Continuing Authorities Program
Section 14, Flood Control Act of 1946, as amended
Emergency Streambank and Shoreline Protection Projects

DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN

Consistent with the National Programmatic Review Plan Model

Kanawha River 35th Street Bridge to Greenbrier Street, Charleston, West Virginia

Huntington District

MSC Approval Date: 12 September 2011
Last Revision Date: 27 July 2011

US Army Corps of Engineers ®

DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN
Consistent with the National Programmatic Review Plan Model

Section 14, Flood Control Act of 1946, as amended
Emergency Streambank and Shoreline Protection Decision Documents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS 1
2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION 4
3. STUDY INFORMATION 4
4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC) 6
5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) 6
6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR) 8
7. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL 8
8. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS 8
9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION 9
10. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES 9
11. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT 9
ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS 10
ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECSION DOCUMENTS 12
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 Kanawha River 35th Street Bridge to Greenbrier Street, Charleston West Virginia Emergency Streambank Protection project decision document developed under **Section 14**, Flood Control Act of 1946, as amended.

Section 14 of the Flood Control Act 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 flood related erosion. Section 14, an authority within the Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) 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 CAP program is a delegated authority to plan, design, and construct certain types of water resource and environmental restoration projects without specific Congressional authorization. The Federal share of costs for any one **Section 14** project may not exceed $1,500,000.

Applicability. This review plan is based on the model National Programmatic Review Plan for **Section 14** 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. However, if the subject project meets any of the triggers for a Type I IEPR as described in the aforementioned Civil Works Review Policy guidance, or if the subject project has significant life safety issues, it will be subject to Type I and/or Type II IEPR respectively, and the model National Programmatic Review Plan is not applicable. In either case a study specific review plan must be prepared by the home district, coordinated with the Flood Risk Management Planning Center of Expertise (FRM-PCX) and approved by the home Major Subordinate Command (MSC) in accordance with EC 1165-2-209. Triggers for Type I IEPR will be discussed below.

Ultimately, 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 FRM-PCX or Headquarters, USACE. The initial decision as to the applicability of the model plan should be made no later than the Federal Interest Determination milestone (as defined in Appendix F of ER 1105-2-100, F-10.e.1) during the feasibility phase of the project. 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. This review plan will be revised for the design and implementation phase and coordinated with the Review Management Organization (RMO)prior to approval of the final decision document in accordance with EC 1165-2-209. Reapproval of the Review Plan by the MSC will not be required.

b. 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, 30 Dec 2009
(3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006

(4) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007
(5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007
(6) Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, Continuing Authority Program Planning Process Improvements

c. Requirements. This programmatic review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, which establishes an accountable, comprehensive, life-cycle review strategy for Civil Works products by providing a seamless process for review of all Civil Works projects from initial planning through design, construction, and operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and rehabilitation (OMRR&R). The EC outlines four general levels of review: District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), and Policy and Legal Compliance Review. In addition to these levels of review, decision documents are subject to cost engineering review and certification (per EC 1165-2-209) and planning model certification/approval (per EC 1105-2-412).

(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 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 home District 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 National Programmatic Review Plan, 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. 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. The Director of Civil Works Policy Memorandum #1, "Continuing Authority Program Planning Process Improvements," dated 19 January 2011, states that CAP projects, with the exception of Section 205 and Section 103, are exempt from Type I IEPR, except where they meet the mandatory triggers described in EC 1165-2-209. A project does not require IEPR if ALL of the following specific criteria are met:

- The project does not involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance;
- The total project cost is less than $45 million;
- There is no request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts;
- The project does not require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS),
- The project 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.

(b) Type II IEPR. Type II IEPR, or Safety Assurance Reviews (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.

The 19 January 2011 Director of Civil Works Policy Memorandum #1 states that Type II IEPR is still required for those CAP projects where life safety risk is significant. For **Section 14** projects developed under the model National Programmatic Review Plan, Type II IEPR is not required.

(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 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 model National Programmatic Review Plan, Regional cost personnel that are pre-certified by the DX will conduct the cost estimate ATR. The DX will provide the Cost Engineering DX 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 and ATR. 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. The use of engineering models is also subject to DQC and ATR.

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.

2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION

The RMO is responsible for managing the overall peer review effort described in this review plan. The RMO for **Section 14** decision documents is the home MSC. The MSC will coordinate and approve the review plan. 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 Flood Risk Management Planning Center of Expertise (FRM-PCX) to keep the PCX apprised of requirements and review schedules.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

a. Decision Document. The Kanawha River 35th Street Bridge to Greenbrier Street, Charleston, West Virginia decision document will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F. The approval level of decision documents (if policy compliant) is the home MSC. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document.

b. Study/Project Description. Flood flow erosion and recession related piping of fill and alluvial soil failures have resulted in extensive stone and fill displacement and bank retreat along the Kanawha River. Within this critical reach of US Route 60 the bank erosion, and resulting stone and fill

displacement, has resulted in failure features and failed soil erosion creating a steepened bank. These conditions are endangering the entire reach of the Kanawha River between the 35th Street Bridge and Greenbrier Street. Subsequent rapid bank retreat has caused bank failure. Additional related failure could result in increasing bank retreat causing possible failure of US Route 60.

The project area is located on the right descending bank of the Kanawha River (Between river mile 60 and 61), extending from the 35th Street Bridge to Greenbrier Street. The area includes two recreational pathways, a middle bank pathway approximately 30 feet above the river and an upper bank pathway immediately adjacent to US Route 60 at the top of the bank, and US Route 60.

A 5,400 foot reach on the Kanawha River's right descending bank would require stabilization to protect US Route 60. An incidental benefit will be stabilization of the existing recreational pathways. A graded filter and graded stone slope protection would be constructed within the lower bank. Upper bank stabilization would require the limited excavation of fill and placement of geotextile encapsulated stabilizing trench structures. Up and down river transitions would be required. Preliminary cost estimates to construct the project are estimated to be approximately $2,025,000.

The primary objective is to design an effective treatment to protect the bank of the Kanawha River at the area of flood flow erosion and recession related piping and fill failure which is endangering US Route 60. Alternative plans to be considered in the study are:

- Toe of Slope Stone Blanket with Upper Bank Trench Drains
- Gabions/Mat/Block
- Top of Bank Stone Blanket
- Vegetative cover
- Relocation of Highway and Utilities
- No Action

Preliminary evaluation of alternatives indicates that placement of a stone blanket and granular bedding/filter on the lower bank slope and construction of trench drains on the upper bank slope will be the least costly alternative for stabilizing the right descending bank of the Kanawha River and protecting existing pathways and US Route 60 in Charleston, West Virginia. The total project cost is estimated to be $2,025,000.

c. **Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review.** The study being conducted will recommend the best solution for stabilizing the bank of the Kanawha River at the affected area. Challenges associated with the study will include determining the optimal method for construction of the recommended alternative. Challenges will also include coordination associated with impacts to the East End Historic District, in which the project is located. Environmental impacts are expected to be minor and a Finding of No Significant Impacts is anticipated. The bank stabilization project will focus on addressing bank erosion in order to maintain the structural integrity of US Route 60 at the top of the bank. Project implementation is not expected to be highly controversial as failure to protect US Route 60 will result in endangerment to this critically essential transportation route.

d. In-Kind Contributions. Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC and ATR, similar to any products developed by USACE. In-kind products by the non-Federal sponsor are not anticipated for this project.

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)

DQC is the review of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the Kanawha River 35th Street Bridge to Greenbrier Street Project Management Plan (PMP). This will be managed by the District and conducted by in-house staff and reviewers who will not be directly involved in the study. Basic quality control tools include a Quality Management Plan (QMP) providing for seamless review, quality checks and reviews, supervisory reviews, Project Delivery Team (PDT) reviews, etc. The quality of the project will be managed using both a Design Quality Management Plan and a Construction Quality Management Plan. Additionally, the PDT is responsible for a complete review to assure the overall integrity of the report, appendices, and the recommendations, as well as signing the District Quality Control Certification sheet before the District Commander signs the report.

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. Certification of the ATR will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. Products to undergo ATR include

- Planning Design Analysis and Environmental Assessment
- Cost Estimate

b. Required ATR Team Expertise.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional 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 or engineering). The Planning or Engineering ATR team member may also serve as ATR Lead
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner who possesses experiences with Section 106 and the NEPA process and whom also has extensive experience with formulation of CAP projects (preferably Section 14 projects).
Engineering	The engineer should be a senior level engineer with extensive experience in the design of stream bank stabilization projects.
Cost Engineering	The cost engineer should be a representative or designate of the Cost Engineering Center of Expertise.

c. Documentation of ATR. DrChecks review software will be used to document all ATR comments, responses and associated resolutions accomplished throughout the review process. Comments

should be limited to those that are required to ensure adequacy of the product. The four key parts of a quality review comment will normally include:

(1) The review concern – identify the product's information deficiency or incorrect application of policy, guidance, or procedures;
(2) The basis for the concern – cite the appropriate law, policy, guidance, or procedure that has not been properly followed;
(3) The significance of the concern – indicate the importance of the concern with regard to its potential impact on the plan selection, recommended plan components, efficiency (cost), effectiveness (function/outputs), implementation responsibilities, safety, Federal interest, or public acceptability; and
(4) The probable specific action needed to resolve the concern – identify the action(s) that the reporting officers must take to resolve the concern.

In some situations, especially addressing incomplete or unclear information, comments may seek clarification in order to then assess whether further specific concerns may exist.

The ATR documentation in DrChecks will include the text of each ATR concern, the PDT response, a brief summary of the pertinent points in any discussion, including any vertical team coordination (the vertical team includes the district, RMO, MSC, and HQUSACE), and the agreed upon resolution. If an ATR concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the ATR team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the vertical team for further resolution in accordance with the policy issue resolution process described in either ER 1110-2-12 or ER 1105-2-100, Appendix H, as appropriate. Unresolved concerns can be closed in DrChecks with a notation that the concern has been elevated to the vertical team for resolution.

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

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

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

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

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.c.(3)(a) 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 Flood Risk Management Planning Center of Expertise (FRM-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. No planning models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document.

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

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study
HEC-RAS 2.0 (River Analysis System)	The Hydrologic Engineering Center's River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) program provides the capability to perform one-dimensional steady and unsteady flow river hydraulics calculations. The program will be used for steady flow analysis to evaluate the 100 year flood flow velocities to determine the necessary stone size needed for treatment design.

8. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. ATR Schedule and Cost.

Products to Undergo ATR	Review Start Date	Estimated Cost
Planning Design Analysis/EA	October 25, 2011	$5,280
Cost Estimate	October 25, 2011	$2,640

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. The Huntington District will make the Draft Section 14 Kanawha River 35th Street Bridge to Greenbrier Street Planning Design Analysis Report and EA available to the public for a period of 30 days. A notice of availability will be published in local newspapers informing the public of the documents availability and on a public website.

10. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The home MSC Commander is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan is appropriate for the specific project covered by the plan. The review plan is a living document and may change as the study progresses. The home district is responsible for keeping the review plan up to date. Minor changes to the review plan since the last MSC Commander approval are documented in Attachment 3. Significant changes to the review plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) should be re-approved by the MSC Commander following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in the MSC Commander determining that use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-209. The latest version of the review plan, along with the Commanders' approval memorandum, will be posted on the home district's webpage.

11. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

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

- Susan Stafford, Planning (LRH), (304) 399-5729
- Hank Jarboe, Lead Planner (LRD), (513) 684-6050

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS

Product Delivery Team Roster		
Team Member	**Expertise**	**Email**
Susan Stafford	Planning/Archeologist	Susan.B.Stafford@usace.army.mil
David Frantz	Project Manager	David.A.Frantz@usace.army.mil
Kim Perry	Office of Counsel	Kimberly.P.Perry@usace.army.mil
Natalie McKinley	Economist	Natalie.J.McKinley@usace.army.mil
Alexander Neal (Lead Engineer)	Civil/Geotechnical Engineer	Alexander.B.Neal@usace.army.mil
Derek Maxey	Cost Engineer	Derek.S.Maxey@usace.army.mil
Shane Hall	Construction	Shane.D.Hall@usace.army.mil
Elizabeth Cooper	Real Estate	Elizabeth.Cooper@usace.army.mil
Janet Wolfe	HTRW	Janet.K.Wolfe@usace.army.mil
Florence Watts	Accountant	Florence.M.Watts@usace.army.mil
Charles Minsker	Public Affairs	Charles.R.Minsker@usace.army.mil
John Bock	Programs and Project Management	John.R.Bock@usace.army.mil

ATR Team Roster				
Team Member	**Org.**	**Discipline**	**Email**	**Credentials**
Kim Franklin	LRN	Lead ATR (Environmental)	Kimberly.S.Franklin @usace.army.mil	Kim Franklin is currently a Biologist/LRD Regional Technical Specialist for Environmental Analysis and Compliance and has worked with the Corps for approximately 20 years in Planning, Regulatory, and Natural Resources. As a reviewer and/or project delivery team member, Kim has participated in all phases of project planning, design, construction, and O&M and worked on projects with varying authorities, including Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, Flood Damage Reduction, Emergency Streambank Stabilization, and Interagency/International Services. Her areas of expertise include technical writing and review and environmental laws and regulations, specifically National Environmental Policy Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and Rivers & Harbors Act.
Bob Bowles	LRN	Cost Engineer	Robert.J.Bowles@ usace.army.mil	Bob has 32 years of cost estimating experience, and has carried four Section 14 projects through to successful bid openings. He was also the cost engineer on a bank stabilization IDIQ contract
Emily Carr	LRN	Engineer	Emily.G.Carr@usac e.army.mil	Emily has 28 years of experience in geotechnical and soils engineering, including bank stabilization projects. She has been chief of the Soils, Design, and Dam Safety section for four years.
Ramune Morales	LRN	Planner	Ramune.Morales @usace.army.mil	Ramune has over two years of experience in Planning. She has been the planner and PM on at least 3 three Section 14 projects.

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 *<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. 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 _____ _____

Name Date
ATR Team Leader
Office Symbol/Company

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Project Manager
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Architect Engineer Project Manager[1]
Company, location

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Review Management Office Representative
Office Symbol

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 Date
Chief, Engineering Division
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Chief, Planning Division
Office Symbol

[1] Only needed if some portion of the ATR was contracted

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

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