PEER REVIEW PLAN

SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, ARKANSAS
FEASIBILITY REPORT AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

1. Purpose and Requirements.

a. This document outlines the Peer Review Plan for the Southeast Arkansas, Arkansas, Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T), General Investigation (GI) Feasibility Study and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Appendixes. Engineer Circular (EC) 1105-2-408 dated 31 May 2005, "Peer Review of Decision Documents," (1) establishes procedures to ensure the quality and credibility of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers decision documents by adjusting and supplementing the review process and (2) requires that documents have a Peer Review Plan. The Circular applies to all feasibility studies and reports and any other reports that lead to decision documents that require authorization by Congress. The feasibility report could lead to congressional authorization and is therefore covered by the Circular.

b. The Circular outlines the requirement of the two review approaches (independent technical review (ITR) and external peer review (EPR)) and 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 Center.

(1) ITR. Districts are responsible for reviewing the technical aspects of the decision documents and their supporting interim products through the ITR approach. The ITR is a critical examination by a qualified person or team that was not involved in the day-to-day technical work that supports the decision document. The ITR is intended to confirm that such work was done in accordance with clearly established professional principals, practices, codes, and criteria. In addition to technical review, documents should also be reviewed for their compliance with laws and policy. The Circular also requires that DrChecks be used to document all ITR comments, responses, and associated resolution accomplished.

(2) EPR. The Circular added EPR to the existing Corps review process. This approach does not replace the standard ITR process. The peer review approach applies in special cases where the magnitude and risk of the project are such that a critical examination by a qualified person outside the Corps is necessary. The EPR can also be used where the information is based on novel methods, presents complex interpretation challenges, contains precedent-setting methods or models, or is likely to affect policy decisions that have a significant impact. The degree of independence required for technical review increases as the project magnitude and project risk increase.

(a) Projects with low magnitude and low risk may use a routine ITR.

(b) Projects with either high magnitude/low risk or low magnitude/high risk would require both Corps and outside reviewers on the ITR team to address the portions of the project that cause the project to rate high on the magnitude or risk scale.

(c) Projects with high magnitude and high risk require a routine ITR as well as an EPR.

(3) PCX Coordination. The Circular outlines PCX coordination in conjunction with preparation of the review plan. Districts should prepare the plans in coordination with the appropriate PCX. The Corps PCX are responsible for the accomplishment and quality of ITR and EPR for decision documents covered by the Circular. Centers may conduct the review or manage the review to be conducted by others. Reviews will be assigned to the appropriate Center based on business programs. The Circular outlines alternative procedures to apply to decision documents. Each Center is required to post review plans to its website every 3 months, as well as links to any reports that have been made public. The Office of Water Policy Review (OWPR) will consolidate the lists of all review plans and establish a mechanism for soliciting public feedback on the review plans.

2. Project Description.

a. Decision Document. The purpose of the decision document, "Southeast Arkansas, Arkansas, Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T), General Investigation (GI) Feasibility Study and Environmental Impact Statement," is to present the results of a feasibility study undertaken to address flood risk management, agricultural water supply, and ecosystem restoration problems and needs in the Southeast Arkansas study area. The Southeast Arkansas study was authorized by study resolution adopted by the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the United States Senate on 23 June 1988. The feasibility phase of this project is cost shared 50/50 with the project sponsors (the Arkansas Natural Resources Commission and the Boeuf-Tensas Regional Irrigation Water Distribution District). This report provides planning, engineering, and implementation details of the recommended plan to allow final design and construction to proceed subsequent to the approval of the plan.

b. General Site Description.

(1) The Southeast Arkansas study area is bounded on the east by the Mississippi River, on the north by the Arkansas River, on the west by the hill line adjacent to Bayou Bartholomew, and on the south by the Arkansas-Louisiana state line. Counties included in the study area are

Jefferson, Lincoln, Drew, Ashley, Chicot, and Desha. The study area encompasses approximately 1.2 million acres. This study addresses current flooding and agricultural water supply problems and needs and provisions to restore, protect, and/or enhance the environment.

(2) The study area is characterized by level, mostly cleared land. This delta area has a flat to slightly undulating surface created by the sedimentation of flood deposits. The topography is further differentiated by crescent-shaped lakes, the remnants of changes in stream courses.

(3) Major streams in the study area include Bayou Bartholomew, Boeuf River, and Bayou Macon. Other tributaries of these streams include Big Bayou Canal; Black Pond Slough; Canals 18, 19, 43, and 81; and numerous other creeks and bayous. With the exception of Bayou Bartholomew, all of the major streams in the study area are either manmade canals or have been channelized. The canals and channelized streams are primarily flood control projects. Bayou Bartholomew is a natural unchannelized stream. The Mississippi and Arkansas Rivers lie outside the study area, but will be evaluated since they are possible sources of import water and recharge for the area.

Project Scope. The proposed project area will include portions of the overall study area and will be defined by the final array of alternatives proposed to be developed during the summer of 2008. The anticipated project is expected to feature a variety of components that function for a specific purpose or joint purposes. The preliminary estimated total project cost developed during reconnaissance studies was $370 million. A summary of these estimated project costs is presented below:

SUMMARY OF FIRST COSTS

Feature	Amount ($000)
Lands and Damages	26,815
Relocations	54,345
Channels and Canals	55,710
Dredging	6,777
Pumping Plants	12,594
Water Control Structure	67,680
Conservation	74,452
Engineering and Design	40,734
Construction and Management	31,228
Total	370,335

NOTE: This tabulation was taken from a report typed some time ago.

These costs will change significantly given the level of plan formulation to date; however, the requirement for EPR is obviously based on the overall scope of the project.

c. Problems and Opportunities. Water and related land resource problems in this watershed are focused in three primary areas--the environment, flood risk management, and agricultural water supply. Addressing any of these independently would be both foolish and a waste of time and resources. A comprehensive plan for the watershed must address these problems together so that each is given the proper emphasis. Specific problems and opportunities are listed below.

(1) Problems.

(a) Urban flooding in the town of Dumas.

(b) Agricultural flooding throughout the watershed.

(c) Degraded habitat in existing canals and interior streams from agricultural runoff.

(d) Decreased water quality in existing streams due to the pumping of surface water during the summer for irrigation.

(e) Ground water declines due to irrigation pumpage.

(f) Saltwater intrusion in ground water relative to specific areas of the watershed.

(g) Improperly placed weirs or other structures in various stream locations throughout the watershed.

(h) Buildup of logs and debris in Bayou Bartholomew.

(2) Opportunities.

(a) Urban and agricultural flood damage reduction.

(b) Stabilization of the alluvial aquifer through reductions in ground-water withdrawal.

(c) Improved water quality and fisheries habitat in area streams.

(d) Restoration of base flows to area streams during the summer.

(e) Increased wetland habitat through nonstructural flood damage reduction measures.

(f) Elimination of ground-water withdrawals in areas of high chloride concentrations.

d. Model Certification. Hydraulic and hydrologic models expected to be used include (1) Geo-Hydraulic Modeling System, (2) Geo-HecRaz, and (3) Hydraulic Modeling System. These models were developed by the Hydraulic Engineering Center and are certified models for use in water resource investigations. Environmental models likely to be used include (1) Hydro-Geomorphic Classification of Wetlands Model, (2) Aquatic Habitat Evaluation Procedures

(HEP), and (3) Terrestrial HEP. These environmental analysis models are certified, widely used throughout the Corps, and widely accepted by natural resource agencies. Economic models likely to be used include (1) HEC/FDA, (2) CACFDAS, and (3) Excel spreadsheets to factor in risk and uncertainty. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) has used models to project ground-water response to irrigation water use that are well documented and have undergone peer review through Department of Interior procedures. Any models proposed for use as the study progresses will be evaluated for certification.

e. Product Delivery Team (PDT). The PDT is comprised of those individuals directly involved in the development of the decision document. Contact information and disciplines are listed below.

Discipline	Office
Project Manager	Planning and Project Management Branch (CEMVK-PP-D)
Biologist	Environmental Analysis Team (CEMVK-PP-PQ)
Economist	Economic Analysis Team (CEMVK-PP-PE)
Structural Design	Structures Section (CEMVK-EC-DS)
Channel Design	Levee and Drainage Section (CEMVK-EC-DL)
Mechanical/Electrical	Architectural, Civil, Mechanical, and Electrical Section (CEMVK-EC-DC)
Real Estate Appraisal	Appraisal and Planning Branch (CEMVK-RE-E)
Real Estate Planning	Appraisal and Planning Branch (CEMVK-RE-E)
Cost Engineering	Cost Engineering and Specifications Section (CEMVK-EC-TC)
Hydrologic Engineering	Hydrologic Engineering Section (CEMVK-EC-HD)
Geotechnical	Analytical Section (CEMVK-EC-GA)
Water Quality	Water Quality Section (CEMVK-EC-HW)

f. 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 Community of Practice (PCoP). The District Project Manager can be contacted at (601) 631-5745, and the DST manager for this project can be contacted at (601) 634-5065.

3. ITR Plan. As outlined in paragraph 1.b(1) above, the District is responsible for ensuring adequate technical review of decision documents and their supporting interim work products described below. The responsible PDT District of this decision document is St. Paul (CEMVP).

a. General. The Project Study Plan (now Project Management Plan (PMP)) for the Southeast Arkansas feasibility study specified technical review procedures including an Independent Review Team within the Vicksburg District, which was the established procedure at the time. Following the issuance of memorandum, CECW-CP, 30 June 2004, subject: Implementation of Quality Management for Civil Works Planning, and subsequent guidance from CEMVD, technical review was moved to St. Paul District. An ITR team was established and CEMVK hosted the ITR team for a field trip to the study area in November 2004. The ITR team is poised to continue this effort; however, current policy indicates the need for an ITR leader from outside CEMVD.

(1) The purpose of an ITR team leader from outside CEMVD is to ensure full objectivity, transparency, and review independence of the ITR. The ITR team leader is responsible for providing information necessary for setting up the review, communicating with the Project Manager (PM), providing a summary of critical review comments, collecting grammatical and editorial comments from the ITR team (ITRT), ensuring that ITRT has adequate funding to perform the review, facilitating the resolution of the comments, and certifying that ITR has been conducted and resolved in accordance with policy.

(2) Inasmuch as the Feasibility Scoping Meeting has not been held yet, the policy of choosing an ITR leader from outside CEMVD will be followed. The lead PCX will select the new ITR Team Leader with input from CEMVK and CEMVD. The new ITR Team Leader will work with the established ITR Team to review project information and document the results as outlined below.

b. Team.

(1) The ITRT is comprised of individuals who have not been involved in the development of the decision document or interim work products and were chosen based on expertise, experience, and/or skills. The members have disciplines that roughly mirror the composition of the PDT and include many of the following:

(a) Hydraulic Engineering. The reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge of HEC-RAS modeling, including the use of Geographic Information System (GIS) (ARC-INFO) inputs to the model. The reviewer(s) should also have a solid understanding of the geomorphology of alluvial rivers.

(b) Cost Engineering. The reviewer should have a solid background in cost engineering and MCACES cost estimating procedures. The Cost Engineering Center at the Walla Walla District will also review the cost estimates in accordance with HQUSACE guidance.

(c) Design Engineering. The reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge in the design of water control structures to include floodgates, pumping stations, and weirs. Expertise in mechanical and electrical is desirable.

(d) Geotechnical Engineering. The reviewer should have a thorough understanding of soils and soils analysis. The soils in the study area are generally fine-grained silts.

(e) Economics. The reviewer should have a solid understanding of Flood Risk Management (FRM) models for agricultural and rural residential areas along with Ecosystem Restoration models and incremental analysis.

(f) Environmental. The reviewer should have a solid background in wetland and stream channel restoration and understand the factors that influence the reestablishment of native species of plants and animals. The reviewer should also understand environmental incremental analysis.

(g) Real Estate. The reviewer should have recent experience in reviewing Real Estate plans for feasibility studies and be able to draw on "lessons learned" in advising the PDT of best practices.

(h) Planning. The reviewer should have recent experience in reviewing Plan Formulation processes for multiobjective studies and be able to draw on "lessons learned" in advising the PDT of best practices.

(i) Cultural Resources. The reviewer should be familiar with historic and prehistoric activities associated with civilization in the Mississippi River alluvial plain and should understand current policy relative to Native American coordination and the management of cultural resources activities.

(2) Other disciplines will be brought to the team as needed. Additional team members will be recommended by the ITR Team Leader and approved by the lead PCX Program Manager. The lead PCX may coordinate with other PCXs as necessary. The ITR will focus on:

(a) Review of the planning process, criteria applied, and models used.

(b) Review of the methods of NER and incremental environmental analysis.

(c) Compliance with client, program, and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements.

(d) Completeness of preliminary design and support documents.

(e) Adequacy of MCACES cost estimates.

c. Communication. The communication plan for the ITR is as follows:

(1) The team will use DrChecks to document the ITR process. The PM will facilitate the creation of a project portfolio in the system to allow access by all PDT and ITRT members. An electronic version of interim technical work products for the Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM), Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB), and the draft report, with appendixes and NEPA document, in Word format shall be posted at ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/ or a hard copy will be provided at least 1 business day prior to the start of the comment period.

(2) The PDT shall send the ITRT leader one hard copy (with color pages, as applicable) of the draft report and appendixes and NEPA document for each ITRT member such that the copies are received at least 1 business day prior to the start of the comment period. Interim technical work products will be provided to the appropriate ITRT members.

(3) The PDT shall host an ITR kickoff meeting virtually to orient the ITRT during the first week of the comment period for the draft report and NEPA document. If funds are not available for an onsite meeting, the PDT shall provide a presentation about the project, including photographs of the site, for the team.

(4) The PM shall inform the ITRT leader when all responses have been entered into DrChecks and conduct an in-progress review to summarize comment responses.

(5) A revised electronic version of the report and appendixes and interim technical work products 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 ITRT members or 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 e-mail or telephone to clarify any confusion. DrChecks shall not be used to post questions needed for clarification.

(8) The ITRT, PDT, and vertical team shall conduct an After Action Review (AAR) no later than 3 weeks after ITR certification.

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 PM will work with the ITRT leader to ensure that adequate funding is available and commensurate with the level of review needed. The current cost estimate for this review is $100,000. Any funding shortages will be negotiated on a case-by-case basis and in advance of a negative charge occurring.

(2) The ITRT leader shall provide organization codes for each team member 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 ITRT leader to any possible funding shortages.

e. Timing and Schedule.

(1) Throughout the development of this document, the PDT will brief Senior staff and subject matter experts from the PDT District to ensure planning quality. Members of the vertical team (DST, Planning CoP, RIT) and ITRT will be invited to provide comments on the product to date.

(2) The ITR will be accomplished in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix G. Three ITRs are planned:

(a) Technical work products that support the FSM documentation to include surveying and mapping, hydrology and hydraulics, average annual damage computation, etc., will be subject to ITR prior to submitting the technical products for the FSM.

(b) Technical work products that support the AFB documentation in addition to those listed in (a) above to include environmental/NEPA documentation, average annual damage benefit calculation, cost estimates, etc., will be subject to ITR prior to the AFB. If the draft report is available, that report may serve as the AFB documentation.

(c) ITR will be conducted on the draft report and EIS.

(3) The PDT will review the interim products including FSM materials, AFB materials, and draft feasibility report with NEPA document to ensure consistency across the disciplines and resolve any issues prior to the start of ITR on these items.

(4) The ITR process for the interim products, feasibility report, and NEPA document will follow the timeline below. Actual dates will be scheduled once the period draws closer. It is estimated that review of the feasibility report and NEPA document will begin in the second quarter of FY 2010.

Task	Date (Week)
Feasibility Scoping Meeting	To be determined
Alternative formulation ongoing	To be determined
Feasibility Report and NEPA Document	To be determined
Comment period begin	1
Kickoff meeting	1
ITR comments due	4
PDT responses due	6
Responses back check	8
Certification	10
Alternative formulation briefing (AFB)	14
AFB policy memorandum issued	18
Recertification, if needed	--
AAR NLT	20

f. Review.

(1) ITRT responsibilities are as follows:

(a) Reviewers shall review the interim work products for the FSM, AFB, and draft report in Environmental Protection Agency documents to confirm that work was done in accordance with established professional principals, 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 who 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 ITRT leader via electronic mail using tracked changes feature in the Word document or as a hard copy markup. The ITRT leader shall provide these comments to the PM.

(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 ITR manager and/or PM first.

(2) The PDT team responsibilities are as follows:

(a) The team shall review comments provided by the ITRT in DrChecks and provide responses to each comment using "Concur," "Nonconcur," or "For Information Only." Concur responses shall state what action was taken and provide revised text from the report, if applicable. Nonconcur 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 ITRT managers to discuss any "nonconcur" 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) Reviewers may "agree to disagree" with any comment response and close the comment with a detailed explanation. The ITRT members shall keep the ITR leader informed of problematic comments. The vertical team will be informed of any policy variations or other issues that may cause concern during Headquarters review.

h. Certification. To fully document the ITR process, a statement of technical review will be prepared. Certification by the ITR leader and PM will occur once issues raised by the reviewers have been addressed to the review team's satisfaction. 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.

i. AFB. The AFB for this project will occur after ITR certification. It is possible that the briefing will result in additional technical or policy comments for resolution. After resolution of significant comments, the ITR will be recertified, if needed.

4. EPR Plan.

a. This decision document will present the details of a feasibility study undertaken to address the issues described in paragraph 2 above. The scope of the anticipated project is reasonably complex and involves several overlapping project purposes. An EPR will likely be needed. The reconnaissance report indicated total project costs of approximately $370 million.

(1) The Southeast Arkansas feasibility report will contain substantial scientific information related to ground and surface water modeling, stream and watershed ecology, and related hydrologic and economic models. Some of this information has been subjected to peer review already (information developed by USGS); however, other studies have not.

(2) It is anticipated that while this study will be challenging and beneficial, it will not be precedent setting. There may be some controversial features and novel concepts involved; however, it will not be extremely significant from a national perspective.

(3) Project Magnitude. This project is anticipated to cost in excess of $45 million (preliminary cost of $370 million in the reconnaissance report). While the hydrology of the study area is not considered to be complex, the formulation could involve some complexity in that individual watersheds or stream reaches will have features with multiple objectives. The project will likely have positive long-term cumulative effects.

(4) Project Risk. This project is considered low risk overall. The potential for failure is considered to be low. There may be some level of risk for increased stream stages to cropland in selected reaches due to certain project features. These situations will be well documented, however, along with measures formulated to offset these impacts. The potential for controversy regarding project implementation is low because the recommended plan will take into account public concerns. A socioeconomic analysis will be prepared and at least one public meeting will be held. The uncertainty of success of the project is indeterminate at this time due to the stage of project formulation. The resource problems in the project area that are under investigation have not reached an irreversible state so it is likely that comprehensive plan of the magnitude proposed will be successful.

(5) The subject matter covered in the decision document is anticipated to be reasonably complex and involves several overlapping project purposes. The project has the potential to generate considerable interagency interest and/or important economic, environmental, or social effects.

(6) Therefore, a separate EPR will be conducted on the decision document and external members will not be part of the ITR team. The ITR, public, and agency review, along with EPR, will serve as the main review approaches.

5. Public and Agency Review.

a. Public review of the feasibility study will occur after issuance of the AFB policy guidance memorandum, after ITR of the draft feasibility report and NEPA document, and concurrence by HQUSACE that the document is ready for public release. The period will last 30 days as required by law. As such, public comments other than those provided at any public meetings or workshops held during the planning process will not be available to the EPR team. Significant public comments that result in changes to the formulation will require a new ITR.

b. The public review of necessary state or Federal permits will also take place during this period.

c. 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, thereby limiting the extent of state and agency comments. Some areas of potential concern might include ecosystem and regulatory changes associated with interbasin transfer of water, regulation of water withdrawal from study area streams, and flood risk associated with stream modification.

d. Upon completion of the review period, comments will be consolidated 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.

6. EPR. As the anticipated implementation cost of the project exceeds the $45 million threshold set by Congress, it is recommended that this feasibility study be subjected to EPR. The FRM PCX is responsible for the accomplishment and quality of the external peer reviews for this project since the primary designation is attributed to flood risk management. The FRM PCX will contract with an independent organization that will establish the EPR team. The FRM PCX will facilitate ERP for this study by coordinating with other relevant PCXs and developing a list of candidate reviewers for consideration by the independent organization. The independent organization can also solicit public input in the selection of candidate reviewers if desired. It is anticipated that four EPR reviewers will be selected from subject matter experts outside the Corps with anticipated disciplines, including flood risk management, ecosystem planning, water supply/management, and project design/cost development. The FRM reviewer should be familiar with aspects of rural and agricultural flood damage, as well as measures to reduce flood risk and the tradeoffs associated with ecosystem restoration vs. agricultural production. The ecosystem planning reviewer should have experience in bottom-land hardwood ecosystems and be familiar with alluvial stream corridor health and management. This person should also be knowledgeable regarding tradeoffs relative to agriculture vs. bottom-land hardwood ecosystems. The water supply/management reviewer needs to understand basic irrigation processes, including physical and chemical factors that influence crop productivity. This person also needs to have an understanding of aquifer and surface water modeling and should be familiar with conjunctive use theory. The project design/cost development reviewer needs to have a good understanding of project features developed for management of flood risk and water supply distribution as well as ecosystem restoration. This person should also be aware of recent fluctuations in cost for project

features due to high energy costs, supply disruption as a result of natural disasters, and any other factors associated with the project environment. The EPR will be conducted concurrently with AFB. The EPR may be conducted at additional points, as deemed appropriate by PCX.

7. PCX Coordination. The appropriate PCX for this document is the National Flood Risk Management Center of Expertise located at CESPD. This review plan will be submitted through the PDT District (CEMVK) Planning, Programs, and Project Management Chief to the PCX Director for approval. Since it was determined that this project is anticipated to be reasonably complex and involves several overlapping project purposes, an EPR will be required. The PCX is requested to review and comment on the sufficiency of this Peer Review Plan including the need for reestablishment of an ITRT and ITRT leader. The approved review plan will be posted to the PCX website. Any public comments on the review plan will be collected by OWPR and provided to the PDT District for resolution and incorporation, if needed. The PCX Program Manager can be contacted at (415) 503-6852.

8. Approvals. The PDT will carry out the review plan as described. The PM will submit the plan to the PDT District Planning, Programs, and Project Management Chief for approval. Coordination with PCX will occur through the PDT District Planning, Programs, and Project Management Chief. Signatures by the individuals below indicate approval of the plan as proposed.

_____ _____

Project Manager (Date)
Southeast Arkansas Project Delivery Team

_____ _____

Chief, Planning, Programs, and Project (Date)
Management Division
Vicksburg District

APPENDIX A
STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW

COMPLETION OF INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW
SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, ARKANSAS
FEASIBILITY REPORT AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)

The Vicksburg District has completed the feasibility report, EIS, and appendixes for the Southeast Arkansas, Arkansas, feasibility project. Notice is hereby given that an independent 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 independent 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 independent technical review was accomplished by an independent team composed of _____staff. All comments resulting from ITR have been resolved.

_____ _____

Team Leader, Southeast Arkansas,
Arkansas Project, Independent
Technical Review Team

(Date)

_____ _____

Project Manager
Southeast Arkansas, Arkansas, Project

(Date)

CERTIFICATION OF INDEPENDENT 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 independent technical review of the project have been fully resolved.

_____ _____

Chief, Planning, Programs, and Project Management Division
Vicksburg District

(Date)

PEER REVIEW PLAN

SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, ARKANSAS
FEASIBILITY REPORT AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Table of Contents

LIST OF APPENDIXES