



**US Army Corps
of Engineers**
Kansas City District

PEER REVIEW PLAN

UPPER TURKEY CREEK FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROJECT FEASIBILITY STUDY PHASE

JANUARY 2008

HEARTLAND ENGINEERS 

PROJECT REVIEW PLAN
UPPER TURKEY CREEK
FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROJECT
FEASIBILITY STUDY PHASE

Table of Contents

1. DOCUMENT OBJECTIVE.....	1
2. GENERAL INFORMATION.....	1
Executive Summary -- Study Purpose and Background.....	1
Study Authority.....	2
Original Project Authority.....	2
Feasibility Study Objectives.....	2
Summary Study Scope and Execution Parameters.	3
Local Sponsorship and Funding.....	4
Description of Existing Overall Project and Problem.....	4
3. LEVELS OF REVIEW	5
Internal Peer Review (IPR).....	5
Independent Technical Review (ITR).....	5
External Peer Review (EPR).....	6
Architect-Engineer (A-E) or Consulting Contacts.....	6
4. SELECTED REVIEW PROCESS(S)	6
ITR References:	7
5. PRIMARY DISCIPLINES AND EXPERTISE NEEDED FOR THE ITR.....	8
Discipline-Specific Guidance & Requirements.....	8
ITR Team Leader.	10
Independent Technical Review Team Members and Organization.....	10
6. ITR SCHEDULE.	10
ITR Team Site Visit.....	10
7. ITR BUDGET.....	11
8. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITIES	11
9. AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS TO REVIEW TEAM.....	11

PROJECT REVIEW PLAN

UPPER TURKEY CREEK FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROJECT FEASIBILITY STUDY PHASE

1. DOCUMENT OBJECTIVE

This Project Review Plan (PRP) is a part of the Project Management Plan (PMP) under the QC/QA element in accordance with EC 1105-2-408 and the Standard Operating Procedures for the Planning Centers of Expertise. This PRP provides guidance to the Project Delivery Team (PDT) on the specific review levels, responsibilities, and process requirements for execution of review on the Upper Turkey Creek project.

2. GENERAL INFORMATION

Executive Summary - Study Purpose and Background. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Kansas City District along with the local project sponsor, Merriam, Kansas, are conducting a feasibility study of the Upper Turkey Creek watershed to examine measures for flood risk management. Congressional authorization specifically for Upper Turkey Creek states this project's primary mission is flood risk management. Other Corps mission areas or authorities are being considered. These include using a systems approach (specifically a watershed approach), collaborative planning, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, are being tied into the plan formulation process where feasible opportunities are found. The selected alternatives will likely be multipurpose, with the main purpose being to examine the full range of structural and nonstructural measures that address flood risk management. Ecosystem restoration and recreation measures will be formulated where feasible, and the team recognizes that these secondary mission areas are compatible with local initiatives for best management practices (BMPs) and for biking trails. Therefore, the team is mindful that flood risk management measures do not have to be the only measures considered in formulating the alternatives. The team is acutely aware of EPA's concerns for Upper Turkey Creek, and the team understands that ecosystem restoration measures overlap with the local BMPs and water quality goals.

The Turkey Creek watershed has a history of Corps involvement. Currently, Lower Turkey Creek has an active construction project. One component is to repair an aging tunnel that conveys all flow from the Turkey Creek



watershed through a bluff to the Kansas River. Channel widening has also been done. Figure 1 shows Upper & Lower Turkey Creek, labeled in purple. A purple line divides the two. The watershed, encompassing parts of Johnson and Wyandotte Counties in Kansas, consist almost exclusively of highly developed urban areas. The Unified Government (UG), which is a municipality made up of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas, is a co-sponsor for the Upper Turkey Creek study, by separate agreements with Merriam, KS. The UG is a co-sponsor of the authorized Turkey Creek project in Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas, located in the lower watershed. Such plans will be technically viable, economically feasible and environmentally acceptable.

Study Authority. The legislation authorized under the Flood Control Acts of 1917, 1936, 1938, 1944, and 1970 and authorities to investigate flood risk management measures per the Water Resources Development Acts, beginning with 1986, and per executive order 11988.

Project Authority. The Upper Turkey Creek project was authorized by the Flood Control Act and approved 16 February 2000 in a resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives (Docket Resolution 2616).

Feasibility Study Objectives. The Kansas City District is undertaking this feasibility study with the following objectives:

1. Determine possible local and federal projects primarily for flood risk management, and with consideration of multipurpose objectives as outlined by local and federal agencies. These include NGOs such as the Mid-American Regional Council (MARC), and Kansas City Chapter of American Public Works Association (KCAPWA). The local agencies are Merriam Drainage District (MDD), Johnson County Public Works (JOCO), and the Kansas Department of Health and Environment. The federal agencies include FEMA, EPA, USDA's Urban Forestry Initiative, and USGS. To assist local cities, MARC and KCAPWA have been actively creating standards for design for many years, and in the last five they have developed standards for BMPs, which are very relevant for water quality. MDD has been very active in their mission, "the free flow of Turkey Creek," by arbitrarily seeking to widen the channel in Merriam with indifference to this study, so we have been making collaboration attempts. MDD owns much of the parcels in the Merriam damage reach. JOCO has nearly completed revising their FEMA flood maps and has coordinated with Corps, providing models (see below). EPA has listed Turkey Creek for water quality concerns and has enabled the Watershed Institute to monitor activities affecting the environment. USDA has not identified with this study effort yet, though their goals for urban tree cover is consistent with reports by USGS. USGS has assisted with monitoring water quality and has written several reports for the southern Kansas City metro area (see below).
2. Coordinate the integration of the HEC-1 and HEC-RAS models that Johnson County has been using and developing since 1999 for the remapping of FEMA FIRMs with the purpose of reducing repetitive efforts and strengthening interagency collaboration. The intent is not exact duplication of results within the models, but rather applying as current versions as possible for application to the evaluation and comparison of alternatives in

the feasibility study on an order of magnitude basis. This objective is in alignment with the Corps' perspective of a systems approach.

3. Include multipurpose measures and opportunities for ecosystem restoration measures that contribute to water quality as appropriate in an urban environment. Reclaiming the stream way corridors is the strongest example where multipurpose measures could work, and local cities, MARC, and KCAPWA are focusing on stream way setbacks to address various concerns, from water quantity problems to some water quality benefits. The sponsor needs to decide if buyouts or relocations are acceptable, but the area has a special opportunity, since very significant, large areas of redevelopment have already occurred on the nearby hilltops. The USGS studies in the adjacent watershed to the east, Brush Creek, observed water quality effects due to channelization on Brush Creek federal project that could be used in the development of any channel improvements to avoid repeating adverse water quality impacts, for example as the pools and sediment have had (reference Water Quality in the Blue River Basin, Kansas City Metropolitan Area MO & KS, July 1998 to Oct 2004 and Effects of Non-point and Selected Point Contaminant Sources on Stream-Water Quality and Relation to Land Use in Johnson County, Northeastern KS Oct 2002 through June 2004). In addition, the work the Corps has done on Rock Creek (a sub-watershed of Brush Creek) Planning Assistance to States project, is complete and is monitoring BMPs for the locals (reference Rock Creek Watershed Planning Feasibility Report, PAS study).

Summary Study Scope and Execution Parameters. The Project Management Plan for this study is based on a phased approach to performing the feasibility study with no changes to the standard stages F1- F9. The current level is at F4, Conference #2 - Alternatives. The study will be conducted in phases defined by carefully documented decision points. At the identified decision points, reviewers will certify concurrence in the assumptions and rationale for a decision. Models being applied for hydrology and hydraulics are standard and not require certification. Methods used with the model for ecosystem restoration, specifically for the measures that include bank stabilization may need application guidance from the Ecosystem Restoration PCX and a determination on certification during Phase II. The stages are identified as follows:

PHASE I (complete). Phase I includes the Existing Conditions and Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM). ITR was conducted during this phase before 2006. Since funding delays create a gap between ITRs of three years, the project's ITR is hereby reorganized with this PRP.

PHASE II. During 2007 the PDT began doing this phase. The phase develops and screens alternative plans composed of specific flood risk management and environmental restoration measures. Alternatives will be designed during Phase II to the level of detail that supports identification of the National Economic Development (NED) plan and the National Environmental Restoration (NER) plan. On completion, this first iteration of plan formulation will be reviewed by the ITR team. Multipurpose alternatives will be looked at after the first iteration, and then the ITR team will be invited for a field visit. The PDT will consider ITR input for the following iterations of plan formulation. A public meeting will then be organized to gage acceptability. An Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) will be held with District,

Division and Headquarter and Sponsors. This phase ends with the completion of analysis for Phase II alternatives and identification of the NED plan, the NER plan, and the Locally Preferred Plan (LPP), if it differs from the other plans.

PHASE III. The ITR will be available throughout Phase III, during which, we will document design of the final array of Plans. A non-structural plan and a No Federal Action plan must be evaluated to the same level of detail as any other plans in the Final Array. Work in Phase III will also resolve any issues expressed in the Project Guidance Memorandum (PGM) that results from the AFB. Phase III ends with identification of one plan from the final array as the Recommended Plan.

PHASE IV. In Phase IV we complete the steps necessary to environmental compliance and prepare final detailed design information for the Recommended Plan, including MCACES baseline cost estimate, real estate plan, and a draft construction phase Project Management Plan (PMP). The products of this phase receive certification by the ITR team and legal review. This phase ends with submitting the final draft report together with the results of quality/independent review, and responses to comments obtained from the agencies and the public to the Division headquarters for review and release of a Division Engineer's Notice of Report Completion.

Local Sponsorship and Funding. Feasibility funding source is 50% Federal General Investigations (GI) -- Civil Works Appropriation & 50% local cost share funding. All local funding will be provided from the City of Merriam, Kansas, although the study extends well into the UG. The Merriam signed an FCSA with the Corps 24 June 2002.

Description of Existing Overall Project and Problem. The study area covers about 20 square miles comprising the Turkey Creek watershed in Wyandotte and Johnson Counties, Kan., from the headwaters to the upstream limits of the authorized Turkey Creek flood risk management project in the lower watershed. The Turkey Creek channel through the upper segment of the fully urbanized watershed is about 15 miles long. The watershed lies in the southwestern part of the Kansas City metropolitan area.

Severe flash flooding has occurred in the Turkey Creek Watershed in 1977, 1993 and 1998. The October 4, 1998 flood caused over \$12 million in flood damages in Merriam, overtopped Interstate 35 and threatened lives in several areas of Johnson and Wyandotte Counties. The study is evaluating the feasibility of structural and non-structural measures to address the flood threat. Turkey Creek habitat is significantly degraded, and water quality is a serious problem. The study is evaluating stream and wetland habitat restoration measures that will also help reduce flood peaks and contribute to bank stability and water quality improvement.

The Upper Turkey Creek watershed is centrally located in a metropolitan region that is conducting bi-state coordination focused on comprehensive watershed planning. The Lower Turkey Creek watershed involves both Kansas City, MO and the UG. The Upper Turkey Creek watershed involves Merriam, KS and the UG. The watershed planning approach provides an opportunity to promote interagency cooperation, multipurpose project planning, and the protection of existing federal flood protection investment. The City of Merriam, Kansas, entered into a Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement and is funding the non-federal share of the study in

cooperation with Johnson and Wyandotte Counties. The UG is represents Wyandotte County and Kansas City, KS.

The Corps undertook a reconnaissance study at the request of the City and completed a reconnaissance investigation, signed by the district 31 July 2001. The subsequent 905(b) document was approved in 4 Oct 2001 by CENWD.

The team has prepared crude channel designs for the two flood damage areas: 1) downtown Merriam and 2) the Roe Lane Industrial Park. The designs are useful to identify obstructions and relocations that must be addressed to improve the hydraulic efficiency of the channel. They do not include the sustainable development features that would be necessary for an implementable project with appropriate environmental sensitivity. The team intends to look at the restoration of a streamway corridor as explained in the KCAPWA standards.

The exact course of the NEPA tasks is unclear at this point, since a feasible solution is under formulation. The Existing Conditions work is almost complete. The biologists believe that an environmental assessment will take place, rather than an EIS. At least one public meeting was held in the past.

3. LEVELS OF REVIEW

The level of review established below will need concurrence from the vertical team once the watershed planning effort has matured and the plan formulation process has at least started the formulation of alternative plans. Since the reconnaissance report did not present an opinion of probable costs for any alternatives, the determination on whether this project's construction cost triggers an external review must be tied to other planning efforts in the Upper Turkey Creek watershed. Recently, the AE projected costs for alternatives be about \$26.9 million, including planning and design costs. This breaks out to \$19.5 for the Merriam damage reach and \$7.4 for the Roe Lane reach. The decision on level of review below is based on this initial opinion of probable costs.

Internal Peer Review (IPR). Internal Peer Review will be conducted on the project feasibility study. As part of the Quality Management Plan on any project, there are internal reviews or design checks that constitute quality control for each deliverable product. Each product development team member, their supervisors, and the project manager have the responsibility to ensure that every product receives an internal quality control review. The supervisor or section chief for each team member is responsible for ensuring that a qualified internal peer review is selected and conducts a review of their product prior to delivery to the project manager, or prior to completion.

Independent Technical Review (ITR). ITR will be conducted on the Upper Turkey Creek feasibility study. ITR is an independent review, outside of Kansas City District, of the deliverables for the project and constitutes an independent review of the entire project. In accordance with EC 1105-2-408 dated 31 May 2005, and CECW-CP Memorandum dated 8 November 2006, all outside independent review teams for qualifying projects is coordinated through the Corps of Engineers' Flood Risk Management Center of Expertise (CX, South Pacific

Division) by the District. The CX works collaboratively with the Division staff and the District project manager to find team member staff outside the Kansas City District with the requisite experience and qualifications to review the project. Review comments will be documented, processed, and resolved through the Dr. Checks software package.

External Peer Review (EPR). EPR does not apply to the Upper Turkey Creek project and will not be conducted. EPR is an additional national level independent review process, outside the Corps of Engineers, to ensure that the projects are of national or regional interest and meet the requirements of Federal participation. Specific criteria that trigger the development and implementation of EPR are projects where novel methods are utilized, where the project presents complex challenges, where the use of precedent setting methods or models, where the project will be likely to present landmark conclusions that will affect policy, or where the project is centered or focused on an issue or proposal that is highly controversial.

The Upper Turkey Creek project is a basic investigation. No features or components of this project are anticipated to be highly controversial or significant to national policy. The anticipated overall cost of the project is considered to be well below any threshold that might trigger EPR under any future provisions of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA). In the proposed study of the Upper Turkey Creek area, Corps of Engineers criteria, methods, and models to be utilized are recognized standard criteria and methods with no novel or precedent setting methods anticipated. Based on the proposed standard approach, the project plan, and the criteria established for development of EPR, the only EPR process will be developed for this project will be that done by JOCO on the models that they provided for use by the Corps.

The hydraulic and hydraulic models used for this study have had a good review by parties outside of the Corps. The University of Kansas had hydraulic modeling experts review all JOCO's models. JOCO provided the same models to the Corps, which the Corps contracted one of JOCO's consultants to modify. Those modifications established a hydraulic model outside of JOCO's county line and into Wyandotte County. NWK then provided senior level review. Finally, the consultant for plan formulation work has reviewed and applied these models. NWK review has been done for this work, too. ITR by the Planning PCXs will be enough for the study.

Architect-Engineer (A-E) or Consulting Contacts. Contracts used on this project will undergo a Quality Assurance Review of each deliverable product by assigned District PDT members. Additionally, any products developed by contract will also undergo ITR along with other products as outlined in the ITR paragraph above. All contractors are required to develop a Quality Management Plan to be submitted as the first deliverable for the contract. This will detail the firm's internal quality management and design check review processes, and is subject to prior approval by the Project Manager and PDT in accordance with the established Kansas City District Business Quality Procedures (BQPs).

4. SELECTED REVIEW PROCESS(S)

The selected review process level for the Upper Turkey Creek project is the ITR. The ITR will be developed in coordination with the CX for Flood Risk Management, and the CX

representative. This process will be coordinated through the Northwestern Division Planning Office. Internal peer review (IPR) or internal design checks will be conducted in accordance with the approved District Business Practices, as outlined above. A-E contracts are anticipated to be utilized for development of technical products for this project. Contracts will be procured in accordance with the prior approval of the District Acquisition Strategy Board, as outlined in the approved District BQPs.

ITR References:

- Refer to ER 1110-1-105, the primary Corps ITR regulation (see enclosed exhibit for summary of the major ITR requirements described in this regulation).
- EC 1105-2-408 dated 31 May 2005
- CECW-CP Memoranda dated 8 November 2006 and 30 March 2007.
- Refer to Kansas City District BQP 5.5.04 (Quality Plans). Pertinent excerpts are quoted below.

5.6 ITRT Members:

- *Verify compliance with established policy, principles and procedures*
- *Verify criteria applied*
- *Verify assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses*
- *Evaluate alternatives*
- *Verify the appropriateness of data used and level of data obtained*
- *Verify completeness of design and documents*
- *Verify reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing Corps policy.*
- *Conduct spot checks for interdisciplinary coordination*
- *Identify the specialized knowledge, experience, or training required to competently complete the product*
- *Verify comments are resolved by:*
 - *Verifying incorporation of their comments or,*
 - *Accepting the verification conducted by either the PM or ITRT Leader or,*
 - *Withdrawing the comment*

6.1.7.7.3 Independent Technical Review: Qualified staff verifies the work meets reasonable professional levels and satisfies the client's need and expectation. For small, simple, low complexity, low risk projects, independent technical review can be accomplished at the section level. Independent technical review can be managed at branch levels when a few disciplines are involved, the project is of moderate cost and complexity and the risk for life safety is relatively low. Independent technical review for all other projects should include individuals who do not have a vested interest in the project and are not involved in the day-to-day direction of the product. The PMP should define the level of independent technical review. Independent technical review is not a detailed check but a broad overview including:

- *Review of criteria applied*
- *Review of the methods of analysis and design*
- *Compliance with client and/or program requirements*
- *Completeness of design and documents*
- *Spot checks for interdisciplinary coordination*
- *Biddability, constructability, operability and environmental*

6.1.7.7.4 Independent reviewers are brought on board early on to participate in establishing criteria selection and broad approaches to be taken in addressing potential issues thus ensuring seamless review.

- Reviewers will be required to use the Dr Checks web-based system for comments. Refer to <https://www.projnet.org/projnet/home/version1/index.cfm> for additional Dr. Checks access information.

5. PRIMARY DISCIPLINES AND EXPERTISE NEEDED FOR THE ITR

Discipline-Specific Guidance & Requirements. ITR Team representation is required in the disciplines listed below. In general, the ITR team members will each have a minimum of 15 years experience in their respective discipline. A statement of qualifications is required for each team member prior to acceptance as an ITR Team member and for any subsequent changes thereto. Multiple requirements may be filled by one ITR team member, depending on individual qualifications.

Hydrology & Hydraulics: Team member will be an expert in the field of urban hydrology & hydraulics, have a thorough understanding of the dynamics of the both open channel flow systems, enclosed systems, application of detention / retention basins, effects of best management practices and low impact development on hydrology, approaches that can benefit water quality, application of levees and flood walls in an urban environment with space constraints, non-structural measures especially as related to multipurpose alternatives including ecosystem restoration, non-structural solutions involving flood warning systems, and non-structural alternatives related to flood proofing. The team member will have an understanding of computer modeling techniques that will be used for this project (HEC-HMS, HEC-RAS, UNET, and TABS). A certified flood plain manager is recommended but not required.

Ecosystem Restoration Specialist: This ITR team member will be familiar with ecosystem restoration, in general, and shall also be specifically familiar with ecosystem restoration for multipurpose projects focused on flood risk management.

Structural: Team member will have a thorough understanding of non-structural measures, levee, flood wall, and retaining wall design, and structures typically associated with levees (pump stations, gatewell structures, utility penetrations, stoplog & sandbag gaps, and other closure structures). A certified professional engineer is recommended though not required.

Mechanical: Team member shall be familiar with levee pump station and closure structure design. *Engineering disciplines other than Mechanical may be acceptable for review of this area of work subject to meeting the experience requirement stated above.*

Electrical (if deemed necessary): Team member shall be familiar with levee pump station and electrical utilities design. Electrical ITR requirements for this study are very minimal.

Geotechnical: Team member will have extensive experience in levee & floodwall design, post-construction evaluation, and rehabilitation. This is a critical ITR team member, and a certified professional engineer is recommended.

Economics: Team member will have extensive experience in related flood risk management multipurpose projects, and have a thorough understanding of HEC-FDA, and be able to provide guidance on trade-off analysis. In the early stages of the feasibility study, the economics ITR reviewer assisted from Portland District.

Plan Formulation: Team member will be familiar with current flood risk management planning and policy guidance, and have experience in plan formulation for multipurpose projects, specifically integrating measures for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, recreation, a watershed approach, and planning in a collaborative environment.

Civil / Site / Utilities / Relocations: This discipline may require a dedicated team member, or may be satisfied by structural or geotechnical reviewer, depending on individual qualifications. Team member will have experience in utility relocations, positive closure requirements and internal drainage for levee construction, and application of non-structural flood risk management, specifically flood proofing. A certified professional engineer is suggested.

Cost Estimating: Team member will be familiar with cost estimating for similar projects using MCACES. Team member will be a Certified Cost Technician, Certified Cost Consultant, or Certified Cost Engineer. These efforts will be coordinated with Cost Engineering Center at the Walla Walla District.

Other disciplines/functions: The planning process typically involves other PDT members whose work may need ITR. The notable disciplines that need ITR by subject matter experts (SMEs) on this project include the disciplines of Water Quality, Environmental/NEPA, Real Estate, Cultural Resources, Hazardous/Toxic Waste, and Legal. In each case, any required ITR within these disciplines may be accomplished within Kansas City District or by other independent sources. The general experience requirements and principles contained in this document also apply to these disciplines/functional areas. For the Upper Turkey Creek project, a biologist from Omaha District was involved in review of the existing conditions phase, however this SME has retired. *(Exception: Legal review is not under the purview of the ITR Team*

Leader but is instead responsible to the Corps of Engineers Ofc of Counsel chain-of-command).

ITR Team Leader. One member of the ITR Team will act as the team leader, and this lead will come from outside CENWK. Team leader designation will be finalized based on input from ITR Team members and the CENWK Project Manager, the PDT, and CENWK staff. The leader shall, in addition to discipline-specific requirements, be responsible for

- Acting as a liaison between the Product Development Team and the ITR Team
- Performing, in conjunction with the PM, active coordination of the ITR process and study findings with the Corps Flood Risk Management Center of Expertise (FRM-CX) in San Francisco District, and ensure compliance with an adequate level of FRM-CX review.
- Distributing information for review and coordinating efforts of the ITR Team
- Ensuring that individual ITR Team members are operating in accordance with the guidelines established for ITR by ER 1110-1-105 (see enclosed exhibit for summary of the major ITR requirements described in this regulation).
- Organizing the ITR team. The ITR team is *not* geographically co-located. Therefore, it is of paramount importance that the ITR Team Leader be capable of organizing the total ITR efforts across District and Division boundaries.
- Being available for the as much of the project's review as possible. A substitute ITR Team Leader from the ITR team will be named by the ITR team leader for periods of extended (over 60 days) absence.

Independent Technical Review Team Members and Organization. Team members and organization of the Upper Turkey Creek project's ITR Team is presented in Appendix A to this PRP.

The ITR team members will be contacted on a regular basis by the corresponding PDT members so as to be kept aware of criteria selection and the broad approaches employed in this study thus ensuring a seamless review when products are submitted for ITR.

6. ITR SCHEDULE

ITR can begin as soon as the first iteration of formulated alternatives finishes the fourth planning step, Evaluate Effects of Alternative Plans. The feasibility phase was initiated in 2002. The Feasibility phase schedule continues to be impacted by constrained levels of Federal funding, and received limited funding in several past fiscal years. Federal funds have been allocated in April 2007 and the feasibility study was continued. Model studies are nearing completion and allowing the evaluation of alternatives in spring 2008. The Alternative Formulation Briefing is scheduled for January 2009.

ITR Team Site Visit. An initial site visit was done in with the ITR members. Another site visit is anticipated as the ITR team needs to re-group after the delays related to intermittent funding and completion of the model studies. The site visit for the ITR members will be in June 2008. This site visit will provide each reviewer with the opportunity to view existing conditions and to meet corresponding Product Development Team members.

7. ITR BUDGET

ITR is currently budgeted at \$30,000 and is identified in the current project management plan budget.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Public review of the PRP will be possible by accessing the Kansas City District website, link as follows: <http://www.nwk.usace.army.mil/projects/utc>. Public review can begin as soon as this is posted, which will be by the end of February 2008.

Public and Agency Review for this project will be conducted in accordance with NEPA, as well as the provisions of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) 2000, and as outlined in ER 1105-2-100. As such the review plan will be available through all public and agency scoping and other processes for the project.

9. AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS TO REVIEW 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 reviews and final reports.