

Civil Works Review Board (CWRB)
Project Summary

Project Reviewed: Wood River, Illinois

Date of CWRB: 25 October 2005

CWRB Members: MG Riley (DCW, Chair); Steve Stockton (DDCW); Tom Waters (Planning CoP); Don Basham (Engineering and Construction CoP); and Jerry Barnes (LRD RIT Leader).

Key Participants:

HQUSACE: CWRB Members, Ed Theriot (NAD RIT Leader), Office of Water Project Review (Colosimo, Einarsen, Warren, Fitzsimmons), Policy and Policy Compliance Division (Leef), Office of Counsel (Nee) & MVD RIT (Montvai, Hughes).

MVD (via VTC): Col Bleakley (representing BG Crear) and Charles Barton.

MVS: LTC Raimondo (representing Col Setliff); David Leake, Tamara Atchley, Joe Kellett and Ed Demsky

ASACW: Doug Lamont

OMB: None.

Sponsor: Mr. Leroy Emerick (Board of Commissioners)

OWPR Recommendation: Approval of the report for release for State and Agency review.

CWRB Decision Made: Approval of release of the report for State and Agency review and filing in the Federal Register.

Vote: Unanimous. A number of conditions were placed on the approval. First, the district needed to coordinate with Programs to determine FY06 potential for design deficiency actions. Second, the district needs to at least qualitatively capture potential impacts resulting from navigation impacts. Finally, the district needs to undertake additional coordination with FEMA as described in item 3 below.

Key Issues/Questions Raised by the CWRB (in no particular order):

1. The basis for the cost-sharing was questioned. In particular, a number of the CWRB members expressed concern about distinguishing between design deficiency and reconstruction activities given that the cost-sharing percentages are the same. It was explained that we have authority to pursue design deficiency activities but need additional authority to undertake reconstruction items, and as a result there is a need to segregate the activities even though the cost-sharing percentages are the same. The CWRB indicated that the district report needs to clearly lay out this issue for decision-makers. The district indicated that the report clearly distinguishes between design deficiency and reconstruction items.

2. Concerns about design deficiency designations were expressed by a number of the CWRB members. Of particular concern was whether the design deficiency determinations made for this project were precedent setting and could have nationwide programmatic implications.
3. The CWRB inquired as to the extent of coordination with FEMA as part of the project development process. The district explained that the levee system is certified and that additional coordination would be undertaken with FEMA to inform them of our proposed plans and associated new responsibilities of the sponsor. It was generally noted that corporately we need to improve our coordination with FEMA in the project development process.
4. The sponsor was asked whether they had an emergency action plan in place. The sponsor explained that they work closely with the local authorities to facilitate evacuation as conditions dictate based on their emergency action plans.
5. In terms of implementation, the CWRB inquired as to whether the design deficiency action would be pursued if reconstruction authorization were not received. The district indicated that the design deficiency actions would be pursued independently but recognized the need to sort out how the whole project is budgeted due to different budgetary rules.
6. The CWRB discussed the need to capture the navigation impacts as well as the costs from oil and gas industry due to catastrophic failure to increase the BCR. It was recognized that processing of the report should not be held up at this point, but the district agreed to at least qualitatively describe these impacts and associated benefits following completion of the Chiefs Report.

Other Issues of Note:

1. Some discussion about whether “other Wood River’s exist in MVD” was undertaken. It was generally acknowledged that there are other Wood River’s in MVD and nationwide. Concerns about the program impact were expressed by a number of the CWRB members. It was agreed that reconstruction activities could become a sizeable program as the existing infrastructure ages and as such may need to be part of future campaign plan(s).
2. Some concern was expressed that the design deficiency standards are being set too low, as the project has performed well for a long period of time.

Attachments: Powerpoint handouts (including District Engineer, Division Engineer, Sponsor and Office of Water Project Review briefs); Project Summary; DE Transmittal Letter; and Draft Chief of Engineers Report.