

# PCoP Panel Q&A Forum

## Today's Panel

**Sue Hughes, Planning Community of  
Practice Deputy**

**Wes Coleman, Chief Office of Water Project  
Review**

**Evie Haberer, OWPR**

**Lisa Kiefel, HQUSACE**

**Jodi Creswell, HQUSACE (detail)**

**Brian Harper, IWR**

**7 May 2015**



®

US Army Corps of Engineers  
**PLANNING SMART  
BUILDING STRONG**®



# Seeing The Panel Today

- We will use slides with a summary of the question we are answering.



- Top right people icon on the video will put it in full screen mode to see the whole panel.
  - ▶ Sue Hughes, Planning Community of Practice Deputy
  - ▶ Wes Coleman, Chief Office of Water Project Review
  - ▶ Evie Haberer, OWPR
  - ▶ Lisa Kiefel, HQUSACE
  - ▶ Jodi Creswell, HQUSACE
  - ▶ Brian Harper, IWR
- Chat a question for technical assistance



# The Questions

1. Who approves the draft report for release to the public after the TSP?



BUILDING STRONG®

# The Questions

2. Can a ROD be signed without ESA and CWA requirements being complete?
3. What environmental documentation will be required by the CWRB? What consultation processes need to be complete?
4. Do we need written assurances from agencies if we cannot complete 404 or ESA?
5. If these processes need to be complete, how do you propose we complete them given the lack of detailed information available during the SMART Planning process?



# The Questions

6. What has emerged as the best practice for a PDT to pull off a charette? Is it:
- a) Make sure you have a facilitator (follow on: where are all the charette facilitators these days?)
  - b) Make sure it occurs before a particular milestone (and if so, which one?)
  - c) Make sure you have the right decision-makers present – physically, not virtually (resource agencies?)
  - d) All of the above

If “All of the Above”, which studies need charettes, and how we can link practitioners to the right PDTs?



# The Questions

WRRDA Section 1001(e)(2) Questions: This section of WRRDA requires the Secretary to "convene a meeting of all Federal, tribal, and state agencies..."

7. Can this meeting be held as a teleconference to save agencies and tribes travel time and expense?
8. What is the intended purpose of this meeting?
9. Could the meeting required by Section 1001 be combined with NEPA scoping to avoid duplication and make it easier on everyone involved?



# The Questions

10. Is it possible to reduce the Cost ATR to only 2 ATRs?

- Draft Report ATR where a class 4 level ATR is conducted for the TSP and class 5 level ATR for the other viable alternatives, and;
- Final report cost ATR at the class 3 level for the Recommended Plan/LPP.



BUILDING STRONG®

# The Questions

11. Can you please clarify which FCSA to use for an FY 15 resumption (recon approved in FY13)?



BUILDING STRONG®

# The Questions

12. Where in the process is the Corps with incorporating the PR&G into the planning process?



BUILDING STRONG®

# The Questions

13. Is there any discussion about streamlining some of the Corps approval processes? E.g., similar to use of Dr.Checks and Projectwise software, as well as submitting items electronically, instead of 8–16 paper copies (saving time and expense)?



# The Questions

14. Who is responsible for updating HQ approved programmatic review plans: District; Division; or HQ?



BUILDING STRONG®

# The Questions

15. Is there a SOP for the alternatives milestone?



BUILDING STRONG®

# The Questions

16. Can you please comment on the use of the “Cost of Flooding Tool” at FloodSmart.gov as a way to prepare gross estimates in the initial stages of a FRM evaluation?



# Thank You!

Type questions in the chat box – send to Everybody.  
We will answer as many as time allows.



®

US Army Corps of Engineers  
**PLANNING SMART**  
**BUILDING STRONG**®

