DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
PACIFIC OCEAN DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
FORT SHAFTER, HAWAII 96858-5440

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CEPOD-PDC

1 August 2007

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDER, ALASKA ENGINEER DISTRICT, ATTN: CEPOA-EN-CW-PF

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for the Whittier Navigation Improvements, Whittier, Alaska Study

1. The enclosed Review Plan for the Whittier Navigation Improvements, Whittier, Alaska study has been prepared in accordance with EC 1105-2-408 and the Director of Civil Works' "Peer Review Process" memorandum dated March 30, 2007.

2. The Review Plan is available for public comment, and the comments received will be incorporated into the Review Plan as appropriate. The Review Plan has been coordinated with the Navigation Planning Center of Expertise of the South Atlantic Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which is the lead office to execute this Review Plan. The Review Plan does not include external peer review because the scope and technical complexity of the feasibility report and Environmental Assessment are not expected to be novel, controversial or precedent setting.

3. I hereby approve this Review Plan, which is subject to change as study circumstances require, consistent with study development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this Review Plan or its execution will require new written approval from this office.

4. The point of contact for this Review Plan can be reached at (907) 753-5619.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

Encl

EUGENE M. BAN, P.E.
Director of Programs

QUALITY CONTROL
AND
PEER REVIEW PLAN
FOR
WHITTIER NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS
WHITTIER, ALASKA
JULY 31, 2007

For questions or comments regarding this Quality Control and Peer Review Plan, please contact the Project Formulator at (907) 753-5619.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS QUALITY CONTROL AND PEER REVIEW PLAN IS DISTRIBUTED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PREDISSEMINATION PEER REVIEW UNDER APPLICABLE INFORMATION QUALITY GUIDELINES. IT HAS NOT BEEN FORMALLY DISSEMINATED BY THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, ALASKA DISTRICT. IT DOES NOT REPRESENT AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO REPRESENT ANY AGENCY DETERMINATION OR POLICY.

REPORT BEING REVIEWED
Integrated Interim Whittier Navigation Improvements Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Effect

PROJECT PURPOSE
Navigation

SCOPE OF STUDY
The report will document the feasibility of navigation improvements at Whittier, Alaska and assess potential environmental effects associated with a range of alternatives that could be implemented to address existing navigation problems. The primary focus of this report will be to describe the feasibility of providing additional protected moorage. The study will be conducted and this integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment will be prepared in accordance with the study authority, the goals and procedures for water resources planning as contained in Engineer Regulation (ER) 1105-2-100, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Alternatives will be examined for their feasibility, considering engineering, economic, environmental, and other criteria. A determination of Federal interest, in accordance with present laws and policies, will also be included.

The Project Delivery Team (PDT) responsible for the different components of the study includes the disciplines detailed in the table below.

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM (PDT)	
Position	Organization
Project Manager	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Plan Formulator	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Non-Federal Sponsor	City of Whittier, Alaska
Economist	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Environmentalist	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Hydraulics & Hydrology	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Cost Engineer	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Real Estate Specialist	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Geotechnical Engineer	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

DISTRICT REVIEWS
Project Delivery Team Review – As report products are developed, the PDT will review the report to check each others work with a particular focus upon consistency between documents, technical sufficiency, and editorial correctness. This review will be an ongoing effort throughout document development, but there will be a comprehensive review by the PDT once the entire report package is complete.

Editorial Review – As the draft and final reports are completed, they will undergo an editorial review by a writer/editor to ensure consistency in formatting, style, readability, grammar, and other items under the editorial purview.

Section Chiefs Review – The Section Chiefs for Project Formulation, Economics, Plan Formulation, and Hydraulics and Hydrology (H&H) will each review the draft and final documents to ensure consistency with Corps policy, holistic programmatic issues, and technical sufficiency.

MODEL CERTIFICATION

The study uses a number of engineering models to develop wind and wave information into estimates of wave climate for the project. The engineering models include the STeady state spectral WAVE (STWAVE) model and ADvanced CIRCulation (ADCIRC) model. These are models in common use, which have been adapted for use for the conditions specific to Whittier by the study team. There is no current requirement for certification of engineering models. Other analytical tools, such as spreadsheets developed for computation of the project benefits and cost allocation will also be utilized but do not require certification. The use and application of these tools for this project are subject to independent technical review.

INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW (ITR)

The purpose of an Independent Technical Review is to ensure the quality and credibility of the government's scientific information. The ITR Team has been identified and approved by the Center for Expertise for Navigation in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' South Atlantic Division, Mobile District. ITR for the feasibility report and appendices will be done by the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division's Buffalo District (CELRB) to ensure complete impartiality for the project justification. Disciplines that will be involved in the ITR are detailed below.

INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW (ITR) TEAM	
Position	Organization
Review Team Leader	Mobile District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Review Facilitator	Buffalo District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Plan Formulator	Buffalo District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Economist	Buffalo District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Coastal Engineer	Buffalo District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Environmental	Buffalo District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Real Estate Specialist	Buffalo District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Cost Engineer	Buffalo District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Geotechnical Engineer	Buffalo District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

A majority of the reviewers on the ITR Team have over 20 years experience in their disciplines. ITRs will occur on draft documents and will utilize Dr Checks as the vehicle for tracking comments. This will be a comprehensive review of the work performed by the PDT. Assumptions, methodology, computations, and conclusion will all be checked. The estimated cost for ITR, response to comments, and back check is $50,000.

PUBLIC / STAKEHOLDER / AGENCY REVIEW

Public, stakeholder, and agency review will occur, at a minimum, as part of the NEPA process which requires a specific period of time be made available for review of the finding of the project. However, in order to gain buy-in from these groups, a series of meetings will occur throughout the study process where input will be solicited to develop an accurate understanding of problems and opportunities as well as the potential for environmental impact and mitigation requirements. The PDT will accept comments from the public for consideration in the study and preparation of documents. The ITR team will generally not receive public comments, as public comments are used to develop the document the ITR team reviews.

EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

An External Peer Review (EPR) is utilized in special cases where risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified person or team outside the Corps and not involved in the day-to-day production of the product is necessary. EPR is also utilized in cases where information based upon novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretation, contains precedent-setting methods or models, presents conclusions that are likely to change common practices, or is likely to affect policy decisions that have significant impact.

The Whittier Navigation Improvements project does not appear to meet any of these criteria. The project will be developed using application of standard policy and practices. The proposed project has neither sufficient risk nor is of sufficient magnitude to warrant an EPR.

REVIEW MILESTONES

ITR of Draft Feasibility Scoping Meeting Document: FY 2008
District Reviews: FY 2009
ITR of Draft Feasibility Report (Alternative Formulation Briefing Document): FY 2009
Public and Agency Review: FY 2009
EPR: N/A