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 New Jersey Alternative Long-Term Nourishment Study Atlantic Coast of New Jersey

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 New Jersey Alternative Long-Term Nourishment Study Atlantic Coast of New Jersey 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

New Jersey Alternative Long-Term Nourishment Study
Atlantic Coast of New Jersey
Feasibility Study

US Army Corps of Engineers: Philadelphia District

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

INTRODUCTION

1. The purpose of this peer review plan (PRP) is to describe the process for ensuring the accomplishment of a high quality and timely general feasibility study for the New Jersey Alternative Long-Term Nourishment Feasibility Study (Study). The purpose of the Study is to develop and implement a regional, systematic approach for maximizing the efficiency of the New Jersey Shore Protection Program. The ultimate goal of the Study is to analyze and maximize New Jersey shore protection projects into a complete coastal system, and to institute improvements to:

- reduce amount of sand needed to maintain Atlantic coast NJ beaches
- reduce life-cycle costs
- reduce environmental impacts

2. The feasibility phase of the Study will help to determine anticipated efficiencies of this regional, systematic approach by developing comprehensive beach, inlet and borrow area management strategies to efficiently manage New Jersey sand resources on a regional basis. Major program goals include the development of products both on a regional (Atlantic coast of New Jersey) and an individual project-level basis. Project-level products include the development of templates, recommendations, tools and methodologies which can be applied to individual prioritized beach nourishment projects. Regional-level products include the development of a coastal inventory and Geographic Information System (GIS) for all USACE shore protection projects along the Atlantic coast of New Jersey, and a regional sediment budget.

3. The six major project goals and products include:

- Coastal Geographic Information System (GIS) development
- Comprehensive Atlantic coast of NJ coastal process modeling database development
- regional sediment budget development for the Atlantic coast of New Jersey
- existing and alternative borrow area GIS database including environmental restraints, and borrow area management guidance for application at individual projects
- regional monitoring program improvements to better analyze and assess beach nourishment project performance, and application of recommendations to an individual project

- comprehensive beach, inlet and borrow area coastal planning tool and methodology guidance development and application at individual beach nourishment projects for improved performance

4. This PRP will govern a formal review process for the technical and policy compliance of the results of the Study 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 of the review and the documentation of the technical review activities that are 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 indicates the methods necessary for this study to adequately address the peer review and external technical review needs 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.

5. The Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) has concurred with conducting the independent technical review (ITR) of the Study. 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

6. The ITR process for the Study will be managed by the PCX. The following is a description of the ITR process as related to the conduct of the Study.

a. Independent Technical Review – ITR has been approved by the PCX for use in this investigation in accordance with Corps policy and procedures. In this regard, the New England District was selected to manage the ITR and the review team is comprised of members from the New England, New York, Baltimore, and Mobile 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 team's review 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.

b. The New England District has been selected to lead the ITR Team. The ITR team will be briefed on the extent of their duties including the fact that the review team's involvement in the study process is on-going and continuous. A New England District employee, in coordination with the ITR team, will:

(1) Lead and manage the ITR
(2) Coordinate the assembly of an appropriate ITR team
(3) Attend all milestones meetings, including IRC's and other vertical team meetings
(4) Conduct external 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 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 Record (MFR) will be the basis of accountability for the review of major products, including the draft and final Study. 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. Minor grammatical or editorial comments should not be included as part of Dr. Checks or the MFR, but sent to the PDT separately.
(7) Maintain a file on all external technical review documentation.
(8) Prepare a quality control report to document and certify the results of ITR.

c. Use of Checklists. Checklists may be used to guide the technical review, ensure that critical items are not overlooked, and to simplify the documentation of the review. Checklists may also be used to track outstanding action items for a particular study. The use of checklists shall not, however, eliminate the requirement to respond to specific comments.

d. Quality Control Report – The ITR team led by the New England District 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.

e. Conflict/Dispute Resolution -- The general 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.

f. 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 Study. 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

7. 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. The following lists the PDT members including each member's discipline/role, and organization:

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM
Project Manager
Technical Team Leader
Plan Formulation Project Manager
NJDEP Liaison

Core Team Members
- Regional Economist
- Environmental Scientist
- Coastal/Hydraulic Engineer
- Geologist

Design Engineer
Cost Engineer
Environmental Scientist
Contracting Specialists
Management Oversight Team Members
Chief, Project Development Branch
Chief, Coastal Planning Section

INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM

8. An independent technical review (ITR) team led by New England District personnel has been established representing all technical elements providing significant input 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 specific technical 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 of external peer review as determined necessary for a quality review. The following is a list of ITR members at this time:

INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM MEMBERS (ITR)
Discipline of technical reviewer
ITR Project Manager
ITR, Plan Formulation
ITR, Hydrology & Hydraulics
ITR, Economics
ITR, Environmental
ITR, Cultural Resources
ITR, Civil and Structural
ITR, Geotechnical
ITR, Cost Engineering
ITR, Real Estate CENAB

STUDY MILESTONE SCHEDULE

9. The accomplishment of the independent technical review process for the Study is the responsibility of the project manager in coordination with the study team leader and PDT. As previously discussed, the New England District has been enlisted to conduct the required ITR. 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 resolution of the issues 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. 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 for Feasibility Study

A detailed schedule for this Study is currently under development.

SUMMARY

10. Independent Technical Review of this Study is an ongoing process that will provide assurance that a comprehensive and independent review has been conducted in accordance with the planning principles and guidelines. 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.