

Peer Review Plan

D. Navigation Adaptive Management

Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program

FY06 Update

February 2007

Peer Review Plan
Navigation Efficiency Reevaluation
Navigation Adaptive Management Project
Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program

Introduction

A feasibility report completed in 2004 recommended implementation of navigation efficiencies on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois rivers. Because the staging of individual aspects of this plan occurred over a number of years and, therefore, involved significant levels of uncertainty, a Navigation Adaptive Management Project was established. This project, which is being conducted as part of the Navigation and Environmental Sustainability Program (NESP), provides a mechanism for analyzing and confirming/modifying as warranted, proposed navigation efficiency features in order to best suit the needs of the Upper Mississippi River System and the nation. The *Navigation Efficiency Reevaluation Report* is the first product of the Navigation Adaptive Management Project.

This reevaluation may come in two phases, the first being an interim report that presents results of an economic update of the feasibility report's recommended plan using newly completed tools from the Corps' Navigation Economic Technologies (NETS) research and development program and updates of economic data. The *Navigation Efficiency Reevaluation, Interim Report* is scheduled to be finalized in January 2008. If it is deemed necessary, the *Navigation Efficiency Reevaluation Report* will go to a second phase that examines all four national accounts and more fully reevaluates a range of efficiency alternatives.

The PRP presented below is a collaborative product of the project delivery team (PDT) and the USACE Planning Center of Expertise for Inland Navigation (PCXIN). The PCXIN shall manage the PRP, which for this study includes both an Independent Technical Review (ITR) and an External Peer Review (EPR).

The Peer Review Plan

The following paragraphs correspond to paragraph 6.a. to 6.j. of Engineering Circular 1105-2-408.

a. Two decision documents are possible. The first decision document shall be a limited re-evaluation report, the *Navigation Efficiency Reevaluation, Interim Report*. This interim report shall present an economic re-analysis of the recommended plan from the 2004 Upper Mississippi-Illinois Waterway feasibility report. Subsequent to completion of the interim, a decision shall be made concerning the need for analysis of a broader range of navigation efficiency alternatives. If it is decided that this broader analysis is required, a general re-evaluation report, the *Navigation Efficiency Reevaluation*, would be prepared and this PRP would be modified and the schedule extended.

The PDT for the reevaluation report is drawn from all four districts in the Corps' Mississippi Valley Division. More information on the NESP and points of contact are available at the study website: <http://www2.mvr.usace.army.mil/UMRS/NESP/>. Additional information on Peer Review is available at the US Army Corps of Engineers, Planning Center of Expertise for Inland Navigation (PCXIN) website: <http://inlandwaterways.lrh.usace.army.mil/>.

b. The interim reevaluation report will use tools only recently developed as part of the Navigation Economic Technologies (NETS) program. This NETS work represents significant new scientific information and tools. These tools, along with more current data on navigation economics, are being used to reevaluate a plan that recommends over \$2 billion in navigation efficiency improvements. For these reasons, the interim reevaluation report shall be subjected to both an EPR and an ITR.

c. Individual members of the ITR team shall review technical products as they are completed, submitting comments to the PDT, receiving responses, and resolving and certifying individual products, including the draft interim reevaluation report. The EPR Panel shall review all technical documents, providing comments and receiving PDT responses; however, individual technical products shall not be certified. Following review of the draft Interim Reevaluation Report, the EPR panel members shall prepare an individual letter report with certification and then oversee and approval the preparation of an executive summary EPR report.

d. As indicated in the paragraph above, an EPR shall be conducted with a panel.

e. There are several mechanisms in place for Public input and review. During the development of the report, the study team has quarterly meetings with other Federal agencies, state agencies and interested stakeholders. As currently planned, a series of public meetings would be held after the draft interim reevaluation report is available for public review and comment.

f. The EPR Panel will attend most of the quarterly meetings and during the public review period of the draft report comments will be provided to the Panel as available.

g. There are five technical experts on the EPR Panel. The ITR team currently is comprised of seven technical experts.

h. The ITR team is comprised of individuals with experience in waterway transportation modeling, transportation rate analysis, waterway traffic demand forecasting, NED financial analysis, and waterway resource plan formulation. The EPR panel is represented by four agricultural economists with specific interests and experience in transportation modeling, production, and markets as they pertain to agriculture, and by a transportation economist with extensive transportation demand, project feasibility, and modeling experience. The following are members of the External Peer Review Panel:

Denver Tolliver, Ph.D., North Dakota State University
Daryll Ray, Ph.D., University of Tennessee
Alexander Metcalf, Ph.D., TEMS, Inc.
Stephen Fuller, Ph.D., Texas A&M University
John Beghin, Ph.D., Iowa State University

i. EPR panel members were nominated by other federal agencies and state agency stakeholders. The nominees were screened for independence and availability to serve on the panel and then presented to the PCXIN for approval.

j. Member nominations for the EPR are described in the paragraph above. The ITR team members were selected by the PCXIN.