



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
SOUTH PACIFIC DIVISION, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
1455 MARKET STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103-1399

9 APR 2009

CESPD-PDC

MEMORANDUM FOR CESP-PM

Subject: Review Plan approval for the Espanola Valley, Rio Grande and Tributaries, New Mexico, General Investigation Detailed Feasibility Study

1. The attached Review Plan for the Espanola Valley, Rio Grande and Tributaries, New Mexico, General Investigation Detailed Feasibility Study has been prepared in accordance with EC 1105-2-410 and is approved with the attached observations from the SPD planning policy group for use in future revisions of the document.
2. The Review Plan will be made available for public comment with a mechanism for comments to be received from the public; comments will be addressed, as appropriate, in future revisions of the Review Plan. The Review Plan has been coordinated with the Ecosystem Restoration Planning Center of Expertise of the Mississippi Valley Division which is the lead office to execute this plan. For further information, contact the PCX at 309-794-5448.
3. The Review Plan does not include independent external peer review.
4. I hereby approve this Review Plan, which is subject to change as study circumstances require, consistent with study development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this Review Plan or its execution will require new written approval from this office.

Encls

1. SPD planing review
2. ECO-PCX approval
3. ECO- PCX reviewer approval
4. QA checklist
5. Project Review Plan

  
VANICE L. DOMBI  
COL, USA  
Commanding

SUBJECT: Comments on Peer Review Plan for Espanola Valley, Rio Grande and tributaries, New Mexico, General Investigation Detailed Feasibility Study, dated February 2009

DATE: March 10, 2009

1. The following review comments are based on the requirements of CESPQ QMP, Appendix C for compliance with EC 1105-2-410.
2. The Review Milestone Schedule should follow the SPD milestone schedule, including but not limited to the F4. See Section Enclosure 1.
3. The Review Plan should include the certification of Without Project Hydrology at the F3 stage.
4. The review plan should identify any products produced by a contractor and the associated review process for them.
5. The RP should specify the Environmental Assessment as one of the products for review at various milestone stages.
6. The RP should identify a dispute resolution process.
7. Identify the need for a VE study between F3 and F4 milestone.
8. Item 6 under ATRT responsibilities may not be appropriate. An alternative is revision of a "Critical Comment" in Dr. Checks, once the ATR lead has discussed issue with the PDT.
9. Recommend numbering of sections and sub-sections as well as an editorial review of the document.