

**Project Management Plan
For
WYNOOCHEE DAM SECTION1135
FISH RESTORATION PROJECT
Last Updated on: 1/16/2003 2:31 PM**

1. PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.1 Scope

This project is proposed under the authority of Section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986. The proposed anadromous fish restoration includes structural modifications of the existing project, increased stream flows from project releases, construction of two short term rearing and release ponds and modifications of the project spring rule curve. Structural modifications include new fish bypass facilities and the addition of a Eicher Screen which would be installed in the penstock to improve fish passage success. The two short term rearing and release ponds would be located downstream of the dam. Modifications to the Project Spring Rule Curve will improve passage success for downstream migrants and to improve downstream conditions for steelhead trout. These proposed modifications would require an amendment to the existing License issued to the Cities of Aberdeen and Tacoma by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) which authorized the construction of the hydroelectric power facilities. Experiments at the other similar facilities have shown that adult return rates are improved when hatchery fish are released into river systems through short-term rearing and release ponds rather than being released directly from traditional hatchery facilities.

1.2 Project Location

The Wynoochee Lake Project, completed in 1972, is located on the Wynoochee River in Grays Harbor County, Washington. The upstream fish passage facilities and barrier dam are located at river mile 49.6 and the main dam is at river mile 51.8 above the confluence with the Chehalis River. The dam is approximately 37 road miles from Montesano, Washington via County Road 141 and U.S. Forest Service Roads 22 and 2294. Access from U.S. Highway 101 via Forest Service Road 22 is 22 miles.

2. Project Delivery Team

Corps Staff:	Name	Phone
Program Manager	Lester Soule	(206) 764-3699
Project Manager	Bruce Sexauer (T)	(206) 764-6959
PM Assistant	Chris Pollock (T)	(206) 764-6947
Biologist	Jeff Dillon (T)	(206) 764-6174
Budget Analyst	Li-Shine Lin	(206) 764-3602
Mechanical	Sven Lie (T)	(206) 764-3680
Hydraulic	Dennis Mekkers (T)	(206) 764-6562
Hydrology	Pat Wheeler	(206) 764-3490
Structural	Paul Noyes (T)	(206) 764-3790

<u>Corps Staff:</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Geotechnical	Monte Kaiser	(206) 764-6194
Civil	Genea Stone	(206) 764-5530
Water Management	Marian Valentine	(206) 764-3543
Counsel	Ann Gerner	(206) 764-3733
Cost Estimator	TBD	
Contracting Officer	Sharon Gonzalez	(206) 764-6696
Construction Review	Matt Satter	(253) 966-4360
Area Engineer, COR	TBD	
Project Engineer	TBD	
Quality Assurance Rep	TBD	
<u>Contractor Staff:</u>		
Project Manager	Harry Gibbons (T)	
Design Team	Bill Fullerton (T)	
<u>Agency Representatives:</u>		
Brett Demond (T)	WDFW	360-249-4628 x241
Ken Bates (T)	WDFW	360-902-2545
Kyle Noble (T)	USFS	360-877-5254
TBD	NMFS	
TBD	USFWS	
Eric Nelson	City of Aberdeen	
<u>Sponsor Team:</u>	Tacoma Public Utilities	
Steve Fischer (T)	Project Manager	253-502-8316
Mark Wickey (T)	Biologist	253-502-8196

A Technical Committee has been formed to provide guidance, advice and input to the project team to make decisions from. This group will also review the various technical products. The Technical Committee will have a list of specific roles, responsibilities, and tasks. Names followed by a (T) indicate membership on the Technical Committee.

3. Major Tasks and Issues

a. Interim Design Report and Plans and Specifications. A multi-disciplined team has been formed to develop the scopes of work for the interim design report and plans and specifications. The team shall consist of relevant disciplines including: hydraulic, mechanical, structural, geotechnical, and civil engineers. There will be two phases of scope development. The initial phase will focus on site investigation tasks and development of an interim design report (35% level). The second phase will consist of development of plans and specification on a preliminary design (65%) and a final (100%) design.

Task Status: Tetra Tech has been contracted with to perform the design through 35%. The 10% draft is due in January 2003. The final 35% is due around May 2003.

b. MOA, MOU, and PCA. A team of specialized individuals will be crafting and negotiating project agreements necessary to implement the fish passage project. A Memorandum of Agreement between the Corps and the cities of Aberdeen and Tacoma will be executed to facilitate the transfer of the Wynoochee Dam to the City of Tacoma. Along with this MOA and Memorandum of Understanding between the Corps and the US Forest Service must be signed to facilitate the transfer of the required OMRR&R responsibilities. The Project Cooperation Agreement can be executed after the MOU and MOA has been signed. The PCA is a deviated PCA and is being coordinated with HQUSACE.

Task Status: The City of Tacoma is currently reviewing the MOA and is expected to submit comments by 20 December.

c. Environmental Compliance. The following shows the permit requirements and when they are required.

After the 35% design phase:

- 404(b)(1) out to DOE for public notice
- EA (Environmental Assessment) → FONSI (most likely)
- Biological Assessment → Concurrence letter
- CZM (Coastal Zone Management) determination

Before Construction:

- 401(b) Water Quality Certification
- NPDS (by contractor)
- Clearing and grading (by contractor)

d. Spring Refill Curve. Due to change hydrologic analysis, the Corps no longer supports the revised spring refill curve. Recent flood events have shown that the statistical hydrology of the river would not allow for a decrease in flood storage during spring refill. This item will be coordinated with the resource agencies to determine what their concerns may be. If this feature can be eliminated, no further hydrologic work will be needed, however there will need to be documentation provided in the EA. The Corps will be performing analysis to determine the following:

1. How often the downstream flooding would be increased with the revised refill curve.
2. How often would the flow criteria be met with the current scenario vs. with the revised refill curve.

Task Status: H&H Branch has prepared a HEMP that details the analysis to be done for this work which they are currently undertaking.

4. Schedule

The detailed schedule is available from the project manager.

Initiate Design	July 2002
10% Design Complete	January 2003
35% Design Complete	May 2003
65% Design Complete	July 2003
Execute MOU/MOA	September 2003
Design Complete	January 2004
Permits Complete	January 2004
Execute PCA	June 2004
Certify Real Estate	August 2004
Advertise	October 2004
Open Bids	January 2005
NTP	February 2005
Construction Complete	TBD (could be two year construction)

5. Cost

For detailed cost estimate, see Appendix E, Project Modification Report and Environmental Assessment, May 1998.

	Project Modification Costs						
	Totals	Local	Federal	Federal Funding Needs			Balance
Previous				FY02	FY03		
Report	657	325	332	332	0	0	0
P&S	900	100	800	19	90	500	191
Construction	3613	868	2745	0	0	0	2745
Totals	5170	1293	3877	351	90	500	2936

6. QUALITY

6.1 Independent Technical Review. The District shall perform the Independent Technical Review of the District's work or AE's submittals (interim design report, preliminary design, final design). For AE review, the review team shall again maximize the use of the personnel that develop the scope of work. Review periods will be 30 days in length and conclude with a review conference between the review team and the AE. The AE will have 30 days to respond to the review comments. The review team will then have 14 days to back check comments. Simultaneous to District Review will be review by the Technical Committee.

6.2 Value Engineering. A value engineering study will commence upon completion of the back check on the Interim Design Report (35% Design). The Seattle District's Value Engineering Section will be coordinated with for this effort.

6.3 Dr. Checks. Dr. Checks, the Corps automated commenting system, will be utilized for all review comments through out all phases of design.

6.4 BCOE. The first BCOE review will occur at 65% design.

6.5 Specific Product Reviews

a. Preliminary Draft Interim Design Report (10% Design). The Corps study team, sponsor and the Technical Committee, will do review of the AE submittal.

b. Draft Interim Design Report (35% Design). The Corps will perform a formal ITR and VE review. The sponsor and members of Technical Committee will also review.

c. 65% Design. The Corps will perform a formal ITR and BCOE review. The sponsor and members of Technical Committee will also review.

d. Final Design / Plans and Specifications. The Corps will perform a formal ITR and BCOE review. The sponsor and members of Technical Committee will also review.

7. COMMUNICATIONS

7.1 Technical Committee. The Technical Committee will be the vehicle for outreach to other stakeholders/agencies/etc. The Technical Committee will provide guidance, advice and input to the project team to make decisions from. This group will also review the various technical products. The Technical Committee will have a list of specific roles, responsibilities, and tasks.

8. PROCUREMENT

8.1 Design. Design services for design through 35% will be procured from TetraTech Inc. TetraTech will be responsible for design of all major project features. However, this is pending discussions with WDFW. In the past, WDFW has indicated the desire and capability to design the supplementation ponds and fish handling facilities.

8.2 Construction. Construction services are expected to be procured through sealed bid (IFB) process. Other, more cost effective options, may exist and will be explored as well, particularly Design-Build

9. CHANGE MANAGEMENT

The decision-making processes for the project will be highly dependent upon the various issues. For the most part, the Corps and Sponsor PMs will make decisions in coordination with their management/supervisory chains. If difficult issues come into play additional management will become involved to develop solutions for the issue. The following team will be members of the management team.

Corps

Les Soule	Chief Civil Projects
Mark Ziminske	Chief ERS
Mike Bevens	Chief PPMD

Tacoma

Kim Moore	TPU
Pat McCarty	Generation Manager
Steve Klein	Director Light Division

10. RISK MANAGEMENT

10.1 Cost. Cost overruns present a serious risk with high impact to the successful implementation of the project. To management this risk, cost estimate are being prepared at the 10%, 35%, 65% and final design levels. In addition, a value engineering study will occur after the 35% design.

10.2 Project Outputs. Achieving the desired project outputs entails risk as well. Adaptive management will be used to optimize the project operation, as well as any tweaking that may be necessary to achieve the fish passage desired.

11. COMMUNICATION PLAN

11.1 Corps Design Team. The Corps Design team, including Corps contractors will meet on a somewhat regular basis to discuss design and product development issues. The Corps and the Contractor have a weekly teleconference to discuss progress.

11.2 Sponsor. The communication with the sponsor has been occurring on an as needed basis, but will be upgraded to include a bi-weekly summary sent out via email. Periodic meetings between the Corps and sponsor management will facilitate project oversight.

11.3 Agencies and Stakeholders. Communication with agencies and stakeholders will occur through the Technical Committee, public notices as required for NEPA coordination, and other outreach channels.

11.4 Webpage.

The project web address is

<http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/PublicMenu/Menu.cfm?sitenamewynoochee&pagename=main>