



US Army Corps
of Engineers®

Buffalo District
Great Lakes and Ohio River Division

Dredged Material Management Plans for Ohio Harbors - Ashtabula, Conneaut, Fairport, Sandusky, Huron, Lorain, Toledo

P2/Project Number: 505146, 505149, 505163, 505166, 506968, 506969, 506970

Programmatic Review Plan Decision Document

PREPARED

BY: Plan Formulator
USACE, LRB District

RECOMMENDED

BY:

District Engineer
USACE, Buffalo District

ENDORSED *Endorsement memo attached*

BY:

Planning Center of Expertise, Inland Navigation (PCXIN)
USACE, Huntington District
Review Management Organization (RMO)

APPROVED

BY:

Regional Program Director
USACE, Great Lakes and Ohio River Division

DOCUMENT HISTORY:

Document	Description & location of Revision	Date Approved
Original RP		
Revision #		

This information is distributed solely for the purpose of pre-dissemination review under applicable information quality guidelines. It has not been formally disseminated by USACE. It does not represent and should not be construed to represent any agency determination or policy.

Dredged Material Management Plans for Ohio Harbors
Programmatic Review Plan
Last Updated: 01/06/2023

1. PURPOSE, AUTHORITY, STUDY DESCRIPTION, AND PRODUCTS

a. Purpose. This programmatic review plan defines levels and scopes of review required for the following Dredged Material Management Plans (DMMPs):

- **Ashtabula Harbor DMMP (P2# 505146)**
- **Conneaut Harbor DMMP (P2# 505149)**
- **Fairport Harbor DMMP (P2# 505163)**
- **Sandusky Harbor DMMP (P2# 505166)**
- **Huron Harbor DMMP (P2# 506968)**
- **Lorain Harbor DMMP (P2# 506969)**
- **Toledo Harbor DMMP (P2# 506970)**

The purpose of a DMMP is to identify and evaluate alternatives to manage the volume of dredged sediment associated with the operation and maintenance (O&M) dredging of federal navigation channels. Dredged Material Management Plans must develop of plan for dredged sediment management over a 20-year period of analysis per 1105-2-100, Appendix E.

b. Authority. The subject harbors have been developed through various authorities as described below:

- **Ashtabula Harbor** - Authorized River and Harbor Act of 1896, 1905, 1910, 1919, 1935, 1937, 1945, 1960 and 1965.
- **Conneaut Harbor** – Authorized by the Rivers & Harbor Acts of 1910, 1935, 1962.
- **Fairport Harbor** – Authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Acts of 1886, 1905, 1919, 1927, 1930, 1935, 1937, 1946.
- **Sandusky Harbor** – Authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Acts of 1899, 1902, 1919, 1927, 1935, 1945, 1960.
- **Huron Harbor** – Authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Acts of 1905, 1919, 1935, and 1962
- **Lorain Harbor** – Authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Acts of 1899, 1907, 1910, 1918, 1930, 1935, 1945, 1960, 1965 and the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.
- **Toledo Harbor** – Authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Acts of 1899, 1911, 1935, 1950, 1954, 1958, and 1960.

c. References.

- Engineer Regulation 1165-2-217 – Water Resources Policies and Authorities – Civil Works Review Policy, 1 May 2021.
- Engineer Circular 1105-2-412 – Planning – Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 March 2011.

- Engineer Regulation 1105-2-100 – Planning – Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix E-15, Dredged Material Management Plans, 22 April 2020.

d. Study Description. All of the harbors covered by this programmatic review plan are located on Lake Erie within the State of Ohio. These harbors have traditionally relied upon open-water placement for the majority of their dredged material management. This DMMP will develop and evaluate alternatives for dredged sediment placement with the intent of identifying a 20-year plan for dredged material management. These alternatives may include beneficial use of dredged material (BUDM), construction of new confined disposal facilities (CDFs), modification or expansion of existing CDFs, placement at non-federal facilities using a 217 agreement, open-water placement, nearshore placement for littoral nourishment, and other. Likely alternatives to be considered and project specific risks are described below:

- **Ashtabula Harbor** – This DMMP is likely to consider BUDM for aquatic habitat restoration as a major component of a 20-yr plan. Risks associated with this DMMP are related to the timing of BUDM projects related to dredging. Additionally, there is a risk that the anticipated BUDM projects may not provide adequate storage for the anticipated volume of sediment that will be dredged over the next 20 years.
- **Conneaut Harbor** – This DMMP is likely to consider placement of dredged sediment at non-fed facility through a Section 217 Agreement. The primary risks associated with this DMMP will be related to the large uncertainty in estimating future tipping fees associated with dredged sediment placement through a Section 217 Agreement and the capacity of non-federal facilities.
- **Fairport Harbor** – This DMMP is likely to consider placement of dredged sediment at non-fed facility through a Section 217 Agreement and BUDM for aquatic habitat restoration as a major component of a 20-yr plan. The primary risks associated with this DMMP will be related to the large uncertainty in estimating future tipping fees associated with dredged sediment placement through a Section 217 Agreement and the capacity of non-federal facilities. There is additional risk associated with the availability of a non-federal sponsor to support BUDM projects and provide cost-share.
- **Sandusky Harbor** – This DMMP is likely to consider BUDM for aquatic habitat restoration as a major component of a 20-yr plan. Risks associated with this DMMP are related to the timing of BUDM projects related to dredging. Additionally, there is a risk that the anticipated BUDM projects may not provide adequate storage for the anticipated volume of sediment that will be dredged over the next 20 years.
- **Huron Harbor** – This DMMP is likely to consider BUDM for aquatic habitat restoration as a major component of a 20-yr plan. There is large uncertainty in the future tonnage and economic viability of this harbor. As a result, there is risk that future tonnage, dredging needs, and harbor benefits may be over/underestimated.

- **Lorain Harbor** - This DMMP is likely to consider placement of dredged sediment at non-fed facility through a Section 217 Agreement and BUDM for aquatic habitat restoration as a major component of a 20-yr plan. The primary risks associated with this DMMP will be related to the large uncertainty in estimating future tipping fees associated with dredged sediment placement through a Section 217 Agreement. There is additional risk associated with the availability of a non-federal sponsor to support BUDM projects and provide cost-share.
- **Toledo Harbor** – This DMMP is likely to consider placement of dredged sediment at non-fed facility through a Section 217 Agreement. The primary risks associated with this DMMP will be related to the large uncertainty in estimating future tipping fees associated with dredged sediment placement through a Section 217 Agreement and the capacity of non-federal facilities.

Dredged Material Management Plans will evaluate historic dredging needs and forecast anticipated dredging requirements over the next 20 years. In addition, the DMMPs will include an integrated environmental assessment. It is unlikely that an environmental impact statement will be necessary.

Significant changes to the scope or risks that deviate from the programmatic review plan will require an individual review plan to be developed, endorsed by the PXC-IN, and approved by the MSC.

e. Products. All DMMPs covered under this review plan are anticipated to produce the same deliverables as indicate below.

Table 1. List of Products to Be Prepared and Reviewed					
Product / Document	Prepared By	Type of Review to be Performed			
		DQC	ATR	Type I IEPR	Policy / Legal
DMMP Main Report and Integrated Environmental Assessment	In-house Resources	X	X		X
Environmental Appendix	In-house Resources	X	X		X
Cost Appendix	In-house Resources	X	X		X
Economic Appendix	In-house Resources	X	X		X
Real Estate Plan Appendix	In-house Resources	X	X		X
Coastal Appendix (If Necessary)	In-house Resources	X	X		X
Geotechnical Appendix (If Necessary)	In-house Resources	X	X		X

2. REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

a. Types of Review. DMMP activities and documents are required to be reviewed in accordance with ER 1165-2-217. Based upon the factors under each heading, this plan will undergo the reviews identified and described below and as outlined in Table 1.

(1) District Quality Control (DQC): DQC procedures will be performed and formally documented for all study products, including supporting documents.

- The Buffalo District will perform and manage DQC procedures in accordance with the District DQC process.
- DQC will be documented using DrChecks, and a DQC summary report / certification will be completed.
- Supervisors within each area of responsibility will assign appropriate, qualified staff to perform QC on their respective products. Personnel performing QC shall have the necessary expertise to address compliance with Corps policy.
- The same DQC team and disciplines will be used for all of the DMMPs covered by this review plan. The following disciplines will be playing a critical role in the DQC for the DMMPs:

Table 2a. DQC Team Technical Disciplines and Expertise		
Technical Discipline	Peer DQC Reviewer	Chief Level DQC Reviewer
Project Management	Each peer-level DQC reviewer will have no production role in the study/project and will have the necessary expertise/experience to thoroughly review the study products identified in Table (1).	CELRB-PMP-M, Chief
Plan Formulation		CELRB-PML-P, Chief
Economics		
Climate Preparedness and Resiliency		CELRB-TDD-T, Chief
Cost Engineering		CELRB-TDD-S, Chief
Structural Engineering		CELRB-TDD-C, Chief
Geotechnical Engineering		CELRB-PML-E, Chief
Biology/Cultural Resources		CELRB-PML-E, Chief
Real Estate		CELRB-PML-E, Chief

(2) Agency Technical Review (ATR): ATR will be scaled to a level commensurate with the risk and complexity of the products to be reviewed. The ATR will assess whether the analyses presented are technically correct and comply with published USACE guidance, and that the document explains the analyses and results in a reasonably clear manner for the public and decision makers. ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.).

- ATR is managed within USACE by the designated RMO (PCXIN) and is conducted by a qualified team from outside the home district that is not involved in the day-to-day production of the project/product.

- ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel and may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate.
- All ATR reviewers must be certified to perform ATR by USACE. Multiple disciplines may be covered by a single reviewer based on appropriate experience, expertise, and certification.
- The team lead will be from outside LRD.
- The ATR review will be documented using DrChecks, and an ATR Summary Report and certification will be completed.
- All members of the ATR team will use the four-part comment structure (see ER 1165-2-217, Chapter 5). If a concern cannot be resolved by the ATR team and PDT, it will be elevated to the vertical team to resolve using the issue resolution process in ER 1165-2-217, chapter 5.9. Concerns will be closed in DrChecks by noting the concern has been elevated.

Table 2b. ATR Technical Disciplines and Expertise Required

ATR Disciplines	Expertise Required	Justification / Rationale
ATR Lead	The ATR Lead should be a senior professional preferably with experience in preparing and conducting ATRs on DMMPs. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. The ATR lead may also serve as a reviewer for a specific discipline such as, planning, economics, environmental resources, etc.	A lead is required to coordinate all ATR activities and provide documentation of ATR certification.
Plan Formulation	The Planning Reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in current planning policies and guidance related to DMMPs, dredged material beneficial use projects, and 217 Agreements.	Plan evaluation and comparison will be necessary in development of the DMMPs and as a major component of this study. Subject expertise needed to review DMMP alternatives.
Economics	The Economics Reviewer should be experienced with economic models and studies related to DMMPs and inland navigation.	DMMPs are anticipated to include significant economic analysis and an economic appendix which will contain the evaluation of multiple dredge material management measures and alternatives.
Environmental, Archeological, Cultural, NEPA	The Environmental Reviewer should be experienced in analysis of DMMP impacts as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other applicable laws, regulations, and executive orders.	DMMPs will evaluate the environmental impacts of alternatives related to NEPA and other federal, state, and local environmental regulations.
Climate Preparedness and Resiliency	Climate Preparedness and Resiliency reviewer should be an expert in performing climate analysis on DMMP projects. At least one member of an ATR Team for inland hydrology, designs, and projects must be certified by the Climate Preparedness and Resilience CoP in CERCAP.	Required by Engineering and Construction Bulletin ECB 2018-14; DMMP alternatives can be affected by future climate conditions; a climate analysis will be used to determine resiliency.
Cost Engineering Reviewer	Cost MCX Staff or Cost MCX Pre-Certified Professional as assigned by the Walla Walla Cost Engineering Mandatory Center of Expertise with experience preparing cost estimates for DMMPs. Must be Certification and Access Program (CERCAP) certified.	Required by ER 1165-2-217.
Real Estate Reviewer	Real Estate Reviewer should be experienced with preparing real estate plans for DMMP projects.	DMMP alternatives may require rights-of-entry or real estate acquisition for project investigation, and/or alternative construction. Due to the nature of the potential

		projects, nonstandard estates and lake bottom-lands may be required.
Geotechnical Engineering (If Necessary)	Geotechnical Engineering reviewer expertise need is possibly anticipated. Experience with the design of projects, particularly related to typical DMMP alternatives, is desired.	Geotechnical Engineering expertise would be required to evaluate subsurface conditions and substrate stability if the DMMPs propose construction of a new CDF or berm raising on existing CDFs.
Coastal Engineering (If Necessary)	Coastal Engineering reviewer expertise is possibly anticipated. Experience with design of projects, particularly related to typical DMMP alternatives, is desired.	Coastal Engineering expertise would be required to evaluate coastal conditions (e.g., wave & water levels) at the project location if the DMMPs propose construction of a new CDF or similar alternative be considered.
HTRW (If Necessary)	An HTRW reviewer may be necessary. The reviewer should have experience related to the placement of dredged material at non-federal facilities and other applications typically related to DMMPs.	HTRW expertise would be required in cases where 401 WQC does not address all potential HTRW concerns associated with the placement, or processing of dredged material, especially in the cases of non-federal placement facilities,
Disciplines with No Anticipated ATR Team Need		
Hydraulics and Hydrology (H&H)	H&H reviewer expertise is not an anticipated need due to the scope and nature of this project being a DMMP.	The study areas are primarily in a coastal setting and are unlikely to contain significant analysis or evaluation related to the H&H discipline.
Structural Design Engineering	Structural Design Engineering expertise is not anticipated but should it be required the reviewer should be experienced with typical DMMP alternatives structural design in a coastal environment.	The DMMPs are unlikely to propose construction of new structural components or contain significant analysis related to the structural discipline.

(3) Type I Independent External Peer Review (IEPR): A Type I IEPR is not required based on the mandatory triggers outlined in ER 1165-2-217. Project studies may be excluded Type I IEPR if the project does not meet any of the mandatory IEPR triggers. This feasibility study does not meet any of the three mandatory IEPR triggers for the following reasons:

- The estimated total cost of the project, including mitigation costs, is not greater than \$200 million.
- The Governor of Ohio has not requested a peer review by independent experts.

- The study is not controversial due to significant public dispute over size, nature, or effects of the project or the economic or environmental costs or benefits of the project.

When none of the three mandatory triggers for IEPR are met, MSC Commanders have the discretion to conduct IEPR on a risk-informed assessment of the expected contribution of IEPR to the project. An IEPR would not provide additional benefit to the study for the following reasons:

- a. This study does not include the development or use of any novel methods.
- b. This project does not pose likely threats to health and public safety.
- c. There is no anticipated inter-agency interest.
- d. Buffalo District has not received a request from the head of any Federal or State agency for a Type 1 IEPR.
- e. The proposed project is not anticipated to have unique construction sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule.

(4) Safety Assurance Review (SAR): In accordance with ER 1165-2-217, Section 7.3, SAR is conducted on PED and construction activities for projects where potential hazards pose a significant threat to human life (public safety). Since this review plan pertains to a planning-level report, (i.e., DMMP) a SAR is not applicable.

(5) Policy and Legal Review: All decision documents will be reviewed for compliance with law and policy. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed in ER 1165-2-217. This regulation defines what needs to be reviewed by the District and Division for policy and legal compliance and outlines the supplemental documentation that is required to formalize the review.

Approval authority for DMMPs is typically at the district level per the Planning Guidance Notebook (PGN), ER-1105-2-100, Appendix E-15b.(1)(a)(3). However, if the recommendation of this DMMP is 217 Agreement, or some other non-standard agreement, MSC review will be completed for the purposes of vertical alignment.

(6) Public Participation.

- a. A public involvement program will be included to satisfy NEPA requirements and solicit public and government agency input.
- b. The Buffalo District shall contact agencies with regulatory review for coordination as required by applicable laws and procedures.
- c. The Buffalo District will review comments resulting from public and agency review, and will provide the ATR team copies of public and agency comments and responses.

2. **MODEL CERTIFICATION OR APPROVAL.** The following models may be used to develop the decision documents:

Table 3a. Planning Models		
Model Name and Version	Model Description and How It Will Be Used	Certification / Approval Status & Date
IWR Planning Suite II (2.0.9.1)	The Institute for Water Resources Planning Suite (IWR-PLAN) is a decision support software package that is designed to assist with the formulation and comparison of alternative plans. IWR-PLAN can assist with plan formulation by combining solutions to planning problems and calculating the additive effects of each combination, or "plan." IWR-PLAN can assist with plan comparison by conducting cost effectiveness and incremental cost analyses, identifying the plans which are the best financial investments and displaying the effects of each on a range of decision variables.	Certified for national use May 31, 2018
GL-SAND V1.0	The Great Lakes Systems Analysis of Navigation Depths (GL-SAND) model was developed by the USACE Buffalo District (LRB) in conjunction with the Planning Center of Expertise for Inland Navigation (PCXIN) to measure navigation project performance in the Great Lakes. The model estimates transportation costs avoided (NED benefit) associated with maintaining federally authorized channel depths.	Currently pursuing FY23 Model Recertification through coordination with the PCXIN. Recertification is anticipated to occur prior to Agency Technical Review.

Table 3b. Engineering Models		
Model Name and Version	Model Description and How It Will Be Used	Approval Status
MII	MII is the second generation of the Micro-Computer Aided Cost Estimating System (MCACES). It is a detailed cost estimating software application that was developed in conjunction with Project Time & Cost LLC. MII provides an integrated cost estimating system (software and databases) that meets the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) requirements for preparing cost estimates.	Enterprise Model

3. **REVIEW SCHEDULE AND BUDGET.** The schedule and budgets for reviews for each DMMP covered by this review plan are included in attachment 2.

ATTACHMENT 1 – Contacts for All Projects

Function	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
RMO Contact	Cade, Beth	615-736-7865	CELRH-PCXIN
MSC Contact – District Support Program Manager	Bright, Roscoe	513-684-3159	CELRD-PDS

DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC) TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
DQC Lead			CELRB-PMP-P
Plan Formulation Reviewer			CELRB-PML-P
Climate Preparedness and Resiliency			CELRB-PML-P
Environmental Reviewer			CELRB-PML-E
Geotechnical & Coastal Engineering Reviewer			CELRB-TDD-C
Economics Reviewer			CELRB-PML-P
Structural Engineering Reviewer			CELRB-TDD-S
Cost Engineering Reviewer			CELRB-TDD-E
HTRW			CELRB-TDE-S
Real Estate Reviewer			CELRB-REP

MSC / HQ Policy and Legal Compliance Review Team			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
Review Manager	TBD		
Planning Reviewer	TBD		
Economics Reviewer	TBD		
Technical Design Reviewer	TBD		
Environmental Reviewer	TBD		
Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering/Climate Reviewer	TBD		
Cost Engineering Reviewer	TBD		
Real Estate Reviewer	TBD		

ATTACHMENT 2 – Project Specific Information

Ashtabula Harbor DMMP (505146)

Product and Review Schedule				
Product(s) to Undergo Review	Review Level	Start Date	Finish Date	Budget (\$)
Draft DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	DQC	05 OCT 2023	02 NOV 2023	
	ATR	09 FEB 2024	23 FEB 2024	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	09 FEB 2024	12 APR 2024	NA
	Public and Agency Review	09 FEB 2024	22 MAR 2024	NA
Final DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	Final DQC	29 APR 2024	17 MAY 2024	
	ATR	20 MAY 2024	03 JUN 2024	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	06 SEP 2024	08 NOV 2024	NA

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office Org Code
Project Manager (Lead)		(716) 481-6536	CELRB-PMP-M
Planners		(716) 879-4168 (716) 879-4437	CELRB-PML-P
Biologist & Cultural Resources*		(716) 879-4488	CELRB-PML-E
Geotechnical Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-C
Economist		(716) 879-4268	CELRB-PML-P
Civil/Structural Engineer		(716) 879-4386	CELRB-TDD-S
Cost Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-T
Real Estate		(716) 879-4113	CELRB-REP
Office of Counsel		(716) 879-4312	CELRB-OC

AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
ATR Lead			CESAM-PD-D
Planning Reviewer			CE-LRH-PXN
Economics Reviewer			CELRH-PXN
Environmental Reviewer	TBD		
Climate Reviewer	TBD		
Cost Engineering Reviewer	TBD		
HTRW Reviewer	If Necessary		
Geotech/Coastal Reviewer	If Necessary		
PCX will determine the ATR Lead and composition of the ATR Team.			

Conneaut Harbor DMMP (505149)

Product and Review Schedule				
Product(s) to Undergo Review	Review Level	Start Date	Finish Date	Budget (\$)
Draft DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	DQC	01 APR 2024	01 MAY 2024	
	ATR	24 MAY 2024	5 JUL 2024	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	07 JUN 2024	09 AUG 2024	NA
	Public and Agency Review	02 SEP 2024	02 OCT 2024	NA
Final DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	Final DQC	01 DEC 2024	31 DEC 2024	
	ATR	06 JAN 2025	05 FEB 2025	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	28 FEB 2025	02 MAY 2025	NA

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office Org Code
Project Manager (Lead)			CELRB-PMP-M
Planners			CELRB-PML-P
Biologist			CELRB-PML-E
Geotechnical Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-C
Economist			CELRB-PML-P
Civil/Structural Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-S
Cost Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-T
Real Estate			CELRB-REP
Office of Counsel			CELRB-OC
* LRB can support basic cultural resource coordination tasks. If significant cultural resources concerns are identified during the feasibility phase, LRB will coordinate with an Archeologist from another District to support the study.			

AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
ATR Lead			CESAM-PD-D
Planning Reviewer			CE-LRH-PXN
Economics Reviewer			CELRH-PXN
Environmental Reviewer	TBD		
Climate Reviewer	TBD		
Cost Engineering Reviewer	TBD		
HTRW Reviewer	If Necessary		
Geotech/Coastal Reviewer	If Necessary		
PCX will determine the ATR Lead and composition of the ATR Team.			

Fairport Harbor DMMP (505163)

Product and Review Schedule				
Product(s) to Undergo Review	Review Level	Start Date	Finish Date	Budget (\$)
Draft DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	DQC	31 JUL 2023	25 AUG 2023	
	ATR	1 DEC 2023	11 JAN 2024	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	1 DEC 2023	1 FEB 2024	NA
	Public and Agency Review	1 DEC 2023	11 JAN 2024	NA
Final DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	Final DQC	16 FEB 2024	7 MAR 2024	
	ATR	8 MAR 2024	21 MAR 2024	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	10 JUN 2024	9 AUG 2024	NA

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office Org Code
Project Manager (Lead)			CELRB-PMP-M
Planner			CELRB-PML-P
Biologist & Cultural Resources*			CELRB-PML-E
Geotechnical Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-C
Economist			CELRB-PML-P
Civil/Structural Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-S
Cost Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-T
Real Estate			CELRB-REP
Office of Counsel			CELRB-OC
* LRB can support basic cultural resource coordination tasks. If significant cultural resources concerns are identified during the feasibility phase, LRB will coordinate with an Archeologist from another District to support the study.			

AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
ATR Lead			CESAM-PD-D
Planning Reviewer			CE-LRH-PXN
Economics Reviewer			CELRH-PXN
Environmental Reviewer	TBD		
Climate Reviewer	TBD		
Cost Engineering Reviewer	TBD		
HTRW Reviewer	If Necessary		
Geotech/Coastal Reviewer	If Necessary		
PCX will determine the ATR Lead and composition of the ATR Team.			

Sandusky Harbor DMMP (505166)

Product and Review Schedule				
Product(s) to Undergo Review	Review Level	Start Date	Finish Date	Budget (\$)
Draft DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	DQC	12 FEB 2024	13 MAR 2024	
	ATR	27 APR 2024	08 JUN 2024	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	27 APR 2024	29 JUN 2024	NA
	Public and Agency Review	11 MAY 2024	10 JUN 2024	NA
Final DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	Final DQC	20 JUL 2024	19 AUG 2024	
	ATR	24 AUG 2024	14 SEP 2024	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	24 SEP 2024	26 NOV 2024	NA

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office Org Code
Project Manager (Lead)		716-879-4461	CELRB-PMP-M
Planners			CELRB-PML-P
Biologist			CELRB-PML-E
Geotechnical Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-C
Economist			CELRB-PML-P
Civil/Structural	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-S
Cost Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-T
Real Estate			CELRB-REP
Office of Counsel			CELRB-OC
* LRB can support basic cultural resource coordination tasks. If significant cultural resources concerns are identified during the feasibility phase, LRB will coordinate with an Archeologist from another District to support the study.			

AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
ATR Lead			CESAM-PD-D
Planning Reviewer			CE-LRH-PXN
Economics Reviewer			CELRH-PXN
Environmental Reviewer	TBD		
Climate Reviewer	TBD		
Cost Engineering Reviewer	TBD		
HTRW Reviewer	If Necessary		
Geotech/Coastal Reviewer	If Necessary		
PCX will determine the ATR Lead and composition of the ATR Team.			

Huron Harbor DMMP (506968)

Product and Review Schedule				
Product(s) to Undergo Review	Review Level	Start Date	Finish Date	Budget (\$)
Draft DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	DQC	01 SEP 2023	30 SEP 2023	
	ATR	15 NOV 2023	10 JAN 2024	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	15 NOV 2023	15 JAN 2024	NA
	Public and Agency Review	29 NOV 2023	1 JAN 2024	NA
Final DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	Final DQC	14 FEB 2024	28 FEB 2024	
	ATR	29 FEB 2024	14 MAR 2024	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	03 JUN 2024	5 AUG 2024	NA

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office Org Code
Project Manager (Lead)			CELRB-PMP-M
Planner			CELRB-PML-P
Biologist/ Cultural Resources*			CELRB-PML-E
Geotechnical Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-C
Economist			CELRB-PML-P
Environmental Engineer			CELRB-TDE-S
Civil/Structural Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-S
Cost Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-T
Real Estate			CELRB-REP
Office of Counsel			CELRB-OC
* LRB can support basic cultural resource coordination tasks. If significant cultural resources concerns are identified during the feasibility phase, LRB will coordinate with an Archeologist from another District to support the study.			

AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
ATR Lead			CESAM-PD-D
Planning Reviewer			CE-LRH-PXN
Economics Reviewer			CELRH-PXN
Environmental Reviewer	TBD		
Climate Reviewer	TBD		
HTRW Reviewer	If Necessary		
Cost Engineering Reviewer	TBD		
Geotech/Coastal Reviewer	If Necessary		
PCX will determine the ATR Lead and composition of the ATR Team.			

Lorain Harbor DMMP (506969)

Product and Review Schedule				
Product(s) to Undergo Review	Review Level	Start Date	Finish Date	Budget (\$)
Draft DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	DQC	01 FEB 2024	15 MAR 2024	
	ATR	29 MAR 2024	13 MAY 2024	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	29 MAR 2024	31 MAY 2024	NA
	Public and Agency Review	12 APR 2024	10 JUN 2024	NA
Final DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	Final DQC	8 JUL 2024	8 AUG 2024	
	ATR	8 AUG 2024	2 SEP 2024	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	16 SEP 2024	18 NOV 2024	NA

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office Org Code
Project Manager (Lead)			CELRB-PMP-M
Planner			CELRB-PML-E
Biologist			CELRB-PML-E
Geotechnical Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-C
Economist			CELRB-PML-E
Civil/Structural Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-S
Cost Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-T
Real Estate			CELRB-REP
Office of Counsel			CELRB-OC
* LRB can support basic cultural resource coordination tasks. If significant cultural resources concerns are identified during the feasibility phase, LRB will coordinate with an Archeologist from another District to support the study.			

AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
ATR Lead			CESAM-PD-D
Planning Reviewer			CE-LRH-PXN
Economics Reviewer			CELRH-PXN
Environmental Reviewer	TBD		
Climate Reviewer	TBD		
HTRW Reviewer	If Necessary		
Cost Engineering Reviewer	TBD		
Geotech/Coastal Reviewer	If Necessary		
PCX will determine the ATR Lead and composition of the ATR Team.			

Toledo Harbor DMMP (506970)

Product and Review Schedule				
Product(s) to Undergo Review	Review Level	Start Date	Finish Date	Budget (\$)
Draft DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	DQC	06 OCT 2023	03 NOV 2023	
	ATR	12 FEB 2024	25 MAR 2024	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	12 FEB 2024	15 APR 2024	NA
	Public and Agency Review	12 FEB 2024	25 MAR 2024	NA
Final DMMP – Main Report, EA, and Appendices	Final DQC	30 APR 2024	20 MAY 2024	
	ATR	21 MAY 2024	04 JUN 2024	
	LRD Policy and Legal Review	09 SEP 2024	12 NOV 2024	NA

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office Org Code
Project Manager (Lead)			CELRB-PMP-M
Planner (Senior)			CELRB-PML-P
Planners			CELRB-PML-P
Biologist & Cultural Resources*			CELRB-PML-E
Geotechnical Engineer			CELRB-TDD-C
Junior Geotechnical Engineer			CELRB-TDD-C
Economist			CELRB-PML-P
Civil/Structural Engineer	TBD	TBD	CELRB-TDD-S
Cost Engineer			CELRB-TDD-T
Real Estate			CELRB-REP
Office of Counsel			CELRB-OC
* LRB can support basic cultural resource coordination tasks. If significant cultural resources concerns are identified during the feasibility phase, LRB will coordinate with an Archeologist from another District to support the study.			

AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
ATR Lead			CESAM-PD-D
Planning Reviewer			CE-LRH-PXN
Economics Reviewer			CELRH-PXN
Environmental Reviewer	TBD		
Climate Reviewer	TBD		
HTRW Reviewer	If Necessary		
Cost Engineering Reviewer	TBD		
Geotech/Coastal Reviewer	If Necessary		
PCX will determine the ATR Lead and composition of the ATR Team.			

ATTACHMENT 3 – Consolidated Review Timelines

[illegible]