



**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**  
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
P.O. BOX 80  
VICKSBURG, MISSISSIPPI 39181-0080

REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF:

CEMVD-PD-N

31 October 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, New Orleans District

SUBJECT: False River, New **Roads**, Louisiana Continuing  
Authorities Program (CAP), Section 206, Review Plan (RP) Approval

1. References:

a. Memorandum, CEMVN-PM-B, 12 October 2011, subject: CAP  
Section 206 False River, Peer Review Plan.

b. Memorandum, CEMVD-PD-KM, 5 April 2011, subject: MVD  
Review Procedures for CAP.

2. The subject RP and supporting checklist provided under  
Reference 1.a above, was reviewed on receipt in our office. The RP  
conforms to the CAP Model RP approved under Reference 1.b, above.  
The enclosed RP is approved for use. The Project Manager should  
post the RP to the District web pages.

3. The MVD point of contact is Mr. James Wojtala, CEMVD-PD-N,  
(601) 634-5931.

Encl

RAYFORD E. WILBANKS  
Chief, Lower District Support  
Team, New Orleans

ROBERT H. FITZGERALD, P.E.  
Chief, Business Technical  
Division



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

CEMVN-PM-B

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
P.O. BOX 60267  
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70160-0267


12 OCT 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Mississippi Valley Division (MVN-DST/R. Wilbanks)

SUBJECT: CAP Section 206 False River –Peer Review Plan

1. The subject Mississippi Valley Division (MVD) CAP Review Plan (encl 1) and Review Plan Checklist (encl 2) are hereby submitted for review and approval.
2. The Review Plan and Review Plan Checklist follow the MVD Model Review Plan for CAP Section 206 projects in accordance with the Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, 19 January 2011, and the MVD Review Procedures for CAP Memorandum, dated 5 April 2011.
3. Due to the limited scope of the False River CAP Section 206 project (total project costs will not exceed \$7,700,000), this project is not likely to have significant economic, environmental, and/or social effects to the Nation. Therefore, Type II IEPR is not anticipated.
5. I recommend that this Review Plan be approved for use. The POC for this study is Mr. Thomas A. Holden Jr., Deputy District Engineer for Project Management. He can be reached at (504) 862-2204.

2 Encls  
as

  
EDWARD R. FLEMING  
Colonel, EN  
Commanding

**Attachment 1: Sample Statement of Technical Review for Decision Documents**

**Completion of Agency Technical Review**

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the Feasibility Report for False River, New Rhodes, LA. 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<sup>sm</sup>.

SIGNATURE

Name

ATR Team Leader

Office Symbol/Company

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

SIGNATURE

Name

Project Manager (home district)

Office Symbol

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

SIGNATURE

Name

Architect Engineer Project Manager<sup>1</sup>

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 (home district)

Office Symbol

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

SIGNATURE

Name

Chief, RPED/or Deputy Chief, RPED (home district)

Office Symbol

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

<sup>1</sup> Only needed if some portion of the ATR was contracted.

**Attachment 2: MVD CAP Review Plan Checklist**

**Date:** August 2011  
**Originating District:** MVN  
**Project/Study Title:** False River  
**P2# and AMSCO#:** 108753/175495  
**District POC:** Nick Sims  
**MSC Reviewer:** TBD  
**CAP Authority:** 206  
**Other Program Directed to follow CAP Processes:** NA

Please fill out this checklist and submit with the draft Review Plan when coordinating with the MSC. Any evaluation boxes checked "No" may indicate the project may not be able to use the MVD Model Review Plan. Further explanation may be needed or a project specific review plan may be required. Additional coordination and issue resolution may be required prior to MSC approval of the Review Plan. Checklist may be limited to Section I or Section II or Both, depending on content of review plan (or subsequent amendments).

**Section I - Decision Documents**

REQUIREMENT	EVALUATION
<b>1. Is the Review Plan (RP) for a Continuing Authorities Project? Or Other Program Directed to follow CAP Processes?</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
a. Does it include a cover page identifying it as following the Model RP and listing the project/study title, originating district or office, and date of the plan?	a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does it include a table of contents?	b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Is the purpose of the RP clearly stated?	c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
d. Does it reference the Project Management Plan (PMP) of which the RP is a component?	d. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
e. Does it succinctly describe the levels of review: District Quality Control (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), and Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) if applicable for Sec 103 or Sec 205?	e. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
f. Does it include a paragraph stating the title, subject, and purpose of the decision document to be reviewed?	f. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

<p>g. Does it list the names and disciplines of the Project Delivery Team (PDT)?*</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> <p><b>Comments:</b></p>	<p>g. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>2. Is the RP detailed enough to assess the necessary level and focus of the reviews?</b></p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>3. Does the RP define the appropriate level of review for the project/study?</b></p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a. Does it state that DQC will be managed by the home district in accordance with the MVD and district Quality Management Plans?</p> <p>b. Does it state that ATR will be managed by MVD?</p> <p>c. Does it state whether IEPR will be performed? For Sec 103 and Sec 205, see additional questions in 5. below.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>4. Does the RP explain how ATR will be accomplished?</b></p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a. Does it identify the anticipated number of reviewers?</p> <p>b. Does it provide a succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed for the review (not simply a list of disciplines)?</p> <p>c. Does it indicate that ATR team members will be from outside the home district?</p> <p>d. Does it indicate where the ATR team leader will be from?</p> <p>e. 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> <p><b>Comments:</b></p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>e. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>ATR members have not yet been assigned. Once assigned info will be added</p>
<p><b>5. For Sec 103 and Sec 205 projects, does the RP explain how IEPR will be accomplished?</b></p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a. Is an exclusion being requested, requiring CG approval?</p>	<p>a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>

<p>b. Does it provide a defensible rationale for the decision on IEPR?</p> <p>c. If IEPR is required, does it state that IEPR will be managed by an Outside Eligible Organization, external to the Corps of Engineers?</p> <p>d. If IEPR is required, does the RP indicate which PCX will manage the IEPR and whether any coordination with the PCX has occurred?</p> <p><b>Comments:</b>      <a href="#">NA, Section 206</a></p>	<p>b. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>6. Does the RP address review of sponsor in-kind contributions?</b></p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>7. Does the RP address how the review will be documented?</b></p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR and IEPR comments using Dr Checks?</p> <p>b. Does the RP explain how the IEPR will be documented in a Review Report?</p> <p>c. Does the RP document how written responses to the IEPR Review Report will be prepared?</p> <p>c. Does the RP detail how the district will disseminate the final IEPR Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the IEPR on the internet and include them in the applicable decision document?</p> <p><b>Comments:</b>      <a href="#">IEPR is not anticipated</a></p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>8. Does the RP address Policy Compliance and Legal Review?</b></p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>9. Does the RP present the tasks, timing and sequence (including deferrals), and costs of reviews?</b></p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a. Does it provide a schedule for ATR including review of the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) materials and final report?</p> <p>b. Does it present the timing and sequencing for IEPR?</p> <p>c. Does it include cost estimates for the reviews?</p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>10. Does the RP indicate the study will address Safety Assurance factors?</b> Factors to be considered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Where failure leads to significant threat to human life</li> <li>● Novel methods\complexity\ precedent-setting models\policy changing conclusions</li> <li>● Innovative materials or techniques</li> <li>● Design lacks redundancy, resiliency of robustness</li> <li>● Unique construction sequence or acquisition plans</li> <li>● Reduced\overlapping design construction schedule</li> </ul>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> <a href="#">As seen in section 3.c the project does not include any safety assurance factors</a></p>

<b>11. Does the RP address opportunities for public participation?</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>12. Does the RP indicate ATR of cost estimates will be conducted by pre-certified district cost personnel who will coordinate with the Walla Walla Cost DX?</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>13. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

## Section II - Implementation Documents

Please fill out this checklist and submit with the draft Review Plan or subsequent Review Plan amendments when coordinating with the MSC. For DQC, the District is the RMO; for ATR and Type II IEPR, MVD is the RMO. Any evaluation boxes checked "No" indicate the RP possibly may not comply with MVD Model Review Plan and should be explained. Additional coordination and issue resolution may be required prior to MVD approval of the Review Plan.

REQUIREMENT	EVALUATION
<b>1. Are the implementation documents/products described in the review or subsequent amendments?</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2. Does the RP contain documentation of risk-informed decisions on which levels of review are appropriate?</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>3. Does the RP present the tasks, timing, and sequence of the reviews (including deferrals)?</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<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>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<b>4. Does the RP address engineering model review requirements?</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. Does it list the models and data anticipated to be used in developing recommendations?</p> <p>b. Does the RP identify any areas of risk and uncertainty associated with the use of the proposed models?</p> <p>c. Does it indicate the certification/approval status of those models and if review of any model(s) will be needed?</p> <p>d. If needed, does the RP propose the appropriate level of review for the model(s) and how it will be accomplished?</p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
<b>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?</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>6. Does the RP address expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor?</b></p> <p>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>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>



**REVIEW PLAN**  
**Using the MVD Model Review Plan**  
**for**  
**Continuing Authorities Program**  
**Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208, or 1135 Projects,**  
**or Projects directed by Guidance**  
**to use CAP processes**

***False River, New Rhodes, LA***  
**Section 206 Project**

***New Orleans District***

**MSC Approval Date: October 31, 2011**  
**Last Revision Date: *none***



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers ®**

**Review Plan  
Using the MVD Model Review Plan**

**False River, New Rhodes, LA  
Section 206 Project**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1. Purpose and Requirements</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Review Management Organization (RMO) Coordination</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Project Information</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4. District Quality Control (DQC)</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>5. Agency Technical Review (Atr)</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>6. Policy and Legal Compliance Review</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>7. Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) Review and Certification</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>8. Model Certification and Approval</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>9. Review Schedules and Costs</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>10. Public Participation</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>11. Review Plan Approval and Updates</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>12. Review Plan Points of Contact</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Attachment 1: Team Rosters</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Attachment 2: Review Plan Revisions</b>	<b>8</b>

**REVIEW PLAN**  
**False River, New Rhodes, LA**

**1. Purpose and Requirements.**

**a. Purpose.** This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the False River, New Rhodes, LA, Section 206 project . The Non-Federal Sponsor is aware of the requirements set forth in the review plan, which is part of the Project Management Plan dated August 2003 (Updated November 2010),with anticipated review products to include, but not be limited to, the AFB Submittal Package, Draft Feasibility Report and supporting technical appendices (environmental assessment; cost estimate; real estate plan; and drawings), Final Feasibility Report and supporting technical appendices if significant comments are received during the public comment period, and Plans and Specifications.

Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, Public Law 104-305, authorizes the Secretary of the Army to carry out a program of aquatic ecosystem restoration with the objective of restoring degraded ecosystem structure, function, and dynamic processes to a less degraded, more natural condition considering the ecosystem's natural integrity, productivity, stability and biological diversity. This authority is primarily used for manipulation of the hydrology in and along bodies of water, including wetlands and riparian areas. This authority also allows for dam removal. 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, Amendment #2.

**b. Applicability.** This review plan is based on the MVD Model Review Plan for Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208, or 1135 Projects or Programs directed by guidance to follow CAP processes, which is applicable to projects that do not require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), as defined by the mandatory Type I IEPR triggers contained in EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy.

**c. References:**

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2010.
- (2) Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, CECW-P, dated 19 January 2011.
- (3) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 March 2010.
- (4) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 September 2006.
- (5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 January 2007.
- (6) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 November 2007.

**REVIEW PLAN**  
**False River, New Rhodes, LA**

**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 206 is MVD. MVD will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the Agency Technical Review (ATR). The home District will post the approved review plan on its public website.

**3. Project Information.**

**a. Decision Document and Implementation Document**The False River, New Rhodes, LA decision document will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F, Amendment #2. The approval level of the decision document (if policy compliant) is MVD. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document. Plans and Specifications (P&S) will also be prepared for implementation of the project and will undergo ATR review.

**b. Study/Project Description.** The project is located in New Roads, Louisiana, in Pointe Coupee Parish, approximately 25 miles northwest of Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The purpose of the proposed ecosystem restoration effort is to restore the health of False River, a 3,300-acre oxbow lake. The ecosystem restoration study looks to improve the currently poor water quality and siltation problems with resulting impacts to fish, wildlife, and aquatic vegetation.

Alternatives being considered include a system of sequential rock weirs in both the North and South flats, dredging of approximately 800K cubic yards of material in the shallow areas of the North and South flats, creation of aquatic benches, lake drawdown to 5ft, and sediment traps. Construction costs range from \$500,000 to \$7,700,000. The Point Coupee Police Jury will serve as the non-Federal Sponsor.

**c. Factors Affecting the Scope and level of Review.** The Model Programmatic Review plan was used to determine the appropriate scope and level of review for this study because CAP Section 206 projects are ecosystem restoration projects that are not highly challenging nor do they present a high magnitude of project risks. Due to the limited scope of CAP Section 206 (total Federal project costs cannot exceed \$5,000,000), this project is not likely to have significant economic, environmental, and/or social effects to the Nation. The decaying ecosystem does not likely involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance as the area in question has been on the decline for approximately 10 years. The project is not likely to have significant interagency interest as a standard Environmental Assessment is being performed, with minimal impacts to the surrounding environment. The information in the decision document and project design will not be highly controversial, based on novel methods, or present complex challenges as standard ecosystem restoration measures will be evaluated (sediment traps, lake drawdown, dredging, etc). Also, being a standard ecosystem restoration project, the project report is not likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment. Due to these factors, IEPR is not anticipated.

**d. In-Kind Contributions.** Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to District Quality Control (DQC) and ATR, similar to any products developed by USACE. No in-kind products are anticipated by the non-Federal Sponsor.

**4. District Quality Control (DQC).**

**REVIEW PLAN**  
**False River, New Rhodes, LA**

All decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC prior to ATR. 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 in accordance with MVD and district Quality Management Plan. Any discrepancies between a reviewer and a Project Delivery Team (PDT) member will be resolved face-to-face. If a concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the DQC team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the section supervisor for further resolution. DQC will be conducted on the AFB submittal/draft decision document and supporting information (including but not limited to the engineering appendix, environmental assessment, real estate plan, cost estimates, and plan formulation methodology). DQC will also be conducted on the P&S. Each of these products will undergo review by Senior level staff within the appropriate technical division.

**5. Agency Technical Review (ATR).**

One ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.), however additional ATRs may be performed if deemed warranted. 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. 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. The ATR team lead will be from within the home MSC.

**a. Products to Undergo ATR.** ATR will be performed throughout the project in accordance with the District and MVD Quality Management Plans. Products to undergo ATR include: ATR will be conducted on the AFB submittal/draft decision document and supporting information (including but not limited to the engineering appendix, environmental assessment, real estate plan, cost estimates, and plan formulation methodology). ATR will also be conducted on the P&S.

**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 206 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 <b>MUST</b> be from outside MVN
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience who has worked with evaluating measures and alternatives using appropriate planning methodologies to address ecosystem restoration projects.
NEPA Compliance	The Environmental Resources reviewer should have experience working with the assessment of construction impacts in marsh and urban areas and related ecosystem species and habitat.
Hydraulic Engineering	The H&H Engineering reviewer should have H&H experience on a design and construction team that worked on restoration projects including lake drawdown and dredging.

**REVIEW PLAN**  
**False River, New Rhodes, LA**

Civil Engineering	The Civil Engineering reviewer should have experience on a design and construction team that worked on restoration projects including lake drawdown and dredging.
Structural Engineering	The Structural Engineering reviewer should have experience on a design and construction team that worked on restoration projects including lake drawdown and dredging.
Cost Engineering	Cost DX Staff or Cost DX Pre-Certified Professional with experience preparing cost estimates for restoration projects
Construction/Operations	The Construction/Operations reviewer should have experience on a design and construction team that worked on restoration projects including lake drawdown and dredging.
Real Estate	The Real Estate reviewer should have experience is ecosystem restoration projects

**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. Any editorial comments should be provided informally by email to the PDT.

**6. 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 MVD 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.

**7. Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) Review And Certification.**

For CAP projects, ATR of the costs may be conducted by pre-certified district cost personnel within the region or by the Walla Walla Cost DX. The pre-certified list of cost personnel has been established and is maintained by the Cost DX at <https://kme.usace.army.mil/EC/cost/CostAtr/default.aspx>. The cost ATR member will coordinate with the Cost DX for execution of cost ATR and cost certification. The Cost DX will be responsible for final cost certification and may be delegated at the discretion of the Cost DX.

**8. Model Certification And Approval.**

Approval of planning models under EC 1105-2-412 is not required for CAP projects. MSC commanders remain responsible for assuring the quality of the analyses used in these projects. ATR will be used to ensure that models and analyses 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.

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

**REVIEW PLAN**  
**False River, New Rhodes, LA**

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).

**Planning and Engineering Models.** The following models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document:

<b>Model Name and Version</b>	<b>Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study</b>
<p>USFW Habitat Suitability Model (HIS) for Largemouth Bass</p>	<p>Habitat outputs will be assessed using the Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP) developed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other agencies for Largemouth Bass. HEP can assess areas that have a variety of habitat types and the habitats can have different suitabilities for species that may occur in that area. The suitabilities are quantified (via Habitat Suitability Indices, or HSIs). The overall suitability of an area for a species is then represented as a product of the areal extent of each habitat and the suitability of the habitats for the species.</p> <p>As habitat changes through time, either by natural or human-induced processes, the overall suitability through time can be quantified by integrating the areal extent-suitability product function over time. Thus, alternatives can be quantitatively compared to the forecasted future without-project condition.</p> <p>The Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP) is an established approach to assessment of natural resources. The HEP approach has been well documented and is approved for use in Corps projects as an assessment framework that combines resource quality and quantity over time. The Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) models provide the format for quantity determinations that are applied within the HEP framework. The following guidelines are provided to help determine the need for certification. ATR of input data is required in all instances.</p>
<p>USACE Hydrologic Engineering Center (HEC) Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS) and River Analysis System (HEC-RAS)</p>	<p>HEC-HMS and HEC-RAS models were used to analyze the potential affects of rainfall on a drawdown of False River. This analysis was conducted inorder to present data and information on a drawdown alternative to take place in the fall. The intent was for the H&amp;H analysis, which was based on existing information and modeling analysis, to assist decision makers in answering stakeholder’s questions regarding the proposed drawdown.</p> <p>The goal was to simulate the drawdown during periods of low, average, and high rainfall. The model simulation was run from September 15 to April 1, with the control structure gates opened on September 15 and closed on January 15. The model simulation was run through April 1 to show how False River would return to pool stage after the gates were closed.</p>
<p>IWR Planning Suite, Cost Effectiveness/Incremental Cost Analysis Software, (CE/ICA)</p>	<p>The Cost Effectiveness/Incremental Cost Analysis Software (CE/ICA) is used to evaluate alternative plans, determine which plans are cost effective, and to identify a National Ecosystem Restoration (NER) Plan. The model will be used to evaluate the project-specific alternatives developed as part of</p>

**REVIEW PLAN**  
**False River, New Rhodes, LA**

	this Section 206 project.
--	---------------------------

**9. Review Schedules And Costs.**

**ATR Schedule and Cost.**

AFB Submittal: November 2011	\$15,000 (estimate, needs to be coordinated with MVD)
Draft Report: December 2011	\$15,000 (estimate, needs to be coordinated with MVD)
Plans and Specifications: TBD (Estimated for 2Q FY 13\$	15,000 (estimate, needs to be coordinated with MVD)

**10. 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. Once the Review Plan is approved, the District will post it to its district public website and notify MVD and the PCX. The draft environmental assessment and report will undergo a 30 day review upon completion. The final decision document will also be posted to the district public website.

**11. Review Plan Approval And Updates.**

The MVD DST and RB Chief is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the MVD Model 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 MVD approval are documented in Attachment 2. Significant changes to the review plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) should be reapproved by MVD following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in MVD determining that use of the MVD Model 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 MVD approval memorandum, will be posted on the home district's webpage.

**12. Review Plan Points Of Contact.**

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

- Nick Sims, MVN Project Manager, 504 862 2128
- Jim Wojtala, MVD, 601 634 5931



**REVIEW PLAN**  
**False River, New Rhodes, LA**

**Attachment 1: Team Rosters**

<b>Functional Area</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Plan Formulation	Shawn Philips	901-544-3321
Plan Formulation	Bret Walters	901-544-0777
Project Management	Brad Inman	504-862-2124
Project Management	Nick Sims	504-862-2128
Project Engineering	Leslie M. Lombard	504-862-2940
Hydraulics	Tzenge-huey Shih	504-862-2423
Waterways	Brian Leaumont	504-862-2777
Geotechnical	Jeremy Daigle	504-862-2170
Cost	Jennifer Stephens	504-862-2972
Structures	Heather Achord	504-862-2456
Relocations	Richel L. Green	504-862-1602
Surveys	Dwayne A. Blanchard	504-862-1589
GIS	Keith Marino	504-862-1358
Real Estate	Hope Jackson	504-862-2891
Environmental	Marsha Raus	901-544-3455
USFWS	TBD	TBD

**REVIEW PLAN**  
**False River, New Rhodes, LA**

**Attachment 2: Review Plan Revisions**

<b>Revision Date</b>	<b>Description of Change</b>	<b>Page/Paragraph Number</b>