



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIVISION, GREAT LAKES AND OHIO RIVER
CORPS OF ENGINEERS
550 MAIN STREET
CINCINNATI, OH 45202-3222

CELRD-PD-GL

22 March 2016

MEMORANDUM for Huntington District Commander, (CELRH-PM-PD-R/Jami Buchanan),
502 Eight Street, Huntington, WV 25701-2070

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval, Section 729, Muskingum River Basin Final Watershed
Assessment

1. Reference CELRH-DE Memorandum dated 15 December 2015, Section 729 Muskingum River Basin Final Watershed Assessment Review Plan, copy enclosed.
2. The subject Review Plan has been prepared in accordance with EC 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review and dated 15 December 2012. The Review Plan was reviewed for policy compliance and MSC comments and the district's resolution are posted in DrChecks. All comments have been satisfactorily resolved and are closed.
3. I approve the enclosed Review Plan. Subsequent revisions to this Review Plan or its execution will require new written approval from this office and is subject to change as circumstances require, consistent with the Project Management Business Process.
4. The District is requested to post the Review Plan to its website. Prior to posting, the names of all individuals identified in the Review Plan should be removed.
5. The point of contact for the MSC's approval is Gary Mosteller, P.E.; he can be reached at 513-684-3159.

Encl

RICHARD G. KAISER
Brigadier General, USA
Commanding

REVIEW PLAN

**Muskingum River Basin
Final Watershed Assessment
State of Ohio
Section 729 Watershed Analysis
Huntington District**

**MSC Approval Date: 22 March 2016
Last Revision Date: none**



**US Army Corps
of Engineers ®**

REVIEW PLAN

**Muskingum River Basin
Final Watershed Assessment
State of Ohio
Section 729 Watershed Analysis**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS..... 1

2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION 1

3. STUDY INFORMATION..... 2

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)..... 4

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) 4

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)..... 6

7. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW 7

**8. COST ENGINEERING AND ATR MANDATORY CENTER OF EXPERTISE (MCX) REVIEW AND
CERTIFICATION 8**

9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL..... 8

10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS..... 8

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION 9

12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES..... 9

13. 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 Error! Bookmark not defined.

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Section 729 Muskingum River Basin Final Watershed Assessment (FWA). It should be noted the FWA will not be a USACE decision document. The FWA may recommend areas and issues for further study but is not intended to recommend, or serve as the basis for authorizing construction of a site specific project.

b. References.

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review, 15 Dec 12
- (2) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 Mar 11
- (3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 06
- (4) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 07
- (5) Section 729 Muskingum River Basin Watershed Assessment Management Plan (WAMP), August 2015
- (6) Section 729 Muskingum River Basin Initial Watershed Assessment, April 2012

c. Requirements. This Review Plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-214, 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 1165-2-214) and planning model certification/approval (per EC 1105-2-412).

2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION

a. The RMO is responsible for managing the overall peer review effort described in this Review Plan. The RMO for decision documents is typically either a Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) or the Risk Management Center (RMC), depending on the primary purpose of the decision document. The RMO for the peer review effort described in this Review Plan is the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division (LRD).

b. The RMO typically coordinates with the Civil Works Cost Engineering and Agency Technical Review Mandatory Center of Expertise (MCX) to ensure the appropriate expertise is included on the review teams to assess the adequacy of cost estimates, construction schedules and contingencies. However, as the Muskingum River Basin FWA will not serve as the basis for authorizing construction of a site specific project, no feasibility level cost estimates are included in this watershed assessment. Therefore, the RMO will not need to coordinate with the Cost Engineering MCX.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

a. Decision Document. The Section 729 Muskingum River Basin FWA is being conducted under the authority of Section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a) , as amended by Section 202 of WRDA of 2000 and Section 2010 of WRDA of 2007. This authority authorizes the USACE to assess the water resources needs of entire river basins and watersheds of the United States, in consultation with appropriate Federal, tribal, state and local agencies and stakeholders.

In contrast to traditional USACE Planning the goal of the subject FWA is to complete a Watershed Management Plan (WMP) which may or may not identify specific USACE projects. The study is likely to conclude with a series of recommendations implementable by a variety of resources agencies, state and local governments – both Federal and non-Federal – as funding becomes available. This report will be a planning and technical study which will not contain recommendations for authorization or funding for construction, but may recommend further study. As such, it is not considered a USACE decision document.

As previously stated, the overarching goal and purpose of the FWA will be to provide a Watershed Management Plan (WMP) for the Muskingum River Basin. It will promote sustainable water resources management while taking into consideration environmental protection, economic development and social well being. The FWA will investigate and recommend solutions and management actions to address the two water resources problems identified as part of the Initial Watershed Assessment (IWA) for the Basin - flooding and water quality - as well as those identified during the scoping process for the FWA: sedimentation at USACE Flood Risk Management (FRM) structures, stormwater management, wastewater management, the MWCD's role in sub-watershed actions, USACE reservoir operations, climate change and future growth in the basin.

The study will not require additional Congressional authorization. Approval authority for the study resides with the USACE Chief of Planning and Policy at USACE Headquarters (HQUSACE). Due to the scope of the study, no NEPA documentation or real estate acquisition will be required. It will be considered a categorical exclusion from NEPA according to ER 200-2-2 (9.c.).

b. Study/Project Description. The WAMP, which is similar to a Project Management Plan (PMP), for the Section 729 Muskingum River Basin FWA outlines components for a feasibility-like study which will result in a WMP, outlining appropriate solutions and management strategies which will help to address the following water resources issues: flooding, water quality, sedimentation at USACE FRM structures, stormwater management, wastewater management, the MWCD's role in sub-watershed actions, USACE reservoir operations, climate change and future growth in the basin.

Increased urban development, specifically the placement of impervious surfaces in the floodplain, has negatively impacted the basin in several ways. It is seen to contribute to flooding issues, stormwater management issues and degraded water quality. Water quality is also negatively impacted by a large number of failing home sewage treatment systems (HSTS). In addition to failing HSTS, wastewater management on a municipal level is also a problem in the basin. In many areas of the basin wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) are in need of upgrades and repairs, while in other areas there exists a need for new and additional plants. The lack of adequately functioning WWTPs is negatively impacting water quality. Impairments to water quality in the basin include ammonia, dissolved oxygen, flow alterations, habitat alterations, nitrates, nutrients, and organic enrichment, PCBs in fish tissue, pathogens, siltation,

sulfates, temperature changes, acidity and sedimentation. Sedimentation at USACE FRM structures is also of particular concern due to its impacts on flood storage capacity.

The MWCD is a political subdivision of the State of Ohio, which was organized in 1933 to develop and implement a plan to reduce the effects of flooding and conserve water for beneficial public uses. The MWCD partnered with the USACE in the 1930s to build the original Muskingum River System of 14 FRM dams in the basin. The MWCD is the largest conservancy district in the State of Ohio and has jurisdiction for operation in all or portions of the 18 counties either wholly or partially contained within the basin. During scoping for the FWA the MWCD asked for USACE assistance in better defining their role in sub-watershed actions within the basin, to ensure their resources are evenly spread in an efficient and effective manner.

During the FWA the Huntington District will also re-examine its reservoir operations within the basin. This re-examination will take place at a very general level, which may in turn lead to follow on Section 216 "Review of Completed Works" studies. As previously mentioned the Muskingum River System was constructed in the 1930s (with two subsequent dams being added in the 1960s and 1970s for a total of 16 FRM structures) and no significant changes have been made to the management of the system in the intervening years.

Finally, the FWA will examine the future of water resources in the basin. The population of the basin is growing, and the demand on the water resources as a result will be analyzed in order to develop a baseline for adaptive management strategies which may be implemented in the future. Additionally, the effects of climate change on those same water resources will also be analyzed to provide forethought on ways in which the water resources may be managed in a holistic manner representing the wide range of stakeholders operating in the area.

As previously stated, the study findings may recommend areas for further study but is not intended to recommend, or serve as the basis for authorizing a site specific project. If the FWA identifies potential projects for USACE implementation, a separate and more detailed planning study may be initiated, but would be considered a "new start" in the USACE budgetary process.

The study will be a multi-purpose mix of flood risk management and ecosystem restoration. The total project cost is approximately \$450,000. The non-Federal cost share sponsor is the MWCD. The cost share is 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal. The non-Federal match will be a combination of cash and in-kind services.

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review. The Muskingum River Basin FWA is not anticipated to be controversial, but is expected to be challenging and beneficial. It may also prove to be novel and precedent setting based upon new paths and processes for watershed resources management on a basin wide level. The watershed assessment focuses on the Muskingum River, which is a tributary to the Ohio River, a nationally significant waterway. The Muskingum River was identified as a priority river system for assessment by the Ohio River Basin Comprehensive Reconnaissance Report (2009). The study will provide strategic guidance for water resources management from a systems-wide perspective. The plan will recommend solutions and management strategies to address the water resources issues described above.

There are no significant project risks associated with the project in terms of funding, PDT expertise or other resources. The funding for the project is in hand, and both the PDT and the non-Federal cost share sponsor have participated in past FWAs which had positive outcomes.

As previously discussed, the outcome of the FWA will be a WMP which will recommend solutions and management strategies to assist in managing the water resources of the basin in a holistic manner, representing the interests of a wide range of stakeholders operating in the basin. As such, the FWA will not be justified by life safety and does not include significant threat to human life and safety. Likewise, there will be no need for redundancy, resiliency and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule.

It is not anticipated there will be a request by the Governor of the State of Ohio for a peer review by independent experts, and the project is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the size, nature, effects, economic/environmental costs or benefits of the project. The study is anticipated to be favorably received by stakeholders and the public.

d. In-Kind Contributions. Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR. The non-Federal sponsor will contribute in-kind services as part of their cost share portion. The scope of these in-kind services and the percentage of them as compared to the cash portion is yet to be determined. The Huntington District will provide oversight and quality control on any in-kind services, and they will be subject to a level of review commiserate with technical Federal contributions to the study.

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 home district shall manage DQC. Documentation of DQC strategies is required and should be in accordance with the Quality Manual of the District and the home MSC.

a. Documentation of DQC. The DQC process is documented in a Quality Control Plan (QCP), which summarizes the reviewed product, review process and major issues and their resolution. DQC comments and responses will be documented and made available to the ATR team.

b. Products to Undergo DQC. The Draft Muskingum River Basin FWA, appendices and supporting documentation will undergo DQC.

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.). The objective of ATR is to ensure consistency with established criteria, guidance, procedures, and policy. The ATR will assess whether the analyses presented are technically correct and comply with published USACE guidance, and that the document explains the analyses and results in a reasonably clear manner for the public and decision makers. ATR is managed within USACE by the designated RMO and is conducted by a qualified team from outside the home district that is not involved in the day-to-day production of the project/product. ATR teams will be comprised of senior

USACE personnel and may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate. The ATR team lead will be from outside the home MSC.

a. Products to Undergo ATR. The Draft Muskingum River Basin FWA, appendices and supporting documentation will undergo ATR.

b. Required ATR Team Expertise. Required ATR experience is described in the table below.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be an environmental professional with experience in preparing Civil Works decision documents and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. The ATR lead may also serve as a reviewer for a specific discipline (such as planning or environmental resources)
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, including water quality and quantity issues.
Environmental	The Environmental reviewer should be well versed on ecosystems and cost-effective analyses. Although the FWA will not include any NEPA evaluations, the concepts and principles behind NEPA will be used to determine the appropriateness of recommended actions. Due to the possibility of future USACE projects being identified, this reviewer should also be familiar with actions requiring review in accordance with environmental policies, procedures, laws and regulations which apply to USACE projects.
Hydrology and Hydraulics	The H&H reviewer should be familiar with the interaction between water management and its impact on the streams, which is of paramount importance to this study. Familiarity with standard H&H modeling (including HEC-RAS, HEC-RES and HEC-SIM) and its application is required.

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.

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

e. 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 1110-1-12 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.

f. 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:

(1) Identify the document(s) reviewed and the purpose of the review;

(2) Disclose the names of the reviewers, their organizational affiliations, and include a short paragraph on both the credentials and relevant experiences of each reviewer;

(3) Include the charge to the reviewers;

(4) Describe the nature of their review and their findings and conclusions;

(5) Identify and summarize each unresolved issue (if any); and

(6) 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.

g. ATR may be certified when all ATR concerns are either resolved or referred to the vertical team for resolution and the ATR documentation is complete. The ATR Lead will prepare a Statement of Technical Review certifying that the issues raised by the ATR team have been resolved (or elevated to the vertical team). A Statement of Technical Review should be completed, based on work reviewed to date, for the draft report. A sample Statement of Technical Review is included in Attachment 2.

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

a. 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 1165-2-214, 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:

(1) 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 1165-2-214.

(2) Type II IEPR. Type II IEPR, or Safety Assurance Review (SAR), are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on design and construction strategies 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 strategies prior to initiation of physical construction and, until construction strategies are completed, periodically thereafter on a regular schedule. The reviews shall consider the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction strategies in assuring public health safety and welfare.

b. Decision on IEPR. This study does not meet any mandatory trigger for Type 1 IEPR described in Paragraph 11.d.(1) or Appendix D of EC 1165-2-214. The consequences of non-performance on project economics, environmental and social well-being are negligible. The product is not likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment. EC 1165-2-214 Paragraph 11.d.(3) explains some project studies may be excluded from IEPR under certain circumstances. Namely, studies which are “so limited in scope or impact that they would not significant benefit from an IEPR...” As the FWA is intended to produce a WMP and the scope of the FWA is such that an Type I IEPR is not warranted. Other criteria for exemption which are met by this FWA include: the study does not include an EIS, is not controversial, has no adverse impacts on scarce or unique tribal, cultural or historic resources, has no adverse impacts on fish and wildlife species and their habitat and has no associated life safety risk.

There are no anticipated requests to conduct IEPR from a head of a Federal or state agency charged with reviewing the project. The proposed project does not meet the criteria for conducting Type II IEPR, as described in Paragraph 2 of Appendix D of EC 1165-2-214. This guidance states: “A Type II IEPR (SAR) shall be conducted on design and construction activities for any project where potential hazards pose a significant threat to human life (public safety.)” As the subject study will not culminate in an implementation document, and as there is no life loss associated with the study, Type II IEPS is not warranted.

c. Products to Undergo Type I IEPR. N/A.

d. Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise. N/A.

e. Documentation of Type I IEPR. N/A.

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 and EC 1165-2-214. 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. COST ENGINEERING AND ATR MANDATORY CENTER OF EXPERTISE (MCX) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION

Cost Engineering Certification is not required for the FWA. It is not anticipated that cost estimates will be prepared as part of this study.

9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

a. EC 1105-2-412 mandates the use of certified or approved models for all planning strategies 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).

b. 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. As part of the USACE Scientific and Engineering Technology (SET) Initiative, many engineering models have been identified as preferred or acceptable for use on Corps studies and these models should be used whenever appropriate. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

(1) Planning Models. No planning models are anticipated to be used in the development of this study. Study findings are based on literature reviews, best professional judgment and expert consultation.

(2) Engineering Models. No engineering models are anticipated to be used in the development of this study¹. Study findings are based on literature reviews, best professional judgment and expert consultation.

10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. **ATR Schedule and Cost.** ATR will be completed prior to submission of the FWA, Appendices and supporting documentation to the MSC/HQUSACE for review and approval. ATR costs for the FWA are

¹ It is not anticipated that any H&H models will be prepared as part of this study.

estimated to be \$15,000. These costs are cost-shared with the study's non-Federal sponsor. The date of the ATR is TBD.

b. Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost. N/A.

c. Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost. N/A.

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In addition to individualized meetings with other government entities, a series of public meetings across the basin will be held once a draft of the FWA is available (anticipated to be before ATR). The purpose of the public meeting is to give the public an opportunity to comment on the draft report. Additionally, the draft and final versions of the FWA will be placed on the Huntington District website, which will allow for public comment during the study process.

12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The Great Lakes and Ohio River Division Commander is responsible for approving this Review Plan. The Commander's approval reflects vertical team input (involving district, MSC, RMO, and HQUSACE members) as to the appropriate scope and level of review for the decision document. Like the PMP, 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 is 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. The latest version of the Review Plan, along with the Commanders' approval memorandum, should be posted on the Home District's webpage. The latest Review Plan should also be provided to the RMO and home MSC.

13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

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

██████████, Study Manager, Huntington District
██████████ - ██████████

██████████, Chief of Planning and Policy Division, Great Lakes and Ohio River Division
██████████ - ██████████

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS

Table 1 - Project Delivery Team				
Name	Role	Office Symbol	Telephone	Email
[REDACTED]	Project Manager	CELRH-PM	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Lead Planner	CELRH-PM-PD-F	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Plan Formulation	CELRH-PM-PD-F	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	GIS	CELRH-PM-PD-F	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Environmental	CELRH-PM-PD-R	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
TBD	H&H	CELRH		
[REDACTED]	Public Affairs	CELRH-PA	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Chief Engineer	MWCD	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Chief of Conservation	MWCD	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Table 2 - District Quality Control Team				
Name	Role	Office Symbol	Telephone	Email
[REDACTED]	Plan Formulation	CELRH-PM-PD	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
TBD	Environmental			
TBD	H&H			

Table 3 – Agency Technical Review Team				
Name	Role	Office Symbol	Telephone	Email
[REDACTED]	H&H – ATR Lead	CEMVP-EC-H	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
TBD	Environmental			
TBD	Plan Formulation			

ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS

COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the <type of product> for <project name and location>. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project’s Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-209. 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 strategies employed appear to be appropriate and effective. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved and the comments have been closed in DrCheckssm.

SIGNATURE _____ Date _____
Name
ATR Team Leader
Office Symbol/Company

SIGNATURE _____ Date _____
Name
Project Manager
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ Date _____
Name
Architect Engineer Project Manager¹
Company, location

SIGNATURE _____ Date _____
Name
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 _____ Date _____
Name
Chief, Engineering Division
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ Date _____
Name
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