

REVIEW PLAN

Calcasieu River and Pass, LA
Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP)

Mississippi Valley Division

New Orleans District

December 2012

MSC Approval Date: 12 December 2012

Last Revision Date: 12 December 2012



US Army Corps
of Engineers ®

REVIEW PLAN

Calcasieu River and Pass DMMP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS 1

2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION 1

3. STUDY INFORMATION 2

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC) 2

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) 3

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR) 5

7. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW 6

8. COST ENGINEERING DIRECTORY OF EXPERTISE (DX) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION 6

9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL 6

10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS 6

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION 8

12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES 8

13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT 8

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS 9

ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS 10

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS 11

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS 12

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the [Calcasieu River and Pass DMMP](#)

a. 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 2011
- (3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
- (4) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007
- (5) ER 5-1-1, Project Management Business Process (11/1/2006)
<http://140.194.76.129/publications/eng-regs/er5-1-11/entire.pdf>
- (6) ER 1110-2-1150, Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects, 31 August 1999
- (7) ER-1110-1-12 Quality Management (6/21/2006)
<http://140.194.76.129/publications/eng-regs/er1110-1-12/entire.pdf>
- (8) ES-08011 QA-QC Process for Study-Design,
<https://kme.usace.army.mil/CE/QMS/QMS%20Documents/2007-10/08011%20QC-QA%20Processes%20for%20Study-Design%20Phase.DOC>
- (9) PMBP Manual, Proc 2000 PMP/PgMP Development
http://bp.usace.army.mil/robo/projects/pmbp_manual/PMBP_Manual/proc2000.htm
- (10) PMBP Manual, REF8008G Quality Management Plan
http://bp.usace.army.mil/robo/projects/pmbp_manual/PMBP_Manual/REF8008G.htm

b. Requirements. This 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, implementation 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 implementation documents is typically either the Risk Management Center (RMC) or the Major Subordinate Command (MSC) depending on the primary purpose of the implementation document. The RMO for the peer review effort described in this Review Plan is [the Mississippi Valley Division](#).

The RMO will coordinate with the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) to ensure the appropriate expertise is included on the review teams to assess the adequacy of cost estimates, construction schedules and contingencies.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

- a. **Implementation Document.** The existing Calcasieu River and Pass Project provides deep-draft navigation access to oil refineries, chemical plants, liquefied natural gas plants, and other facilities along the Calcasieu River. The Implementation Document for the Calcasieu River and Pass DMMP will include Plans and Specifications for the placement of dredged material resulting from the existing Calcasieu River and Pass Project.
- b. **Study/Project Description.** The Calcasieu River and Pass DMMP study area is located in southwest Louisiana in Calcasieu and Cameron Parishes, extending from Lake Charles, Louisiana, southward into the Gulf of Mexico. The project area includes the Calcasieu River and Pass navigation channel and the areas adjacent to them that would potentially be used as a disposal location for dredged material. The proposed action is the placement of sediment dredged from the Calcasieu River and Pass project to enable the channel to be maintained at its authorized dimensions for at least the next 20 years.
- c. **Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review.** Plans and Specifications for the placement of dredged material will not likely be challenging, nor involve novel methods or the use of innovative materials or techniques, as it will follow dredged material management techniques approved in the original Calcasieu River and Pass DMMP. Magnitude of risk is low and a significant threat to human life is not likely to exist in conjunction with the placement of material. There has been no request by the Governor of affected states for a peer review by independent experts and the Plans and Specifications are not likely to involve significant public disputes. Redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule will not be used as accepted material placement techniques will be used.
- d. **In-Kind Contributions.** Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR. No in kind services are anticipated

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)

All implementation 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.

- a. **Documentation of DQC.** DQC will be managed by the home district in accordance with the Major Subordinate Command (MSC) and MVN district Quality Management Plans. MVN's Senior Project Manager will submit its work products to personnel in the District office not involved in the development for review and comment. Each DQC member will enter comments into DrChecks for review and resolution. A Certification of Quality Control Review will be signed by the N.O. District ED Chief.
- b. **Products to Undergo DQC.** Dredged Material Placement Plans and Specifications

c. Required DQC Expertise.

DQC Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
DQC Lead	The DQC lead should be a senior professional with experience in dredged material placement and conducting DQC. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the DQC process.
Hydraulic Engineering	The hydraulic reviewer should be a senior hydraulic engineer with experience in dredged material placement.
Geotechnical Engineering	The Geotech reviewer should be a senior geotechnical engineer with experience in dredged material placement.
Civil Engineering	The Civil reviewer should be a senior Civil Engineer with experience in dredged material placement.
Cost Engineering	The cost reviewer should be a Cost Pre-Certified Professional with experience preparing cost estimates for dredged material placement.
Environmental	The Structural reviewer should be a senior Environmental Manager with experience in dredged material placement.
Construction/Operations	The Construction/Operations reviewer should be a senior Construction/Operations Manager with experience in dredged material placement.

Review Milestone	Review Products	Date Planned
100% DQC review	1) Dredged Material Placement Plans and Specifications	3 rd Qtr FY13

Review Milestone	#reviewers/total hours	Approximate cost/hr	Totals
100%DQC review	7/56	\$110	\$6,160

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

ATR is mandatory for all implementation 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. [Dredged Material Placement Plans and Specifications](#)

b. Required ATR Team Expertise.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATRLead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional with experience in dredged material placement and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process.
Hydraulic Engineering	The hydraulic reviewer should be a senior hydraulic engineer with experience in dredged material placement.
Geotechnical Engineering	The Geotech reviewer should be a senior geotechnical engineer with experience in dredged material placement.
Civil Engineering	The Civil reviewer should be a senior Civil Engineer with experience in dredged material placement.
Cost Engineering	The cost reviewer should be a Cost Pre-Certified Professional with experience preparing cost estimates for dredged material placement.
Environmental	The Structural reviewer should be a senior Environmental Manager with experience in dredged material placement.
Construction/Operations	The Construction/Operations reviewer should be a senior Construction/Operations Manager with experience in dredged material placement.

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 be 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 1110-1-12 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, based on work reviewed to date, for the AFB, draft report, and final report. A sample Statement of Technical Review is included in Attachment 2.

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

IEPR may be required for implementation 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 implementation 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.
- 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.

- a. **Decision on IEPR.** *Plans and Specifications for the placement of dredged material will not likely be challenging, nor involve novel methods or the use of innovative materials or techniques, as it will follow dredged material management techniques approved in the original Calcasieu River and Pass DMMP. Magnitude of risk is low and a significant threat to human life is not likely to exist in conjunction with the placement of material. There has been no request by the Governor of affected states for a peer review by independent experts and the Plans and Specifications are not likely to involve significant public disputes. Redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule will not be used as accepted material placement techniques will be used. The statement of rational for recommendation to no conduct IEPR is attached as attachment 4.*
- 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 implementation 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 implementation documents.

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

All implementation documents shall be coordinated with the Cost Engineering DX, located in the Walla Walla District. The DX will assist in determining the expertise needed on the ATR team and Type I IEPR team (if required) and in the development of the review charge(s). The DX will also provide the Cost Engineering DX certification. The RMO is responsible for coordination with the Cost Engineering DX.

9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

EC 1105-2-412 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, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

EC 1105-2-412 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, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

- a. **Planning Models.** [No Planning models are anticipated during the development of Plans and Specifications](#)
- b. **Engineering Models.** [No Engineering models are anticipated during the development of Plans and Specifications](#)

10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

ATR Schedule and Cost

Review Milestone	Review Products	Date Planned
Initial ATR review	1) Dredged Material Placement Plans and Specifications	3 rd Qtr FY13
ATR Back Check	2) Dredged Material Placement Plans and Specifications	3 rd Qtr FY13
100% ATR review	3) Dredged Material Placement Plans and Specifications	3 rd Qtr FY13

Review Milestone	#reviewers/total hours	Approximate cost/hr	Totals
Initial ATR review	7/112	\$110	\$12,320
ATR Back Check	7/56	\$110	\$6,160
100% ATR review	7/7	\$110	\$770
		TOTAL	\$19,250

- a. **Type II IEPR Schedule and Cost.** [Not Applicable](#)
- b. **Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost.** [Not Applicable](#)

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Draft Plans and Specifications will be provided to the Local Sponsor, who will be free to receive public comments. Unless specifically requested, the public will not comment on the development of the Plans and Specifications otherwise.

12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The *Mississippi Valley Division* Commander is responsible for approving this Review Plan. The Commander's approval reflects vertical team input (involving district, MSC, RMO, and HQUSACE members) as to the appropriate scope and level of review for the implementation document. Like the PMP, 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. The latest version of the Review Plan, along with the Commanders' approval memorandum, should be posted on the Home District's webpage. The latest Review Plan should also be provided to the RMO and home MSC.

13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

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

- *Darrel Broussard* *504-862-2702*
- *Mincer Minor* *601-634-5841*
- *Jim Wojtala* *601-634-5931*

ATTACHMENT 2: STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW

COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the [Dredged Material Plans and Specifications](#) for [the Calcasieu DMMP](#). 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 DrCheckssm.

SIGNATURE

Name
ATR Team Leader
Office Symbol/Company _____ Date

SIGNATURE

Name
Project Manager
Office Symbol _____ Date

SIGNATURE

Name
Architect Engineer Project Manager¹
Company, location _____ Date

SIGNATURE

Name
Review Management Office Representative
Office Symbol _____ Date

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
Chief, Engineering Division
Office Symbol _____ Date

SIGNATURE

Name
Chief, Planning Division
Office Symbol _____ Date

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
CSDR	Coastal Storm Damage Reduction	O&M	Operation and maintenance
DPR	Detailed Project Report	OMB	Office and Management and Budget
DQC	District Quality Control/Quality Assurance	OMRR&R	Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation
DX	Directory of Expertise	OEO	Outside Eligible Organization
EA	Environmental Assessment	OSE	Other Social Effects
EC	Engineer Circular	PCX	Planning Center of Expertise
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	PDT	Project Delivery Team
EO	Executive Order	PAC	Post Authorization Change
ER	Ecosystem Restoration	PMP	Project Management Plan
FDR	Flood Damage Reduction	PL	Public Law
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	QMP	Quality Management Plan
FRM	Flood Risk Management	QA	Quality Assurance
FSM	Feasibility Scoping Meeting	QC	Quality Control
GRR	General Reevaluation Report	RED	Regional Economic Development
Home District/MS	The District or MSC responsible for the preparation of the implementation document	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

EXPLANATION OF RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION TO NOT CONDUCT A TYPE II IEPR (SAR)

CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (DMMP)

DESIGN IMPLEMENTATION PACKAGES

Risk Based Determination of Need to NOT conduct a Type II IEPR (aka Safety Assurance Review (SAR))

Per EC 1165-2-209, two factors mandate a SAR and three additional factors should be considered in determination whether or not a SAR should be conducted. These factors and their relevancy to this project are discussed below. If there is any lingering concern regarding the rationale presented in the following table a vertical team should be assembled upon request.

Factor		Relevancy to this Project
1) Is the project was justified by life safety?	Mandate	No. This project is in support of the Operation and Maintenance of an existing navigation project.
2) Would the project's failure pose a significant threat to human life?	Mandate	No.
3) Does the project involves the use of innovative materials or techniques where the engineering is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretations, contains precedent-setting methods or models, or presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices?	Consider	No. The plan is for documentation of available capacity of dredged material disposal areas, and management thereof. This type of work has been performed numerous times by MVN.
4) Does the project design require redundancy, resiliency, or robustness?	Consider	No.
5) Does the project have unique construction sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule?	Consider	No. Construction will be simple and similar to other work that has been done by MVN.

Background Information about Project: The actions and strategies as set forth in the Calcasieu river and Pass DMMP/SEIS will provide for the management of materials dredged through operations and maintenance of the ship channel and berthing areas for a minimum of 20 years.

Discussion on analyses and failure modes considered: No analysis was performed on risk and failure modes for the project. Failure of this project would not increase life safety risk. The project would not provide any increased protection nor would it impact existing protection.

The DMMP/SEIS report package which included the proposed disposal areas and overall management plan has been previously reviewed, and did undergo a Type II IEPR review.

Current Approved Version: May 6, 2011. Printed copies are for "Information Only." The controlled version resides on the MVD Regional QMS SharePoint Portal.

RECOMMENDATION REGARDING TYPE II IEPR (SAR)

Based on the above assessment, it is the risk-informed recommendation of the Project Delivery Team and the Chief of E&C or Engineering that Type II IEPR (SAR) is NOT required for this project.

The decision to not conduct a Type II IEPR (SAR) is recommended by:



WALTER O. BAUMMY, JR., Chief, Engineering Division

7 Dec '12

Date

The above recommendation is Approved Disapproved by

Signature of RMO

Date

Review Plan Checklist for Implementation Documents

Date: December 2012
Originating District: New Orleans
Project/Study Title: Calcasieu River and Pass, LA Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP)
PWI #: 399818
District POC: Darrel Broussard

Please fill out this checklist and submit with the draft Review Plan when coordinating with the appropriate RMO. For DQC, the District is the RMO; for ATR of Dam and Levee Safety Studies, the Risk Management Center is the RMO; and for non-Dam and Levee Safety projects and other work products, MVD is the RMO; for Type II IEPR, the Risk Management Center is the RMO. Any evaluation boxes checked 'No' indicate the RP possibly may not comply with EC 1165-2-209 and should be explained. Additional coordination and issue resolution may be required prior to MSC approval of the Review Plan.

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	EVALUATION
1. Is the Review Plan (RP) a standalone document?	EC 1165-2-209, Appendix B, Para 4a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
a. Does it include a cover page identifying it as a RP and listing the project/study title, originating district or office, and date of the plan?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
b. Does it include a table of contents?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
c. Is the purpose of the RP clearly stated and EC 1165-2-209 referenced?	EC 1165-2-209 Para 7a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
d. Does it reference the Project Management Plan (PMP) of which the RP is a component including P2 Project #?	EC 1165-2-209 Para 7a (2)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
e. Does it include a paragraph stating the title, subject, and purpose of the work product to be reviewed?	EC 1165-2-209 Appendix B, Para 4a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
f. Does it list the names and disciplines in the home district, MSC and RMO to whom inquiries about the plan may be directed?*	EC 1165-2-209, Appendix B, Para 4a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p><i>*Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.</i></p>		

Current Approved Version: May 6, 2011. Printed copies are for "Information Only." The controlled version resides on the MVD Regional QMS SharePoint Portal.

Review Plan Checklist for Implementation Documents

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	EVALUATION
2. Documentation of risk-informed decisions on which levels of review are appropriate.	EC 1165-2-209, Appendix B, Para 4b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
a. Does it succinctly describe the three levels of peer review: District Quality Control (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), and Independent External Peer Review (IEPR)?	EC 1165-2-209 Para 7a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
b. Does it contain a summary of the CW implementation products required?	EC1165-2-209 Para 15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
c. DQC is always required. The RP will need to address the following questions:	EC1165-2-209 Para 15a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
i. Does it state that DQC will be managed by the home district in accordance with the Major Subordinate Command (MSC) and district Quality Management Plans?	EC1165-2-209 Para 8a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
ii. Does it list the DQC activities (for example, 30, 60, 90, BCOE reviews, etc)	EC 1165-2-209 Appendix B (1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
iii. Does it list the review teams who will perform the DQC activities?	EC 1165-2-209 Appendix B, Para 4g	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
iv. Does it provide tasks and related resource funding and schedule showing when the DQC activities will be performed?	EC 1165-2-209 Appendix B, Para 4c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
d. Does it assume an ATR is required and if an ATR is not required does it provide a risk based decision of why it is not required? If an ATR is required the RP will need to address the following questions:	EC1165-2-209 Para 15a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
i. Does it identify the ATR District, MSC, and RMO points of contact?	EC 1165-2-209 Para 7a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
ii. Does it identify the ATR lead from outside the home MSC?	EC 1165-2-209 Para 9c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Current Approved Version: May 6, 2011. Printed copies are for "Information Only." The controlled version resides on the MVD Regional QMS SharePoint Portal.

**Review Plan Checklist
for Implementation Documents**

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	EVALUATION
<p>iii. Does it provide a succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed for the review (not simply a list of disciplines)? If the reviewers are listed by name, does the RP describe the qualifications and years of relevant experience of the ATR team members?*</p> <p><i>*Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.</i></p>	EC 1165-2-209 Appendix B, Para 4g	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
iv. Does it provide tasks and related resource, funding and schedule showing when the ATR activities will be performed?	EC 1165-2-209 Appendix C, Para 3e	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
v. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR comments using Dr Checks?	EC 1165-2-209 Para 7d (1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
e. Does it assume a Type II IEPR is required and if a Type II IEPR is not required does it provide a risk based decision of why it is not required including RMC/ MSC concurrence? If a Type II IEPR is required the RP will need to address the following questions:	EC1165-2-209 Para 15a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
i. Does it provide a defensible rationale for the decision on Type II IEPR?	EC 1165-2-209 Para 7a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
ii. Does it identify the Type II IEPR District, MSC, and RMO points of contact?	EC 1165-2-209 Appendix B, Para 4a	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
iii. Does it state that for a Type II IEPR, it will be contracted with an A/E contractor or arranged with another government agency to manage external to the Corps of Engineers?	EC 1165-2-209 Appendix B, Para 4k (4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
iv. Does it state for a Type II IEPR, that the selection of IEPR review panel members will be made up of independent, recognized experts from outside of the USACE in the appropriate disciplines, representing a balance of expertise suitable for the review being conducted?	EC 1165-2-209 Appendix B, Para 4k(1) and Appendix E, Para's 1a & 7	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

Current Approved Version: May 6, 2011. Printed copies are for "Information Only." The controlled version resides on the MVD Regional QMS SharePoint Portal.

Review Plan Checklist for Implementation Documents

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	EVALUATION
v. Does it state for a Type II IEPR, that the selection of IEPR review panel members will be selected using the National Academy of Science (NAS) Policy which sets the standard for “independence” in the review process?	EC 1165-2-209 Para 6b (4) and Para 10b	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
vi. If the Type II IEPR panel is established by USACE, has local (i.e. District) counsel reviewed the Type II IEPR execution for FACA requirements?	EC1165-2-209 Appendix E, Para 7c(1)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
vii. Does it provide tasks and related resource, funding and schedule showing when the Type II IEPR activities will be performed?	EC1165-2-209 Appendix E, Para 5a	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
viii. Does the project address hurricane and storm risk management or flood risk management or any other aspects where Federal action is justified by life safety or significant threat to human life? Is it likely? If yes, Type II IEPR must be addressed.	EC1165-2-209 Appendix E, Para 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
ix. Does the RP address Type II IEPR factors? Factors to be considered include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project involve the use of innovative materials or techniques where the engineering is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretations, contains precedent setting methods or models, or presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices? • Does the project design require redundancy, resiliency and robustness • Does the project have unique construction sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule; fro example, significant project features accomplished using the Design-Build or Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) delivery systems. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
f. Does it address policy compliance and legal review? If no, does it provide a risk based decision of why it is not required?	EC 1165-2-209 Para 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

Current Approved Version: May 6, 2011. Printed copies are for “Information Only.” The controlled version resides on the MVD Regional QMS SharePoint Portal.

Review Plan Checklist
for Implementation Documents

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	EVALUATION
<p>3. Does the RP present the tasks, timing, and sequence of the reviews (including deferrals)?</p> <p>a. Does it provide an overall review schedule that shows timing and sequence of all reviews?</p> <p>b. Does the review plan establish a milestone schedule aligned with the critical features of the project design and construction?</p>	<p>EC 1165-2-209, Appendix B, Para 4c</p> <p>EC 1165-2-209, Appendix C, Para 3g</p> <p>EC 1165-2-209, Appendix E, Para 6c</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>4. Does the RP address engineering model certification requirements?</p> <p>a. Does it list the models and data anticipated to be used in developing recommendations?</p> <p>b. Does it indicate the certification /approval status of those models and if certification or approval of any model(s) will be needed?</p> <p>c. If needed, does the RP propose the appropriate level of certification/approval for the model(s) and how it will be accomplished?</p>	<p>EC 1165-2-209, Appendix B, Para 4i</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>
<p>5. Does the RP explain how and when there will be opportunities for the public to comment on the study or project to be reviewed?</p> <p>a. Does it discuss posting the RP on the District website?</p> <p>b. Does it indicate the web address, and schedule and duration of the posting?</p>	<p>EC 1165-2-209, Appendix B, Para 4d</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>
<p>6. Does the RP explain when significant and relevant public comments will be provided to the reviewers before they conduct their review?</p> <p>a. Does it discuss the schedule of receiving public comments?</p> <p>b. Does it discuss the schedule of when significant comments will be provided to the reviewers?</p>	<p>EC 1165-2-209, Appendix B, Para 4e</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>

Current Approved Version: May 6, 2011. Printed copies are for "Information Only." The controlled version resides on the MVD Regional QMS SharePoint Portal.

Review Plan Checklist
for Implementation Documents

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	EVALUATION
<p>7. Does the RP address whether the public, including scientific or professional societies, will be asked to nominate professional reviewers?*</p> <p>a. If the public is asked to nominate professional reviewers then does the RP provide a description of the requirements and answer who, what, when, where, and how questions?</p> <p><i>* Typically the public will not be asked to nominate potential reviewer</i></p>	EC 1165-2-209, Appendix B, Para 4h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
<p>8. Does the RP address expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor?</p> <p>a. If expected in-kind contributions are to be provided by the sponsor, does the RP list the expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor?</p>	EC 1165-2-209, Appendix B, Para 4j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
<p>9. Does the RP explain how the reviews will be documented?</p> <p>a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR comments using Dr Checks and Type II IEPR published comments and responses pertaining to the design and construction activities summarized in a report reviewed and approved by the MSC and posted on the home district website?</p> <p>b. Does the RP explain how the Type II IEPR will be documented in a Review Report?</p> <p>c. Does the RP document how written responses to the Type II IEPR Review Report will be prepared?</p> <p>d. Does the RP detail how the district/PCX/MS and CECW-CP will disseminate the final Type II IEPR Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the Type II IEPR on the internet?</p>	<p>EC 1165-2-209, Para 7d</p> <p>EC 1165-2-209 Appendix B , Para 4k (14)</p> <p>EC 1165-2-209 Appendix B, Para 4k (14)</p> <p>EC 1165-2-209 Appendix B, Para 5</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
<p>10. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?</p>	EC 1165-2-209, Appendix B, Para 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Current Approved Version: May 6, 2011. Printed copies are for "Information Only." The controlled version resides on the MVD Regional QMS SharePoint Portal.