



MISSISSIPPI VALLEY DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 80
VICKSBURG, MISSISSIPPI 39181-0080

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

CEMVD-PD-KM

2 April 2008

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Vicksburg District

SUBJECT: Cross Lake Water Supply, Shreveport, Louisiana, Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement, Water Management and Reallocations Studies Planning Center of Expertise Recommendation for Approval of Peer Review Plan

1. References:

a. EC 1105-2-408, Peer Review of Decision Documents, 31 May 2005.

b. Multiple memorandum, CECW-CP, 30 March 2007, subject: Peer Review Process.

c. Supplement to memorandum, CEMVD-PD-N, 30 March 2007, subject: Peer Review Process.

d. Memorandum, CESWD-PDS-P, 21 March 2008, subject: Cross Lake Water Supply Study, Vicksburg District, Peer Review Plan (encl).

2. I hereby approve the subject Peer Review Plan (PRP) and concur in the recommendation that only independent technical review of this project is required. The proposed PRP was coordinated with, and concurred in by, the Water Management and Reallocation Studies Planning Center of Expertise (WMRS-PCX). The PRP complies with all applicable policy and provides an adequate independent technical review of the plan formulation, engineering and environmental analyses, and other aspects of the plan development. Non-substantive changes to this PRP do not require further approval.

3. Post the PRP to your web page, provide the WMRS-PCX a link for posting on its web page, and furnish a copy of the final approved PRP to the WMRS-PCX. In accordance with reference 1.c. above, before posting to your web page, remove the names of Corps/Army employees.

CEMVD-PD-KM

SUBJECT: Cross Lake Water Supply, Shreveport, Louisiana,
Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement, Water
Management and Reallocations Studies Planning Center of
Expertise Recommendation for Approval of Peer Review Plan

4. My point of contact for this PRP is Program Management,
CEMVD-PD-KM, (601) 634-5065.

Encl

Brigadier General, USA
Commanding

CF (w/encl):
CECW-CP
CEMVD-PD-N

PEER REVIEW PLAN
CROSS LAKE WATER SUPPLY, SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA
FEASIBILITY REPORT AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Table of Contents

<u>Paragraph</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS	1
2	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2
3	ITR PLAN	5
4	EPR PLAN	11
5	PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW	12
6	PCX COORDINATION	13
7	APPROVALS	13

LIST OF APPENDIXES

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>
A	STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW

PEER REVIEW PLAN

CROSS LAKE WATER SUPPLY, SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA FEASIBILITY REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

1. Purpose and Requirements.

a. This document outlines the Peer Review Plan for the Cross Lake Water Supply, Shreveport, Louisiana, General Investigation (GI) Feasibility Study and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Appendixes. Engineer Circular (EC) 1105-2-408 dated 31 May 2005, "Peer Review of Decision Documents," (1) establishes procedures to ensure the quality and credibility of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers decision documents by adjusting and supplementing the review process and (2) requires that documents have a Peer Review Plan. The Circular applies to all feasibility studies and reports and any other reports that lead to decision documents that require authorization by Congress. The feasibility report could lead to congressional authorization and is therefore covered by the Circular.

b. The Circular outlines the requirement of the two review approaches (independent technical review (ITR) and external peer review (EPR)) and provides guidance on Corps Planning Centers of Expertise (PCX) involvement in the approaches. This document addresses review of the decision document as it pertains to both approaches and planning coordination with the appropriate Center.

(1) ITR. Districts are responsible for reviewing the technical aspects of the decision documents and their supporting interim products through the ITR approach. The ITR is a critical examination by a qualified person or team that was not involved in the day-to-day technical work that supports the decision document. The ITR is intended to confirm that such work was done in accordance with clearly established professional principals, practices, codes, and criteria. In addition to technical review, documents should also be reviewed for their compliance with laws and policy. The Circular also requires that DrChecks be used to document all ITR comments, responses, and associated resolution accomplished.

(2) EPR. The Circular added EPR to the existing Corps review process. This approach does not replace the standard ITR process. The peer review approach applies in special cases where the magnitude and risk of the project are such that a critical examination by a qualified person outside the Corps is necessary. The EPR can also be used where the information is based on novel methods, presents complex interpretation challenges, contains precedent-setting methods or models, or is likely to affect policy decisions that have a significant impact. The degree of independence required for technical review increases as the project magnitude and project risk increase.

(a) Projects with low magnitude and low risk may use a routine ITR.

(b) Projects with either high magnitude/low risk or low magnitude/high risk would require both Corps and outside reviewers on the ITR team to address the portions of the project that cause the project to rate high on the magnitude or risk scale.

(c) Projects with high magnitude and high risk require a routine ITR as well as an EPR.

(3) PCX Coordination. The Circular outlines PCX coordination in conjunction with preparation of the review plan. Districts should prepare the plans in coordination with the appropriate PCX. The Corps PCX are responsible for the accomplishment and quality of ITR and EPR for decision documents covered by the Circular. Centers may conduct the review or manage the review to be conducted by others. Reviews will be assigned to the appropriate Center based on business programs. The Circular outlines alternative procedures to apply to decision documents. Each Center is required to post review plans to its website every 3 months, as well as links to any reports that have been made public. The Office of Water Policy Review (OWPR) will consolidate the lists of all review plans and establish a mechanism for soliciting public feedback on the review plans.

2. Project Description.

a. Decision Document. The purpose of the decision document, “Cross Lake Water Supply, Shreveport, Louisiana, General Investigation (GI) Feasibility Study and Environmental Impact Statement,” is to present the results of a feasibility study undertaken to develop plans that address the present and future environmental and water resources/water supply issues of Cross Lake. The Cross Lake study is authorized by study resolution adopted 26 July 2000 by the House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The resolution reads as follows:

“Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, which the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Red River Basin, Arkansas and Louisiana, Comprehensive Study published as House Report 98-217, with a view to determine the feasibility of measures relating to water supply, flood damage reduction, and recreation at Cross Lake, Louisiana.”

The feasibility phase of this project is cost shared 50/50 with the project sponsor (the city of Shreveport). This report provides planning, engineering, and implementation details of a recommended plan to allow final design and construction to proceed subsequent to the approval of the plan.

b. Federal Interest. This project does not fall within the Corps traditional authorization; however, authority for Federal participation in similar projects is embodied in Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1992, as amended. This legislation requires a 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal cost share of the total project cost. The 25 percent non-Federal cost share may be in the form of cash and lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocation, and dredged disposal areas (LERRD). In instances where the LERRD exceeds 25 percent of the total project cost, no reimbursement will be given and no cash will be required. Under this authority, work-in-kind is not allowed as non-Federal cost-share credit. Upon project completion, the project sponsor will own the project and will be solely responsible for all operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation.

c. General Site Description.

(1) Cross Lake is a manmade resource, constructed in the 1920s, as a water supply source for the city of Shreveport. The lake was engineered by constructing a dam at the point where Cross Bayou and an existing railroad trestle bisect one another, forming the easternmost limit of Cross Lake. Once in place, the dam restricted the normal channel flow dynamics of Cross Bayou and allowed for retention of water within the Cross Bayou Basin. Today, Cross Lake serves Shreveport and Barksdale AFB as a municipal and industrial (M&I) water supply source, a site for various forms of waterborne recreation, and as part of the Mississippi Flyway, it offers habitat for migratory waterfowl and year-round habitat for other wildlife.

(2) The lake has a surface area of approximately 14 square miles. The lake shoreline is approximately 70 miles long. The average depth of Cross Lake is approximately 8.5 feet with a maximum depth of 18.3 feet. Present lake capacity is 65,807 acre-feet. The Cross Lake Watershed consists of approximately 260 square miles, of which 35 percent is in Harrison County, Texas, with the remaining 65 percent in Caddo Parish, Louisiana. The western portion of Cross Lake Watershed features wetlands characterized by swamps and cypress groves. The northern and southern portions of the watershed near the lake are characterized as urban residential, suburban residential, industrial, commercial, and other developed land uses. The resource is contained by a dam on the eastern limit that features a spillway with an elevation of 171.12 feet, National Geodetic Vertical Datum (NGVD). The city owns the resource and all lands surrounding the lake up to 172.0 feet, NGVD. Several bayous drain into Cross Lake—on the western limit, Shettleworth, Piney, and Paw Paw Bayous; on the southern limit, Cross and Page Bayous; and on the northern limit, Choctaw and Logan Bayous.

d. Project Scope. As a result of preliminary investigations and findings and with congressional direction and funding, it was determined that further studies were warranted to investigate the feasibility of water resource improvements for Cross Lake. Cross Lake is located in the northwestern most sector of Louisiana in Caddo Parish near the Texas-Louisiana border. The lake forms the northwestern limits of Shreveport, and two-thirds of its shoreline is developed. Reconnaissance studies identified plans that address the study objective of increased

water supply for the city of Shreveport by making improvements to the lake and/or improvements in adjacent streams and water bodies. Detailed feasibility studies will further develop and investigate alternatives identified during reconnaissance studies. At this time, a minimum of three alternative plans are scheduled to be investigated. As feasibility studies progress, new plans may be developed based on study findings. In this instance, coordination will be conducted to assure all affected parties are informed and allowed the opportunity participate in plan development.

e. Problems and Opportunities. Feasibility studies will focus on identifying the existing problems, needs, and opportunities of the study area and formulating alternative plans to address the problem and needs. An assessment of existing conditions and future without- and with-project conditions will be made. Existing conditions are a layout of the present hydrologic and hydraulic, economic, social, and environmental characteristics of the study area. Future without-project conditions are those that will most probably prevail over the planning period in the absence of construction of water resource improvements within the study area. Future without-project conditions become the baseline conditions for which any future plan will be compared. The scope of studies will consist of detailed engineering, economic, and environmental analyses to determine the optimum plan for water resource improvements. Studies will be conducted at a level of detail sufficient to determine the baseline cost of improvements in order to compare plans and select the most effective plan to meet the study objectives. All studies will be conducted in accordance with various Corps regulations, circulars, and other applicable state and Federal standards. The project must also meet the needs of the non-Federal sponsor (NFS). The NFS will participate in the study management, data collection and assimilation, plan formulation and evaluation, and engineering and design activities necessary for completion of the study.

f. Model Certification. Hydraulic and hydrologic models expected to be used include (1) Geo-Hydrologic Modeling System, (2) Geo-HecRaz, and (3) Hydrologic Modeling System. These models were developed by the Hydraulic Engineering Center and are certified models for use in water resource investigations. Environmental models likely to be used include (1) Hydro-Geomorphic Classification of Wetlands Model, (2) Aquatic Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP), and (3) Terrestrial HEP. These environmental analysis models are certified, widely used throughout the Corps, and widely accepted by natural resource agencies. Any models proposed for use as the study progresses will be evaluated for certification.

Product Delivery Team (PDT). The PDT is comprised of those individuals directly involved in the development of the decision document.

g. Vertical Team. The Vertical Team includes District management, District Support Team (DST), and Review Integration Team (RIT) staff, as well as members of the Planning of Community of Practice (PCoP).

3. ITR Plan. As outlined in paragraph 1.b(1) above, the District is responsible for ensuring adequate technical review of decision documents and their supporting interim work products described below. The responsible PDT District of this decision document is Vicksburg (CEMVK).

a. General. An ITR team leader shall be designated for the ITR process. The designated PCX for Water Management and Reallocation is the Southwestern Division (CESWD) (e-mail

WMRSPCX@usace.army.mil). CESWD will assign the ITR team (ITRT) and ITR team leader. The ITR team leader is responsible for providing information necessary for setting up the review, communicating with the Project Manager (PM), providing a summary of critical review comments, collecting grammatical and editorial comments from ITRT, ensuring that ITRT has adequate funding to perform the review, facilitating the resolution of the comments, and certifying that ITR has been conducted and resolved in accordance with policy.

b. Team. The ITRT will be comprised of individuals who have not been involved in the development of the decision document or interim work products and will be chosen based on expertise, experience, and/or skills. The members will roughly mirror the composition of the PDT. It is anticipated that this team will be assigned by [REDACTED], CESWD-PDP

██████████, or other members of the CESWD staff. This Peer Review Plan will be updated to include the ITRT members, their disciplines, and other relevant information once members are designated.

(1) It is anticipated that six to seven reviewers total should be available in the following disciplines:

- (a) Hydraulic Engineering
- (b) Cost Engineering
- (c) Design Engineering
- (d) Geotechnical Engineering
- (e) Economics
- (f) Environmental
- (g) Real Estate
- (h) Planning

(2) Review Disciplines. The expertise that should be brought to the review team includes the following:

(a) Hydraulic Engineering. The reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge of HEC-RAS modeling, including the use of Geographic Information System (GIS) (ARC-INFO) inputs to the model. The reviewer(s) should also have a solid understanding of the geomorphology of alluvial rivers.

(b) Cost Engineering. The reviewer should have a solid background in cost engineering and MCACES cost estimating procedures. The Cost Engineering Center at the Walla Walla District will also review the cost estimates in accordance with HQUSACE guidance.

(c) Design Engineering. The reviewer(s) should have extensive knowledge in the design of water control structures to include floodgates, pumping stations, and weirs. Expertise in mechanical and electrical is desirable.

(d) Geotechnical Engineering. The reviewer should have a thorough understanding of soils and soils analysis. The soils in the study area are generally fined grained silts.

(e) Economics. The reviewer should have a solid understanding of water supply analysis.

(f) Environmental. The reviewer should have a solid background in Habitat Evaluation Procedures.

(g) Real Estate. The reviewer should have recent experience in reviewing Real Estate plans for feasibility studies and be able to draw on “lessons learned” in advising the PDT of best practices.

(h) Planning. The reviewer should have recent experience in reviewing Plan Formulation processes for multiobjective studies and be able to draw on “lessons learned” in advising the PDT of best practices.

(i) The ITR will focus on:

1. Review of the planning process, criteria applied, and models used.
2. Review of the methods of National Economic Development analysis.
3. Compliance with client, program, and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements.
4. Completeness of preliminary design and support documents.
5. Adequacy of MCACES cost estimates.

c. Communication. The communication plan for the ITR is as follows:

(1) The team will use DrChecks to document the ITR process. The PM will facilitate the creation of a project portfolio in the system to allow access by all PDT and ITRT members. An electronic version of interim technical work products for the Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM), Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB), and the draft report, with appendixes and NEPA document, in Word format shall be posted at <ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/> or a hard copy will be provided at least 1 business day prior to the start of the comment period.

(2) The PDT shall send the ITRT leader one hard copy (with color pages, as applicable) of the draft report and appendixes and NEPA document for each ITRT member such that the copies are received at least 1 business day prior to the start of the comment period. Interim technical work products will be provided to the appropriate ITRT members.

(3) The PDT shall host an ITR kickoff meeting virtually to orient the ITRT during the first week of the comment period for the draft report and NEPA document. If funds are not available for an onsite meeting, the PDT shall provide a presentation about the project, including photographs of the site, for the team.

(4) The PM shall inform the ITRT leader when all responses have been entered into DrChecks and conduct an in-progress review to summarize comment responses.

(5) A revised electronic version of the report and appendixes and interim technical work products with comments incorporated shall be posted at <ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/> for use during back checking of the comments.

(6) PDT members shall contact ITRT members or leader as appropriate to seek clarification of a comment's intent or provide clarification of information in the report. Discussions shall occur outside of DrChecks, but a summary of discussions may be provided in the system.

(7) Reviewers will be encouraged to contact PDT members directly via e-mail or telephone to clarify any confusion. DrChecks shall not be used to post questions needed for clarification.

(8) The ITRT, PDT, and vertical team shall conduct an After Action Review (AAR) no later than 3 weeks after ITR certification.

d. Funding.

(1) The PDT district shall provide labor funding by cross charge labor codes. Funding for travel, if needed, will be provided through Government order. The PM will work with the ITRT leader to ensure that adequate funding is available and commensurate with the level of review needed. The current cost estimate for this review is \$30,000. Any funding shortages will be negotiated on a case-by-case basis and in advance of a negative charge occurring.

(2) The ITRT leader shall provide organization codes for each team member and a responsible financial point of contact (CEFMS responsible employee) for creation of labor codes.

(3) Reviewers shall monitor individual labor code balances and alert the ITRT leader to any possible funding shortages.

e. Timing and Schedule.

(1) Throughout the development of this document, the PDT will brief Senior staff and subject matter experts from the PDT District to ensure planning quality. Members of the vertical team (DST, Planning CoP, RIT) will be invited to attend and provide comments on the product to date.

(2) The ITR will be accomplished in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix G. Three ITRs are planned:

(a) Technical work products that support the FSM documentation to include surveying and mapping, hydrology and hydraulics, average annual damage computation, etc., will be subject to ITR prior to submitting the technical products for the FSM.

(b) Technical work products that support the AFB documentation in addition to those listed in (a) above to include environmental/NEPA documentation, average annual damage benefit calculation, cost estimates, etc., will be subject to ITR prior to the AFB. If the draft report is available, that report may serve as the AFB documentation.

(c) ITR will be conducted on the draft report and NEPA document.

(3) The PDT will review the interim products including FSM materials, AFB materials, and draft feasibility report with NEPA document to ensure consistency across the disciplines and resolve any issues prior to the start of ITR on these items.

(4) The ITR process for the interim products, feasibility report, and NEPA document will follow the timeline below. Actual dates will be scheduled once the period draws closer. It is estimated that review of the feasibility report and NEPA document will begin in the second quarter of FY 2010.

Task	Date (Week)
Feasibility Scoping Meeting	To be determined
Alternative formulation ongoing	To be determined
Feasibility Report and NEPA Document	To be determined
Comment period begin	1
Kickoff meeting	1
ITR comments due	4
PDT responses due	6
Responses back check	8
Certification	10
Alternative formulation briefing (AFB)	14
AFB policy memorandum issued	18
Recertification, if needed	--
AAR NLT	20

f. Review.

(1) ITRT responsibilities are as follows:

(a) Reviewers shall review the interim work products for the FSM, AFB, and draft report and NEPA documents to confirm that work was done in accordance with established professional principals, practices, codes, and criteria and for compliance with laws and policy. Comments on the report shall be submitted into DrChecks.

(b) Reviewers shall pay particular attention to one's discipline, but may also comment on other aspects as appropriate. Reviewers who do not have any significant comments pertaining to their assigned discipline shall provide a comment stating this.

(c) Grammatical and editorial comments shall not be submitted into DrChecks. Comments should be submitted to ITRT leader via electronic mail using tracked changes feature in the Word document or as a hard copy markup. The ITRT leader shall provide these comments to the PM.

(d) Review comments shall contain these principal elements:

1. A clear statement of the concern
2. The basis for the concern, such as law, policy, or guidance
3. Significance for the concern
4. Specific actions needed to resolve the comment

(e) The "Critical" comment flag in DrChecks shall not be used unless the comment is discussed with the ITR manager and/or PM first.

(2) The PDT team responsibilities are as follows:

(a) The team shall review comments provided by the ITRT in DrChecks and provide responses to each comment using "Concur," "Nonconcur," or "For Information Only." Concur responses shall state what action was taken and provide revised text from the report, if applicable. Nonconcur responses shall state the basis for the disagreement or clarification of the concern and suggest actions to negotiate the closure of the comment.

(b) Team members shall contact the PDT and ITRT managers to discuss any “nonconcur” responses prior to submission.

g. Resolution.

(1) Reviewers shall back check PDT responses to the review comments and either close the comment or attempt to resolve any disagreements. Conference calls shall be used to resolve any conflicting comments and responses.

(2) Reviewers may “agree to disagree” with any comment response and close the comment with a detailed explanation. The ITRT members shall keep the ITR leader informed of problematic comments. The vertical team will be informed of any policy variations or other issues that may cause concern during Headquarters review.

h. Certification. To fully document the ITR process, a statement of technical review will be prepared. Certification by the ITR leader and PM will occur once issues raised by the reviewers have been addressed to the review team’s satisfaction. Indication of this concurrence will be documented by the signing of a certification statement (Appendix A). A summary report of all comments and responses will follow the statement and accompany the report throughout the report approval process.

i. AFB. The AFB for this project will occur after ITR certification. It is possible that the briefing will result in additional technical or policy comments for resolution. After resolution of significant comments, the ITR will be recertified, if needed.

4. EPR Plan.

a. This decision document will present the details of a feasibility study undertaken to develop plans that address the present and future environmental and water resource/water supply issues of Cross Lake as described in paragraph 2 above. The scope and technical complexity do not warrant an EPR. The Section 905(b) analysis identified an alternative that met the study objectives with an estimated first cost of approximately \$4,358,000. This estimate is well below the \$45 million threshold for peer review established by WRDA 2007.

(1) It is unlikely that the Corps report to be disseminated will contain influential scientific information. The water supply measures that were identified within the Section 905(b) analysis will be evaluated using standard hydrologic, hydraulic, geotechnical, environmental, and economic processes. The efforts envisioned to date will not result in a highly influential scientific assessment.

(2) It is anticipated that while this study will be challenging and beneficial, it will not be novel, controversial or precedent setting, nor have significant national importance.

(3) Project Magnitude. The magnitude of this project is determined as low. The hydrology of the study area is not considered complex nor is the project particularly complex. The project will likely have positive long-term cumulative effects.

(4) Project Risk. This project is considered low risk overall. The potential for failure is considered to be low. The potential for controversy regarding project implementation is low because the recommended plan will take into account the public concerns. A socioeconomic analysis will be prepared and at least one public meeting will be held. The uncertainty of success of the project is low because the methods used for evaluating the project are standard.

(5) The subject matter covered in the decision document is not expected to be novel, controversial, or precedent-setting, and the project will not have significant interagency interest or significant economic, environmental, or social effects.

(6) Therefore, a separate EPR will not be conducted on the decision document, provided the project cost estimate does not exceed the \$45 million threshold established in WRDA 07 and external members will not be part of the ITR team. The ITR, public, and agency review will serve as the main review approaches.

5. Public and Agency Review.

a. Public review of the document will occur after issuance of the AFB policy guidance memorandum, after ITR of the draft feasibility report and NEPA document, and concurrence by HQUSACE that the document is ready for public release. The period will last 30 days as required by law. As such, public comments other than those provided at any public meetings or workshops held during the planning process will not be available to the review team. Significant public comments that result in changes to the formulation will require a new ITR.

b. The public review of necessary state or Federal permits will also take place during this period.

c. A formal state and agency review will occur concurrently with the public review. However, it is anticipated that intensive coordination with these agencies will have occurred concurrent with the planning process. There are no known public concern issues at this time.

d. Upon completion of the review period, comments will be consolidated and addressed, if needed. A comment resolution meeting will take place, if needed, to decide upon the best resolution of comments. A summary of the comments and resolutions will be included in the document.

6. PCX coordination. The appropriate PCX for this document is the National Water Management and Reallocation Planning Center of Expertise located at CESWD. This review plan will be submitted through the PDT District (CEMVK) Planning, Programs, and Project Management Chief to the PCX Director (██████████) and PCX POC (██████████) for review. Since it was determined that this project is low magnitude and low risk, an EPR will not be required. The PCX is requested to review and comment on the sufficiency of this Peer Review Plan and assist in assigning an ITRT and ITRT leader. CEMVD, in coordination with the PCX, will approve the PRP subsequent to PCX review and resolution of comments. The approved review plan will be posted to the CEMVK website. Any public comments on the review plan will be collected by OWPR and provided to the PDT District for resolution and incorporation, if needed.

7. Approvals. The PDT will carry out the review plan as described. The PM will submit the plan to the PDT District Planning, Programs, and Project Management Chief for approval. Coordination with PCX will occur through the PDT District Planning, Programs, and Project Management Chief. Signatures by the individuals below indicate approval of the plan as proposed.

██████████ (Date)
Project Manager
Cross Lake Water Supply, Shreveport,
Louisiana, Project Delivery Team

██████████ (Date)
Chief, Planning, Programs, and Project
Management Division
Vicksburg District

██████████ (Date)
Director, National Water Management and
Reallocation Planning Center of Expertise


APPENDIX A
STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW

COMPLETION OF INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW
CROSS LAKE WATER SUPPLY,
SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA, PROJECT
FEASIBILITY REPORT AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)

The Vicksburg District has completed the feasibility report, EIS, and appendixes for the Cross Lake Water Supply, Shreveport, Louisiana, Project. Notice is hereby given that an independent technical review, that is appropriate to the level of risk and complexity inherent in the project, has been conducted as defined in the Review Plan. During the independent technical review, compliance with established policy principles and procedures, utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses; alternatives evaluated; the appropriateness of data used and level obtained; and reasonableness of the result, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing Corps policy. The independent technical review was accomplished by an independent team composed of _____ staff. All comments resulting from ITR have been resolved.

(To be designated by CESWD)
Team Leader, Cross Lake Water Supply,
Shreveport, Louisiana, Project, Independent
Technical Review Team

(Date)


Project Manager
Cross Lake Water Supply, Shreveport,
Louisiana, Project


(Date)

CERTIFICATION OF INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW

A summary of all comments and responses is attached. Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows:

(Describe the major technical concerns, possible impact and resolution)

As noted above, all concerns resulting from the independent technical review of the project have been fully resolved.


Chief, Planning, Programs, and Project
Management Division
Vicksburg District

(Date)