Lake Michigan Waterfront Program
Section 125, Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 2006

DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN

USING THE NATIONAL PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW PLAN MODEL

Portage Park Project
Section 125, Lake Michigan Waterfront
Portage, Indiana

Chicago District, US Army Corps of Engineers

MSC Approval Date: Pending
Last Revision Date: December 2011

US Army Corps
of Engineers ®

DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN
USING THE NATIONAL PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW PLAN MODEL

Lake Michigan Waterfront Program
Section 125, Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS 1
2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION 5
3. STUDY INFORMATION 5
4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC) 6
5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) 6
6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR) 7
7. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL 8
8. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS 9
9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION 9
10. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES 9
11. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT 10
ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS 11
ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECSION 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 Portage Park Lake Michigan Waterfront project decision document developed under Section125 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 2006 (P.L. 109-163).

Section 125 authorized the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to carry out a continuing program for the restoration of the Lake Michigan Waterfront and Related Areas, Lake and Porter Counties, Indiana.

(1) DEFINITIONS. —

(A) Related areas are defined as adjacent or close sites that have an impact or influence on the waterfront areas or aquatic habitat.

(B) Restore is defined as—

(i) activities that improve a site's ecosystem function, structure, and dynamic processes to a less degraded and more natural condition, and/or

(ii) the management of contaminants that allow the site to be safely used for ecological and/or economic purposes.

(2) JUSTIFICATION. — Projects can be justified by ecosystem benefits, clean-up of contaminated sites, public health, safety, economic benefits or any combination of these. Sites restored for economic purposes can be redeveloped by others. Restoration sites may include compatible recreation facilities that do not diminish the restoration purpose and do not increase the Federal cost share by more than 10 percent.

(3) COST SHARING. — The construction of projects are cost shared at 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal except when there is a demonstration of innovative technology. The cost share is then 85 percent Federal and 15 percent non-Federal.

As directed by CELRD-PDS-P prior to the Alternative Formulation Briefing on November 22, 2011 for this project, the Chicago District used the Continuing Authority Program (CAP) programmatic review plan template as this project is a CAP like project and most appropriate template to use until the model Programmatic Review Plan for Section 125 is approved.

b. Applicability. This review plan is based on the model National Programmatic Review Plan for Section 206 project decision documents, which is applicable to projects that do not require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), as defined in ER 1165-2-209 Civil Works Review Policy. A Section 206 project does not require IEPR if <u>ALL</u> of the following specific criteria are met:

- The project does not involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance;
- The total project cost is less than $45 million;
- There is no request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts;
- The project does not require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS),
- The project is not likely to have significant economic, environmental, and/or social effects to the Nation;
- The project/study is not likely to have significant interagency interest;
- The project/study is not likely highly controversial;
- The decision document is not likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific;

- The information in the decision document or proposed project design is not likely to be based on novel methods, involve the use of innovative materials or techniques, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices; and
- The project has not been deemed by the USACE Director of Civil Works or Chief of Engineers to be controversial nature.

If any of the above criteria are not met, the model National Programmatic Review Plan is not applicable and a study specific review plan must be prepared by the home district, coordinated with the National Ecosystem Planning Center of Expertise (ECO-PCX) and approved by the home Major Subordinate Command (MSC) in accordance with EC 1165-2-209.

Applicability of the model National Programmatic Review Plan for a specific project is determined by the home MSC. If the MSC determines that the model plan is applicable for a specific study, the MSC Commander may approve the plan (including exclusion from IEPR) without additional coordination with the ECO-PCX or Headquarters, USACE. Approval of the RP under these specific circumstances has been delegated to the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division Chief of Planning and Policy. The initial decision as to the applicability of the model plan should be made no later than the Federal Interest Determination milestone (as defined in Appendix F of ER 1105-2-100, F-10.e.1) during the feasibility phase of the project, unless otherwise determined by the MSC Chief of Planning and Policy. In addition, the home district and MSC should assess at the Alternatives Formulation Briefing (AFB) whether the initial decision on the use of the model plan is still valid or if a project specific review plan should be developed based on new information. If a project specific review plan is required, it must be approved prior to execution of the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) for the study.

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

c. References

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

d. Requirements. This programmatic review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, which establishes an accountable, comprehensive, life-cycle review strategy for Civil Works products by providing a seamless process for review of all Civil Works projects from initial planning through design, construction, and operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and rehabilitation (OMRR&R). The EC outlines four general levels of review: District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), and Policy and Legal Compliance Review. In addition to these levels of review, decision documents are subject to

cost engineering review and certification (per EC 1165-2-209) and if necessary, a planning model certification/approval (per EC 1105-2-412).

(1) District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC). All decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC. DQC is an internal review process of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the Project Management Plan (PMP). The home district shall manage DQC. Documentation of DQC activities is required and should be in accordance with the Quality Manual of the District and the home Major Subordinate Command (MSC).

(2) 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 US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) guidance, and the document explains the analyses and results in a reasonably clear manner for the decision makers. ATR is managed within USACE by a designated Review Management Organization (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.

For decision documents prepared under the model Programmatic Review Plan for Section 125, the leader of the ATR team shall be from outside the home district, but may be from within the home MSC.

(3) 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 is generally for decision documents and Type II is generally for implementation products.

(a) Type I IEPR. Type I IEPR reviews are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on project studies. Type I IEPR panels assess the adequacy and acceptability of the economic and environmental assumptions and projections, project evaluation data, economic analysis, environmental analyses, engineering analyses, formulation of alternative plans, methods for integrating risk and uncertainty, models used in the evaluation of environmental impacts of proposed projects, and biological opinions of the project study. Type I IEPR will cover the entire decision document or action and will address all underlying engineering, economics, and environmental work, not just one aspect of the study. For decision documents where a Type II IEPR (Safety Assurance Review) is anticipated during project implementation, safety assurance shall also be addressed during the Type I IEPR as specified in EC 1165-2-209.

For decision documents prepared under the model Section 125 Programmatic Review Plan, Type I IEPR is not required.

(b) 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 decision documents prepared under the model Section 125 Programmatic Review Plan, Type II IEPR is not required except where public safety issues are present.

(4) Policy and Legal Compliance Review. All decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. These reviews culminate in determinations that the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy, and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority by the home MSC Commander. DQC and ATR augment and complement the policy review processes by addressing compliance with pertinent published Army policies, particularly policies on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents.

(5) Cost Engineering CX Review and Certification. All decision documents shall be coordinated with the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX), located in the Walla Walla District.

For decision documents prepared under the Section 125 Programmatic Review Plan Model, regional cost engineering personnel that are pre-certified by the CX will conduct the cost estimate ATR. The DX will provide the Cost Engineering CX certification.

(6) Model Certification/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 decision documents. 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. The use of engineering models is also subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

For decision documents prepared under the model Section 125 Programmatic Review Plan, use of existing certified or approved planning models is encouraged. Where uncertified or unapproved models are used, approval of the model 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.

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 125 decision documents is the home MSC. The MSC will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the ATR. The home District will post the approved review plan on its public website. A copy of the approved review plan (and any updates) will be provided to the National Ecosystem Planning Center of Expertise (ECO-PCX) to keep the PCX apprised of requirements and review schedules.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

a. Decision Document. The DPR decision document for the Portage Park Lake Michigan Waterfront project is being prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F. The approval level of decision documents (if policy compliant) is the home MSC. An Integrated Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document.

Study/Project Description. The study area is part of the Lake Michigan coastline and is located in northwestern Indiana in Porter County. The proposed restoration project would be south of the Lake Michigan shoreline, north of I-94, west of State Route 249 and east of the Town of Ogden Dunes. The project boundary is found on the Portage and Ogden Dunes USGS 24 minute Quad Maps, T37, R7W Sec. 25, 26, 35, 36, which is mostly owned by the City of Portage (the local sponsor). The goal of this project is to restore 3 acres of dune and swale, 56 acres of wet savanna, and naturalize a man-made channel.

b. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review. This is a low-risk ecosystem restoration project that focuses on restoring native plant communities and wetlands. There is no threat to human health and life associated with this project.

- There are no foreseeable technical, institutional or social challenges.
- There is no reason to believe there will be any significant economic, environmental or social effects to the Nation
- The project/study will not be highly controversial for the reason stated above.

c. Work-In-Kind (WIK) Contributions. Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC and ATR, similar to any products developed by USACE. During Feasibility there are no WIK contributions.

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)

The product team is responsible for producing quality services and/or products. The technical element assembling the DPR is the Environmental Plan Formulation Section (PM-PL-E). Methodology, concurrence, technical adequacy and product quality (i.e., format, grammar, spelling, consistency, computations, etc.) are obtained through periodic internal reviews by the product team and technical supervisors. Within engineering and real estate, the Branch Chiefs responsible for product preparation will document this internal review through certification of product development checklists. The checklists, to be followed by the product team and certified by the technical supervisors, are not attached to this QCP. Each PDT member is responsible for following current checklist, and coordinating review of document and checklist with their technical supervisor for signature.

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

a. **Products to Undergo ATR.** ATR will be performed throughout the study in accordance with the District and MSC Quality Management Plans. The ATR shall be documented and discussed at the AFB milestone. Certification of the ATR will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. Products to undergo ATR include the DPR.

b. **Required ATR Team Expertise.** For this small, low risk Ecosystem Restoration Project, the ATR Lead will represent all disciplines except for Cost Engineering, H&H and Real Estate. The cost analysis will be reviewed by a certified cost ATR reviewer, and certified by NWW. Real Estate ATR will be conducted using the RE ATR process.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
Planning	The Planning team member should be a Regional Technical Expert (RTS) in Plan Formulation and NEPA.
Cost Engineering	The cost ATR Reviewer will be a certified cost ATR reviewer.
Hydraulics and Hydrology	The H&H reviewer will have 5-10 years of experience in hydraulic modeling applications to ecosystem restoration projects.
Real Estate	The Real Estate reviewer will be a qualified real estate specialist with 5 years of experience on ecosystem restoration and/or Great Lakes 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. 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 1110-2-12 or ER 1105-2-100, Appendix H, as appropriate. Unresolved concerns can be closed in DrChecks with a notation that the "concern has been elevated to the vertical team for resolution".

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

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

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

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

a. Decision on IEPR. Based on the information and analysis provided in paragraph 3(c) of this review plan, the project covered under this plan is excluded from IEPR because it does not meet the mandatory IEPR triggers and does not warrant IEPR based on a risk-informed analysis. If any of the criteria outlined in paragraph 1(b) are not met, the model National Programmatic Review Plan is not applicable and a study specific review plan must be prepared by the home district, coordinated with the National Ecosystem Planning Center of Expertise (ECO-PCX) and approved by the home Major Subordinate Command (MSC) in accordance with EC 1165-2-209.

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

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

d. Documentation of Type I IEPR. Not Applicable.

7. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

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

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Certification / Approval Status
Floristic Quality Index (FQA)	This assessment tool was designed to be used as an all inclusive method, not just as a way to identify high quality sites. The FQA was originally developed for the Chicago Region, but has since been developed for regions and states throughout North America. This method assesses the sensitivity of individual plant species that inhabit an area. Each native species is assigned a coefficient of conservatism ranging from "0 to 10". A "0" is assigned to species that are highly tolerant to disturbance and are considered general in their habitat distribution and a "10" is assigned to species with a very low tolerance to disturbance and displays a very specific relationship to a certain habitat type. This model is used in this study to assess the ecological value of the existing site (future-without-project) condition and any proposed management measures, based on the function of the plant community.	Under review for Regional Certification
Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI)	The QHEI was developed by the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency employed to assess the physical riverine habitat quality. The QHEI consists of eight sections with a maximum total of 100 points.	Under review for Regional Certification
Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI)	The Region 4 Illinois IBI employs fish assemblage as the indicator of biological form and function. This method makes use of a systematic process to set quantitative criteria that enables the measurement of riverine stream quality. This index employs ten parameters or "metrics" based on structural and functional components of the fish assemblage. Structural components include diversity, taxonomic guilds, and abundance.	Under review for Regional Certification
IWR Planning Suite	IWR Planning Suite assists with plan formulation by combining user-defined solutions to planning problems and calculating the effects of each combination, or "plan." The program can assist with plan comparison by conducting cost effectiveness and incremental cost analyses, identifying the plans which are best financial investments and displaying the effects of each on a range of decision variables.	Certified

b. Engineering Models.

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study
HEC-RAS 4.1	HEC-RAS, or River Analysis System, was developed by USACE's Hydrologic Engineering Center. The program is designed to perform one-dimensional hydraulic calculations for a full network of natural and constructed channels. This model will be used to compute water surface profiles for the without-project and proposed conditions.

8. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. ATR Schedule and Cost. An estimate of $10K has been budgeted for ATR. ATR was completed in January 2011.

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

c. Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost. For decision documents prepared under the model National Programmatic Review Plan, use of existing certified or approved planning models is encouraged. Where uncertified or unapproved model are used, approval of the model for use will be accomplished through the ATR process. The ATR team will apply the principles of EC 1105-2-412 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.

9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

10. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The home MSC Commander is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the Section 125 Programmatic Review Plan is appropriate for the specific project covered by the plan. Approval of the RP under the specific circumstances identified in this Programmatic Review Plan for Section 125 planning decision documents has been delegated to the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division Chief of Planning and Policy. 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 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 following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in the MSC determining that use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan for Section 125 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 MSC Commanders' approval memorandum, will be posted on the home district's webpage.

11. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

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

[redacted]
US Army Corps of Engineers
Chicago District
CELRD-PD-R
PHONE: [redacted]

[redacted]
US Army Corps of Engineers
Chicago District
CELRC-PLE
PHONE: [redacted]

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS

PDT Members

Discipline	Name	Phone	E-mail
Project Manager	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Lead/Restoration Ecologist	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Restoration Ecologist/Botanist	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Cultural & Arch. Resources	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Real Estate	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Real Estate	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
GIS Support	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Cost Engineer	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Civil Engineer	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Surveyor	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Hydraulic Engineer	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Environmental Engineer	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

ATR Team Members

Discipline	Name	Phone	E-mail
Formulation/Compliance	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Cost ATR	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
H&H	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Real Estate	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

MSC Team

Name	Discipline	Phone	E-mail
[redacted]	LRDOR	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	LRDOR	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	LRDOR	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Attorney	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	LRDOR	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	LRDOR	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	CELRD	[redacted]	[redacted]

ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECSION DOCUMENTS

COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the Detailed Project Report (DPR) for Portage Park Lake Michigan Waterfront Section 125 Project, located in Portage, IN. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project's Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-209. During the ATR, compliance with established policy principles and procedures, utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses, alternatives evaluated, the appropriateness of data used and level obtained, and reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing US Army Corps of Engineers policy. The ATR also assessed the District Quality Control (DQC) documentation and made the determination that the DQC activities employed appear to be appropriate and effective. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved and the comments have been closed in DrChecks[sm].

SIGNATURE _____ _____ Date

[redacted]
ATR Team Leader
CELRB-PM-PA

SIGNATURE _____ _____ Date

[redacted]
Project Manager
CELRC-PM-PM

SIGNATURE _____ _____ Date

[redacted]
Review Management Office Representative
CELRD-PD-R

CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows: There are no significant concerns.

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

SIGNATURE _____ _____ Date

[redacted]
Chief, Design Branch
CELRC-TS-D

SIGNATURE _____ _____ Date

[redacted]
Chief, Planning Branch
CELRC-PM-PL

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

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