DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN

USING THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW PLAN MODEL

for

Continuing Authorities Program

Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 Projects

21st Avenue West Wetland Creation, Duluth, Minnesota

Section 204 Regional Sediment Management Plan

Detroit District

MSC Approval Date: 02 April 2013

Last Revision Date: None

US Army Corps of Engineers ®

DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN
USING THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW PLAN MODEL

21st Avenue West Wetland Creation, Duluth, Minnesota
Section 204 Regional Sediment Management Plan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the 21st Avenue West Wetland Creation, Duluth, Minnesota, Section 204 Regional Sediment Management Plan (RSMP) decision document.

Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, Public Law 102-580, provides the authority to carry out projects to reduce storm damage to property, to protect, restore and create aquatic and ecologically related habitats, including wetlands, and to transport and place suitable sediment, in connection with dredging for construction, operation, or maintenance by the Secretary of an authorized Federal water resources project. It is a Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) which focuses on water resource related projects of relatively smaller scope, cost and complexity. Traditional USACE civil works projects are of wider scope and complexity and are specifically authorized by Congress. The Continuing Authorities Program is a delegated authority to plan, design, and construct certain types of water resource and environmental restoration projects without specific Congressional authorization.

Additional Information on this program can be found in Engineering Regulation 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F.

b. Applicability. This review plan is based on the model Programmatic Review Plan for Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 project decision documents, which is applicable to projects that do not require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), as defined in ER 1165-2-214 Civil Works Review Policy. A Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 project does not require IEPR if ALL of the following specific criteria are met:

- The project does not involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance;
- The total project cost is less than $45 million;
- There is no request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts;
- The project does not require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS),
- The project/study is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project;
- The project/study is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project;
- The information in the decision document or anticipated project design is not likely to be based on novel methods, involve the use of innovative materials or techniques, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices;
- The project design is not anticipated to require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule; and
- There are no other circumstances where the Chief of Engineers or Director of Civil Works determines Type I IEPR is warranted.

If any of the above criteria are not met, the model Programmatic Review Plan is not applicable and a study specific review plan must be prepared by the home district, coordinated with the appropriate

Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) and approved by the home Major Subordinate Command (MSC) in accordance with EC 1165-2-214.

Applicability of the model Programmatic Review Plan for a specific project is determined by the home MSC. If the MSC determines that the model plan is applicable for a specific study, the MSC Commander may approve the plan (including exclusion from IEPR) without additional coordination with a PCX or Headquarters, USACE. The initial decision as to the applicability of the model plan should be made no later than the Federal Interest Determination (FID) milestone (as defined in Appendix F of ER 1105-2-100, F-10.e.1) during the feasibility phase of the project. A review plan for the project will subsequently be developed and approved prior to execution of the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) for the study. In addition, per EC 1165-2-214, the home district and MSC should assess at the Alternatives Formulation Briefing (AFB) whether the initial decision on Type I IEPR is still valid based on new information. If the decision on Type I IEPR has changed, the District and MSC should begin coordination with the appropriate PCX immediately.

This programmatic review plan may be used to cover implementation products. Following the format of the model programmatic review plan, the project review plan may be modified to incorporate information for the review of the design and implementation phases of the project.

c. References

(1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review, 15 Dec 2012
(2) Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, Jan 19, 2011
(3) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 Mar 2010
(4) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
(5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007
(6) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007
(7) Section 2037 of WRDA 2007 and HQUSACE Implementation Guidance for Regional Sediment Management, Sec 2037 of WRDA 2007, dated 8 April 2008

d. Requirements. This programmatic review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-214, which establishes an accountable, comprehensive, life-cycle review strategy for Civil Works products by providing a seamless process for review of all Civil Works projects from initial planning through design, construction, and operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and rehabilitation (OMRR&R). The EC outlines four general levels of review: District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), and Policy and Legal Compliance Review. In addition to these levels of review, decision documents are subject to cost engineering review and certification (per EC 1165-2-214) and ensuring that planning models and analysis are compliant with Corps policy, theoretically sound, computationally accurate, transparent, described to address any limitations of the model or its use, and documented in study reports (per EC 1105-2-412).

2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION

The RMO is responsible for managing the overall peer review effort described in this review plan. The RMO for Section 204 Regional Sediment Management Plan decision documents is the home MSC. The MSC will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the ATR. The home District will post the

approved review plan on its public website. A copy of the approved review plan (and any updates) will be provided to the ECO-PCX to keep the PCX apprised of requirements and review schedules.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

a. Decision Document. The 21st Avenue West Wetland Creation, Duluth, Minnesota RSMP will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F. The approval level of the decision document (if policy compliant) is the home MSC. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the RSMP.

b. Study/Project Description.

The project location is in Duluth-Superior Harbor. Duluth-Superior Harbor is located within the cities of Duluth, Minnesota (St. Louis County), and Superior, Wisconsin (Douglas County). The harbor occupies roughly 32 square miles and has over 100 miles of waterfront in the St Louis watershed.

The study area includes the 21st Ave West Channel (de-authorized by section 347(a)(8) of WRDA 2000, 33 USC 59ee-1) and the surrounding inlet.

The St. Louis River watershed is classified as an Area of Concern under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (1987 Protocol). In 1992, the St. Louis River RAP, Stage I report was completed. The Stage I RAP documented that industrial discharges resulted in the degradation of the river sediments through chemical discharge and physical modifications, both of which have affected the biological integrity of the estuary.

Lack of vibrant submergent and emergent wetlands within the lower river has been identified as the most significant impediment to the delisting of habitat and populations BUIs in the St. Louis River. Healthy and ecologically functional sheltered bay wetlands and open water flats habitat is considered the primary limiting factor within the lower portion of the St. Louis River. This includes habitat components such as emergent wetland fringes and submerged aquatic vegetation beds in association with sand substrates in high-energy zones and muck and silt substrates in sheltered areas. These habitat types are documented as critical component pieces in restoration of habitat. These shallow water habitat types are critical to all various life stages of native fish assemblages and are components proposed within the reconstructed wetland.

Since the proposed habitat creation project also utilizes dredged material, the project would provide much needed dredged material capacity for Duluth Superior Harbor. The current disposal practices for the harbor consist of placement at the USACE disposal site (Erie Pier) and some limited beach nourishment. The Erie Pier disposal site is essentially at capacity and sediment characteristics preclude most material from beach nourishment. Unless other sites are developed, maintenance dredging in areas of the harbor that have lower traffic would need to be postponed, resulting in shoal build-up. This could lead to light loading for the larger deep draft vessels. Long-term adverse economic impacts to shipping and shipping related industry and employment would occur with significant channel depth reductions due to shoal buildup in the navigation channels.

The preliminary alternatives for the project are all variations of the same theme. First, a wave barrier would be placed at the most lakeward alignment of the project, then subsequent years of maintenance dredge spoils would be strategically placed behind the barrier at predetermined

elevations to create submergent and emergent wetlands. All alternatives would include an access channel for small boats and fish.

The preliminarily recommended alternative consists of using suitable dredged material to fill the alignment of the wave barrier to the bottom elevation of the barrier under the USACE operations and maintenance (O&M) activities. When the appropriate elevation is reached, the barrier would be constructed under the authority of section 204. Subsequent O&M dredging operations would strategically place dredged material behind the barrier to create submergent wetlands, emergent wetlands, access channel, and a sand bar with a sandy island for tern habitat.

The proposed wetland construction project would likely occur over a 15-20 year period as dredging in the Federal navigation channels provide the suitable materials. Final development of the emergent and submergent wetland components could take an additional 5-10 years.

LRE will develop Operations Lifecycle Costs to maintain the area, monitoring, and long-term vegetation maintenance. LRE will address and incorporate lifecycle costs into the feasibility report and O&M manual so that the non-federal sponsor can anticipate the costs in advance.

Preliminary cost estimates for the Design and Implementation Phase are provided in the table below:

Summary of Design and Implementation Phase Costs

Project Partnership Agreement Development (PPA)	$100,000
Plans and Specifications, Value Engineering	$200,000
Implementation (construction of wave barrier)	$1,950,000

The Letter of Intent dated August 10, 2012 shows that there is a committed, motivated, and enthusiastic group of local agencies interested in the project. The letter states that the City of Superior, WI and the Duluth Seaway Port Authority have agreed to be financial partners with the City of Duluth, MN, the official non-Federal sponsor.

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review. The RSMP will outline the disposal of routine maintenance dredging spoils to create wetlands. It would consist of selectively placing dredged materials in a sheltered bay. The project is considered to have low complexity and the scope and level of review should be commensurate with the level of complexity of the project. Therefore, the Model Programmatic Review Plan is applicable.

Challenges: The measures involved in dredging and disposal of dredged material from the river are not expected to generate significant technical, institutional, or social challenges. The Detroit District has significant in-house expertise in dredging and experience constructing measures such as those that will be used for this project. Likely challenge will be coordination with the local regulatory agencies over open water disposal.

Project Risks: Risks associated with this project are expected to be low. The assessment and minimization of risks associated with dredging and placement of material is well established and

regulated within the District. The study is being evaluated and developed by a multi-agency group including Federal and MN and WI State agencies.

Life Safety: The project will neither be justified by life safety or will involve significant threat to human life/safety assurance. There is no reason to believe that any measures involved in the project are associated with a significant threat to human life.

Governor Request for Peer Review: The Governor **has not** requested peer review by independent experts.

Public Dispute: The project/study is not anticipated to be controversial nor result in significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project or to the economic or environmental costs or benefits of the project.

Project Design/Construction: The anticipated project design will take advantage of prevailing practices and methodologies. It is also not expected to be based on novel methods or will involve the use of innovative techniques, or present complex challenges for interpretation. It also not anticipated that the project will require unique construction sequencing or redundancy.

d. In-Kind Contributions. Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC and ATR, similar to any products developed by USACE. Section 204 Regional Sediment Management Plan feasibility studies are conducted at 100% Federal cost (Reference 1.c.(7)). No in-kind products or analyses by non-Federal sponsors will be provided.

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)

All decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC. DQC is an internal review process of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the Project Management Plan (PMP). The document undergoing DQC shall be reviewed thoroughly and in its entirety by the DQC team to assure the technical, policy and procedural integrity. The home district shall manage DQC in accordance with Section 7.1 - Quality Plans in procedure 08504 LRD - QC / QA Procedures for Civil Works in Qualtrax. Documentation of DQC activities is required and should be in accordance with the Quality Manual of the District and the home MSC.

a. Documentation of DQC. The DQC reviewer will sign a DQC certificate of completion. The DQC documentation will be provided to the ATR Team for review.

b. Products to Undergo DQC. RSMP and associated EA.

c. Required DQC Expertise. The DQC reviewer for this project must have experience in Civil Works planning studies related to navigation and familiarity with the NEPA process. A DQC Environmental reviewer may be called upon to provide additional review should the study have unexpected environmental impacts, such as contaminated sediment. Should contaminated sediments be encountered, a Hazardous, Toxic or Radioactive Waste (HTRW) expert may be called in to assist on the forward planning of the handling of such sediments.

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.). The objective of ATR is to ensure consistency with established criteria, guidance, procedures, and policy. 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 managed within USACE by the designated RMO 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. The ATR team lead will be from outside the home MSC.

a. Products to Undergo ATR. ATR will be performed throughout the study in accordance with the District and MSC Quality Management Plans. The ATR shall be documented and discussed at the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) milestone. Certification of the ATR will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. Products to undergo ATR include the RSMP and associated NEPA documentation.

b. Required ATR Team Expertise.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional preferably with experience in preparing Section 204 Regional Sediment Management Plan decision documents and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. Typically, the ATR lead will also serve as a reviewer for a specific discipline (such as planning, economics, environmental resources, etc). The ATR Lead MUST be from outside the home district's MSC.
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in disposal of dredged material.
Economics	Team member will have a strong understanding of economic models and studies related to inland navigation.
Environmental Resources (NEPA)	Experience in NEPA for routine disposal of dredged material
Cost Engineering/Civil Design	Team member will have a strong knowledge of cost estimating practices for construction projects and civil design procedures.
Operations	Team member will be an expert in dredging operations.
Real Estate	Team member will be an expert in ecosystem restoration planning outside the client district, and selected from the Real Estate ATR roster

c. Documentation of ATR. DrChecks review software will be used to document all ATR comments, responses and associated resolutions accomplished throughout the review process. Comments should be limited to those that are required to ensure adequacy of the product. The four key parts of a quality review comment will normally include:

(1) The review concern – identify the product's information deficiency or incorrect application of policy, guidance, or procedures;

(2) The basis for the concern – cite the appropriate law, policy, guidance, or procedure that has not been properly followed;
(3) The significance of the concern – indicate the importance of the concern with regard to its potential impact on the plan selection, recommended plan components, efficiency (cost), effectiveness (function/outputs), implementation responsibilities, safety, Federal interest, or public acceptability; and
(4) The probable specific action needed to resolve the concern – identify the action(s) that the reporting officers must take to resolve the concern.

In some situations, especially addressing incomplete or unclear information, comments may seek clarification in order to then assess whether further specific concerns may exist.

The ATR documentation in DrChecks will include the text of each ATR concern, the PDT response, a brief summary of the pertinent points in any discussion, including any vertical team coordination (the vertical team includes the district, RMO, MSC, and HQUSACE), and the agreed upon resolution. If an ATR concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the ATR team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the vertical team for further resolution in accordance with the policy issue resolution process described in either ER 1110-2-12 or ER 1105-2-100, Appendix H, as appropriate. Unresolved concerns can be closed in DrChecks with a notation that the concern has been elevated to the vertical team for resolution.

At the conclusion of each ATR effort, the ATR team will prepare a Review Report summarizing the review. Review Reports will be considered an integral part of the ATR documentation and shall:

- Identify the document(s) reviewed and the purpose of the review;
- Disclose the names of the reviewers, their organizational affiliations, and include a short paragraph on both the credentials and relevant experiences of each reviewer;
- Include the charge to the reviewers;
- Describe the nature of their review and their findings and conclusions;
- Identify and summarize each unresolved issue (if any); and
- Include a verbatim copy of each reviewer's comments (either with or without specific attributions), or represent the views of the group as a whole, including any disparate and dissenting views.

ATR may be certified when all ATR concerns are either resolved or referred to the vertical team for resolution and the ATR documentation is complete. The ATR Lead will prepare a Statement of Technical Review certifying that the issues raised by the ATR team have been resolved (or elevated to the vertical team). A Statement of Technical Review should be completed prior to the District Commander signing the final report. A sample Statement of Technical Review is included in Attachment 2.

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

IEPR may be required for decision documents under certain circumstances. IEPR is the most independent level of review, and is applied in cases that meet certain criteria where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of USACE is warranted. A risk-informed decision, as described in EC 1165-2-214, is made as to whether IEPR is appropriate. IEPR panels will consist of independent, recognized experts from outside of the

USACE in the appropriate disciplines, representing a balance of areas of expertise suitable for the review being conducted. There are two types of IEPR:

- Type I IEPR. Type I IEPR reviews are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on project studies. Type I IEPR panels assess the adequacy and acceptability of the economic and environmental assumptions and projections, project evaluation data, economic analysis, environmental analyses, engineering analyses, formulation of alternative plans, methods for integrating risk and uncertainty, models used in the evaluation of environmental impacts of proposed projects, and biological opinions of the project study. Type I IEPR will cover the entire decision document or action and will address all underlying engineering, economics, and environmental work, not just one aspect of the study. For decision documents where a Type II IEPR (Safety Assurance Review) is anticipated during project implementation, safety assurance shall also be addressed during the Type I IEPR per EC 1165-2-214.

  For Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 decision documents prepared under the model Programmatic Review Plan, Type I IEPR is not required.

- Type II IEPR. Type II IEPR, or Safety Assurance Review (SAR), are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on design and construction activities for hurricane, storm, and flood risk management projects or other projects where existing and potential hazards pose a significant threat to human life. Type II IEPR panels will conduct reviews of the design and construction activities prior to initiation of physical construction and, until construction activities are completed, periodically thereafter on a regular schedule. The reviews shall consider the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities in assuring public health safety and welfare.

  For Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 decision documents prepared under the model Programmatic Review Plan, Type II IEPR is not anticipated to be required in the design and implementation phase, but this will need to be verified and documented in the review plan prepared for the design and implementation phase of the project.

a. Decision on IEPR. Based on the information and analysis provided in the preceding paragraphs of this review plan, the project covered under this plan is excluded from IEPR because it does not meet the mandatory IEPR triggers and does not warrant IEPR based on a risk-informed analysis. If any of the criteria outlined in paragraph 1(b) are not met, this model Programmatic Review Plan is not applicable and a study specific review plan must be prepared by the home district, coordinated with the appropriate PCX and approved by the home MSC in accordance with EC 1165-2-214.

b. Products to Undergo Type I IEPR. Not applicable.

c. Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise. Not Applicable.

d. Documentation of Type I IEPR. Not Applicable.

7. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW

All decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100.

These reviews culminate in determinations that the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy, and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority by the home MSC Commander. DQC and ATR augment and complement the policy review processes by addressing compliance with pertinent published Army policies, particularly policies on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents.

8. COST ENGINEERING DIRECTORY OF EXPERTISE (DX) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION

All decision documents shall be coordinated with the Cost Engineering DX, located in the Walla Walla District. For decision documents prepared under the model Programmatic Review Plan, Regional cost personnel that are pre-certified by the DX will conduct the cost engineering ATR. The DX will provide the Cost Engineering DX certification. The RMO will coordinate with the Cost Engineering DX on the selection of the cost engineering ATR team member.

9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

The approval of planning models under EC 1105-2-412 is not required for CAP projects. MSC Commanders are responsible for assuring models for all planning activities to ensure the models are technically and theoretically sound, compliant with USACE policy, computationally accurate, and based on reasonable assumptions. Therefore, the use of a certified/approved planning model is highly recommended and should be used whenever appropriate. Planning models are defined as any models and analytical tools that planners use to define water resources management problems and opportunities, to formulate potential alternatives to address the problems and take advantage of the opportunities, to evaluate potential effects of alternatives and to support decision making. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC and ATR.

The responsible use of well-known and proven USACE developed and commercial engineering software will continue and the professional practice of documenting the application of the software and modeling results will be followed. As part of the USACE Scientific and Engineering Technology (SET) Initiative, many engineering models have been identified as preferred or acceptable for use on Corps studies and these models should be used whenever appropriate. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC and ATR.

a. Planning Models. The following planning models are anticipated to be used in the development of the RSMP:

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Certification / Approval Status
HEP-HSI for smallmouth bass	Used spawning habitat criteria to assess the potential reproduction suitability of the restored wetland for identified species.	Approved for use
HEP-HSI for northern pike	Used spawning habitat criteria to assess the potential reproduction suitability of the restored wetland for identified species.	Approved for use

HEP-HSI for yellow perch	Used spawning habitat criteria to assess the potential reproduction suitability of the restored wetland for identified species.	Approved for use
HEP-HSI for common shiner	Used spawning habitat criteria to assess the potential reproduction suitability of the restored wetland for identified species.	Approved for use

b. Engineering Models. The following engineering models are anticipated to be used in the development of the RSMP:

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Approval Status
STFATE	STFATE determines the short term fate of the dredged material when it is dumped into the open water. The software will help to determine if material will make it from the water surface to the bottom of the lake, so we can estimate where the material will land on the bottom. We will use mild weather conditions to see if the dredge material makes it to the lake bottom. Currents and waves will be the largest driving factors on the sediment particles as they fall through the water column.	HH&C CoP Preferred Model
LTFATE	LTFATE determines the long term fate of the dredged material. This model will help determine if deposited sediment will stay on the lake bottom when large storm events come through the area.	HH&C CoP Preferred Model

10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. ATR Schedule and Cost. The study will undergo the ATR reviews listed below. The listed dates are preliminary and may be adjusted as the study progresses.

The estimated cost for ATR Review of this study is $36,000.

- ATR Review of Feasibility Scoping Meeting Documents — Jan 2014
- Feasibility Scoping Meeting — Sep 2014
- ATR Review of Alternative Formulation Briefing Documents — Sep 2016
- Alternative Formulation Briefing — Mar 2017
- ATR Review of Draft RSMP and EA — Sep 2017
- Draft Final Report and EA to CELRD — Mar 2018

b. Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost. Not applicable.

c. Model Review Schedule and Cost. For decision documents prepared under the model Programmatic Review Plan, use of existing certified or approved planning models is encouraged. Where uncertified or unapproved model are used, review of the model for use will be accomplished through the ATR process. The ATR team should apply the principles of EC 1105-2-412 during the ATR to ensure the model is theoretically and computationally sound, consistent with USACE policies,

and adequately documented. If specific uncertified models are identified for repetitive use within a specific district or region, the appropriate PCX, MSC(s), and home District(s) will identify a unified approach to seek certification of these models.

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

State and Federal resource agencies may be invited to participate in the study covered by this review plan as partner agencies or as technical members of the PDT, as appropriate. Agencies with regulatory review responsibilities will be contacted for coordination as required by applicable laws and procedures. The ATR team will be provided copies of public and agency comments. The EA will be posted for 30 day public comment period. This Review Plan will be posted on the District's internet site and comments from the public will be accepted.

12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The home MSC Commander is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan is appropriate for the specific project covered by the plan. The review plan is a living document and may change as the study progresses. The home district is responsible for keeping the review plan up to date. Minor changes to the review plan since the last MSC Commander approval are documented in Attachment 3. Significant changes to the review plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) should be re-approved by the MSC Commander following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in the MSC Commander determining that use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-214 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1. The latest version of the review plan, along with the Commanders' approval memorandum, will be posted on the home district's webpage.

13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

Public questions and/or comments on this review plan can be directed to the following points of contact:

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS.

Table 1 – Study Project Delivery Team

Discipline	Name	Phone	E-mail
Project Manager			
Chief, Plan Formulation			
Lead Planner			
Regional Economist			
Biologist			
Chemist / Biologist			
Cost Engineer			
Civil Engineer			
Geotechnical Engineer			
Coastal Engineer			
Real Estate			
Operations			

Table 2 – Major Subordinate Command Planning and Policy Team & RIT Manager

Discipline	Office	Name	Phone	E-mail
Chief, Planning & Policy				
District Liaison				
Planning & Policy				
Planning & Policy				
MSC Dredge Manager				

Table 3 – Planning Centers of Expertise Team

Discipline	Office	Name	Phone	E-mail
ECO-PCX				

Table 4 – Agency Technical Review Team

Discipline	Office	Name	Phone	E-mail
ATR Lead/ NEPA Compliance				
Plan Formulation				
Environmental Eng/Chemist				
Economics				
Cost Engineering/Civil Design				
Cost Certification				
Operations				
Real Estate				

ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECSION DOCUMENTS

COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the *<type of product>* for *<project name and location>*. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project's Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-214. During the ATR, compliance with established policy principles and procedures, utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses, alternatives evaluated, the appropriateness of data used and level obtained, and reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing US Army Corps of Engineers policy. The ATR also assessed the District Quality Control (DQC) documentation and made the determination that the DQC activities employed appear to be appropriate and effective. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved and the comments have been closed in DrChecks[sm].

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
ATR Team Leader
Office Symbol/Company

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Project Manager (home district)
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Architect Engineer Project Manager[1]
Company, location

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Review Management Office Representative
Office Symbol

CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows: *Describe the major technical concerns and their resolution.*

As noted above, all concerns resulting from the ATR of the project have been fully resolved.

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Chief, Engineering Division (home district)
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Chief, Planning Division (home district)
Office Symbol

[1] Only needed if some portion of the ATR was contracted

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Term	Definition	Term	Definition
AFB	Alternative Formulation Briefing	NED	National Economic Development
ASA(CW)	Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works	NER	National Ecosystem Restoration
ATR	Agency Technical Review	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
CAP	Continuing Authorities Program	O&M	Operation and maintenance
CSDR	Coastal Storm Damage Reduction	OMB	Office and Management and Budget
DPR	Detailed Project Report	OMRR&R	Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation
DQC	District Quality Control/Quality Assurance	OEO	Outside Eligible Organization
DX	Directory of Expertise	OSE	Other Social Effects
EA	Environmental Assessment	PCX	Planning Center of Expertise
EC	Engineer Circular	PDT	Project Delivery Team
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	PAC	Post Authorization Change
EO	Executive Order	PMP	Project Management Plan
ER	Ecosystem Restoration	PL	Public Law
FDR	Flood Damage Reduction	QMP	Quality Management Plan
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	QA	Quality Assurance
FRM	Flood Risk Management	QC	Quality Control
FSM	Feasibility Scoping Meeting	RED	Regional Economic Development
GRR	General Reevaluation Report	RMC	Risk Management Center
HQUSACE	Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	RMO	Review Management Organization
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review	RSMP	Regional Sediment Management Plan
ITR	Independent Technical Review	RTS	Regional Technical Specialist
LRR	Limited Reevaluation Report	SAR	Safety Assurance Review
MSC	Major Subordinate Command	USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
		WRDA	Water Resources Development Act