DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NORTH ATLANTIC DIVISION, US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
FORT HAMILTON MILITARY COMMUNITY
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11252-6700

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

JAN 11 2008

CENAD-PSD-P

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Philadelphia District, ATTN: CENAP-PL

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for Hereford Inlet to Cape May Inlet Feasibility 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 Hereford Inlet to Cape May Inlet Feasibility 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 does not include 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

Hereford Inlet to Cape May Inlet Feasibility Study

Quality Control (QC) And Independent Technical Review (ITR) Plan

INTRODUCTION

1. This peer review plan (PRP) describes the process to accomplish independent technical review (ITR) that will contribute to a timely and high-quality Feasibility Report for the ongoing Hereford Inlet to Cape May Inlet study. The Feasibility Report will document the effects of coastal storms on the Hereford Inlet to Cape May Inlet shoreline and provide a recommended plan of action based on the results. This PRP describes the review process for the technical and policy compliance of the Feasibility Report with the goal of producing a high quality product that is completed on time and within budget. 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. This PRP has been prepared in accordance with EC 1105-2-408, Peer Review of Decision Documents.

2. The NAD PCX concurred with conducting ongoing independent technical review (ITR). The PCX manages ITR for all new feasibility studies, including external peer review (EPR) for complex projects of nationwide significance with novel methods. The risk and magnitude of this project are not deemed sufficient to require an external peer review (EPR) by a person or team outside of the Corps and not involved in the day-to-day production of technical products of the study. Additionally, there are no novel methods being employed for this Study. There are no complex challenges for interpretation or any conclusions that will be made that are likely to affect changes to prevailing practices or to affect policy decisions that have a significant impact. Furthermore, there are no precedent-setting models being used in this Study. All the models in use for this Study have been used before and are being used on other projects at this time. Additionally, all models have gone through the certification process or are undergoing certification and will be certified during the Study.

ITR PROCESS

3. The ITR for the Feasibility Report will be managed by the PCX. The following is a description of the roles & responsibilities as related to the conduct of the Feasibility Report Peer Review.

A. Independent Technical Review has been approved by the Coastal Storm Damage Reduction National Planning Center of Expertise for use in this investigation in accordance with Corps policy and procedures. In this regard, a District is to be selected to manage the ITR and the review team is to be designated. The ITR team will ensure that all technical products of the study team meet Corps regulations, standards, and 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(s) that are submitted for policy review. As previously discussed, technical review 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. Technical review 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 team will be responsible for the following activities:

(1) Lead and manage the ITR.

(2) Assemble an appropriate ITR team.

(3) Attend all milestones meetings, including Issue Resolution Conferences and other vertical team meetings.

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

(5) Maintain continuous review of distinct products as they are completed such as problems, needs, and opportunities; assumptions, constraints, evaluation criteria, and forecasting methods; without project condition; possible solutions and initial screening of alternative plans; evaluation of detailed plans (benefit analysis, designs, cost estimates, environmental and cultural impacts, real estate requirements, etc; and plan selection).

(6) Conduct reviews and provide written comments with coordinated responses of major products and draft and final report including environmental documentation. Dr. Checks, a computer program applied to aggregate comments, and a memorandum for the record (MFR) will be the basis of accountability for the review of major products, including the draft and final Feasibility Report. A review team member will prepare the MFR and it will become part of the review team's records. Specific issues raised in the review will be documented in a comment, response, action required, and action taken format.

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

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

B. Quality Control Report – The ITR team will prepare a quality control report (QCR) for the draft and final report to include how the quality control process was performed, summary of issues and detailed comments, how they were resolved, minutes of technical review meetings, and other documentation supporting technical review and formal certification of technical review and legal sufficiency. The QCR will accompany submission of the draft and final report to NAD and HQUSACE.

C. Conflict/Dispute Resolution -- The process for resolving technical and policy issues identified during the ITR is summarized in the Standard Operating Procedures for the Planning and Policy Community of Practice, Appendix 4, Quality Management, dated 12 May 2005.

D. 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 Feasibility 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 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. Appropriate replacements will be provided, as necessary, by the oversight/resource availability team members.

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM & ORGANIZATIONS

Discipline & Organization
Project Manager; CENAP-PL-PC
Economist; CENAP-PL-D
Environmental Scientist; CENAP-PL-E
Cultural Resources; CENAP-PL-E
Coastal Engineer; CENAP-EC-H
Geologist; CENAP-EC-DG
Cost Engineer; CENAP-EC-EC
Civil Engineer; CENAP-EC-DC
Real Estate; CENAB-RE-C
Contracting; CENAP-CT-C
Public Affairs; CENAP-PA
Surveys; CENAP; OP-TS
Safety; CENAP-SA

Management Team Members
Chief, Planning CENAP-PL
Chief, Project Development CENAP-PL-P

INDEPENDENT REVIEW TEAM

5. An independent technical review (ITR) team is being established to represent all technical elements providing significant input to the study. The technical review team will have 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 specific technical products under their review. External peer review is not anticipated to be required. The following is a list of anticipated internal ITR technical disciplines:

ITR TEAM MEMBERS

Discipline of Technical Reviewer & Organization
ITR Project Manager, Plan Formulation
ITR, Hydrology & Hydraulics
ITR, Economics
ITR, Environmental
ITR, Cultural Resources
ITR, Civil and Structural
ITR, Geotechnical
ITR, Cost Engineering
ITR, Real Estate

STUDY MILESTONE SCHEDULE

6. The independent technical review for the Hereford Inlet to Cape May Inlet Feasibility Report is the responsibility of the review manager in coordination with the study team leader and PDT. It is important to ensure that technical review is an ongoing process. As issues are identified, meetings will be scheduled to resolve those issues, and documentation of the issue resolution will be prepared and coordinated. 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 will be documented for the technical review files. The following table presents the major milestones that are scheduled in 2008. 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.

SCHEDULE

1-Draft Feasibility Submitted for Concurrent review to Public, HQ, ITR	3/1/08
2-Deadline for Comments from Public HQ, ITR, Agencies	4/1/08
3-Response to Comments	4/15/08
4-Incorporate Comments	5/1/08
5-Feasibility Resolution Conference	5/10/08
6-Program Guidance Memorandum	6/15/08
7-Final Feasibility Report re-submitted to Public, HQ, Agencies and ITR	8/31/08

SUMMARY

7. In summary, ITR of the Hereford Inlet to Cape May Inlet Feasibility study is an ongoing process that will provide a comprehensive review conducted in accordance with the guidelines established and incorporated in the study process and Feasibility Report. The ITR leader, working through the Project Manager will ensure that this is accomplished. In addition, District Commanders, District Chiefs, the DST, Planning COP, and RIT share the responsibility of ensuring a quality product.