DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN

USING THE NATIONAL PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW PLAN MODEL

for

Continuing Authorities Program

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

Archer Highway Twin Bridges, Madison County, Idaho

Section *14* Project

Walla Walla District

MSC Approval Date: *Pending*

Last Revision Date: *September 12, 2011*

US Army Corps of Engineers ®

DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN
USING THE NATIONAL PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW PLAN MODEL

Archer Highway Twin Bridges, Madison County, Idaho
Section 14 Project

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Archer Highway Twin Bridges, Madison County, Idaho, Section *14* project decision document.

Section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946, as amended, authorizes the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to study, design and construct emergency streambank and shoreline works to protect public services including (but not limited to) streets, bridges, schools, water and sewer lines, National Register sites, and churches from damage or loss by natural erosion. 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 National 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 1165-2-209 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 National 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 1165-2-209.

Applicability of the model National 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 1165-2-209, 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 review plan does not cover implementation products. A review plan for the design and implementation phase of the project will be developed prior to approval of the final decision document in accordance with EC 1165-2-209.

c. References

(1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
(2) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 Mar 2010
(3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
(4) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007
(5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007
(6) PMP

d. Requirements. This programmatic review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, 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 1165-2-209) and planning model certification/approval (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 14, 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 FRM-PCX to keep the PCX apprised of requirements and review schedules.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

a. Decision Document. The Archer Highway Twin Bridges, Madison County, Idaho decision document 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 decision document.

b. Study/Project Description. The project area is on the South Fork of the Snake River in Madison County, Idaho. It is in Sections 16 and 17 in Township 4 North, Range 40 East. The Snake River flows east to west through the proposed project area and the Archer Highway Twin Bridges are oriented north-south. The bridges are approximately 7.5 miles due east of Rigby, Idaho and approximately 3 miles south-southeast of Archer, Idaho. This project focuses on the north bridge, south abutment and its approach.

The Ririe-Archer Highway crosses a braided reach of the South Fork of the Snake River with two bridges crossing channels approximately half a mile apart. In 1997, the South Fork of the Snake River experienced a significant flow event causing the complete failure of the South Twin Bridge and damaging the North Twin Bridge to an unusable state. Both structures were replaced in 1998. Since 1997, the river has shifted course between the north and south channels at the Twin Bridges. Historically, the south channel 76% of the total flow, but now the north channel is carrying most of the flow. As a result, the North Twin Bridge experiences damaging scour during spring high flows. Future spring high flow events will eventually damage the bridge to the point where failure is likely. A large spring flood like the 1997 event will severely damage or destroy the structure.

In order to meet the goals of an emergency streambank stabilization project for the Ririe-Archer Highway Twin Bridges, six(6) alternatives were being considered for evaluation on abutment protection. These six alternatives are; Armor Stone Revetments, Concrete Panels, Gabions, Grouted Stone Revetments, Articulated CMU Mats, and Intrusion Grout. The estimated costs of these alternatives range from $300k to $700k. Recently, the project focus switched to the approach along the left bank of the north channel as the County has moved forward with construction ofimmediate protection of the abutment due to runoff concerns. Currently two (2) alternatives are being evaluated for approach protection; gabion baskets and riprap. The latter is expected to be a more cost effective approach. The estimated maximum total project cost is $1.4 million and is limited to $1 million Federal. Madison County, Idaho is the non-Federal sponsor for this project.

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review. The use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan for the Archer Highway Twin Bridges, Madison County, Idaho, Section *14* project is supported by the simplistic nature of the problem that needs to be solved. The methods used to stabilize a bank around bridge abutments and their approaches are used frequently throughout the nation by the Corps. Environmental issues that would affect the project are limited because the location of this streambank stabilization project is located at a previously disturbed bridge crossing site.

The hydrology of the river at the bridge crossing site is the most difficult portion of this project. A determination of the hydrology and river velocities will have impacts to the scale of the design and the effectiveness if the design in the future to protect the bridge abutment and/or its approach.

For this project it is determined that:

- The project does not involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance. There is some risk of failure of infrastructure, however the situation is being monitored closely and would be closed to public access well before there was a significant threat to human safety;
- There is no request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts;
- The project/study is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project. Because this is an small scale emergency stream bank restoration project at the abutment of a bridge the public is not likely to have concerns over the methods used, or the effects of 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 reliability of this bridge crossing is very important for the movement of people and good in this area. It is a necessary piece of infrastructure that would have many negative impacts to the local communities. Economic cost associated with the project will be supported by the public;
- 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 expected methods used to stabilize the bank around the bridge abutment are tested methods that have been used in many situations similar to this project; and
- The project design is not anticipated to require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule. The construction of the project will take place over a short period of time during low flow conditions. There are no anticipated needs for any unique design and construction sequencing or schedules.

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. No in-kind services are anticipated for the feasibility portion of this project. There may be some desire of the sponsor to provide in-kind services during the design and implementation phase of the project.

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 home district shall manage DQC. Documentation of DQC activities is required and should be in accordance with the Quality Manual of the District and the home MSC.

DQC comments will be compiled in a Microsoft Word table or Excel spreadsheet format, and should follow the Corps' four part comment structure (described in Section 5b). The final DQC review package will be provided to the ATR Team. A sample DQC comment table can be found in Attachment 5.

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 ATR will be performed for the preliminary Draft Feasibility Report (including the NEPA/environmental compliance documentation and technical appendices).

b. Required ATR Team Expertise. The Agency Technical Review Team (ATRT) will be comprised of individuals that have not been involved in the development of the decision document and will be chosen based on expertise, experience, and/or skills. The members will roughly mirror the composition of the PDT and, wherever possible, reside outside of the Northwestern Division region. It is anticipated that the team will consist of approximately 4 to 6 reviewers. The ATRT Lead will be outside the home MSC as required by EC1105-2-410 (or new EC1165-2-209). The ATRT members will be identified at the time the review is conducted and will be identified in Attachment 1.

The following table provides the disciplines needed to be included on the ATR team.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional preferably with experience in preparing Section 14 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 CENWD.
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in Section 14 emergency stream bank stabilization projects and in stream bank stabilization techniques, economics and basic environmental compliance.
Civil Engineering	The civil engineer reviewer must be familiar with river mechanics and geotechnical bank stabilization techniques around bridge abutments and their approaches.
Cost Engineering	Cost DX Staff or Cost DX Pre-Certified Professional with experience preparing cost estimates for river bank stabilization projects.
Real Estate	The real estate reviewer must have an understanding of real estate issues in relationship to a Section 14, Corps civil works project.

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 1165-2-209, 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 1165-2-209.

  For Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 decision documents prepared under the model National 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 National 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, the model National 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 1165-2-209.

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 National Programmatic Review Plan Model, 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

EC 1105-2-407 mandates the use of certified or approved 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. Planning models, for the purposes of the EC, 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 use of a certified/approved planning model does not constitute technical review of the planning product. 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.

EC 1105-2-407 does not cover engineering models used in planning. 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. No planning models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document:

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

Model Name and	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in	Approval

Version	the Study	Status
HEC-RAS 4.0 (River Analysis System)	The Hydrologic Engineering Center's River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) program provides the capability to perform one-dimensional steady and unsteady flow river hydraulics calculations. The program will be used to evaluate the future without- and with-project conditions and determine velocities for appropriate design (rip rap sizing).	HH&C CoP Preferred Model

10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. ATR Schedule and Cost. The ATR for the Archer Highway Twin Bridges, Madison County, Idaho Section 14 Project is estimated to occur during May 2011. The estimated timeframe for the ATR to occur is 2 to 4 weeks. Coordination with the RMO is requested to complete the requirements of ATR. For scheduling and budgeting purposes it is assumed that the ATR lead will participate in the AFB milestone conference. The ATR is estimated to cost $12,000. This cost includes the time necessary for the review of the report and for model approval.

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

c. Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost. For decision documents prepared under the model National Programmatic Review Plan, use of existing certified or approved planning models is encouraged. Where uncertified or unapproved model are used, approval of the model for use will be accomplished through the ATR process. The ATR team will apply the principles of EC 1105-2-407 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.

Public participation will be pursued as needed. This project is an emergency stream bank protection project at the abutment of a bridge and/or its approach, and its overall size and significance in relationship to the public interest is low. However it is of very high public interest that this bridge continues to function as a safe means of travel for those in the area. The Public will be able to comment on the Environmental Assessment and provide comments on alternatives and impacts at that time. Madison County Commissioners have been and will continue to be heavily involved in this process and will have the opportunity to provide input on the decision document.

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 1165-2-209. 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:

- *Mark Mendenhall, Project Manager, CENWW, (208)345-2064*
- *Valerie Ringold, DST Planner, CENWD (503)808-3984*

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 Section 14 Feasibility Report for Archer Highway Twin Bridges, Madison County, Idaho. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project's Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-209. 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].

John Grothaus — Date
ATR Team Leader
CENWK-PM-PF

Mark Mendenhall — Date
Project Manager (home district)
CENWW-PM-PD

Valerie Ringold — Date
Review Management Office Representative
CENWD-PDD

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
Brian Miller — Date
Chief, Engineering Division (home district)
CENWW-EC-D

SIGNATURE
Rebecca Kalamasz — Date
Chief, Planning Division (home district)
CENWW-PM-PD

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	RTS	Regional Technical Specialist
ITR	Independent Technical Review	SAR	Safety Assurance Review
LRR	Limited Reevaluation Report	USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
MSC	Major Subordinate Command	WRDA	Water Resources Development Act

ATTACHMENT 5: SAMPLE DQC COMMENT TABLE

Project Title				Reviewer: *NAME* NWW – *DISCIPLINE*
Item #	**Statement of Concern**	**Basis for Concern**	**Significance of Concern**	**Recommended Action**
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				

ATTACHMENT 6: PROJECT SCHEDULE

AFB – April 4, 2011
DQC – April 25, 2011
ATR – May 23, 2011
Draft Feasibility Report –June 28, 2011
Final Feasibility Report – July 28, 2011