



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
PACIFIC OCEAN DIVISION, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
573 BONNEY LOOP, BUILDING 525
FORT SHAFTER, HAWAII 96858-5440

CEPOD-PDC

FEB 20 2018

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Alaska Engineer District (CEPOA-PM-C/Amber Metallo), P.O. Box 6898 JBER, AK 99506-0898

SUBJECT: Approval of the Review Plan for the Petersburg Navigation Section 107 Feasibility Report

1. References:

a. Engineering Circular 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review, 15 Dec 12.

b. Review Plan for the Petersburg Navigation Section 107 Feasibility Report, Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (Encl)

2. This memorandum constitutes approval of the Review Plan for the Petersburg Navigation Section 107 Feasibility Report, Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which does not include a Type I Independent External Peer Review.

3. The approved Review Plan is subject to change as circumstances require, consistent with project development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent significant revisions to this Review Plan or its execution require my written approval.

4. POC is Mr. Russell Iwamura, Senior Economist, Civil Works Integration Division, at 808-835-4625 or email Russell.K.Iwamura@usace.army.mil.

Encl

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "TJ Tickner", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

THOMAS J. TICKNER, PMP
Brigadier General, USA
Commanding

**REVIEW PLAN
FOR CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM (CAP)
SECTION 107 PROJECTS**

Petersburg Navigation Section 107

Alaska District

20 February 2018

**MSC Approval Date: 20 February 2018
Last Revision Date: None**



**US Army Corps
of Engineers®**

**REVIEW PLAN
FOR CAP SECTION 107 PROJECTS**

Petersburg Navigation Section 107, Petersburg, Alaska

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS	1
2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION.....	2
3. STUDY INFORMATION.....	2
4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC).....	3
5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)	3
6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR).....	6
7. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW.....	7
8. COST ENGINEERING DIRECTORY OF EXPERTISE (DX) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION	7
9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL.....	7
10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS.....	8
11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.....	9
12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES	9
13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT (POC).....	8
ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS	10
ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS	12
ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS	14
ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	15

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Petersburg Navigation, Section 107 project decision document.

Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960, as amended, authorizes the Corps to study, adopt, construct and maintain navigation projects. This is a Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) authority that focuses on water resource related projects of relatively smaller scope, cost, and complexity. Unlike the traditional Corps' civil works projects that are of wider scope and complexity, the CAP is a delegated authority to: plan, design, and construct certain types of water resource and environmental restoration projects without specific Congressional authorization.

b. Applicability. This Pacific Ocean Division (POD) model review plan is applicable to those Section 107 project decision documents that do not require an Independent External Peer Review (IEPR).

c. References

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review, 12 Dec 12.
- (2) Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, Continuing Authority Program Planning Process Improvements, 19 Jan 11.
- (3) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 Mar 11.
- (4) Engineer Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 06.
- (5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 07.
- (6) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 07.
- (7) Project Management Plan (PMP).
- (8) POD and/or District Quality Management Plan(s).

d. Requirements. This POD Model Review Plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-214, 12 Dec 12 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, 19 Jan 11, which establishes an accountable, comprehensive, life-cycle review strategy for Civil Works CAP products by providing a seamless process for review of all Civil Works projects during the Feasibility Phase. The EC outlines four general levels of review: District Quality Control (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), IEPR, and Policy and Legal Compliance Review. In addition to these levels of review, CAP decision documents are subject to cost engineering review and certification (per EC 1165-2-214),

Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, and the Value Management Plan requirements in the Implementation Guidance for Section 1004 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) of 2014, Removal of Duplicative Analysis, CECW-EC, dated April 27, 2017. The requirements for VE studies during feasibility studies has been rescinded. VE studies during D&I phase may still be required.

2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION

The RMO is responsible for managing the overall peer review effort described in this Review Plan. The RMO for this Section 107 decision document is POD. POD will coordinate and approve the Review Plan and manage the ATR.

Upon approval by the RMO, the Alaska District (POA) will post the approved Review Plan on its public website. Coordination has begun with Small Boat Harbor Planning sub-Center of Expertise (SBH-PSCX) within the Deep Draft Navigation-Planning Center of Expertise (DDN-PCX). A copy of the approved Review Plan (and any updates) will be provided to the DDN-PCX to keep them apprised of requirements and review schedules.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

a. Decision Document. The Petersburg Navigation Section 107 decision document will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 07. The approval level of the decision document (if policy compliant) is POD. At this time, the District assumes an EA will be prepared with the feasibility report. If an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required, the Alaska District will update the Review Plan accordingly.

b. Study/Project Description. The sponsor for the Petersburg Navigation Section 107 feasibility study is the Petersburg Borough. Petersburg is a community with a commercial fishing lifestyle. The community is not on the road system and can be reached only by boat or plane. There are currently three harbors in Petersburg, North Harbor, Middle Harbor, and South Harbor. North Harbor is the only Federal Project location; Middle Harbor and South Harbor were under the State's ownership until 2003, at which time ownership was passed onto the Borough. Approximately 98% of South Harbor's activities support commercial fishing activities.

Shallow depths are impacting the efficient use of portions of the Petersburg Harbor system. Vessels often run aground and portions of the harbor are inaccessible at lower tidal stages. The shallow depths are perceived to be due to a combination of localized areas of sedimentation adjacent to water inflows and isostatic rebound. The primary focus of this study is South Harbor. South Harbor is not a Federally constructed harbor with an authorized project depth. Original harbor design depths are not readily available for comparison.

The likely recommended plan is dredging of shallow portions of South Harbor to an optimal depth to be determined during the Feasibility Phase of this study. Establishment of General Navigation Features (GNF) and Local Service Facilities (LSF) will also be determined during the Feasibility Phase. The local sponsor will be responsible for the cost to dredge the portions designated LSF while the Federal government will be responsible for those designated GNF.

Two alternatives for providing navigational improvements at this site are being considered, including reconfiguration of the current float system as a non-structural solution. The harbor system at Petersburg has a haul out area located approximately 2.5 miles north at Scow Bay. Scow Bay is being considered as a possible upland disposal site for the dredged material from the harbor. The construction of a breakwater to protect the haul out area at Scow Bay is also being considered as part of the Section 107 project.

c. In-Kind Contributions. Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC and ATR, similar to any products developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)

All decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC prior to ATR. DQC is an internal review process of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the PMP. POA shall manage DQC.

a. Documentation of DQC. Documentation of DQC activities is required and should be in accordance with the Quality Management Plans of the District and POD.

b. Products to Undergo DQC. All decision documents, including cost estimates are to be prepared in accordance with the POA Quality Management Plan.

c. Required DQC Expertise. DQC reviewers should have experience in developing Section 107 or navigation feasibility studies and construction of small boat harbors.

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.). The objective of ATR is to ensure consistency with established criteria, guidance, procedures, and policy. The ATR will assess whether the analyses presented are technically correct and comply with published USACE guidance, and that the document explains the analyses and results in a reasonably clear manner for the public and decision makers. ATR is managed within USACE by the designated RMO and is conducted by a qualified team from outside POA that is not involved in the day-to-day production of the project/product. ATR teams will

be composed of senior USACE personnel and may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate.

a. Products to Undergo ATR. ATR will be performed throughout the study in accordance with the District and POD Quality Management Plans. The ATR may still be on-going, but ATR status update should be discussed at the MSC (Major Subordinate Command) Decision Milestone (MDM) meeting. Certification of the ATR will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. Products to undergo ATR include the draft and final Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Section 107 Petersburg Navigation Project.

b. Required ATR Team Expertise.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional preferably with experience in preparing Section 107 decision documents and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. Typically, the ATR lead will also serve as a reviewer for a specific discipline (such as planning, economics, environmental resources, etc).
Planning	The planning reviewer should be a water resources planner with experience in planning related to small boat harbor studies.
Economics	The economics reviewer should be a senior economist with experience in economic analysis related to small boat harbor studies.
Environmental Resources	The environmental reviewer should be a senior National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) expert. They should have a working knowledge of NEPA requirements related to small boat harbor studies.
Cultural Resources	The cultural resource reviewer is typically a senior archaeologist with experience cultural resources investigation and compliance.
Cost Engineering	The cost engineering reviewer will be from the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) Staff or Cost DX Pre-Certified Professional with experience in preparing cost estimates for small boat harbor studies.
Real Estate	The real estate reviewer should be a senior real estate expert with experience in developing real estate plans for civil works projects.
Geotechnical Engineer	The geotechnical engineering reviewer should be a senior geotechnical engineer with experience in navigation projects.
Hydraulics and Hydrology	The Hydraulics and Hydrology reviewer should be a senior engineer with experience in navigation projects.

The ATR team members for this study and a brief description of their credentials will be included in Attachment 1.

c. Documentation of ATR. DrChecks review software will be used to document all ATR comments, responses, and associated resolutions accomplished throughout the review process. Comments should be limited to those that are required to ensure adequacy of the product. The four key parts of a quality review comment will normally include:

(1) The review concern – identify the product's information deficiency or incorrect application of policy, guidance, or procedures;

(2) The basis for the concern – cite the appropriate law, policy, guidance, or procedure that has not been properly followed;

(3) The significance of the concern – indicate the importance of the concern with regard to its potential impact on the plan selection, recommended plan components, efficiency (cost), effectiveness (function/outputs), implementation responsibilities, safety, Federal interest, or public acceptability; and

(4) The probable specific action needed to resolve the concern – identify the action(s) that the reporting officers must take to resolve the concern.

In some situations, especially addressing incomplete or unclear information, comments may seek clarification in order to then assess whether further specific concerns may exist.

The ATR documentation in DrChecks will include the text of each ATR concern, the Project Delivery Team (PDT) response, a brief summary of the pertinent points in any discussion, including any vertical team coordination (the vertical team includes POA, POD, and HQUSACE), and the agreed upon resolution. If an ATR concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the ATR team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the vertical team (VT) for further resolution in accordance with the policy issue resolution process described in either ER 1110-2-12 or ER 1105-2-100, Appendix H, as appropriate. Unresolved concerns can be closed in DrChecks with a notation that the concern has been elevated to the vertical team for resolution.

At the conclusion of each ATR effort, the ATR team will prepare a Review Report summarizing the review. Review Reports will be considered an integral part of the ATR documentation and shall:

- Identify the document(s) reviewed and the purpose of the review;
- Disclose the names of the reviewers, their organizational affiliations, and include a short paragraph on both the credentials and relevant experiences of each reviewer;
- Include the charge to the reviewers;

- Describe the nature of their review and their findings and conclusions;
- Identify and summarize each unresolved issue (if any); and
- Include a verbatim copy of each reviewer's comments (either with or without specific attributions), or represent the views of the group as a whole, including any disparate and dissenting views.

ATR may be certified when all ATR concerns are either resolved or referred to the vertical team for resolution and the ATR documentation is complete. The ATR lead will prepare a Statement of Technical Review certifying that the issues raised by the ATR team have been resolved (or elevated to the vertical team). A Statement of Technical Review should be completed, based on work reviewed to date, for the MDM draft report, and final report. A sample Statement of Technical Review is included in Attachment 2.

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

IEPR may be required for decision documents under certain circumstances. 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 USACE is warranted. A risk-informed decision, as described in EC 1165-2-214, is made as to whether IEPR is appropriate. IEPR panels will consist of independent, recognized experts from outside the USACE in the appropriate disciplines, representing a balance of areas of expertise suitable for the review being conducted. There are two types of IEPR:

- **Type I IEPR.** Type I IEPR reviews are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on project studies. Type I IEPR panels assess the adequacy and acceptability of the economic and environmental assumptions and projections, project evaluation data, economic analysis, environmental analyses, engineering analyses, formulation of alternative plans, methods for integrating risk and uncertainty, models used in the evaluation of environmental impacts of proposed projects, and biological opinions of the project study. Type I IEPR will cover the entire decision document or action and will address all underlying engineering, economics, and environmental work, not just one aspect of the study.

All CAP projects are excluded from Type I IEPR except Section 205 and Section 103 projects or those projects that include an EIS or meet the mandatory triggers for Type I IEPR as stated in EC 1165-2-214. Exclusions from Type I IEPR for Section 205 and Section 103 projects will be approved on a case by case basis by the POD Commander, based upon a risk informed decision process as outlined in EC 1165-2-214, and may not be delegated.

- **Type II IEPR.** Type II IEPR, or Safety Assurance Review (SAR), is managed outside the USACE and is conducted on design and construction activities for hurricane,

storm, and flood risk management projects or other projects where existing and potential hazards pose a significant threat to human life. Type II IEPR panels will conduct reviews of the design and construction activities prior to initiation of physical construction and, until construction activities are completed, periodically thereafter on a regular schedule. The reviews shall consider the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities in assuring public health, safety, and welfare.

For Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208, and 1135 decision documents prepared under this POD Model Review Plan, Type II IEPR is not anticipated to be required in the design and implementation phase, but this will need to be verified and documented in the Review Plan prepared for the design and implementation phase of the project.

IAW reference 1.c.(2) of this Review Plan, this Section 107 project is excluded from Type I IEPR.

7. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW

All decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed in Appendix F, ER 1105-2-100. These reviews culminate in 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 POD Commander. DQC and ATR augment and complement the policy review processes by addressing compliance with pertinent published Army policies, particularly policies on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents.

8. COST ENGINEERING DIRECTORY OF EXPERTISE REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION

For CAP projects, ATR of the costs may be conducted by pre-certified district cost personnel within the region or by the Walla Walla Cost DX. The pre-certified list of cost personnel has been established and is maintained by the Cost DX at: <https://kme.usace.army.mil/EC/cost/CostAtr/default.aspx>. The cost ATR member will coordinate with the Cost DX for execution of cost ATR and cost certification. The Cost DX will be responsible for final cost certification and may be delegated at the discretion of the Cost DX.

9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

a. Planning Models. The approval of planning models under EC 1105-2-412 is not required for CAP projects. The POD Commander is responsible for assuring models for all planning activities are technically and theoretically sound, compliant with USACE policy, computationally accurate, and based on reasonable assumptions. 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. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

The planning models for use in this study are undetermined as of the approval date of this review plan. Brief descriptions of the applicable planning models will be included in this Review Plan once they are identified.

b. Engineering Models. The responsible use of well-known and proven USACE developed and commercial engineering software will continue and the professional practice of documenting the application of the software and modeling results will be followed. As part of the USACE Scientific and Engineering Technology (SET) Initiative, many engineering models have been identified as preferred or acceptable for use on Corps studies, and these models should be used whenever appropriate. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

The engineering models for use in this study are undetermined as of the approval date of this review plan. Brief descriptions of the applicable engineering models will be included in this review plan once they are identified.

10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. ATR Schedule and Cost. The ATR for the Section 107 Petersburg Navigation Project will be accomplished in accordance with the cost and schedule in the Project Management Plan. As of the approval date of this Review Plan, the ATR is scheduled for Spring 2018 and may be subject to change. The ATR is expected cost approximately \$60,000.

b. IEPR Schedule and Cost. As discussed in paragraph 6, an IEPR is not required for CAP Section 107 studies.

c. Model Review Schedule and Cost. For CAP decision documents prepared under the POD Model Review Plan, use of existing certified or approved planning models is encouraged. Where uncertified or unapproved model are used, review of the model for use will be accomplished through the ATR process. The ATR team should apply the principles of EC 1105-2-412 during the ATR to ensure the model is theoretically and computationally sound, consistent with USACE policies, and adequately documented. If specific uncertified models are identified for repetitive use within a specific district or region, the appropriate Planning Center of Expertise (PCX), division(s), and home District(s) will identify a unified approach to seek certification of these models.

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

State and Federal resource agencies may be invited to participate in the study covered by this Review Plan as partner agencies or as technical members of the PDT, as appropriate. Agencies with regulatory review responsibilities will be contacted for coordination as required by applicable laws and procedures. The ATR team will be provided copies of public and agency comments. This Review Plan and all decision documents will be posted on the Alaska District's website for public review.

12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The POD Commander is responsible for approving this Review Plan and ensuring that use of the POD CAP Model Review Plan is appropriate for the specific project covered by the plan. The Review Plan is a living document and may change as the study progresses. POA is responsible for keeping the Review Plan up to date. Minor changes to the Review Plan since the last POD approval are documented in Attachment 3. Significant changes to the Review Plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) should be re-approved by POD following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in POD determining that use of the POD CAP Model Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific Review Plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-214 and the Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1. The latest version of the Review Plan, along with POD's approval memorandum, will be posted on POA's webpage.

13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT (POC)

Public questions and/or comments on this Review Plan can be directed to the following points of contact:

- Alaska District POC, Amber Metallo (907) 753-5632
- Pacific Ocean Division POC, Russell Iwamura, (808) 835-4625