

NWK Lessons Learned

1. Length of study required extra efforts to maintain knowledge of key milestones and past decisions.
2. Identify risks/potential impacts due to changes in team members, new policies, or updated design criteria. Especially in the last year leading up to CWRB.
3. Briefing for HQ on Phase 1 only would have established better background information and awareness for the review team.
4. Study would have benefitted by more frequent formal IPR's involving NWD, ATR team, and HQ, similar to Smart Planning process.
5. ATR and IEPR reviews were very beneficial in producing quality products.
6. The strong sponsor partnerships have greatly contributed to the high level of maintenance of the levee system and in the study process and report development.



NWD Lessons Learned

- Because the entire HQ review team changed between Phase I and Phase II, we should have held a detailed vertical team briefing on Phase I, prior to the Phase II reviews
- Site visits help reviewers better understand the project, particularly when there are several separate elements that function as a system
- Draft IEPR responses should be coordinated with the vertical team earlier to resolve any potential issues
- Initiate tracking spreadsheet for all phases of review to provide vertical team alignment on completeness, with embedded documentation



Agency Technical Review Lessons Learned

- The review plan did not include an H&H subject matter expert and did not include a flood risk analysis subject matter expert. It was assumed that these disciplines were not needed because the study relied on existing published H&H information from the 2006 Interim Report. This resulted in some terminology issues and consistency issues in the Final Report. In the future a risk analysis subject matter expert should be on all flood risk management studies.
- In some instances the PDT was required to provide reviewers with documentation on study area baseline data that had been included in the Phase I report, but left out of the Phase II report. While this did not ultimately lead to any major technical comments, it did cause some wastage of time to perform the ATR.
- The phasing of the study effort led to an inordinately long time frame for the review. Most original ATR team members had to be replaced due to changing job status. Hopefully this study represents a unique circumstance unlikely to reoccur.

