrodynamic-salinity, ship simulation, sediment, erosion and coastal shoreline models/studies.

c. Geotechnical – the reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge of coastal geomorphology.

d. Economics – the reviewer should have a strong understanding of economic models or studies relative to deep draft navigation (e.g. multi-port, container and bulk cargo analyses).

e. Environmental – the reviewer(s) should have strong background in coastal ecosystems (e.g. hypersaline, lagoonal, wind-tidal flat system) and Texas environmental laws and regulations.

f. Real Estate – the reviewer should have knowledge in reviewing RE Plans for feasibility studies (e.g. navigation servitude).

g. Plan Formulation – the reviewer(s) should have a strong knowledge in current planning policies and guidance related to feasibility studies.

h. Cost Engineering – the reviewer should have a strong knowledge of the cost estimating practices for deep draft navigation projects.

3) Review Cost

The cost for ATR on the draft Engineering Appendix and associated models for this study was $56,103 with the cost of ATR by the PCX on the draft reports to date of $71,825. The additional cost for ATR to complete the report is estimated to be $30,000.

4) Review Schedule

TASK	Date Conducted / Proposed
Initial ATR Review	
PCX identifies ATR team	June 2006
Review of Preliminary Engineering Appendix	July – August 2006
ATR Teleconference	September 6, 2006
ATR completed	October 2006
ATR review of draft documents (before AFB)	
ATR Briefing of study/breakout sessions	March 21, 2007
ATR review of draft documents	March – May 2007
ATR certification	August 2007
Participation in AFB meeting	May 30, 2007
Model Assessment of WVA Model	
Development of SOW for Contractor	July07-Dec 2007
Model Assessment by Contractor	Jan - Apr 2008
SAM accepted final report	Apr 2008
ATR assessment finalized	TBD
ATR review of draft report/EIS (before Policy/Public Review)	
ATR coordination	July 22, 2009
ATR review of draft documents	September – October 2009
ATR certification	November 2009

B. Independent External Peer Review (IEPR)

1) General

The SNWW Project is a typical navigation study for deepening and widening an existing navigation channel. EC 1105-2-408 and EC 1105-2-410 identify concerns which would trigger IEPR: “In cases where there are public safety concerns, a high level of complexity,

novel or precedent-setting approaches; where the project is controversial, has significant interagency interest, has a total project cost greater than $45 million, or has significant economic, environmental and social effects to the nation, or where requested by the Governor of an affected state, IEPR will be conducted. Although the scope and technical complexity of this project is not expected to warrant IEPR and it is not controversial, the project will have significant interagency interest because of its location through the sensitive environmental habitat and the fact that an EIS will be completed for this study. Additionally, the construction costs for any deepening and/or widening of the channel are anticipated to be over $1 billion of dollars range. Due to the estimated project cost (greater than $45 million) and the need for an EIS, the SNWW Channel Improvement Project required IEPR. For these reasons, IEPR was conducted.

2) IEPR Panel

IEPR panels are made up of recognized independent experts from outside of USACE, with disciplines appropriate for the type of review being conducted. The PCX contracted with an appropriate Outside Eligible Organization (OEO) to manage the review. IEPR panel members were selected by an OEO using the National Academy of Science's policy for selecting reviewers. Since this feasibility study is a navigation study to deepen and/or widen the existing channel, anticipated disciplines of IEPR reviewers were engineering (hydrology and hydraulics), economics, and environmental. The IEPR panel would have a minimum of three members. The IEPR panel review was federally funded, including the costs associated with obtaining the IEPR panel contract. Responding to IEPR comments was cost shared with the local sponsor. The public, including scientific or professional societies, were not asked to nominate potential external peer reviewers. Once the panel has been identified, the IEPR Panel members' names and disciplines will be included in Appendix A of this document.

Army Research Office (ARO) awarded a task order to Battelle Memorial Institute to identify reviewers. The task order to Battelle Memorial Institute was awarded on May 15, 2007. Initiation of IEPR was approved by HQ and documents were loaded on the ftp site on June 29, 2007. The IEPR workplan and other documentation were made available on the Galveston District website, at http://www.swg.usace.army.mil/pe-p/SNWW.

3) Review Cost

The cost for IEPR was $321,000. This effort consisted of $248,000 for IEPR, $25,000 for PCX, and $48,000 for Battelle Memorial Institute.

4) Timing and Sequencing

The estimated timeline for the IEPR is as follows:

TASK	Date Conducted / Proposed
Approval of Workplan	June 22, 2007
Initiation of IEPR	June 29, 2007

IEPR comments received	August 21, 2007
District response to IEPR Comments	August 22, 2007
Battelle submits final IEPR Report to USACE	September 21, 2007

5) Project Risk

The SNWW Project is a typical deepening and widening (channel improvement) project involving traditional methods of dredging, traditional placement of dredged material, and beneficial use of dredged material to restore, maintain, and nourish the Gulf shoreline. Anticipate minimal risk is involved with the project. No novel methods were utilized, and no methods, models or conclusions were precedence setting or likely to change policy decisions. Additionally, there is no significant threat to human life with implementation of the project or in its failure. However, the project is a large-scale project (77 miles long) and many of the analyses performed were complex (even though the interpretation and implementation of the project is straightforward and uncomplicated). Based on the estimated project cost of over $1 billion and the enormity of the project, IEPR was conducted. Project risks in a typical dredging project are generally minimal; however, due to the large scale of this project, implications of project risks are increased.

6) Products for Review

Interim products for hydrology and hydraulics, economics, and environmental were provided before the draft report was released for public review. For IEPR, DrChecks was used to document comments and aid in the preparation of the Review Report by the IEPR Panel. The district, with assistance from the PCX, prepared a written proposed response to the IEPR Review Report, whether the views expressed in the report were adopted or not adopted, the actions undertaken or to be undertaken in response to the report, and the reasons those actions were believed to satisfy the key concerns stated in the report (if applicable). The proposed response was coordinated with the MSC and HQUSACE to ensure consistency with law, policy, project guidance, ongoing policy and legal compliance review, and other USACE or National considerations. The IEPR comments and responses will be discussed at the Civil Works Review Board (CWRB) with an IEPR panel or OEO representative in attendance. Upon satisfying its concerns, HQUSACE will determine the appropriate command level for issuing the formal USACE response to the IEPR Review Report. When the USACE response is issued, the district shall disseminate the final IEPR Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the review on its website, and include them in the applicable decision document. Chief of Engineers' reports for decision documents that undergo IEPR shall summarize the IEPR Review Report and USACE responses. This documentation will become a critical part of the review record and will be addressed in recommendations made by the Chief of Engineers.

7. PROJECT REVIEW PLAN

The components of the PRP were developed pursuant to the requirements of EC 1105-2-408 and EC 1105-2-410.

A. General Information

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

B. Scientific Information

The majority of the final feasibility report (and supporting documentation) is anticipated to contain standard engineering, economic analyses, and information. Based on comments from USACE-HQ, the environmental modeling (WVA model) underwent a separate model assessment to ensure the validity of the model and the accuracy of the estimated project impacts and mitigation requirements.

C. Timing

The ATR process began at the initiation of the feasibility study process and is projected to end once the Draft Report is acceptable for public and agency review. The IEPR process was initiated after Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) comments were incorporated into the draft reports. The IEPR process is expected to be completed prior to public and agency review of the draft report.

D. Public Comment

The USACE and Sponsor developed a public involvement plan to be used during the feasibility phase. The goal of the public involvement plan was to ensure that USACE and the Sponsor were responsive to the needs and concerns of all stakeholders and to ensure public involvement through an open, interactive process.

Coordination with resource agencies was conducted primarily through ICT and technical working group meetings. Resource agencies and the study team met regularly throughout the study process. Over 30 workgroup meetings and 10 ICT meetings were held.

A pro-active outreach program was initiated to ensure that the public, resource agencies, industry, local government, and other interested parties were informed about the project and that any concerns were identified and addressed. Public review is scheduled after the AFB and those comments will be summarized in the EIS with responses provided.

The following public involvement activities are important to the study process:

TASK	DATE CONDUCTED /PROPOSED
Public Scoping Meeting	May 2001
Workgroup Meetings	December 5, 2006 January 8, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, and 28, 2002 Feb 5, 6, and 7, 2002

Public Meetings	Louisiana	May 28, 2002
	Texas	May 29, 2002
ICT Meetings	throughout study process	
Public Review of DFR & EIS	November 2009 to January 2010	
Public Meetings (Draft Report)	Texas	December 2009
	Louisiana	December 2009

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 SNWW Project website (http://www.swg.usace.army.mil/pe-p/SNWW).

F. Points of Contact

Questions about this Review Plan may be directed to Ms. Sheri Willey, Galveston District PDT Planning contact at (409)766-3917 or sheridan.s.willey@usace.army.mil or Mr. Bernard Moseby, PCX Manager at (757) 201-7589 or bernard.e.moseby@usace.army.mil .