

PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Davenport, Iowa Flood Protection (PWI 074987) Limited Reevaluation Study

1. **Date:** 29 October 2001, revised 6 December 2001
2. **Reference:** ER 5-1-11, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Business Process
3. **Project Description:** The city of Davenport is located in Scott County, Iowa on the Mississippi River. A reconnaissance-level Limited Reevaluation study would review the previous proposal for flood protection contained in the 1982 General Design Memorandum (GDM) and establish whether there is continued Federal interest in the project. This includes a determination of whether the project is still economically justified, environmentally acceptable, technically appropriate, and adequately supported by non-Federal interests. The study would review and update previous project assumptions and perform limited surveys, sampling, and application of other techniques to develop a reasonable estimate of project benefits. See the attached Issue Paper for more information.
4. **Scope of Work/Products:** The products of the limited reevaluation study are a Limited Reevaluation Report (LRR), a Project Management Plan (PMP) for any subsequent PED activities recommended by the LRR, and a cost sharing agreement (Design Agreement) for any subsequent PED activities recommended by the LRR. The LRR will include a limited update of the GDM including economic analysis, necessary design changes, and environmental compliance. The scope of work described in this document has been coordinated with the project sponsor, the City of Davenport.
5. **Schedule:** The timeframe for completing this limited reevaluation is 12 months from the date of initial expenditure of funds. The Project Manager will monitor schedule and costs. The official project schedule will be maintained within the PM-AIS system and can be viewed on the intranet at the PPDS website at <http://ppdsintra-w.usace.army.mil/ppds/home>. Following is a list of significant milestones:

<u>Event:</u>	<u>Date:</u>
Initiate Limited Reevaluation	30 Oct 2001
Coordination Meeting with Sponsor	30 Oct 2001
Site Visit by Team	13 Nov 2001
Public Involvement Coordination Meeting	15 Nov 2001
Distribute Draft LRR to Team for Review	01 Feb 2002
Public Meeting Hosted by City of Davenport	Feb/Mar 2002
Review LRR/Incorporate Comments	01 Mar 2002
Submit LRR to MVD	01 Apr 2002
MVD Review & Approval	01 May 2002
Draft PMP & Design Agreement	01 July 2002
Coordination Meeting with Sponsor	15 July 2002
Review PMP & Design Agreement	15 Aug 2002
Final PMP & Design Agreement	15 Sep 2002
Execute Design Agreement	30 Sep 2002

6. **Budget:** PWI# 074987. Each Division or Branch will be responsible for managing the funds under the appropriate work item, including creating and amending PR&Cs.

<u>ORG</u>	<u>FWI</u>	<u>LRR Budget</u>	<u>PMP Budget</u>
PM-M	1852L1	\$20,000	\$13,000
ED	30JG1D	\$20,000	\$5,000
PM-A	8BL25D	\$30,000	\$5,000
RE	HJ296D	\$5,000	\$2,000

7. **Product Development/Preconstruction Engineering & Design Team Members:**

Name, Discipline	Organization	Phone	Email
Perry A. Hubert, Project Manager,	Corps, CEMVR-PM-M	309-782-5366	Perry.A.Hubert@usace.army.mil
Clayton Lloyd, Main POC for City of Davenport	Davenport-Director, Community & Economic Development	563-326-7769	cml@ci.davenport.ia.us
Dennis Hamilton, Product Line Manager	Corps, CEMVR-PM-M	309-794-5634	Dennis.W.Hamilton@usace.army.mil
Roger Less, Project Engineer	Corps, CEMVR-ED- DM	309-794-5664	Roger.A.Less@usace.army.mil
Robert Riebe, Engineering	Corps, CEMVR-ED- DM	309-794-5507	Robert.T.Riebe@usace.army.mil
Dan Johnson, Chief of Cost Engineering	Corps, CEMVR-ED-C	309-794-5857	Daniel.J.Johnson@usace.army.mil
Chuck VanLaarhoven, Cost Engineering	Corps, CEMVR-ED-C	309-794-5627	Charles.Van.Laarhoven@usace.army.mil
George Sporer, Realty Specialist	Corps, CEMVR-RE-A	309-794-5382	George.J.Sporer@usace.army.mil
Daniel Fetes, Economics	Corps, CEMVR-PM-A	309-794-5569	Daniel.P.Fetes@usace.army.mil
Jim Ross, Cultural/Historical Resources	Corps, CEMVR-PM-A	309-794-5540	James.S.Ross@usace.army.mil
Gail Clingerman, Environmental Analysis	Corps, CEMVR-PM-A	309-794-5791	Gail.A.Clingerman@usace.army.mil
Sue Simmons, Public Involvement	Corps, CEMVR-PM-A	309-794-5573	Suzanne.R.Simmons@usace.army.mil
Mary Craig, GIS Specialist	Corps, CEMVR-PM-M	309-794-5816	Mary.R.Craig@usace.army.mil
Dee F. Bruemmer, Dir. of Public Works	Davenport, Director, Public Works	563-326-7734	dfb@ci.davenport.ia.us
Patrick McGrath, City Engineer	Davenport, City Engineer	563-326-7729	Pat4418@yahoo.com
Gene Hellige, Senior Engineer	Davenport, Engineering	563-326-7729	grh@ci.davenport.ia.us
Charles Heston, Project Manager	Community & Economic Development Dept.	563-326-7756	ceh@ci.davenport.ia.us

8. **Site Visits:** Product development team members and reviewers will coordinate with the Project Manager to make site visits during the study as needed.

9. **Coordination/Communication:** Coordination will be made with Engineering Division for updated hydraulic and hydrologic data, surveys, geotechnical engineering, environmental engineering, project design, cost estimates, and other engineering data. Coordination also will be made with Real Estate Division for updating Real Estate data. Within the Planning, Programs, and Project Management Division, coordination will be made for plan formulation, social & economic analysis and environmental compliance considerations.

Product team members and reviewers are responsible for reading all written documents related to the project and for attending project meetings as appropriate. Regularly scheduled project meetings will be held and used as a forum for discussing issues related to product quality. Individual team members and reviewers are responsible for communicating issues, concerns and problems with each other and with the Project Manager, so that appropriate solutions can be developed in a timely fashion. Team members are also responsible for monitoring the schedule and budget for the tasks for which they are responsible, and keeping those tasks on schedule and within budget. Team members are responsible for coordinating the workload with their supervisor and others as necessary to accommodate the workload.

10. **Guidance:** Pertinent regulations include, but are not limited to, ER 5-1-11, Program and Project Management; ER 1105-2-100, Guidance for Conducting Civil Works Planning Studies; and ER 1110-2-1150, Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects, as well as appropriate Engineering Manuals. Plates and drawings will be prepared using CADD. The study will be completed using English units of measure.

11. **Quality Assurance Reviews:**

a. Environmental: Coordination with the Economics & Environmental Analysis Branch (PM-A) regarding environmental statute compliance (i.e., National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, National Historic Preservation Act) and with Engineering Division, Design Branch, Environmental Engineering Section (ED-DN) regarding environmental hazard, safety analysis, and pollution control compliance (i.e., Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act; Resource Conservation and Recovery Act; Clean Air Act; and Clean Water Act) will be initiated as appropriate.

b. Internal Product Review: The product development team is responsible for producing a high quality product to meet the needs of the customer. Technical supervisors will assure that each team member's technical work is checked for completeness, accuracy, and clarity by other experienced technical persons who have been involved with similar work. Internal reviews will be documented through certification of a product development team checklist. Further reviews will not proceed before all checks have been accomplished.

c. Independent Technical Review (ITR). The ITR team will consist of appropriate personnel from the following organizations in the Rock Island District:

Planning, Programs, and Project Management Division:

Project Management Branch	PM-M
Economics & Environmental Analysis Branch	PM-A

Engineering Division:

Cost Engineering Branch	ED-C
Design Branch, Project Management Section	ED-DM
Design Branch, Environmental Engineering Section	ED-DN
Geotechnical Branch	ED-G
Hydrology and Hydraulics Branch	ED-H

Real Estate Division:	RE
------------------------------	----

The ITR Team members will not have been directly involved with development of the LRR. The expertise and technical backgrounds of the team members will qualify the team to provide a comprehensive technical review of this project. An ITR will be performed at the 95-percent-complete level. All comments resulting from their review will be resolved in accordance with the QMP.

d. Review Documentation. Copies of documentation of all review comments and responses, along with the Technical and Policy Compliance Checklist will be provided to the Chief of the Project Management Branch and the Assistant Chief of Design Branch.

12. **Approval:** Final approval of the product is accomplished when the Technical and Compliance Checklist is signed by the District Engineer.

13. **Cost Monitoring and Control:** Schedule and costs during the study will be monitored by the Project Manager. The Project Manager will be promptly notified of significant cost variations and funding needs. Changes to the project scope, schedule, and/or budget will be coordinated with the sponsor and Rock Island District Project Review Board (PRB) and formalized by amending this document.

SIGNATURES:

SUBMITTED BY: _____
Project Manager **Date**

REVIEWED BY: _____
Chief, Project Management Branch **Date**

**Chief, Economic & Environmental Analysis
Branch** **Date**

Chief, Design Branch **Date**

APPROVED BY: _____
**Chief, Planning, Programs, and
Project Management Division** **Date**

Chief, Real Estate Division **Date**

Chief, Engineering Division **Date**

CONCUR: _____
**Director, City of Davenport, Community &
Economic Development Department** **Date**

Attachment: Issue Paper dated 29 October 2001, revised 6 Dec 2001

CF:

Dist File (PM)
Product Development Team Members
ED
ED-D
RE

ISSUE PAPER

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT DAVENPORT, IOWA

STATEMENT OF ISSUE: The City of Davenport has requested the Corps reevaluate the flood protection project authorized in 1970 to determine if it, or other flood damage reduction alternatives, are feasible based on current conditions.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE: The Davenport flood protection project was authorized for construction on 31 December 1970. A Phase I General Design Memorandum was completed in August 1976 and approved on 2 May 1978. A Phase II General Design Memorandum (GDM) recommending revisions to the project was completed in February 1982. The benefit-cost ratio in the GDM was 1.17, and the City's share of the \$33.9 million project was \$13 million based on the Corps' policy requiring a 35% local cost share for new start projects. In May 1984, the City declined to participate due to the cost of the project and poor economic conditions at that time.

Record flood levels in 1993 were nearly matched in 2001, causing extensive flood damages and attracting national attention. The baseball stadium, residential areas, commercial/industrial areas, and significant reaches of the downtown area were flooded. The water treatment plant was threatened by flooding, but remained in service during the floods due to emergency flood-fighting actions. The wastewater treatment plant was unable to keep up with the high water levels, and the City was forced to bypass sanitary sewer flows into the river. Davenport has been identified as the largest city along the Mississippi River without a flood damage reduction system. The prior decision (May 1984) not to proceed with structural flood protection has been brought into question. A City Council resolution was passed on 16 May 2001 requesting a reconnaissance study and appropriation of funds by Congress.

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY: In accordance with Corps of Engineers policy for resumption of authorized projects that have not been constructed, a reconnaissance-level Limited Reevaluation study would review the previous proposal for flood protection contained in the 1982 DM and establish whether there is continued Federal interest in the project. This includes a determination of whether the project is still economically justified, environmentally acceptable, technically appropriate, and adequately supported by non-Federal interests. The study would review and update previous project assumptions and perform limited surveys, sampling, and application of other techniques to develop a reasonable estimate of project benefits. A Limited Reevaluation Report (LRR) would be produced in approximately 4 to 6 months and be submitted to higher authority for approval.

SUBSEQUENT ACTIVITIES: Following are brief summaries of activities that could be recommended by the LRR:

- If the project is determined to be unjustified or inappropriate, and there appears to be no Federal interest in reformulating the project, the limited reevaluation study would be terminated.
- If the project or portions of the project are determined to be justified and appropriate for construction, then preconstruction engineering and design (PED) activities could proceed. A cost-shared design agreement (75% Federal and 25% Non-Federal) with the sponsor would be executed for preparation of an Engineering Documentation Report (EDR) and preparation of detailed plans and specifications for those portions of the project as recommended.
- If the project or portions of the project are determined to be unjustified or inappropriate for construction, but there appears to be a Federal interest in reformulating the project to consider other alternatives, a General Reevaluation study would be recommended to fully evaluate alternatives that may be justified and appropriate. These alternatives would include the broadest range of structural and non-structural alternatives deemed appropriate. A cost-shared design agreement (75% Federal and 25% Non-Federal) with the sponsor would be executed for preparation of the General Reevaluation study. The study would result in a General Reevaluation Report (GRR) that would make recommendations for implementation of alternatives that are determined to be in the Federal interest.

COST: A reconnaissance-level Limited Reevaluation study would be conducted at a cost not to exceed \$100,000. A 25% local cost share would be required following completion of the Limited Reevaluation and execution of a cost sharing agreement.

AUTHORIZATION: The project was authorized for construction on 31 December 1970 by P.L. 91-611.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: IA-1

POINT OF CONTACT: Perry A. Hubert, Project Management Branch, CEMVR-PM-M, telephone (309) 782-5366. E-mail address: Perry.A.Hubert@usace.army.mil