
**PEER REVIEW PLAN
FOR
FEASIBILITY PHASE STUDY
OF
SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, MASON COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

**Final Peer Review
Plan**

PEER REVIEW PLAN
FOR FEASIBILITY PHASE STUDY
OF SKOKOMISH RIVER

1. INTRODUCTION

The Skokomish basin is located in the southwestern portion of the Puget Sound in northwestern Washington primarily in Mason County and the Skokomish Indian Reservation, Washington. Purpose of the project is to provide ecosystem restoration and flood damage reduction improvements that will restore habitat for four Endangered Species Act listed salmonid species, and provide structural and non-structural flood damage reduction measures.

The purpose of the General Investigation (GI) feasibility phase of the project development is to investigate and formulate a solution to address ecosystem restoration and flood damage reduction in the Skokomish River. The sponsor's objective is to restore proper natural function to the Skokomish River basin while reducing flood damages to valley residents including the Skokomish Indian Tribe. The recommended plan identified in the feasibility report must be both technically and economically viable and capable of being implemented to meet project objectives. The feasibility phase includes formulating alternative solutions and assessing impacts to satisfy the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements, evaluating costs and benefits, preparing initial designs, and recommending a plan to initiate solutions to the problem.

The purpose of the peer review plan is to assign the appropriate level and review independence, establish the procedures, and assign responsibilities for conducting the independent technical reviews (ITRs) of all applicable decision documents to ensure the quality and credibility of all decision documents developed during the GI. This plan is compliant with EC 1105-2-408 *Peer Review of Decision Documents*, 31 May 2005, section 6, parts a. through j. This plan also is compliant with the 20 April 2007 USACE Northwestern Division memorandum *Peer Review Process*.

The project delivery team is presented in Table 1. The project manager, Mamie Brouwer, is the main point of contact at Seattle District for more information about this project and the peer review plan.

TABLE 1.
FEASIBILITY PHASE PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM

<u>Discipline</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Office/Agency</u>
Project Manager	Mamie Brouwer	CENWS-PM-CP
Program Manager (GI)	Linda Smith	CENWS-PM-PL
Planning Center of Expertise	David Vigh	CENWS-MVD-RB-T
Program Analyst	Patricia Bauccio	CENWS-PM-CU
Plan Formulation	Noel Gilbrough	CENWS-PM-PL
Report Formatting/Editing	TBD	CENWS-EC-DB-SP
Environmental Coordinator	Mike Scuderi	CENWS-PM-PL-ER
Cultural Resources	Ronald Kent	CENWS-PM-PL-ER

PEER REVIEW PLAN
FOR FEASIBILITY PHASE STUDY
OF SKOKOMISH RIVER

Historic Properties	Lauren McCroskey	CENWS-EC-DB-AS
Environmental Eng/HTRW	Brenda Bachman	CENWS-EC-TB-ET
Biological Analysis	Charles Ebel	CENWS-PM-PL-ER
Civil Design	Jennifer West	CENWS-EC-DB-CS
Survey/ CADD Mapping/GIS	Kurt Noble	CENWS-EC-TB-SY
GIS	Dave Fox/Stephen Jesse	CENWS-IM-PI
Geotechnical	TBD	
Hydraulics & Hydrology	Karl Eriksen	CENWS-EC-TB-HE
Economic Evaluation	TBD	CENWS-PM-PL
Cost Engineering	Stephen Pierce	CENWS-EC-CO-C
Real Estate	TBD	CENWS-RE-RS
Public Affairs Office	Nola Leyde	CENWS-PA
Office of Counsel	Sue Leong	CENWS-OC
Co-Sponsor PM	Keith Dublanica	Skokomish Indian Tribe
Co-Sponsor PM	Rich Geiger	Mason County

2. PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE

The GI Feasibility Report (FR)/ Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not likely to develop or contain influential scientific information and is not expected to be an influential scientific assessment. Therefore, the GI phase documents (i.e., the without project report, the with-plan report, and the Draft EIS/FR) and major engineering products (e.g., sediment management plan) will only be reviewed by an ITR team selected by the Planning Center of Expertise. An external peer review will not be conducted.

3. REVIEW SCHEDULE

ITRs will be conducted for all major GI phase documents (i.e., without project report, feasibility scoping documents, plan selection report, and Draft EIS/FR) and major engineering and scientific documents products (e.g., cultural resources overview, sediment management plan, and programmatic biological assessment). The review schedule is included in the Final Project Management Plan, and will be updated as reviews are scheduled.

4. EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

An external peer will not be conducted as the FR/EIS is not likely to develop or contain influential scientific information and is not expected to be an influential scientific or controversial assessment.

5. PUBLIC REVIEW OPPORTUNITIES

The public will be invited to comment directly to the PDT through public scoping meetings and public review periods programmed into the feasibility schedule. Although

PEER REVIEW PLAN
FOR FEASIBILITY PHASE STUDY
OF SKOKOMISH RIVER

resources have been programmed for a public review of the Final FR/EIS, a public review of the final EIS/FR will not be conducted unless the final document is significantly different from the draft, which is not expected due to the nature of the GI.

6. AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS TO ITR TEAM

Public input from the NEPA workshops and the public scoping meetings will be available to the ITR members to ensure that public comments have been considered in the development of the without project conditions report, the sediment management report, and the draft FR/EIS. However, the draft FR/EIS will be independently reviewed prior to the conclusion of the public comment period, and, therefore, these comments will not be available to the ITR members. In the event that the final FR/EIS is significantly revised from the draft, another ITR will be scheduled and public comment on the draft will be available to the reviewers.

7. ANTICIPATED NUMBER OF REVIEWERS

The current ITR plan is to include at least 10 independent reviewers. This number is based on the disciplines required to develop the feasibility products and the draft and final FR/EIS.

8. PRIMARY DISCIPLINES AND EXPERTISE NEEDED FOR THE ITR

The disciplines and expertise required for the ITR team are presented in Table 2.

**TABLE 2.
PROPOSED INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM**

<u>Discipline</u>	<u>Reviewer</u>
Review Team Leader	TBD
Plan Formulation	TBD –Coordinated with Planning CX
Environmental Coordinator	TBD –Coordinated with Planning CX
Cultural Resources	TBD
Civil Design	TBD
Geotechnical	TBD
Economic Evaluation	TBD – Coordinated with Planning CX
Cost Engineering	TBD
Real Estate	TBD
Sponsor (Skokomish Tribe)	TBD
Sponsor (Mason County)	TBD
Hydraulics and Hydrology	TBD

PEER REVIEW PLAN
FOR FEASIBILITY PHASE STUDY
OF SKOKOMISH RIVER

This information will be updated as the without project conditions report nears completion.

The Independent Technical Review Team will be selected on the basis of having the proper knowledge, skills, and experience necessary to perform the task and their lack of affiliation with the development of the feasibility report/EIS and associated appendixes. The review team is primarily drawn from NWD personnel, to ensure that the technical work and products from engineering, cost estimating, real estate, and H&H achieve a quality product. Other ITR members from disciplines such as Economics, Environmental, and Plan Formulation will be coordinated through the Planning CX, and funding their participation may include travel to Seattle District for the review conference. All ITRs will be completed through DRCHECKS where comments and comment resolution are captured.

Technical review will use appropriate analytical methods for each technical area. Technical review will rely on periodic technical review team meetings to discuss critical plan formulation or other project decisions, and on the review of the written feasibility report documentation and files. Independent technical review will ensure that:

- the feasibility report/EIS is consistent with current criteria, procedures and policy
- clearly justified and valid assumptions that are in accordance with established guidance and policy have been utilized, with any deviations clearly identified and properly approved
- concepts, features, analytical methods, analyses, and details are appropriate, fully coordinated, and correct
- problems/issues are properly defined and scoped
- conclusions and recommendations are reasonable and justified.

9. EXTERNAL PEER REVIEWERS

N/A. Please see Section 4.

10. PUBLIC SELECTION OF PEER REVIEWERS

Public recommendation or selection of ITR or other reviewers is not anticipated at this time.