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

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CEPOD-PDC

11 October 2007

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

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for the Matanuska-Susitna Watershed Study Mat-Su Borough, Alaska

1. The enclosed Review Plan for the Matanuska-Susitna Watershed Study, Mat-Su Borough, Alaska, 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 will be coordinated with the Flood Risk Management Planning Center of Expertise of the South Pacific 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 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) 753-2521.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

Encl

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

QUALITY CONTROL
AND
PEER REVIEW PLAN
FOR
MATANUSKA-SUSITNA WATERSHED STUDY
MAT-SU BOROUGH, ALASKA
SEPTEMBER 14, 2007

For questions or comments regarding this Quality Control and Peer Review Plan, please contact the study's Project Formulator at (907) 753-2521.

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
Matanuska-Susitna Watershed Study

PROJECT PURPOSE
Multi-Purpose (Watershed)

SCOPE OF STUDY
The overall purpose of this study is to produce a comprehensive watershed assessment for the Matanuska-Susitna watershed. The watershed assessment will provide several planning tools and products that will serve as a decision-making framework for local, state, and federal agencies, and other interested stakeholders. An important component of this process will be a concentrated effort on the wetlands resources. In scoping this study effort, wetlands resources were brought up at almost every meeting with every stakeholder as a resource of concern. We will be working on a coordinated multi-agency effort to map, delineate jurisdictional, as well as perform a qualitative functional assessment of the wetland resources in currently developed, developing, and areas recognized for future development within the watershed. This effort is high priority for the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) as well as the non-Federal Sponsor. As such, the Sponsor is working with the USFWS using USFWS grant funds to begin mapping wetlands in the summer of 2007.

It is envisioned that local, state and federal agencies and non-profit groups will work together in a collaborative manner, as well as independently through their own resources and authorities to implement concepts and recommendations identified in the assessment and implementation tools. Document review will include independent technical review (ITR), POD, HQ, and public reviews as appropriate

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	Mat-Su Borough
Economist	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Environmental Resources Specialist/NEPA	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Regulatory Specialist	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Hydraulics & Hydrology	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Tribal Liaison	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Civil and/or Geotechnical Engineer	Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
GIS Specialist	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 on consistency between products and documents, technical sufficiency, and editorial correctness. This review will be an ongoing effort throughout product development, but there will be a comprehensive review by the PDT once the product(s) are 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, Hydraulics and Hydrology (H&H), and Regulatory will each review the draft and final documents and/or products to ensure consistency with Corps policy, holistic programmatic issues, and technical sufficiency.

MODEL CERTIFICATION

The study may use some engineering models to develop flood risk or other hydrology and hydraulics information related to erosion, bank stability, or stream dynamics for use in evaluating stream health and potential ecosystem restoration. The engineering models could include HEC-RAS or HEC-HMS; models in common use. Per EC-1105-2-407, that Circular does not cover engineering models used in planning which will be certified under a separate process to be established under Science and Engineering Technology (SET). Other analytical tools such as spreadsheets developed for computation of economic trends related to future development may also be utilized but do not require certification. The use and application of tools such as habitat modeling or hydrogeographic modeling for this project are subject to independent technical review. It is unknown what other planning models may be used in this study at this time. If any models are proposed for use, such as any watershed modeling tools, or models associated with rating relative values or functional qualities related to the wetlands work, they will be coordinated with the appropriate Planning Center of Expertise to determine need and model certification process, as applicable.

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 will be identified and approved by the Center for Expertise for Flood Risk Management in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' South Pacific Division, or other Planning Center of Expertise if it is determined to be more appropriate. ITR for any reports and appendices will be assigned as products are identified by the PDT and coordinated with the PCX. The ITR process will ensure complete impartiality for any project justification that may be identified. Disciplines that may be involved in the ITR are detailed in the table below, but it should be noted that this list may be modified to meet the technical needs of the products being reviewed.

INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW (ITR) TEAM	
Position	Organization
Review Team Leader	TBD
Review Facilitator	TBD
Plan Formulator	TBD
Economist	TBD
Civil or Geotechnical Engineer	TBD
Environmental Resources/NEPA	TBD
Regulatory Specialist	TBD
Hydrology/Hydraulics	TBD
GIS Specialist	TBD

ITR will occur on draft documents and/or products as appropriate, 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 $TBD.

PUBLIC / STAKEHOLDER / AGENCY REVIEW

Public, stakeholder, and agency coordination and review of products will occur, and is an inherent part of a good watershed study process. 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 general information about the study area. Interests, ideas, on-going activities and the future of the watershed will also be important information to gather from these meetings. 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 changes common practices, or is likely to affect policy decisions that have significant impact.

The Mat-Su Watershed study does not appear to meet any of these criteria. It is anticipated that the project will be developed using application of standard policy and practices for similar watershed-level projects. The proposed project has neither sufficient risk nor is of sufficient magnitude to warrant an EPR.

REVIEW MILESTONES
District Reviews of Phase I work: Oct 2008
ITR of Draft Feasibility Document: TBD
Public and Agency Review: TBD
EPR: N/A

VICINITY MAP