

**DECISION DOCUMENT & IMPLEMENTATION PHASE  
REVIEW PLAN  
for  
Water Control Manuals**

Dewey Lake, Floyd County Kentucky  
Huntington District

MSC Approval Date: 04 April 2013

Last Revision Date: 01 May 2013



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers** ®

**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. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL..... 7**

**9. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS ..... 8**

**10. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ..... 8**

**11. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES ..... 9**

**12. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT ..... 9**

**ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS..... 10**

**ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS..... 11**

**ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS..... 12**

**ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS ..... 13**

## 1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

- a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Dewey Lake in Floyd County Kentucky, project decision document.

Reservoirs, locks and dams, re-regulation and major control structures and inter-related water resources systems are required to have an up-to-date Water Control Manual (WCM) as required by Engineering Regulation 1110-2-240. The water control plans contained in the manuals must be prepared giving appropriate consideration to all applicable Congressional Acts relating to operation of Federal facilities, i.e., Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, National Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Water Act, etc. Water Control Manuals should comply with ER 1165-2-214, Water Resource Policy and Authorities, Civil Works Review. Guidance on the content and format of Water Control Manuals is contained in ER 1110-2-8156 with additional guidance in EM 1110-2-3600. The level of review is predicated upon the criteria as detailed in this Review Plan.

Additional Information on water control plan development can be found in Engineering Regulation 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook and in ER 1165-2-119, Modifications to Completed Projects.

- b. Applicability. This review plan is for Water Control Manual decision documents prepared in accordance with ER 1165-2-214 Civil Works Review. A Water Control Manual may require a Type I IEPR if any of the following specific criteria are met:

- The project involves a significant threat to human life/safety assurance;
- There is a request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts;
- The project requires an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS),
- The project/study is likely to involve significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project;
- The project/study is likely to involve significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project;
- The information in the decision document or anticipated project design is 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;
- The project design is anticipated to require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule; and
- There are other circumstances where the Chief of Engineers or Director of Civil Works determines Type I IEPR is warranted.

If any of the above criteria are met, a study/project specific review plan must be prepared by the home district, coordinated with the appropriate Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) and approved by the home Major Subordinate Command (MSC) in accordance with EC 1165-2-214.

**c. References**

- (1) EC 1165-2-214, Water Resources Policy and Authorities, Civil Works Review, December 2012. Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, Jan 19, 2011
- (2) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 Mar 2010
- (3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
- (4) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007
- (5) ER 1110-2-240, Water Control Management
- (6) ER 1110-2-8156, Preparation of Water Control Manuals
- (7) Memorandum, CELRD-DE, Subject: CWMS Implementation and Water Control Manual Revisions

- d. Requirements.** This Review Plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-214, Water Resources Policy and Authorities, Civil Works Review 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 must ensure that planning models and analysis are compliant with Corps policy, theoretically sound, computationally accurate, transparent, described to address any limitations of the model or its use, and documented in study reports (per EC 1105-2-412).

**2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION**

The RMO is responsible for managing the overall peer review effort described in this review plan. The RMO for Water Control Manual is the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division (LRD). LRD will coordinate and approve the Review Plan and manage the ATR. The Huntington District will post the approved Review Plan on its public website.

**3. STUDY INFORMATION**

- a. Decision Document.** The update to the WCM for Dewey Lake in Floyd Co. Ky will be prepared in accordance with ER 1110-2-240, Water Control Management and ER 1110-2-8156, Preparation of Water Control Manuals. The approval level of the decision document (if policy compliant) is LRD. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document if changes to the water control plan are made.
- b. Study/Project Description.** Dewey Lake is a tributary storage project located 5.4 miles upstream of the mouth of Johns Creek in the Big Sandy Basin. Its original congressionally authorized purposes are flood control and low flow augmentation. Through subsequent legislation, its authorized purposes also include water quality, recreation, fish/wildlife and forest conservation. The main purpose of this and all Water Control Manual is for day-to-day use in water control for essentially all foreseeable conditions affecting a project or system. The current WCM was prepared by the Huntington District USACE and is dated August 1994. The update of the Dewey Lake WCM is expected to include an update to the style and format of the document to meet current standards

and regulations, updates to various charts and plots with observed data, and updates to the contact information. In addition, as part of the Dam Safety Program, a parapet wall was added to the top of the day in 2004, the original spillway was modified in 2001, and an auxiliary spillway was constructed 2002. These physical changes will be added to the description of the project.

- c. **Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review.** The Water Control Manual update is not expected to be challenging and is not anticipated to result in any significant changes to the existing water control plan as the physical changes to the project allow the water control plan to be implemented safely. There are no project risks associated with this update. Only the format and charts/plots are expected to require an update. The update to the manuals does not involve a significant threat to human life/safety as no significant changes to the Dewey Lake water control plan are anticipated. There is no request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts. The project/study is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project because no changes in water control plan are anticipated that could potentially affect the public interests. The Water Control Manual update is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project since no significant changes are anticipated and the cost of the update is relatively low. The information in the updated Water Control Manual will not 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. The update does not involve any design, thus it is not anticipated to require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule.

#### **4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (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 Huntington District shall manage the DQC. Documentation of DQC activities is required and should be in accordance with the Quality Manual of the Huntington District and the LRD MSC.

The DQC will be conducted by in-house staff and reviewers who will not be directly involved in the WCM update. DrChecks review software will be used to document all DQC comments, responses, and associated resolutions accomplished throughout the review process. DrChecks report documenting the comments and resolutions will be provided to the ATR team along with the DQC certification.

#### **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 LRD.

- 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 conducted according to protocol set forth in the review plan. Certification of the ATR will be provided prior to the District Commander approving the final Water Control Manual. The product to undergo ATR is the Dewey Lake Water Control Manual.
- b. **Required ATR Team Expertise.** An estimated two to three ATR team members would be required for the review of the Dewey Lake WCM representing the expertise in the disciplines listed in the table below. The ATR Lead role preferably would be assigned to the water management ATR team member. The ATR Team Leader will use the “ATR Lead Checklist” and “ATR Charge Template” developed by the National Planning Centers of Expertise as resources when conducting the review.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional preferably with experience in preparing Water Control Manuals 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, hydraulics/hydrology, economics, environmental resources, etc). The ATR Lead MUST be from outside LRD.
Environmental Resources	This reviewer should be a senior scientist who is familiar with the competing demands on a multi-purpose reservoir. Although water quality control may not be an authorized project purpose, compliance with Public Law 92-500 requires that all Federal facilities be managed, operated, and maintained to protect and enhance the quality of water and land resources through conformance with applicable Federal, State, Interstate and local standards. Consequently the reviewer must understand water quality control aspects (environmental impacts) of project regulation.
Water Management	The water management reviewer will be an expert in the field of water management, with a particular emphasis in reservoir operations. This includes a thorough understanding of hydrology and hydraulics as it pertains to reservoir systems.

- 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)**

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. For example, the development of a controversial Master Manual for which numerous alternatives are considered may fall in this category. A risk-informed decision, as described in

EC 1165-2-214, is made as to whether IEPR is appropriate. IEPR panels will consist of independent, recognized experts from outside of the USACE in the appropriate disciplines, representing a balance of areas of expertise suitable for the review being conducted. There are two types of IEPR:

- **Type I IEPR.** Type I IEPR reviews are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on project studies. Type I IEPR panels assess the adequacy and acceptability of the economic and environmental assumptions and projections, project evaluation data, economic analysis, environmental analyses, engineering analyses, formulation of alternative plans, methods for integrating risk and uncertainty, models used in the evaluation of environmental impacts of proposed projects, and biological opinions of the project study. Type I IEPR will cover the entire decision document or action and will address all underlying engineering, economics, and environmental work, not just one aspect of the study. For 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 per EC EC 1165-2-214.

For water control plans prepared under the Review Plan, Type 1 IEPR will typically not be required.

- **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.

Type II IEPR is not usually anticipated for water control plans unless they are integral to 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.

- a. Decision on IEPR.** Based on the information and analysis provided in the preceding paragraphs of this review plan, the project covered under this plan appears to be consistent with the conditions and policy that would grant an exclusion to the requirement for a Type I IEPR because it does not meet the mandatory IEPR triggers and does not warrant IEPR based on a risk-informed analysis. An exclusion request form a Type I IEPR is currently being sought from Headquarters.
- b. Products to Undergo Type I IEPR.** Expected not to be applicable.
- c. Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise.** Expected not to be applicable.
- d. Documentation of Type I IEPR.** Expected not to be applicable.

## **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 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.

## 8. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

MSC Commanders are 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 or water management models is highly recommended and should be used whenever appropriate. Planning and water management 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 and ATR.

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 and ATR.

- 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 Water Control Manual:

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Approval Status
HEC-RAS (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. It is expected that this model will be used to redevelop the gate and spillway rating curves at the project.	HH&C CoP Preferred Model
HEC-HMS (Hydrologic Modeling System)	HMS will be used to develop inflows of theoretical and historic storms.	HH&C CoP Preferred Model
HEC-ResSim (Reservoir Systems Simulation)	ResSim will be used to reconstitute pre-project floods to get annual maximums, optimize reservoir regulations of previous and hypothetical floods, and determine the impact of operational alternatives on both the POR and hypothetical scenarios.	HH&C CoP Preferred Model
HEC-SSP (Statistical Software Package)	This software allows you to perform statistical analyses of hydrologic data. The current version of HEC-SSP can perform	HH&C CoP Preferred

	flood flow frequency analysis based on Bulletin 17B, "Guidelines for Determining Flood Flow Frequency" (1982), a generalized frequency analysis on not only flow data but other hydrologic data as well, a volume frequency analysis on high and low flows, a duration analysis, a coincident frequency analysis, and a curve combination analysis. This model may be used to update the frequency of fill curve.	Model
HEC-DSSVUE (Data Storage System)	This software allows data to be graphed, tabulated, edited and manipulated. This model may be used to update the frequency of fill curve and develop digital plots of historical events at the project.	HH&C CoP (Allowed for use) Model

## 9. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

- a. **ATR Schedule and Cost.** LRH shall provide labor funding by cross charge labor codes. The Project Manager will work with the ATR Lead to ensure that adequate funding is available and is commensurate with the level of review needed. Any funding shortages will be negotiated on a case by case basis and in advance of a negative charge occurring. The ATR Lead shall provide organization codes for each team member and a responsible financial point of contact (CEFMS responsible employee) for creation of labor codes. Reviewers shall monitor individual labor code balances and alert the ATR leader to any possible funding shortages. The ATR is estimated to cost \$10,000. Once actual costs are determined, this RP will be revised. Until then, ATR and assistance is estimated at \$10,000 for the update of the Water Control Manual. An estimated schedule is presented below pending approval of the Review Plan and availability of reviewers.

Task	Starting Date	Ending Date
ATR of Dewey Lake Dam Water Control Manual	01 July 2013	31 July 2013
PDT Evaluates ATR comments	01 August 2013	31 August 2013
ATR Back Check	01 September 2013	14 September 2013

- e. **Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost.** Expected not to be applicable.
- b. **Model Review Schedule and Cost.** For decision documents prepared under this 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 should 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.

**10. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

State and Federal resource agencies may be invited to participate in the study covered by this Review Plan as partner agencies or as technical members of the PDT, as appropriate. 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. No public meetings are expected as the water control plan will not change.

**11. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES**

The home MSC Commander is responsible for approving this Review Plan and ensuring that use of the 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 Huntington District is responsible for keeping the Review Plan up to date. Minor changes to the Review Plan since the last LRD 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 LRD Commander following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in the MSC Commander determining that use of the Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific Review Plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-214 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1. The latest version of the review plan, along with the Commanders' approval memorandum, will be posted on the home district's webpage.

**12. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT**

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

- 
- 

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS. Include contact information for the DQC, PDT, ATR team, and MSC. The credential and years of experience for the ATR team should be included when it is available.

Product Delivery Team Roster		
Team Member	Expertise	Telephone
	Water Quality, Project Manager	[REDACTED]
	Water Management	[REDACTED]
	Hydraulics	[REDACTED]
	Hydraulics	[REDACTED]
	Planning, Techn Writ	[REDACTED]
	Planning	[REDACTED]
	Water Quality	[REDACTED]
	Natural Resources	[REDACTED]
	Project Ops	[REDACTED]
	Realty Specialist	[REDACTED]
	Office of Counsel	[REDACTED]

ol Team Roster

Expertise	Telephone
Natural Resources	[REDACTED]
Water Management	[REDACTED]
Hydraulics	[REDACTED]
Water Quality	[REDACTED]
Planning	[REDACTED]
Realty Specialist	[REDACTED]

Expertise	Telephone
Water Management	[REDACTED]
Environmental	[REDACTED]

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 1165-2-214. During the ATR, compliance with established policy principles and procedures, utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses, alternatives evaluated, the appropriateness of data used and level obtained, and reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets the customer’s needs consistent with law and existing US Army Corps of Engineers policy. The ATR also assessed the District Quality Control (DQC) documentation and made the determination that the DQC activities employed appear to be appropriate and effective. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved and the comments have been closed in DrChecks<sup>sm</sup>.

SIGNATURE

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name  
ATR Team Leader  
Office Symbol/Company

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SIGNATURE

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name  
Project Manager (home district)  
Office Symbol

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SIGNATURE

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name  
Architect Engineer Project Manager<sup>1</sup>  
Company, location

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SIGNATURE

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name  
Review Management Office Representative  
Office Symbol

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows: Describe the major technical concerns and their resolution.

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

SIGNATURE

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name  
Chief, Engineering Division (home district)  
Office Symbol

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SIGNATURE

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name  
Chief, Planning Division (home district)  
Office Symbol

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

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

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Term	Definition	Term	Definition
AFB	Alternative Formulation Briefing	NED	National Economic Development
ASA(CW)	Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works	NER	National Ecosystem Restoration
ATR	Agency Technical Review	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
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