

**REVIEW PLAN**  
**USING THE NWD MODEL REVIEW PLAN**  
for  
**Continuing Authorities Program**  
**Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208, 1135 and projects directed by guidance to**  
**use CAP procedures**

**Portneuf River Section 1135**  
**Pocatello, Idaho**

**Walla Walla District**

**MSC Approval Date: 1 February 2013**  
**Last Revision Date: 12 December 2012**



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers®**

**REVIEW PLAN  
USING THE NWD MODEL REVIEW PLAN**

**Portneuf River Section 1135  
Pocatello, Idaho**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. PROJECT INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC).....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>6. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7. COST ENGINEERING Directory of Expertise (DX) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>8. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>9. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>10. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>11. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>12. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 2: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS.....</b>	<b>9</b>

## 1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

- a. Purpose.** This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Portneuf River Section 1135, Pocatello, Idaho.

Section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Public Law 99-662, provides the authority to modify existing US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) projects to restore the environment and construct new projects to restore areas degraded by Corps projects with the objective of restoring degraded ecosystem structure, function, and dynamic processes to a less degraded, more natural condition considering the ecosystem's natural integrity, productivity, stability and biological diversity. This authority is primarily used for manipulation of the hydrology in and along bodies of water, including wetlands and riparian areas. It is a Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) which focuses on water resource related projects of relatively smaller scope, cost and complexity. Traditional USACE civil works projects are of wider scope and complexity and are specifically authorized by Congress. The Continuing Authorities Program is a delegated authority to plan, design, and construct certain types of water resource and environmental restoration projects without specific Congressional authorization.

Additional Information on this program can be found in Engineering Regulation 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F Amendment #2.

- b. Applicability.** This review plan is based on the NWD Model Review Plan for Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208, 1135 and authorities directed by guidance to follow CAP procedures, which is applicable to projects that do not require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), as defined in EC 1165-2-209 Civil Works Review Policy.

### c. References

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
- (2) EC 1105-2-412, Model Certification, 31 May 2005
- (3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
- (4) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007
- (5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007
- (6) Continuing Authority Program Planning Process Improvements, Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, 19 Jan 2011

## 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 Section 1135 projects is the home Major Subordinate Command (MSC). The MSC will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the Agency Technical Review (ATR). The home District will post the approved review plan on its public website and provide the appropriate NWD District Support Planner with the link. A copy of the approved review plan (and any updates) will be provided to the Ecosystem Center of Expertise (ECO-PCX) to keep them apprised of requirements and review schedules.

### 3. PROJECT INFORMATION

- a. **Decision Document.** The Portneuf River Section 1135, Pocatello, Idaho, decision document will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F. The approval level of the decision document (if policy compliant) is the home MSC. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document.
- b. **Study/Project Description.** Between 1966 and 1968, the Corps constructed a flood control project extending along a 6.2-mile reach of the Portneuf River through the City of Pocatello, Idaho. The project consisted of a 1.5-mile rectangular concrete channel and 4.7 miles of revetted levee upstream and downstream of the concrete channel.

Aerial photos taken prior to project construction indicate the extensive meandering of the river. Riparian vegetation and wetlands were evident along both banks, although residential encroachment had reduced suitable habitat for fish and wildlife. Significant environmental impacts, including a reduction in river meandering and a subsequent reduction of fish and wildlife habitat, were incurred as a direct result of the construction of this project.

The old flood control project was identified as an area with strong potential for environmental improvement, particularly at a promising meander site lost following the 1968 construction. This site was to be restored or rehabilitated to replace lost riparian habitat and other environmental values associated with the Portneuf River prior to project construction. The City of Pocatello was the local sponsor of the proposed project.

A feasibility study and an environmental assessment (with an accompanying Finding of No Significant Impact) were completed in January 1997. Originally, seven alternatives were screened and a recommended plan was selected (North City Park Plan). Unfortunately, the report was never finalized and approved.

Until recently, no funding was available for this project. The project was reaffirmed in September 2009, and received funding this fiscal year. The City of Pocatello is still the project sponsor. The Corps Project Manager met with city officials March 7, 2011, to understand changes that have occurred since 1997 in order to better scope the 2011 project. Upon discussion, it was discovered that a project similar to the previously-recommended plan had already been constructed by the City of Pocatello. It should be noted that the city officials were unaware of the previously-completed report. The sponsor has communicated, in writing, that the only alternative formulated previously (see Figure 1) for which the public showed support was physically modifying a section of concrete channel at the existing project.

The goal of the study at this point is to develop a supplement to the original report, update the environmental assessment, and submit to the MSC for approval. Once the feasibility report is approved, the project can move into the DI contingent upon a signed PPA.



**Figure 1. Raymond Park, Potential Channel Modification Site**

- c. In-Kind Contributions.** Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to District Quality Control (DQC) and ATR, similar to any products developed by the Corps. No in-kind contributions have been produced by the sponsor at this point.

#### **4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)**

All decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC prior to ATR. The home district shall manage DQC.

#### **5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)**

One ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.), however additional ATRs may be performed if deemed warranted. The ATR is managed by the designated RMO, and is conducted by a qualified team from within the Corps, but outside the home district, that is not involved in the day-to-day production of the project/product. The ATR teams will be comprised of senior Corps personnel. The ATR team lead will be from within the home MSC, but must be from outside the home district. Once the ATR team members have been selected, they will be listed in Attachment 1.

- a. Required ATR Team Expertise.** An ATR Team member may serve multiple roles if the scope of the study and the level of effort warrant. The ATR Team Leader should use the “ATR Lead Checklist” and “ATR Change Template,” developed by the National Planning Centers of Expertise, as resources when conducting the review.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional, preferably with experience in preparing Section 1135 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 (i.e., planning, economics, environmental resources, etc). The ATR Lead MUST be from outside Walla Walla District
Plan Formulation/Economics	The Plan formulation/ Economics reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in plan formulation for riparian and aquatic environmental restoration projects. The reviewer should be familiar with western U.S. ecosystem compositions and function. The reviewer should also have experience with CE/ICA Analysis.
Environmental Resources (Biology/NEPA)	The Environmental Resources reviewer should be a senior level environmental resource specialist with experience in aquatic and riparian and wetlands ecosystem restoration. The reviewer will also need to have knowledge and experience with NEPA and other environmental compliance requirements and ecosystem output evaluation using HEP and HSI.
Civil Engineering	This reviewer should be a senior level hydraulic engineer/ civil engineer proficient with river hydraulics and associated models and hydraulic statistics. The reviewer should also have civil engineering experience relating to river morphology, earthwork, planning analysis, and a number of closely related technical subjects.
Cost Engineering	The cost engineering expert will be a Cost DX Pre-Certified Professional with experience preparing costs estimates for environmental restoration projects using MCACES/MII that include earth work and vegetative plantings.
Real Estate	This reviewer should be a real estate specialist familiar with real estate valuations, land cost estimates, utility relocations, and easements and rights-of-ways necessary for implementation of Civil Works ecosystem projects.

- b. Charge Document.** The district will prepare a charge document that clearly identifies review requirements. This document must be completed prior to requesting an ATR team.
- 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. If an ATR concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the ATR team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the vertical team 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.

## **6. 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 H, 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 home MSC 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.

## **7. COST ENGINEERING DIRECTORY OF EXPERTISE (DX) 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. 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.

## **8. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL**

Approval of planning models under EC 1105-2-412 is not required for CAP projects. MSC commanders remain responsible for assuring the quality of the analyses used in these projects. ATR will be used to ensure that models and analyses are compliant with Corps policy, theoretically sound, computationally accurate, transparent, described to address any limitations of the model or its use, and documented in study reports.

- a. EC 1105-2-412.** This EC does not cover engineering models used in planning. 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 and ATR.
- b. Planning and Engineering Models.** The following models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document:

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Certified?
IWR PLAN	This is an economic planning model certified by the Corps, which assists with the formulation and comparison of alternative plans. It assists with plan formulation by combining solutions to planning problems and calculating the additive effects of each combination. It will compare the cost effectiveness and incremental cost of each plan, identifying the plans that are the best financial investments and displaying the effects of each on a range of decision variables.	yes
HEP/HSI	The Habitat Evaluation Procedure (HEP) will be used to quantify habitat benefits. Habitat benefits will be calculated using HEP and Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) models. The study will be using HIS models developed for the great blue heron, rainbow trout and mallard duck. All are approved for use by the USACE.	yes
HEC-RAS 4.1 (River Analysis System)	The Hydrologic Engineering Center's River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) program provides the capability to perform one-dimensional steady and unsteady flow river hydraulics calculations. The program will be used for steady flow analysis to evaluate the future without- and with project conditions along the Portneuf River.	yes
MCACES/MII	This is a cost estimating model that was developed by Building Systems Design Inc. The Corps began using the model in 1989. This software will be used to estimate construction costs for three surface water storage sites based on 15 percent engineering design.	yes

## 9. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

**The ATR Schedule and Cost.** An ATR of the decision document and preliminary environmental assessment and its supporting analyses will occur before release of documents for public review. Documents would be ready for ATR in the summer of 2013. The estimated cost for ATR is \$10,000 for review by the external ATR team. Given the current Federal funding situation, ATR will likely occur in fiscal year 2013, as noted below.

- Agency Technical Review (ATR) September 1 – September 30, 2013
- Address ATR / Sponsor Comments October 1 – October 18, 2013
- Back Check and Closeout October 21 – November 15, 2013

## 10. 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.



On August 11, 2011, the current Project Manager gave a presentation to the Pocatello City Council regarding the current state of the project and the path forward.

The revised feasibility report and preliminary environmental assessment will be distributed electronically and by the U.S. Postal Service for a 30-day public review and comment period. A public meeting will occur during the comment period.

#### **11. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES**

The MSC Commander is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the NWD 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. The home district is responsible for keeping the review plan up to date. Minor changes to the review plan since the last approval are documented in Attachment 2. Significant changes to the review plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of the review) should be approved by the MSC Commander following the process used for initial approval the plan. Significant changes may result in the MSC Commander determining that use of the NWD Model Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-209. The latest version of the review plan, along with the Chief's approval memorandum, will be posted on the home district's webpage.

#### **12. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT**

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

- Mark Mendenhall, Project Manager, Walla Walla District, Boise Outreach Office, 208-345-2064
- Ben Swaner, Planner, Walla Walla District, 509-527-7235
- Rebecca Kalamasz, Chief of Planning Division, Walla Walla District, 509-527-7277
- Rebecca Weiss, Planning, Northwestern Division, 503-808-3858