

**Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project
Nevada**

General Reevaluation Report

Review Plan

October 2008
Revised April 2009

**Truckee Meadows Flood Project
Review Plan
Table of Contents**

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS.....	1
A. Purpose	1
B. Requirements	1
2. STUDY INFORMATION	4
Decision Document	4
Location	4
Background	4
Product Delivery Team	5
Vertical Team	5
Model Certification	5
3. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW PLAN.....	8
A. General	8
B. Agency Technical Review	8
C. Communication	8
D. Funding	9
E. Timing and Schedule	9
F. Review.....	10
G. Resolution	11
H. Certification	11
I. Alternative Formulation Briefing	11
4. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW PLAN	12
A. Project Magnitude.....	13
B. Project Risk.....	13
C. Vertical Team Consensus.....	13
D. Product for Review.....	13
E. Communication and Documentation.....	13
F. Funding.....	15
5. PUBLIC REVIEW	15
6. PCX COORDINATION	15
7. APPROVALS	16
8. POINTS OF CONTACT.....	16
APPENDICES	
Appendix A	Statement of Technical Review
Appendix B	Review Plan Teams

Truckee Meadows Flood Project Review Plan

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

A. Purpose. This document outlines the Review Plan for the Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project, Nevada. This feasibility study process is anticipated to culminate in a decision document to Congress for potential reauthorization of a previously authorized project. Engineer Circular (EC) *Peer Review of Decision Documents* 1105-2-408, dated 31 May 2005, (1) established procedures to ensure the quality and credibility of Corps decision documents by adjusting and supplementing the review process, and (2) required that documents have a peer review plan. That EC applies to all feasibility studies and reports and any other reports that lead to decision documents that require authorization by Congress. The General Reevaluation Report for the Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project is anticipated to result in recommendations to Congress for authorization of a project and is therefore covered by this EC.

A subsequent circular, *Review of Decision Documents*, EC 1105-2-410, dated 22 August 2008, revises the technical and overall quality control review processes for decision documents. It formally distinguishes between technical review performed by in-district (District Quality Control, "DQC") and out-of-district resources (formerly Independent Technical Review, "ITR," now Agency Technical Review, "ATR"). It also reaffirms the requirement for Independent External Peer Review (IEPR); this is the most independent level of review and is applied in cases that meet certain criteria where the risk and magnitude of a proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is warranted.

B. Requirements. EC 1105-2-410 outlines the requirement of the three review approaches (DQC, ATR, and IEPR). EC 1105-2-408 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 PCX. The Truckee Meadows Flood Control Study will investigate flood risk management (FRM) and ecosystem restoration (ER) issues in the study area. The non-Federal partners have expressed a strong desire that FRM be considered the primary focus of the feasibility study, while identifying opportunities for ecosystem restoration where they are consistent with FRM features. Therefore, the FRM-PCX is considered to be the primary PCX for coordination. The FRM-PCX will coordinate with the ECO-PCX as appropriate.

(1) District Quality Control. DQC is the review of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project Management Plan (PMP) for the study (to which this Review Plan will ultimately

be appended). It is managed in the Sacramento District and may be conducted by in-house staff as long as the reviewers are not doing the work involved in the study, including contracted work that is being reviewed. Basic quality control tools include a Quality Management Plan (QMP) providing for seamless review, quality checks and reviews, supervisory reviews, Project Delivery Team (PDT) reviews, etc. Additionally, the PDT is responsible for a complete reading of the report to assure the overall integrity of the report, technical appendices and the recommendations before the approval by the District Commander. For the Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project, non-PDT members and/or supervisory staff will conduct this review for major draft and final products, including products provided by the non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services following review of those products by the PDT. It is expected that the Major Subordinate Command (MSC)/District QMP address the conduct and documentation of this fundamental level of review. A Quality Control Plan (QCP) is included in the PMP for the subject study and addresses DQC; DQC is not addressed further in this Review Plan. DCQ is required for this study.

(2) Agency Technical Review. EC 1105-2-410 recharacterized ATR (which replaces the level of review formerly known as Independent Technical Review) into an in-depth review, managed within USACE, and conducted by a qualified team outside of the home district that is not involved in the day-to-day production of a project/product. The purpose of this review is to ensure the proper application of clearly established criteria, regulations, laws, codes, principles and professional practices. The ATR team reviews the various work products and assures that all the parts fit together in a coherent whole. ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel (Regional Technical Specialists (RTS), etc.) and may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate. To assure independence, the leader of the ATR team shall be from outside the home MSC. EC 1105-2-408 requires that DrChecks <https://www.projnet.org/projnet/> be used to document all ATR comments, responses, and associated resolution accomplished. This Review Plan outlines the proposed approach to meeting this requirement for the Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project. ATR is required for this study.

(3) Independent External Peer Review. EC 1105-2-410 recharacterized the external peer review process that was originally added to the existing Corps review process via EC 1105-2-408. IEPR is the most independent level of review, and is applied in cases that meet certain criteria where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of USACE is warranted. IEPR is managed by an outside eligible organization (OEO) that is described in the Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c) (3), is exempted from Federal tax under Section 501(a), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; is independent; is free from conflicts of interest; does not carry out or advocate for or against Federal water resources projects; and has experience in establishing and administering IEPR panels. The scope of review will address all the underlying planning, engineering,

including safety assurance, economics, and environmental analyses performed, not just one aspect of the project. This Review Plan outlines the planned approach to meeting this requirement for the Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project. IEPR is required for this study.

(4) Policy and Legal Compliance Review. In addition to the technical reviews, decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. These reviews culminate in Washington-level determinations that the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy, and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority by the Chief of Engineers. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed further in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. Technical review described in EC 1105-2-410 are to augment and complement the policy review processes by addressing compliance with published Army polices pertinent to planning products, particularly polices on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents. DQC and ATR efforts are to include the necessary expertise to address compliance with published planning policy. Counsel will generally not participate on ATR teams, but may at the discretion of the district or as directed by higher authority. When policy and/or legal concerns arise during DQC or ATR efforts that are not readily and mutually resolved by the PDT and the reviewers, the district will seek issue resolution support from the MSC and HQUSACE in accordance with the procedures outlined in Appendix H ER 1105-2-100. IEPR teams are not expected to be knowledgeable of Army and administration polices, nor are they expected to address such concerns. An IEPR team should be given the flexibility to bring important issues to the attention of decision makers. Legal reviews will be conducted concurrent with ATR of the preliminary, draft and final feasibility report and environmental impact statement.

(5) Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) Coordination. EC 1105-2-408 and EC 1105-2-410 outline PCX coordination in conjunction with preparation of the Review Plan. This Review Plan is being coordinated with the PCX for Flood Risk Management (FRM), who in turn will coordinate with the PCX for Ecosystem Restoration (ER) as appropriate. The FRM-PCX is responsible for the accomplishment and quality of ATR and IEPR for the Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project.

(6) Review Plan Approval and Posting. In order to ensure the Review Plan is in compliance with the principles of EC 1105-2-410 and the MSC's QMP, the Review Plan must be approved by the applicable MSC, in this case the Commander, South Pacific Division (SPD). Once the Review Plan is approved, the Sacramento District will post it to its district public website and notify SPD and the FRM-PCX.

(7) Safety Assurance Review. In accordance with Section 2035 of WRDA

2007, EC 1105-2-410 requires that all projects addressing flooding or storm damage reduction undergo a safety assurance review during design and construction. Safety assurance factors must be considered in all reviews for those studies. Implementation guidance for Section 2035 is under development. When guidance is issued, the study will address its requirements for addressing safety assurance factors, which at a minimum will be included in the draft report and appendixes for public review. Prior to preconstruction engineering and design (PED) of the project identified for construction, a PMP will be developed that will include safety assurance review. Safety assurance review will also be accomplished during construction.

Study Information

Decision Document. The Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project is a General Reevaluation Report resulting in a GRR. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will also be prepared. The study reevaluates the authorized plan as well as additional alternatives to determine the Federal interest in flood risk management and ecosystem restoration along the Truckee River.

Location. The study area includes the Truckee River in Washoe County, Nevada, within and below Reno, Sparks, and Truckee Meadows, extending east forming a border between Washoe County (on the north) and Storey County (on the south) and onto the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribal lands to the river's terminus at Pyramid Lake. Because of the expanse of land area and length of river miles, the study area was divided into three general reaches: downtown Reno, Truckee Meadows, and downstream Truckee River.

The downtown Reno reach extends from just above Booth Street in Reno's central business district downstream to Highway 395. The Truckee Meadows reach encompasses an area along the Truckee River from Highway 395 on the west to Vista and the Virginia and Pah Rah Mountain Ranges on the east, south along Steamboat Creek to Huffaker Hills, and includes Sparks to the north. The Lower Truckee River reach extends from Vista downstream to the river's terminus at Pyramid Lake.

Background. In 1996, the local communities requested that flooding problems in Truckee Meadows be reevaluated, and the decision was also made to expand the study area beyond Truckee Meadows and consider ecosystem restoration as a project purpose. Since the addition of a project purpose is not within the approval authority of the District Commander, a post-authorization General Reevaluation Report must be prepared.

The GRR analyzes the flood and ecosystem problems, and develops alternatives to reduce flood risks, restore environmental resources, and increase recreational opportunities in the study area. The alternatives include the no action plan and various combinations of structural and non-structural

measures. The engineering, economic, and environmental feasibility of the alternatives is evaluated, and the optimal alternative is identified. If the optimal alternative is found to be feasible and comparable to the plan authorized by WRDA 1988, the alternative will be recommended and carried forward for continued PED and construction. If the recommended plan is not consistent with the authorized plan, the plans will need to be compared, and the plan will likely need to be reauthorized by Congress.

The multi-purpose project will result in a recommended plan that includes flood risk reduction, ecosystem restoration, and recreation. The project will provide substantial flood risk reduction for the cities of Reno and Sparks, as well as restoration of aquatic and terrestrial habitat and fish passage for endangered and threatened fish species in the Truckee River. The estimated cost of the recommended plan is \$1.6 billion.

Project Delivery Team. The PDT is comprised of those individuals directly involved in the development of the decision document. Individual contact information and disciplines are presented in appendix B. In accordance with the PMP, it is planned that the non-Federal sponsors will contribute in-kind services for project management; public involvement, coordination and outreach; environmental studies; GIS mapping and graphics; hydrology studies, reservoir operations study and report; hydraulic analysis and report; hydraulic data collection and mapping; Engineering Design Analysis and Report; Geotechnical and geology Studies & Report; cost engineering and report; and participating in reviews. All in-kind work products will undergo review by the PDT for a determination of adequacy; products will ultimately undergo DQC. In-kind products will undergo both ATR and IEPR (described later in this Review Plan)

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). Specific points of contact for the Vertical Team can be found in appendix B.

Model Certification. The USACE Planning Models Improvement Program (PMIP) was established in 2003 to assess the state of planning models in the USACE and to make recommendations to assure that high quality methods and tools are available to enable informed decisions on investments in the Nation's water resources infrastructure and natural environment. The main objective of the PMIP is to carry out "a process to review, improve and validate analytical tools and models for USACE Civil Works business programs." In carrying out this initiative, a PMIP Task Force was established to examine planning model issues, assess the state of planning models in the Corps, and develop recommendations on improvements to planning models and related analytical tools. The PMIP Task Force collected the views of Corps leaders and recognized technical experts, and conducted investigations and numerous discussions and debates on

issues related to planning models. It identified an array of model-related problems, conducted a survey of planning models, prepared papers on model-related issues, analyzed numerous options for addressing these issues, formulated recommendations, and wrote a final report that is the basis for the development of this RP section. The Task Force considered ongoing Corps initiatives to address planning capability, and built upon these where possible. Examples include several efforts under the Planning Excellence Program (training, specialized planning centers of expertise, modeling); the Science & Engineering Technology (SET) initiative and associated Technical Excellence Network (TEN), which endeavors to provide uniform Science and Engineering tools and practices to the Corps and share them throughout; and, recognition of existing Quality Assurance/Quality Control programs and internal technical review within the Districts.

For the purposes of this RP, planning models are defined as any models and analytical tools that planners use to define water resources management problems and opportunities, to formulate potential alternatives to address the problems and take advantage of the opportunities, to evaluate potential effects of alternatives and to support decision-making. It includes all models used for planning, regardless of their scope or source, as specified in the following sub-paragraphs. This Review Plan does not cover engineering models used in planning which will be certified under a separate process to be established under SET.

The computational models to be employed in the Truckee Meadows Flood Control General Reevaluation Study have either been developed by or for the USACE. Model certification and approval for all identified planning models will be coordinated through the PCX as needed. Project schedules and resources will be adjusted to address this process for certification and PCX coordination. They are:

1. HEC- FDA Version 1.2.4 (Certified): This model, developed by the Corps' Hydrological Engineering Center, will assist the PDT in applying risk analysis methods for flood damage reduction studies as required by, EM 1110-2-1419. This program:
 - o Provides a repository for both the economic and hydrologic data required for the analysis
 - o Provides the tools needed to understand the results
 - o Calculates the Expected Annual Damages and the Equivalent Annual Damages
 - o Computes the Annual Exceedence Probability and the Conditional Non-Exceedence Probability
 - o Implements the risk-based analysis procedures contained in EM 1110-2-1619
2. Various Habitat Evaluation Procedure models. The Ecosystem Restoration Planning Center of Expertise has responsibility for approving

ecosystem output methodologies for use in ecosystem restoration planning and mitigation planning. The Ecosystem PCX will need to certify or approve for use each regionally modified version of these methodologies and individual models and guidebooks used in application of these methods. The PDT will coordinate with the Ecosystem PCX during the study to identify appropriate models and certification approval requirements.

3. IWR-Planning Suite (Certified). This software assists with the formulation and comparison of alternative plans. While IWR-PLAN was initially developed to assist with environmental restoration and watershed planning studies, the program can be useful in planning studies addressing a wide variety of problems. IWR-PLAN can assist with plan formulation by combining solutions to planning problems and calculating the additive effects of each combination, or "plan." IWR-PLAN can assist with plan comparison by conducting cost effectiveness and incremental cost analyses, identifying the plans which are the best financial investments and displaying the effects of each on a range of decision variables.

The following are considered to be engineering models as opposed to planning models and undergo a different review and approval process for usage. Engineering tools anticipated to be used in this study are:

1. MCACES or MII: These are cost estimating models.
2. HEC-HMS: By applying this model the PDT is able to:
 - o Define the watersheds' physical features
 - o Describe the metrological conditions
 - o Estimate parameters
 - o Analyze simulations
 - o Obtain GIS connectivity
3. HEC-ResSim: This model predicts the behavior of reservoirs and to help reservoir operators plan releases in real-time during day-to-day and emergency operations. The following describes the major features of HEC-ResSim
 - o Graphical User Interface
 - o Map-Based Schematic
 - o Rule-Based Operations
4. HEC-RAS: The function of this model is to complete one-dimensional hydraulic calculations for a full network of natural and man made channels. HEC-RAS major capabilities are:
 - o User interface
 - o Hydraulic Analysis
 - o Data storage and Management
 - o Graphics and reporting
5. HEC-2: The HEC-2 program computes water surface profiles for one-

- dimensional steady, gradually varied flow in rivers of any cross section.
6. FLO-2D: This model will be used for the overbank reaches.
 7. Groundwater Modeling System (GMS): This model is used to conduct seepage analysis.

Ecosystem models used for habitat evaluations include the following:

- o Habitat Evaluation Procedure - U.S. Fish and Wildlife
- o Aquatic Habitat Evaluation Procedure
- o Truckee River Restoration Benefits Evaluation

Agency Technical Review Plan

For general reevaluation studies, ATR is managed by the PCX. For this feasibility study, due to the heavy emphasis on flood risk management, the FRM-PCX will identify individuals to perform ATR. Sacramento District can provide suggestions on possible reviewers.

A. General. An ATR Leader shall be designated by the PCX for the ATR process. The ATR Leader for this project is currently Mike Hallisy, SPL. However, the ATR Leader should be from outside the MSC, so we will work with the PCX to identify a new ATR Leader prior to the next ATR, tentatively scheduled to begin in November 2009. The ATR Leader is responsible for providing information necessary for setting up the review, communicating with the PDT, providing a summary of critical review comments, collecting grammatical and editorial comments from the ATR team (ATRT), ensuring that the ATRT has adequate funding to perform the review, facilitating the resolution of the comments, and certifying that the ATR has been conducted and resolved in accordance with policy. ATR will be conducted for project planning, environmental compliance, economics, hydrology and reservoir operations, hydraulic design, civil design, geotechnical engineering, cost engineering, real estate, cultural resources; reviews of more specific disciplines maybe identified if necessary. In addition, coordination with Walla Walla District, DX for Cost-Estimating has been initiated and will continue for the cost-risk analysis.

B. ATR Team (ATRT). The ATRT is 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 roughly mirror the composition of the PDT and wherever possible, the lead shall reside outside of the South Pacific Division region. Since ATR has already been performed on read-ahead submittals for previous milestone conferences for this project, the ATR lead is within SPD region. The current ATR team consists of nine reviewers. The current ATRT members are presented in appendix B.

C. Communication. The communication plan for the ATR is as follows:

(1) The team will use DrChecks to document the ATR process. The Lead planner will facilitate the creation of a project portfolio in the system to allow access by all PDT and ATRT members. An electronic version of the document, appendices, and any significant and relevant public comments shall be posted in Word format at: <ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/> at least one business day prior to the start of the comment period.

(2) The PDT shall send the ATR Leader one hard copy (with color pages as applicable) of the document and appendices for each ATRT member such that the copies are received at least one business day prior to the start of the comment period.

(3) The PDT shall host an ATR kick-off meeting virtually or on-site to orient the ATRT during the first week of the comment period. If funds are not available for an on-site meeting, the PDT shall coordinate a virtual presentation meeting or at a minimum provide a presentation about the project, including photos of the site, for the team.

(4) The ATR Leader shall ensure all responses have been entered into DrChecks and conduct a briefing to summarize comment responses to highlight any areas of disagreement.

(5) A revised electronic version of the report and appendices with comments incorporated shall be posted at <ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/> for use during back checking of the comments.

(6) PDT members shall contact ATR Leader as appropriate to seek clarification of a comment's intent or provide clarification of information in the report. Discussions shall occur outside of DrChecks but a summary of discussions may be provided in the system.

(7) Reviewers will be encouraged to contact PDT members directly via email or phone to clarify any confusion. DrChecks shall not be used to post questions needed for clarification.

(8) The ATRT, the PDT, and the vertical team shall conduct an after action review (AAR) no later than 2 weeks after the policy guidance memo is received from HQUSACE for the for the AFB and draft reports.

D. Funding

(1) The PDT district shall provide labor funding by cross charge labor codes. Funding for travel, if needed, will be provided through government order. The lead planner will work with the ATR Leader to ensure that adequate funding is available and is commensurate with the level of review needed. The current cost estimate for this review is \$138,000. Any funding shortages will be negotiated on a case by case basis and in advance of a

negative charge occurring.

(2) The team leader shall provide organization codes for each team members and a responsible financial point of contact (CEFMS responsible employee) for creation of labor codes.

(3) Reviewers shall monitor individual labor code balances and alert the ATRT Lead planner to any possible funding shortages.

E. Timing and Schedule

(1) Throughout the development of this document, the PDT will conduct seamless review to ensure planning quality.

(2) The ATR will be convened early in the study and will participate in the Technical Review Strategy Session (TRSS) with the PDT and DST. The TRSS is to verify the basic plan of study and the rationale for key planning assumptions.

(3) The ATR will be conducted on the Alternative Formulation Briefing documentation; the draft General Reevaluation Report; and if changes are made to the draft report, those changes will be reviewed in the Final General Reevaluation Report.

(4) The PDT will hold a “page-turn” session to review the draft report to ensure consistency across the disciplines and resolve any issues prior to the start of ITR. Writer/editor services will be performed on the draft prior to ATR as well.

(5) The ATR process for this document will follow the following timeline. Actual dates will be scheduled once the period draws closer. All products produced for these milestones will be reviewed.

ATR Timeline

Task	Date
Participation in TRSS	Complete
ATR Feasibility Scoping Meeting material	Complete
ATR Alternatives Review Conference	Complete
ATR of Draft Report Comment Period	January 2010
Kickoff meeting	During 1 st week
ATR Comments	March 2010
PDT Responses	End 3 rd week
Responses Back check	End 4 th week
Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB)	May 2010
AFB Policy Memo Issued	July 2010

ATR Certification Draft Report	July 2010
Public Review of Draft Report	July-Sept 2010
ATR Certification Final Report	December 2010
ATR After Action	January 2011
Final District Report Review	March 2011

¹Required by the Major Subordinate Command.

Review

(1) ATRT responsibilities are as follows:

(a) Reviewers shall review conference material and the draft report to confirm that work was done in accordance with established professional principles, practices, codes, and criteria and for compliance with laws and policy. Comments on the report shall be submitted into DrChecks.

(b) Reviewers shall pay particular attention to one's discipline but may also comment on other aspects as appropriate. Reviewers that do not have any significant comments pertaining to their assigned discipline shall provide a comment stating this.

(c) Grammatical and editorial comments shall not be submitted into DrChecks. Comments should be submitted to the ATR Leader via electronic mail using tracked changes feature in the Word document or as a hard copy mark-up. The ATR Leader shall provide these comments to the Lead planner.

(d) Review comments shall contain these principal elements:

1. a clear statement of the concern
2. the basis for the concern, such as law, policy, or guidance
3. significance for the concern
4. specific actions needed to resolve the comment

(e) The "Critical" comment flag in DrChecks shall not be used unless the comment is discussed with the ATR Leader.

(2) PDT Team responsibilities are as follows:

(a) The team shall review comments provided by the ATRT in DrChecks and provide responses to each comment using "*Concur*", "*Non-Concur*", or "*For Information Only*". *Concur* responses shall state what action was taken and provide revised text from the report if applicable. *Non-Concur* responses shall state the basis for the

disagreement or clarification of the concern and suggest actions to negotiate the closure of the comment.

(b) Team members shall contact the PDT and ATRT managers to discuss any "Non-Concur" responses prior to submission.

G. Resolution

(1) Reviewers shall back check PDT responses to the review comments and either close the comment or attempt to resolve any disagreements. Conference calls shall be used to resolve any conflicting comments and responses.

(2) A reviewer may close a comment if the comment is addressed and resolved by the response, or if the reviewer determines that the comment was not a valid technical comment as a result of a rebuttal, clarification, or additional information, or because the comment was advisory, primarily based on individual judgment or opinion, or editorial. If reviewer and responder cannot resolve a comment, it should be brought to the attention of the ATR Leader and, if not resolved by the ATR Leader, it should be brought to the attention of the planning chief who will need to sign the certification. ATRT members shall keep the ATR Leader informed of problematic comments. The vertical team will be informed of any policy variations or other issues that may cause concern during HQ review.

H. Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB)

The AFB for this project will occur after the majority of the ATR comments have been resolved. It is possible that the briefing will result in additional technical or policy comments from high level reviewers for resolution. The resolution of significant policy comments may result in major changes to the document. Therefore, the ATR Leader will perform a brief review of the report to ensure that technical issues are resolved.

Any in-kind sponsor contributions are to be reviewed as part of the ART package.

I. Certification

To fully document the ATR process, a statement of technical review will be prepared. Certification by the ATR Leader and the lead planner will occur once issues raised by the reviewers have been addressed to the review team's satisfaction and the final report is ready for submission for HQ review. Indication of this concurrence will be documented by the signing of a certification statement (Appendix A). A summary report of all comments and responses will follow the statement and accompany the report throughout the

report approval process. An interim certification will be provided by the ATR team lead to indicate concurrence with the report to date until the final certification is performed when the report is considered final.

4. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW PLAN

The Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project conducted IEPR during the period of time prior to the implementation of ER 1105-2-410. Using the guidance available, the PDT provided the hydrological model and underlying assumptions for the sub-basin on the North Truckee Drain and the ecosystem design reports for IEPR prior to the passage of WRDA 2007 and its implementing guidance. Disciplines for review were hydrology and ecosystem restoration design. These are the disciplines considered critical to developing sound designs and cost estimates and are important to the decision making process.

Individual subject matter experts who work external to the Corps were identified to conduct this IEPR. The two IEPR members were identified by each respective Sacramento District technical function. Neither the public nor any outside group was asked to nominate IEPR members; however the local sponsors were requested to provide potential IEPR members. PDT members representing hydrology, hydraulics and landscape engineering conducted interviews with potential IEPR contractors. These interviews were used to determine: 1) did the candidate firm have sufficient in-house expertise and experience in “high desert environments” to perform peer review; 2) had the contractor performed any work on the study area either under contract with the Corps, the local sponsors, or stakeholders in the region; 3) did the contractor expect to have future contracts with the Corps, sponsors or stakeholders in the near future; 4) could the contractor complete the peer review within the time allocated by the Corps; and, 5) allow the contractor to present to the PDT members any special qualifications that would ensure a successful IEPR would be conducted. Appendix B has a table showing the contractors that were selected to perform the IEPR.

The IEPR teams were provided with both the technical documents for review and all backup documentation, including the in-progress draft of the GRR and Basis of Design.

In addition to the IEPR, all products are undergoing DQC and seamless and formal Agency Technical Review. The draft reports will undergo formal ATR. The draft reports will be available for public review following the formal ATR period. IEPR comments and evaluation and draft treatment of comments will be provided to the ATR team for their information and use.

IEPR has been completed for this study. IEPR review team conducted a review of the technical documents and provided comments. As a result of the review, additional work was completed following the recommendations of the

IEPR review team. Based on the additional work, the PDT believes that the additional work addresses concerns expressed by the IEPR team. Documentation in the form of a Memorandum For Record was completed following completion of the additional work.

A. Project Magnitude. For reasons described in the preceding paragraphs, the magnitude of this project is determined as high.

B. Project Risk. This project is considered to have moderate overall risk due to the completion of the IEPR and subsequent revisions to the study. The potential for failure is moderate because of the complex nature of the study area. It will be important to make sound planning assumptions in application of all the modeling and judgment and to do so will require application of multiple levels of review. Public and agency input will be sought in order to minimize the potential for controversy. Any time multi-purpose projects are formulated, the potential for conflicting values among the public is higher than single purpose projects. The project includes both highly urban and rural areas, along with tribal lands. The PDT currently briefs a number of local governing bodies, as well as the Pyramid Paiute Tribe, on a regular basis. Uncertainty of success of the project ultimately will be moderate - if the proposed review processes are implemented - because the methods used for evaluating the project are standard and the concept of implementing proposed project features is not innovative.

C. Vertical Team Consensus. This Review Plan will serve as the coordination document to obtain vertical team consensus. Subsequent to PCX approval, the plan will be provide to the vertical team for approval. MSC approval of the plan will indicate vertical team consensus. Should it be determined that additional IEPR is required, the following process will be followed.

D. Products for Review. Interim products for hydrology, hydraulic and geotechnical design and economics will be provided before the draft report is released for public review. The full IEPR panel will receive the entire draft feasibility report, environmental impact statement and all technical appendixes concurrent with public review. The final report to be submitted by the IEPR panel must be submitted to the PDT within 60 days of the conclusion of public review. A representative of the IEPR panel must attend any public meeting(s) held during public review of the draft report. The Sacramento District will draft a response to the IEPR final report and process it through the vertical team for discussion at the Civil Works Review Board (CWRB). An IEPR panel member must attend the CWRB. Following the CWRB, the Corps will issue final response to the IEPR panel and notify the public.

E. Communication and Documentation. The communication plan for the IEPR is as follows:

(1) The panel will use DrChecks to document the IEPR process. The lead planner will facilitate the creation of a project portfolio in the system to allow access by all PDT and a qualified Outside Eligible Organization (OEO). An electronic version of the document, appendices, and any significant and relevant public comments shall be posted in Word format at: <ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/> at least one business day prior to the start of the comment period.

The OEO will compile the comments of the IEPR panelists, enter them into DrChecks, and forwards the comments to the District. The District will consult the PDT and outside sources as necessary to develop a proposed response to each panel comment. The District will enter the proposed response to DrChecks, and then return the proposed response to the panel. The panel will reply to the proposed response through the OEO, again using DrChecks. This final panel reply may or may not concur with the District's proposed response and the panels final response will indicate concurrence or briefly explain what issue is blocking concurrence. There will be no final closeout iteration. The District will consult the vertical team and outside resources to prepare an agency response to each comment. The initial panel comments, the District's proposed response, the panels reply to the District's proposed response, and the final agency response will all be tracked and archived in DrChecks for the administrative record. However, only the initial panel comments and the final agency responses will be posted. This process will continue to be refined as experience shows need for changes. This is specifically in accordance with the EC 1105-2-410 Frequently Asked Questions, dated 3 November 2008.

(2) The PDT shall send each IEPR panel member one hard copy (with color pages as applicable) of the document and appendices such that the copies are received at least one business day prior to the start of the comment period.

(3) The Lead planner shall inform the IEPR panel when all responses have been entered into DrChecks and conduct a briefing to summarize comment responses to highlight any areas of disagreement.

(4) A revised electronic version of the report and appendices with comments incorporated shall be posted at <ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/> for use during back checking of the comments.

(5) PDT shall contact the OEO for the IEPR panel members as appropriate to seek clarification of a comment's intent or provide clarification of information in the report. Discussions shall occur outside of DrChecks but a summary of discussions may be provided in the system.

(6) The IEPR panel shall produce a final Review Report to be provided to the PDT not later than 60 days after the close of the public review of the draft

report. This report shall be scoped as part of the effort to engage the IEPR panel. The Sacramento District will draft a response report to the IEPR final report and process it through the vertical team for discussion at the CWRB. Following direction at the CWRB and upon satisfactorily resolving any relevant follow-on actions, the Corps will finalize its response to the IEPR Review Report and will post both the Review Report and the Corps final responses to the public website.

F. Funding

The FRM-PCX will identify someone independent from the PDT to scope the IEPR and develop an Independent Government Estimate. The Sacramento District will provide funding to the IEPR panel and for PCX support for the IEPR.

5. PUBLIC REVIEW

The public and agencies will have multiple opportunities to participate in this study. The earliest opportunity will be as part of the public scoping process during the first year of the study. Public review of the draft feasibility report 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 teams. Public review of the draft report will begin approximately 1 month after the completion of the ATR process and policy guidance memo. The period will last a minimum of 45 days as required for an Environmental Impact Statement. One or more public workshops will be held during the public review period. Comments received during the public comment period for the draft report could be provided to the IEPR team prior to completion of the final Review Report and to the ATRT before review of the final Decision Document. The public review of necessary state or Federal permits will also take place during this period. 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. 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. A plan for public participation will be developed early in the study which might identify informal as well as additional formal forums for participation in the study.

6. PCX COORDINATION

The appropriate PCX for this document is the National Flood Risk Management Center of Expertise located at SPD. The FRM-PCX will coordinate with the National Ecosystem Restoration Planning Center of Expertise at MVD, as

appropriate for this multi-purpose study. This revised Review Plan will be submitted to the FRM-PCX Manager for review and comment. For ATR, the PCX is requested to provide replacements to the existing ATR team should a team member be unavailable. The approved Review Plan will be posted to the Sacramento District's public website. Any public comments on the Review Plan will be collected by the Sacramento District for resolution and incorporation if needed.

7. APPROVALS

The PDT will carry out the Review Plan as described. The Lead planner will submit the plan to the PDT District Planning Chief for approval. Formal coordination with FRM-PCX will occur through the PDT District Planning Chief. Approval of this Review Plan will be coordinated through the MSC with the PCX.

8. POINTS OF CONTACT

Questions about this Review Plan may be directed to Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project, Planning Lead at (916) 557-6706, or Program Manager for the Planning Center of Expertise for Flood Risk Management, at (415) 503-6852.

APPENDIX A
STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW

COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW
TRUCKEE MEADOWS FLOOD CONTROL, NEVADA
FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

GENERAL REEVALUATION STUDY, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
STATEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPENDICES

The Sacramento District has completed the GRR report, environmental impact statement/environmental impact report and appendices of the Truckee River Flood Control Study. Notice is hereby given that an agency technical review, that is appropriate to the level of risk and complexity inherent in the project, has been conducted as defined in the Review Plan. During the agency technical review, compliance with established policy principles and procedures, utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses; alternatives evaluated; the appropriateness of data used and level obtained; and reasonableness of the result, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing Corps policy. The ATR was accomplished by an agency team composed of staff from multiple districts. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved.

TBD _____

NAME _____ Date _____
Team Leader, Truckee Meadows Flood Control Study
Agency Technical Review Team, Leader

CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

A summary of all comments and responses is attached. Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows:

(Describe the major technical concerns, possible impact and resolution)

As noted above, all concerns resulting from the agency technical review of the project have been fully resolved.

Francis C. Piccola
Chief, Planning Division

Date

APPENDIX B

PRODUCT DELIVERY TEAM

Name/District	PDT Members Title/Discipline	Office
SPK		
Roger Henderson	Project Manager	CESPK-PM
Bill Fakes	Technical Lead Engineering	CESPK-ED-DR
Jim Lee	Technical Lead Ecosystem	CESPK-ED-W
Jerry Fuentes	Lead Planner	CESPK-PD-W
Dan Artho	Environmental Planner	CESPK-PD-RP
Scott Stonestreet	Hydraulic Engineer	CESPK-ED-DH
John High	Hydrologist	CESPK-ED-DW
Pat Dwyer	Real Estate Specialist	CESPK-RE-CP
George Heubeck	Real Estate Appraiser	CESPK-RE-A
Richard Perry	Archeologist	CESPK-PD-RC
Jim Louis	Cost Engineer	CESPK-ED-SC

AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM

Name	Discipline	Office	Experience
Mike Hallisey	ATR Leader/Economics	CESPL-PD-WE	17 years
David Pham	Civil Design	CESPL-ED-DA	TBD
Peter LaCivita	Environmental Resources	CESPN-ET-PB	TBD
Bill Firth	Hydrology/Reservoir	CESPN-ET-EW	TBD
Bill Firth	Hydraulics	CESPN-ET-EW	TBD
Kim Gavigan	Plan Formulation	CESPL-PD	11 years
Gareth Clausen	Cost Engineering ¹	CENWW-EC-X	TBD
TBD	Real Estate/Lands		
Richard Stradford	Cultural Resources	CESPN-ET-PA	TBD
TBD	Geotechnical Engineering		

¹The cost engineering team member nomination will be coordinated with the NWW Cost Estimating Center of Expertise as required. That PCX will determine if the cost estimate will need to be reviewed by PCX staff.

VERTICAL TEAM

Name	Discipline	Office
Karen Berresford	District Support Team	CESPD-PDC
Ken Zwickl	Regional Integration Team	CEMP-SPD

INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL

Name/Affiliation	Discipline
David Ford Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Hydrologic Engineering
Northwest Hydraulics	Ecosystem Restoration Design

PLANNING CENTER OF EXPERTISE FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT

Eric Thaut	Program Manager, PCX - FRM	CESPD-PDS
David Vigh	Program Manager - PCX - Ecosystem Restoration	CEMVD-RB-T