DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NORTH ATLANTIC DIVISION, US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
FORT HAMILTON MILITARY COMMUNITY
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11252-5700

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

JAN 10 2008

CENAD-PSD-P

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, New York District, ATTN: CENAN-PP

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point (FIMP) Long Island, New York Reformulation Study

1. Reference:

a. EC 1105-2-408, Peer Review of Decision Documents, 31 May 2005.

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

2. The enclosed Review Plan for the Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point (FIMP) Long Island, New York Reformulation Study has been prepared in accordance with the referenced guidance.

3. The Plan has been made available for public comment, and any comments received have been incorporated. It has been coordinated with the Planning Center of Expertise for Coastal Storm Damage Reduction. The Plan currently includes external peer review.

4. I hereby approve this 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.

Encl

Joseph R. Vietri
Chief, Planning & Policy Community of Practice
Program Support Division
Programs Directorate

Peer Review Plan

Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point (FIMP)
Long Island, New York
Reformulation Report

DRAFT

January 2008

Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, Long Island, New York

Reformulation Report

Peer Review Plan

DRAFT

INTRODUCTION

This peer review plan (PRP) presents the process for ensuring a high quality and timely Reformulation Report for the Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point (FIMP), Long Island, New York, Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction (HSDR) Project. The purpose of the Reformulation Report is to study and analyze the effects of coastal storms on the Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point study area and to provide recommendations based on the results. This PRP will prescribe the review process for technical and policy compliance of the Reformulation Report with the goal of producing a high quality product that is completed on time and within budget. The PRP describes this review process with emphasis on the conduct and documentation of the technical review activities accomplished throughout the study process. The technical review ensures compliance with established policy, principles, and procedures and the presentation of assumptions, methodology, appropriateness of data used, reasonableness of results, and ability of the plan to meet the needs of the community, region, and Nation. The PRP describes the methods necessary for this study to adequately address the independent technical review (ITR) and external peer review (EPR), including the identification of study team and technical review team members. This PRP has been prepared in accordance with EC 1105-2-408, Peer Review of Decision Documents.

ITR PROCESS

The overall management of ITR for the Reformulation Report is the responsibility of the National Planning Center of Expertise for Coastal Storm Damage Reduction (PCX-CSDR). The Philadelphia District (NAP) team of the PCX-CSDR will provide operational project management of the ITR, and the review team will be comprised of members from the Philadelphia and other USACE Districts. The ITR team is responsible for ensuring that all technical products of the study team meet Corps regulations, standards, and current guidance. The ITR will focus on the underlying assumptions, conclusions, recommendations, models, and analyses in the context of established policy and guidance. The technical review for this study will be fully documented, and documentation and certification of technical/legal review will accompany the report that is submitted for policy review. ITR is the process that confirms the proper selection and application of established criteria, regulations, laws, codes, principles, and professional

procedures to ensure a quality product. ITR also confirms the constructability and effectiveness of the product and the utilization of clearly justified and valid assumptions and methodologies. Early identification of technical issues facilitates efficient resolution, minimizes policy review comments, and increases the likelihood of approval of worthy projects.

The ITR management team has been briefed on the extent of their duties, and they understand that the review team's involvement in the study process is on-going and continuous. The NAP ITR team will be responsible for the following activities:

(1) Lead and manage the ITR.

(2) Assemble an ITR team.

(3) Attend all milestones meetings, including IRC's and other vertical team meetings.

(4) Conduct technical review meetings with the PDT, as necessary, to resolve identified issues early on.

(5) Maintain ongoing and continuous review of distinct products as they are completed.

(6) Manage review comments and responses of report products using Dr. Checks. At the conclusion of ITR, the ITR management team will prepare an MFR to document comments, responses, and issue resolution.

(7) Maintain a file on all technical review documentation.

(8) Prepare a quality control report to document and certify the results of ITR.

Conflict/Dispute Resolution -- The process for resolving issues identified during the ITR is summarized below, as extracted from "*Standard Operating Procedures for Planning Centers of Expertise*", Planning Community of Practice, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, August 2007:

- Comment Dispute Resolution
    - The ITR PM facilitates discussion between the ITR team and the FIMP PDT to resolve review issues.
    - If this discussion does not resolve the issue, it is raised through the chain of command to the NAD Planning Review Board, which has final authority for ITR comment resolution.

DRAFT

- Comments that are not resolved through the PDT-ITR discussion should be identified in the ITR report.
- Comments in DrChecks must be 'back checked' against the final document prior to closing the comments and issuing the ITR certification.

Any significant issues shall be documented in the quality control report. NAN will request the NAD Planning Community of Practice Leader to assist in the resolution of complex technical and policy issues.

Public Review – The public will be able to review the document during the public review period. The Office of Water Policy Review will determine if an expedited review is warranted or if the review will take place after higher authority reviews the draft Reformulation Report. All comments received from the public will be given the same consideration as those received from the ITR team. The ITR team will likely be conducting its review at the same time the public review is on going. However, the ITR team will be made aware of the review comments received from the public and have an additional opportunity to comment.

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM

4. The NAN PDT for this effort was selected based on the expertise necessary to provide the technical input required to address the scope of work as detailed in the project management plan. The PDT consists of a project manager, study team leader, core team members, extended technical resource team members, including supervisory oversight/resource availability team members and management oversight team members. During the course of the study, PDT members may change because of workload, study priorities, turnover, etc. The following lists the PDT members including each member's discipline/role, and organization:

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM

Discipline	Organization
Project Manager	CENAN-
Technical Team Leader/	CENAN-
Plan Formulation	CENAN
Civil Engineer	CENAN
Coastal Engineer	CENAN
Core Team Members	
Regional Economist	CENAN-
Environmental Scientist	CENAN-

DRAFT

Sociologist/Cultural Resources Specialist	CENAN-
H&H - Coastal Engineer	CENAN-
Geologist and Coastal Engineer	CENAN-
Cost Engineer	CENAN-
Real Estate Specialist	CENAN-
Environmental Scientist	CENAN-
Contracting Specialists	CENAN-
Public Affairs Specialist	CENAN-
Budget Analyst	CENAN-

Management Oversight Team Members

Chief, Planning and Policy Branch	CENAN-
Chief, Planning Resources Section	CENAN-

INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM

An independent technical review (ITR) team led by NAP staff has been established representing all technical elements relevant to the study. The technical review team has the credentials and experience necessary to provide a comprehensive review relating to specific study disciplines as the team members provide input in their principal areas of expertise. The independent review team members are not involved in the report products under their review. In addition, the independent review team can be augmented, as needed, with members from other Corps offices, Centers of Expertise, labs, academia, or other sources as determined necessary for a quality review. The following list presents proposed ITR team members.

INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM (ITR)

Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New York Reformulation Study EITR Team

Discipline	Individual	RTS	District	PCX	Confirmed	Additional Info
Project Manager		No	NAP	CSDR	Yes	
H&H - Coastal Engineer (modeling, design, layout)		Yes	NAP	CSDR	Yes	
Geotechnical Engineer (seismic, borrow area, compatibility)		No	NAB	CSDR	Yes	
Cost Engineer		Yes	SAW	DDN	Yes	

DRAFT

Biologist (offshore, terrestrial, estuarial, endangered species, restoration)		Yes	NAE	CSDR	Yes	
Biologist (habitat modeling)		Yes	NAP	CSDR	Yes	
Cultural Resource Specialist for archeology (terrestrial and underwater)		No	NAB	CSDR	Yes	
Cultural Resource Specialist for historic architecture		No	NAB	CSDR	Yes	
Plan Formulation (coastal SDR, coastal restoration)		Yes	NAE	CSDR	Yes	
Economist (coastal SDR, habitat restoration)		No	NAP	CSDR	Yes	
Real Estate		No	NAB	CSDR	Yes	
Risk Expert (EST, lifecycle analyses)	Dr. Charles Yoe	No	College of Notre Dame, Maryland	N/A	Yes	410-744-0940; cyoe1@comcast.net
Non-structural planning expert		Yes	CENWO	N/A	Yes	

STUDY SCHEDULE

The ITR of the Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, Long Island, New York Reformulation Report is the responsibility of the project manager in coordination with the study team leader and PDT. The NAP team of the PCX-CSDR has been designated as the lead to conduct the ITR. It is important to ensure that technical review is ongoing and as issues are identified, meetings are scheduled to resolve those issues and proper documentation of the resolution of the issues is prepared, filed, and coordinated, as appropriate. Milestone meetings that include higher authority, local interests, and District personnel will be scheduled as required to discuss the scope of the study, study process and progress, study direction, and any pertinent issues that require such a meeting. All issue meetings are documented for the technical review files. The following table presents the major milestones that are scheduled or have already been conducted. In addition, technical review meetings, in-progress review meetings, project review board meetings, and issue resolution conferences will be held, as needed, and documented for the ITR files.

DRAFT

REFORMULATION STUDY SCHEDULE	
1. Formulation Report Released to NYSDEC, and CENAD	**11/30/2006**
· Meeting with NYSDEC	**12/19/2006**
· Formulation Report Released to NYSDEC, Region 1, NYSDOS, NPS	**1/4/2007**
· USACE meeting with NPS	**1/12/2007**
2. Formulation Report Released to Suffolk County	**1/22/2007**
3. Formulation Report Released to DOI	**1/22/2007**
· USACE meeting with NYS / Suffolk	**2/1/2007**
· USACE meeting with NYSDEC & DEC Region I	**2/15/2007**
· USACE meeting with NYSDEC & NYSDOS	**2/16/2007**
· USACE Meeting with DOI	**2/22/2007**
4. Vertical Team Coordination Meeting – NAD	**3/13/2007**
· IRG Meeting (Interagency Reformulation Group)	**6/28/2007**
NOTE: In effort to advance schedule, meetings with agencies and towns will continue without distribution of the Formulation Report. Submission of Formulation Report is required as read-ahead material to set up a USACE vertical team meeting.	
· ESC Meeting (Executive Steering Committee)	**7/11/2007**
· Briefing for Congressional interests (formulation and alternatives)	**7/23/2007**
· Briefing for Easthampton	**7/27/2007**
· Briefing for Westhampton Beach and Westhampton Dunes (groin mod alt)	**8/23/2007**
· Formulation Report transmitted to NAD/RIT for information for IPR	**9/12/2007**
· Briefing for Southampton	10/1/2007
· Briefing for Brookhaven	10/16/2007
· Briefing for Islip	10/21/2007

DRAFT

5. Identification of a DOI supportable plan (supported by DOI)*	10/1/2007
Risk: If a preferred or mutually agreeable plan is not achieved, then elevation of Plan and issues will be made to higher authority, with a meeting arranged between the heads of the respective Departments. Decision will be required to determine whether to advance non-confrontational areas. Timeline will not be met if NAN, NYS and DOI cannot determine mutually acceptable plan.	
· **Facilitated workshop – Id elements of a mutually agreeable plan**	10/10/2007
(NAN, NYS, DOI, Suffolk County, FEMA, EPA)	10/11/2007
5. Vertical Team Coordination Meeting – NAD, HQ, RIT	10/13/2007
· Public Informational Meeting	11/16/2007
(Status, Alternatives, Tentative Plan)	
6. ID of NYS Tentatively Selected Plan (plan or elements supported by NYS)	11/20/2007
Milestone has been delayed due to late meetings with Towns	
· Complete Expanded Risk Assessment Framework (ERAF)	11/21/2007
7. ID Tentative Preferred Plan	12/20/2007
Based on NYS and DOI concurrence and incorporating expanded risk assessment.	
Risks: Timeline will not be met if NYS AND DOI do not provide concurrence. Impacts of expanded risk assessment may result is changed project plans that could also impact schedule.	
8. Preparation of GRR/DEIS	
· Final Design	2/18/2008
· Final Quantity/Cost Estimates	3/19/2008
· Engineering Appendix	4/18/2008
· Gross Appraisal	3/19/2008
· Real Estate Plan	4/18/2008
· Economics Appendix	4/18/2008
· Draft EIS	4/18/2008
· Draft GRR and DEIS	5/18/2008
9. Review of Draft General Reevaluation Report/DEIS	
· Issued for Corps Review	5/18/2008
· Production reviews/ QA/QC- NAN	7/2/2008
· Revisions based on production review comments	8/16/2008
· Independent Technical Review - PCX	9/30/2008

DRAFT

· Revisions based on PCX review comments	11/14/2008
· Issued to PCX-CSDR for External Peer Review (EPR)	12/29/2008
· Issued to NAD/Agencies for Review	12/29/2008
(CENAD, NYSDEC, NYSDOS, NYSDEC Region 1, DOI)	
· Comments received from EPR, NAD and agencies	2/27/2009
· Issue Resolution Conference (IRC)	4/28/2009
· Project Guidance Memorandum (PGM)	5/28/2009
· GRR/DEIS sent out for Public Review	6/12/2009
· Public Meeting	7/12/2009
· Public comments received	7/27/2009
· Finalize GRR/EIS	8/26/2009
· CWRB Meeting	9/10/2009

EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

The decision document will present the details of a reevaluation report undertaken to provide hurricane protection and beach erosion control along five reaches of the south shore of Long Island between Fire Island Inlet and Montauk Point, a distance of 83 miles. This project meets the high magnitude criteria for both cost and risk outlined in EC 1105-2-408, and will therefore undergo external peer review (EPR) as elaborated below.

The Baltimore District (NAB) team of the PCX-CSDR is the lead for the accomplishment and quality of the EPR. EPR will be performed by a contractor and will use subject matter experts outside the Corps. The PCX will act in a management role for EPR. Contactor tasks will include identifying, contacting, and selecting reviewers; preparing scopes of work and procuring contracts with reviewers; compiling review comments, compiling NAN response to comments; and compiling comments and responses into an EPR Report. All contractor tasks will be overseen by PCX-CSDR and will follow EC-1105-2-408.

EPR will be performed on products submitted for final acceptance by the PCX prior to distribution to the general public. These documents are the basis for all study-related decisions for location, type, and technical analyses associated with the design alternatives for increased, comprehensive hurricane protection for the Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point study area.

The external peer review will be conducted on the Draft General Reevaluation Report and all appendices following ITR, and will address the following:

- Overall adequacy of the scope and structure of the comprehensive plan, and soundness of assumptions;

DRAFT

•Additional data or analyses required to make a good decision regarding implementation of alternatives; and
•Evaluation of the adequacy of proposed multi-objective water resources alternative plans that will be carried into the comprehensive plan.

The peer review panel is estimated to consist of 4 reviewers with expertise in:

- coastal engineering,
- coastal economic analysis
- coastal planning
- coastal ecosystems and processes
-

The identification of individual EPR candidates will be based on the following criteria:

•Scientific and technical stature -- Evidence of stature in the broad scientific and technical community (invited contributions to workshops, conferences or panels; evidence of scientific and technical leadership; awards, membership, or important committee assignments in prestigious organizations).
•Advisory experience -- Experience advising top managers and promoting constructive uses of science and technology, especially in arenas relevant to water and sediment management and/or ecosystem restoration.
•Technical publications -- A strong record of publication in peer-reviewed scientific literature or other appropriate venues in an area of expertise relevant to the issues at hand.
•Relevant knowledge -- Evidence of extensive and/or intensive working knowledge of a scientific or technical field related to the specific issues of concern.
•People skills -- Evidence of abilities to work and communicate well with people.
•Reputation for achieving balance -- Evidence of ability to weigh issues in a balanced manner when in an advisory capacity.

Schedule and Cost/ The EPR is expected to be conducted during the first quarter of calendar year 2009. Following is the draft schedule for the EPR:

- Draft General Reevaluation Report issued to PCX-HSDP for EPR….January 2009
- Comments received from EPR……...March 2009

Planning Model Certification

The PCX will provide the necessary documentation for all planning models utilized for this study as per EC 1105-2-407. NAP will work with NAN to accomplish this. Planning models which are environmental in nature are being coordinated with the PCX for Ecosystem Restoration (Mississippi Valley Division-MVD).

DRAFT

SUMMARY

In summary, conduct and documentation of the ITR and EPR for the Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, Long Island, New York, Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction Project Reformulation Report is an ongoing process that will provide assurance that a comprehensive and independent review has been conducted in accordance with the principles and guidelines established. The independent technical review team leader, working through the project manager and technical team leader will ensure that the above is accomplished. In addition, District Commanders, District functional chiefs, the DST, Planning COP, and RIT share the responsibility of ensuring a quality product.

DRAFT