

## APPENDIX I

POST-AUTHORIZATION DECISION DOCUMENT CHECKLIST  
FOR  
DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORTS  
AND  
SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM MAJOR REHABILITATION  
REPORTS

**I-1. Basic Information:**

I-1.1. Name of Authorized Project: Dover Dam, DSA, OH

I-1.2. Name of Separable Element: Not applicable

I-1.3. PWI Number: 054010

I-1.4. Authorizing Document: Dover DSA Program Evaluation Report

I-1.5. Law/Section/Date of Project Authorization: The US Army, Corps of Engineers (“USACE”) constructed the original system of 14 reservoir projects in the Muskingum River Basin, among which Dover Dam is included, in cooperation with the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District (“MWCD”). MWCD filed its original request to partner with the federal government through an application to the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works in August 1933. The Administration allocated funds to USACE to construct the projects. MWCD and USACE subsequently entered into an agreement to partner in implementing the projects (“the 1934 Agreement”). USACE completed construction of the 14 projects in 1938.

(Note: attach copy to checklist)

I-1.6. Laws/Sections/Dates of previous Post-Authorization Modification: None.

I-1.7. Non-Federal Sponsor(s): The Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District (MWCD).

I-1.8. Project/Separable Element Purpose(s): Flood Control.

I-1.9. Congressional Interests (Senator(s), Representative(s) and District(s)): Senator Sherrod Brown, Senator George Voinovich and Congressman Zack Space (18<sup>th</sup> District)

**I-2. Project Documents:**

I-2.1. Type of Decision Document: Dam Safety Assurance Program Evaluation Report.

I-2.2. Approval Authority of Decision Document: The Great Lakes and Ohio River Division (LRD).

I-2.3. Project Management Plan Approval Date: 16 February 2007

I-2.4. Independent Technical Review (ITR) Approval Date: 10 January 2007

I-2.5. Is Mitigation Required:  Yes  No Cost of Mitigation

There is no compensatory mitigation required for this project. Significant impacts to all ecological resources were successfully avoided in the design of the recommended alternative. A mussel survey will be included in the DDR phase as well as additional wetland delineation. The cost of this effort is estimated to be \$45,000.

Describe Type of Mitigation and Whether Included in Project Report:

(Note: Project report is the one that supports the authorization for the mitigation. Need to make sure that mitigation is authorized as part of the project cost)

I-2.6. Current M-CACES Estimate: \$ 109.1 M, prepared January 2007 Date Prepared and Price Level: 2007

I-2.7. 120% Cost Limit: \$ 130.9 M Fully Funded as of 1 Oct FY 07

I-2.8. Date of Latest Economic Analysis: January 2007

**I-3. Cost Sharing Summary:**

Purpose (s)	Non- Fed Cash	Non-Fed LERRD	Non-Fed Const. Credit	Total Non-Fed Share	Federal Share (%) Cost	Total Project Cost
<u>Flood Control</u>	<u>3,762,584</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3,762,584</u>	<u>96.55%</u>	<u>109,060,412</u>
<u>Totals</u>	<u>3,762,584</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3,762,584</u>		<u>109,060,412</u>

I-3.1. Projected Credit for Section 215 Work and Date 215 Agreement Signed: Not applicable

I-3.2. Projected Credit for Section 104 or Other Authorized Creditable Work and Date Work .

Approved by ASA(CW) or Agreement Addressing Work Signed: Not applicable

I-3.3. Annual Non-Fed OMRR&R Costs (1 Oct FY 07 Price Levels 0):

**I-5. Certification For Delegated Decision Documents:** You must answer "Yes" to all of the following questions to approve the decision document under delegated authority.

I-5.1. Project Plan

Has the project study issue checklist been completed and all issues resolved?  Yes  No

(Note: Is the project the same as contained in the project report supporting authorization; if not, is it within the 902 limit, who has the authority to allow the change by regulation...district, division, Chief, Congress)

Does the non-Federal sponsor concur in the project plan as submitted?  Yes \_\_\_ No

I-5.2. Authority.

Has authority been delegated to the MSC for approval of the project report?  Yes \_\_\_ No

Is authority adequate to complete the project as proposed?  Yes \_\_\_ No

\*Remarks: [Explain what additional authority is needed.]

I-5.3. Policy/Legal/Technical Compliance.

Has the District Counsel reviewed and approved the decision document for legal sufficiency?  Yes (Certification included in decision document package submittal) \_\_\_ No

Have all aspects of ITR been completed with no unresolved issues remaining?  Yes \_\_\_ No

Has the District Dam Safety Officer documented policy/legal/technical compliance of the decision document?  Yes \_\_\_ No

Has the MSC Dam Safety Officer certified the policy/legal/technical compliance of the decision document?  Yes \_\_\_ No

I-6. Authentication:

*Rodney J. Lawrence* Date: 4 MAY 2007  
Project Manager

*Clyde K. Juby for Michael Worley* Date: 7 May 2007  
Chief, Planning Div

*Thomas R. Bradley for H.D. Tarrusso* Date: 7 May 2007  
District Counsel

*John Saeg* Date: 7 MAY 07  
District Dam Safety Officer

*Scott H. Walsh* Date: 4 May 2007  
District Support Team Leader

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
MSC Counsel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
MSC Dam Safety Officer