



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
PACIFIC OCEAN DIVISION, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
FORT SHAFTER, HAWAII 96858-5440

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CEPOD-PDC

2 5 SEP 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDER ALASKA ENGINEER DISTRICT (CEPOA-PM-C-PL/JASON NORRIS), P.O. BOX 6898, JOINT BASE ELMENDORF-RICHARDSON, AK 99506-6898

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for the St. Michael Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Section 14 Report, St. Michael, Alaska, Emergency Shoreline Protection Project

1. References:


- a. EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2010.
- b. Change 1, 31 January 2012, to EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2010.
- c. Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, subject: Continuing Authority Program Planning Process Improvements, 19 January 2011.

2. The enclosed Review Plan for the St. Michael Section 14 Report, St. Michael, Alaska, emergency shoreline protection project has been prepared in accordance with References 1.a., b., and c. The Pacific Ocean Division is the lead office to execute this Review Plan, which does not include Type I Independent External Peer Review.

3. I approve this Review Plan. It is subject to change as circumstances require, consistent with project development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this Review Plan or its execution will require new written approval from this office.

4. The point of contact for this memorandum is Mr. Russell Iwamura, Senior Economist, Civil Works Integration Division, at 808-835-4625 or email, Russell.K.Iwamura@usace.army.mil.

Encl


GREGORY C. GUNTER
Colonel, EN
Acting Commander

**REVIEW PLAN
FOR CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM (CAP)
SECTION 14 PROJECTS**

St. Michael Section 14

Alaska District

**MSC Approval Date: 25 September 2012
Last Revision Date: None**



**US Army Corps
of Engineers ®**

**REVIEW PLAN
FOR CAP SECTION 14 PROJECTS**

St. Michael, Alaska

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS	1
2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION	2
3. STUDY INFORMATION	2
4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)	3
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.....	7
10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS.....	7
11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	7
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	11
ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS.....	13
ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	14

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

- a. **Purpose.** This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the St. Michael, 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, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007.

- b. **Applicability.** This Pacific Ocean Division (POD) model review plan is applicable to those Section 14 project decision documents that do not require an Independent External Peer Review (IEPR).

c. References

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
- (2) Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, Continuing Authority Program Planning Process Improvements, 19 Jan 2011
- (3) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 Mar 2010
- (4) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
- (5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007
- (6) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007
- (7) Project Management Plan (PMP)
- (8) POD and/or District Quality Management Plan(s)

- d. **Requirements.** This POD Model Review Plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, 31 Jan 2010 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum#1, 19 Jan 2011, which establishes an accountable, comprehensive, life-cycle review strategy for Civil Works Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) products by providing a seamless process for review of all Civil Works projects during the Feasibility Phase. 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, CAP decision documents are subject to cost engineering review and certification (per EC 1165-2-209) and the Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1.

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 this Section 14 decision document is POD. POD will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the Agency Technical Review (ATR).

Upon approval by the RMO 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 PCX-CSDR to keep the PCX apprised of requirements and review schedules.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

- a. **Decision Document.** The St. Michael Section 14 decision document will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007. The approval level of the decision document (if policy compliant) is POD. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared with the decision document.
- b. **Study/Project Description.** The purpose of this study is to identify problems and opportunities associated with providing shoreline protection at St. Michael, Alaska. The study seeks to protect approximately 1,400 feet of shoreline fronting a wastewater treatment plant with associated utilidor and a cemetery. Storm generated wave action erodes the bank fronting these facilities, causing the foundations of the utilidor to become undermined. In addition, graves have become exposed, causing a loss of human remains.

The utilidor extends along the shore from the sewer treatment plant in a northeast to southwest direction. The distance from the utilidor to the eroding bluff varies between 10-50 feet. Protecting the utilidor would include armoring approximately 1,000 feet of shoreline. This would protect the bluff fronting the utilidor northeast of the vacuum plant and partially protect the utilidor southwest of the plant. The estimated cost for this alternative ranges from \$1,250,000 to \$1,500,000 including: contingency, engineering and design, and supervision and administration.

The cemetery is located atop a bluff on a point extending into Saint Michael Bay. The bluff is eroding and the eroded material is washed away rather than allowing the bluff to stabilize with the eroded material. Protecting the cemetery would involve armoring the toe of the bluff to prevent niching. The cost presented here is the cost to armor 400 feet of shoreline at the cemetery. This protects the toe along the shoreline fronting the cemetery up to 14 feet MLLW. The estimated cost for this alternative ranges from \$400,000 to \$500,000 including: contingency, engineering and design, and supervision and administration.

- c. **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. In-kind contributions by the local sponsor are not anticipated at this time. Should in-kind contributions become a possibility they will be adequately addressed in the relevant Project Partnership Agreement.

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)

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.

- a. Documentation of DQC.** Documentation of DQC activities is required and should be in accordance with the Quality Manual of the District and POD.
- b. Products to Undergo DQC.** All decision documents, including cost estimates are to be prepared in accordance with the Alaska District Quality Management Plan.
- c. Required DQC Expertise.** DQC reviewers should have a minimum of 4 years experience in construction of revetments. Reviewers will not be directly involved in the study process. The DQC team is listed in Attachment 1.

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 POD Quality Management Plans. The ATR shall be documented and discussed at the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) milestone. Certification of the ATR will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. Products to undergo ATR include the draft and final Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment for the St. Michael Section 14 Project.
- 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 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 POD.
Planning	The planning reviewer should be a water resources planner with experience in preparing Section 14 decision documents. It is preferable that this person also act as the ATR Lead.
Environmental Resources	The environmental reviewer should be a NEPA expert with a working knowledge of the NEPA requirements related to rock armoring of a bank/shore.
Coastal Engineering	The engineering reviewer should be an engineer with experience in design and construction of coastal armoring structures.
Cost Engineering	The cost engineering reviewer will be the Cost DX Staff or Cost DX Pre-Certified Professional with experience in preparing cost estimates for coastal armoring structures.

The ATR team members for this study and a brief description of their credentials are in Attachment 1.

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, 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 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.

All CAP projects are excluded from Type I IEPR except Section 205 and Section 103 or those projects that include an EIS or meet the mandatory triggers for Type I IEPR as stated in EC 1165-2-209. Exclusions from Type I IEPR for Section 205 and Section 103 projects will be approved on a case by case basis by the MSC Commander, based upon a risk informed decision process as outlined in EC 1165-2-209 and may not be delegated.

- 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 this POD Model 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.

IAW reference 1c(2) of this review plan, this Section 14 decision document (Feasibility Phase) is excluded from a Type I IEPR.

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 POD 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

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.

9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

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

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).

10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

- a. ATR Schedule and Cost.** The ATR for the St. Michael Section 14 Project study will be accomplished in accordance with the cost and schedule in the Project Management Plan.
- b. Model Review Schedule and Cost.** For CAP decision documents prepared under the POD Model Review Plan, use of existing certified or approved planning models is encouraged. Where uncertified or unapproved model are used, review of the model for use will be accomplished through the ATR process. The ATR team will apply the principles of EC 1105-2-412 during the ATR to ensure the model is theoretically and computationally sound, consistent with USACE policies, and adequately documented. If specific uncertified models are identified for repetitive use within a specific district or region, the appropriate PCX, MSC(s), and home District(s) will identify a unified approach to seek certification of these models.

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

State and Federal resource agencies may be invited to participate in the study covered by this review plan as partner agencies or as technical members of the PDT, as appropriate. Agencies with regulatory review responsibilities will be contacted for coordination as required by applicable laws and procedures. The ATR team will be provided copies of public and agency

comments. This review plan and all decision documents will be posted on the Alaska District's website for public review.

12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The POD Commander is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the POD CAP 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 POD 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 POD following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in POD determining that use of the POD CAP 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 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1. The latest version of the review plan, along with POD's 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:

- Alaska District POC, Bruce Sexauer, (907) 753-5619
- Pacific Ocean Division POC, Russell Iwamura, (808) 835-4625

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS

The Project Delivery Team (PDT) is comprised of the following individuals:

Project Manager	David Williams
Planner	Jason Norris
Environmental Resources	Erin Laughlin
Hydraulics and Hydrology	Dee Ginter
Cost Engineering	Anne Fore
Office of Counsel	Robert Stolzman

The District Quality Control (DQC) Team is comprised of the following individuals:

Planning	Bruce Sexauer
Cost Engineering	Karl Harvey
Hydraulics and Hydrology	Ken Eisses
Environmental Resources	Michael Salyer

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) Team is comprised of the following individuals:

ATR Team Leader and Planning	Donald Bisbee, Seattle District, Northwestern Division	Economist for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers since May 2001. Currently the Senior Economist at the Seattle District. Serves as lead economist on district feasibility and CAP studies (including Section 14 studies) and has extensive experience in the Corps' planning process. Also involved in Dam Safety, Levee Safety, Silver Jackets, and PL84-99 Levee Rehabilitations. Has extensive experience and expertise in various models including HEC-FDA, GIS, HEC-FIA, EAD, and WATS. Serves on local flood teams, and deployed to New Orleans for Katrina recovery. Has served as a panel member on ATRs for Investigations, CAP, and Levee Rehabilitation studies and is also the ATR Leader for a project expected to cost over \$45 million. Received a BS in Economics from the University of Washington w/Quantitative and Financial Accounting certifications (Class of 2000).
Environmental Resources	Elizabeth McCasland, Seattle District, Northwestern Division	Ten years experience in Corps NEPA compliance on projects such as wetland and coastal habitat restoration, levee construction and rehab, and storm water management. Has served as the Corps biologist on an inter-agency wetland and coastal restoration team evaluating potential project sites, project planning, and environmental documentation. Has knowledge in NEPA compliance through course work from subject matter experts in environmental law, cumulative impact assessment, and writing NEPA documents. Prior to working for the Corps, spent eight years

		with USFWS as a fish health (pathology) biologist; and three years working for a state agency as a field research biologist on both fisheries and small mammal projects.
Coastal Engineering	Thomas Smith, Honolulu District, Pacific Ocean Division	Leader of the Coastal Center of Planning Expertise at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's Jacksonville District until 2003. Currently serving as the Senior Coastal Engineer at the Honolulu District focusing on shore protection and navigation. Received an undergraduate degree in Ocean Engineering from the Florida Institute of Technology and a Masters of Ocean Engineering from Texas A&M.
Cost Engineering	James Neubauer, Walla Walla District, Northwestern Division	Since August 2007 has served as the ATR coordinator and a lead reviewer in the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise for Civil Works located in U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Walla Walla District (Cost DX). He has served 29 years as a civil engineer with experience in military and civil works construction, project management, and cost engineering. Mr. Neubauer is a licensed professional engineer, a certified cost engineer and a certified project manager – level 1. Mr. Neubauer has led many cost ATRs and numerous teams in developing or reviewing multi-billion dollar estimates for the Corps and the Department of Energy.

MSC Contact Information

POD CAP Manager	Tim Young	808-835-4627
POD Civil Works Planning Team Leader	Linda Hihara-Endo	808-835-4621

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

COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the <type of product> for <project name and location>. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project's Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-209 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1. 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 (home district)

Office Symbol

Date

SIGNATURE

Name

Architect Engineer Project Manager¹

Company, location

Date

SIGNATURE

Name

Review Management Office Representative

Office Symbol

Date

¹ Only needed if some portion of the ATR was contracted

CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (CONT'D)

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, Planning Division (home district)

Office Symbol

Date

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>	<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>
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
Home District/MSD	The District or MSD responsible for the preparation of the CAP decision document.	RMO	Review Management Organization
HQUSACE	Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	RTS	Regional Technical Specialist
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review	SAR	Safety Assurance Review
ITR	Independent Technical Review	USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
LRR	Limited Reevaluation Report	WRDA	Water Resources Development Act
MSC	Major Subordinate Command		