

PEER REVIEW PLAN

**X. LOCKS AND DAM 25 - DAM POINT CONTROL
NAVIGATION AND ECOSYSTEM SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAM
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT WITH
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

PEER REVIEW PLAN

X. LOCKS AND DAM 25 - DAM POINT CONTROL NAVIGATION AND ECOSYSTEM SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAM PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT WITH ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

I. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

A. The Document. This document outlines the peer review plan for Project X. Locks and Dam 25 - Dam Point Control Ecosystem Restoration Project Implementation Report (PIR) with Environmental Assessment and Appendices. The project is a component of the Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program (NESP). The NESP was authorized for study and design by Section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970. Construction authorization is currently pending in the 2007 version of the Water Resources Development Act. The Chiefs Report for the comprehensive feasibility study recommending the need for further study on several ecosystem restoration projects was approved on 02 December 2004. The PIR for this project build on the comprehensive feasibility study and provides the site specific planning details necessary for project approval.

EC 1105-2-408 dated 31 May 2005 “Peer Review of Decision Documents” 1) establishes procedures to ensure the quality and credibility of Corps decision documents by adjusting and supplementing the review process and 2) requires that documents have a peer review plan. The Circular applies to all feasibility studies and reports and any other reports that lead to decision documents that require authorization by Congress. The feasibility level reports (PIRs) in this program will lead to Congressional Authorization and are therefore covered by the Circular.

B. The Circular. The Circular outlines the requirement of the two review approaches—independent technical review (ITR) and external peer review (EPR)—and provides guidance on Corps Planning Centers of Expertise (PCX) involvement in the approaches. This document addresses review of the decision document as it pertains to both approaches and planning coordination with the appropriate Center.

1. INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW (ITR). Districts are responsible for reviewing the technical aspects of the decision documents through the ITR approach. Independent Technical Review is a critical examination by a qualified person or team that was not involved in the day-to-day technical work that supports the decision document. Independent Technical Review is intended to confirm that such work was done in accordance with clearly established professional principles, practices, codes, and criteria. In addition to technical review, documents should also be reviewed for their compliance with laws and policy. The Circular also requires that DrChecks (<https://www.projnet.org/projnet/>) be used to document all ITR comments, responses, and associated resolution accomplished.

2. EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (EPR). The Circular added external peer review to the existing Corps review process. This approach does not replace the standard ITR process. The peer review approach applies in special cases where the magnitude and risk of the project are such that a critical examination by a qualified person outside the Corps is necessary. External Peer Review can also be used where the information is based on novel methods, presents complex interpretation challenges, contains precedent-setting methods or models, or is likely to affect policy decisions that

have a significant impact. The degree of independence required for technical review increases as the project magnitude and project risk increase.

a. Projects with low magnitude and low risk may use a routine ITR.

b. Projects with either high magnitude/low risk or low magnitude/high risk would require both Corps and outside reviewers on the ITR team to address the portions of the project that cause the project to rate high on the magnitude or risk scale.

c. Projects with high magnitude and high risk require a routine ITR as well as an EPR.

3. PCX Coordination. The Circular outlines PCX coordination in conjunction with preparation of the review plan. Districts should prepare the plans in coordination with the appropriate PCX. The Corps PCX are responsible for the accomplishment and quality of ITR and EPR for decision documents covered by the Circular. Centers may conduct the review or manage the review to be conducted by others. Reviews will be assigned to the appropriate Center based on business programs. The Circular outlines alternative procedures to apply to decision documents. Each Center is required to post review plans to its website every three months as well as links to any reports that have been made public. The Office of Water Project Review (OWPR) will consolidate the lists of all review plans and establish a mechanism for soliciting public feedback on the review plans.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Decision Document. The purpose of the decision document entitled Project X. Locks and Dam 25 - Dam Point Control Ecosystem Restoration Project Implementation Report (PIR) with Environmental Assessment and Appendices is to present the results of a feasibility study undertaken to restore the ecosystem within the navigation pool upstream of Locks and Dam 25. The feasibility phase of this project is not cost shared with the project sponsor. This report provides planning, engineering, and implementation details of the recommended restoration plan to allow final design and construction to proceed subsequent to the approval of the plan.

B. General Site Description. Project X. Locks and Dam 25 - Dam Point Control is located in portions of Calhoun County, Illinois, and Lincoln and Pike Counties, Missouri. Lock and Dam 25 (LD 25) is located at Winfield, Missouri, between Mississippi River miles 241 and 242, measured upstream of the mouth of the Ohio River. The drainage area upstream of this structure is about 142,000 square miles.

C. Project Scope. The proposed project area encompasses approximately 88,000 acres. The preliminary estimated total project cost is \$14 million.

D. Problems and Opportunities. The current Water Control Plan has been effective in meeting navigation goals and providing important ecological benefits (via Environmental Pool Management (EPM), which utilizes the flexibility within the current control plan to benefit the environment), but has not provided the water control manager with the flexibility needed to optimize habitat benefits for fish and wildlife. Pool drawdowns during increased flow situations, depending on the time of year, can be either beneficial or detrimental to the biological resources in Pool 25. The opportunity exists to consider modification of the Water Control Plan to benefit the biological resources in Pool 25 by changing the timing and/or reducing the frequency, duration, and magnitude of pool drawdowns.

E. Product Delivery Team. The product delivery team (PDT) is comprised of those individuals directly involved in the development of the decision document. Contact information and disciplines are listed below.

First	Last	Discipline	Phone	Email
REMOVED	REMOVED	Team Leader	REMOVED	REMOVED
REMOVED	REMOVED	Hydrology and Hydraulics	REMOVED	REMOVED
REMOVED	REMOVED	Hydrology and Hydraulics	REMOVED	REMOVED
REMOVED	REMOVED	Real Estate Appraisal	REMOVED	REMOVED
REMOVED	REMOVED	Real Estate Acquisition	REMOVED	REMOVED
REMOVED	REMOVED	Operations	REMOVED	REMOVED
REMOVED	REMOVED	Environmental	REMOVED	REMOVED
REMOVED	REMOVED	Geotechnical	REMOVED	REMOVED
REMOVED	REMOVED	Cost Engineering	REMOVED	REMOVED
REMOVED	REMOVED	Water Control	REMOVED	REMOVED
REMOVED	REMOVED	Cultural Resources	REMOVED	REMOVED

F. Vertical Team. The Vertical Team includes District management, District Support Team (DST) and Regional Integration Team (RIT) staff as well as members of the Planning of Community of Practice (PCoP). The District project manager is REMOVED, CEMVR-PM-M, at REMOVED. The regional project manager is REMOVED. DST manager for this project is REMOVED, CEMVD-PD-SP at REMOVED. The RIT manager is REMOVED at REMOVED. The PCoP contact is REMOVED, CEMVD-PD-N at REMOVED.

III. INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL PLAN

As outlined above in paragraph 1.b. (1), the District is responsible for ensuring adequate technical review of decision documents. The responsible PDT District of this decision document is St. Louis. The Rock Island District is recommended as the ITR District because there is another Dam Point Control study planned for the NESP, and MVR could utilize lessons learned from this study.

A. General. An ITR Manager shall be designated for the ITR process. Because the ITR for this product is not anticipated until the year 2010, the ITR Manager for this project has not yet been identified. As required by the PCX, the manager will be from outside the PDT's Division. The proposed scope of work for the ITR Process is provided in Appendix A. In general, the ITR Manager is responsible for providing information necessary for setting up the review, communicating with the Team Leader, providing a summary of critical review comments, collecting grammatical and editorial comments from the ITR team (ITRT), ensuring that the ITRT has adequate funding to perform the review, facilitating the resolution of the comments, and certifying that the ITR has been conducted and resolved in accordance with policy.

B. Team. The ITRT will be comprised of individuals that have not been involved in the development of the decision document and will be chosen based on expertise, experience, and/or skills. The members will roughly mirror the composition of the PDT. The ITRT areas of expertise are:

Discipline
ITR Manager/Plan Formulation
Hydrology and Hydraulics
Real Estate Appraisal
Real Estate Acquisition
Operations
Environmental
Geotechnical
Cost Engineering ¹
Water Control
Cultural Resources

¹The cost engineering team member nomination will be coordinated with the NWW Cost Estimating Directory of Expertise as required. The Directory will decide if the cost estimate will need to be reviewed by Directory Staff.

C. Timing and Schedule

1. Throughout the development of this document, the team will hold planning charrettes to ensure planning quality. Senior staff and subject matter experts from the PDT District and members of the vertical team (DST, Planning CoP, RIT) will attend the charrettes and provide comments on the product to date.

2. The ITR process for this document will follow the timeline below. Actual dates will be scheduled once the review period draws closer. It is estimated that review of this document will be begin in the 2nd Quarter of FY 2010.

Task	Date
Comment Period Begin	Week 1
Kickoff Meeting	Week 1
ITR Comments Due	Week 4
PDT Responses Due	Week 6
Responses Backcheck	Week 8
Certification	Week 10
Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB)	Week 14
AFB Policy Memo Issued	Week 18
After Action Review	NLT Week 20

IV. EPR PLAN

A. This decision document will present the details of a feasibility study undertaken to restore the Project X. Locks and Dam 25 - Dam Point Control as described in paragraph 2 above. This critical restoration project is part of a larger program aimed at restoration of the Upper Mississippi River Basin. This project does not meet the EPR standards outlined in the Circular.

1. Project Magnitude. The magnitude of this project is determined as low. The cost of the project will likely not exceed \$14 million. It is assumed that the amount of benefits accrued by the project will be worth the cost. The scale of the project is limited because the project construction footprint will be limited to approximately 7200 acres but will still contribute to the overall goal of the program. The project is not considered complex and involves restoration of aquatic habitat through the implementation of standard concepts. The project will have positive long term and cumulative effects.

2. Project Risk. This project is considered low risk overall. The potential for failure is low because restoration of aquatic habitat via water level management is a straight forward concept with numerous successful national applications. The potential for controversy regarding project implementation is low because the recommended plan will take into account the public's concerns. A socio-economic analysis will be prepared and at least one public meeting will be held. The uncertainty of success of the project is low because the methods used for evaluating the project are standard and the concept of implementing water level management is not innovative. The ecosystem has not reached an irreversible state so it is likely that a restoration effort of the magnitude proposed will be successful. No influential scientific information will likely be generated from this project.

3. Vertical Team Consensus. The vertical team concurs that the subject matter covered in the decision document is NOT novel, controversial, or precedent-setting, and the project will not have significant interagency interest or significant economic, environmental or social effects.

4. Therefore, a separate EPR will not be conducted on the decision document and external members will not be part of the ITR team. The ITR, Public, and Agency Review will serve as the main review approaches.

V. PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW

A. Public review of the document will occur after issuance of the AFB policy guidance memo and concurrence by HQUSACE that the document is ready for public release. As such, public comments other than those provided at any public meetings held during the planning process will not be available to the review team.

B. Public review of this document will begin approximately one month after the completion of the ITR process and policy guidance memo. The estimated time frame for this review is April 2010. The period will last 30 days.

C. The public review of necessary State or Federal permits will also take place during this period.

D. A formal State and Agency review will occur concurrently with the public review. However, it is anticipated that intensive coordination with these agencies will have occurred concurrent with the planning process. Possible public concern issues are potential land acquisition. Possible State and Agency issues are concern over possible impacts to mussel beds (no impacts are anticipated but the

study has not progressed to the point of being able to evaluate impacts). Possible coordinating parties' issues are compensation to the levee districts for increased pumping and groundwater.

E. Upon completion of the review period, comments will be consolidated in a matrix and addressed, if needed. A comment resolution meeting will take place if needed to decide upon the best resolution of comments. A summary of the comments and resolutions will be included in the document.

VI. MODEL CERTIFICATION

This project will use the Aquatic Habitat Appraisal Guide (AHAG) and the Wildlife Habitat Appraisal Guide (WHAG) to evaluate benefits. The certification of these models is still pending. These models are commonly used for assessing potential project benefits on most of the ecosystem restoration projects. Most teams using these models are comprised of a variety of individuals including the Corps, USFWS, and state agencies.

VII. PCX COORDINATION

The appropriate PCX for this document is the National Ecosystem Planning Center of Expertise. This review plan will be submitted through the PDT District Planning Chief, to the PCX Director, REMOVED, and PCX Deputies, REMOVED and REMOVED, for approval. Because it was determined that this project is low magnitude and low risk, an EPR will not be required. As such, the PCX will not be asked to manage the review, but is requested to review and comment on the sufficiency of the ITR team proposed in paragraph 3.b. above. The approved review plan will be posted to the PCX website. Any public comments on the review plan will be collected by the Office of Water Project Review (OWPR) and provided to the PDT District for resolution and incorporation if needed.

VIII. APPROVAL

The PDT will carry out the review plan as described. The Team Leader will submit the plan to the PDT District Planning Chief for approval. Coordination with PCX will occur through the PDT District Planning Chief. Signatures by the individuals below indicate approval of the plan as proposed.

_____	_____
REMOVED	Date
Team Leader, Project X. Locks and Dam 25 - Dam Point Control Product Delivery Team	

_____	_____
REMOVED	Date
Ecosystem Technical Manager, Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program	

REMOVED
Plan Formulation Technical Manager,
Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program

Date

REMOVED
District Project Manager,
Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program

Date

REMOVED
Chief, Planning and Policy Branch
St. Louis District

Date