



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION  
60 FORSYTH STREET SW, ROOM 10M15  
ATLANTA, GA 30303-8801

CESAD-PDP

13 DEC 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Savannah District (CESAS-PD/B. Bailey)

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW) Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP)

1. References:

a. Memorandum, CESAS-PD, 25 October 2012, subject: Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW) Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP), Review Plan

b. EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2010

2. The enclosed Review Plan for the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Dredged Material Management Plan has been prepared in accordance with Engineer Circular (EC) 1165-2-209. The Review Plan has been coordinated with the National Deep Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise (DDNPCX) of the South Atlantic Division (SAD), which is the lead office to execute this plan. For further information, please contact the DDNPCX at (251) 694-3884. The Review Plan includes independent external peer review.

3. I hereby approve this Review Plan, which is subject to change as circumstances require, consistent with study development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this Review Plan or its execution will require new written approval from this office. The District shall post the approved Review Plan and a copy of this approval memorandum to the SAS District public internet website and provide a link to the DDNPCX for their use. Before posting to the website, the names of Corps employees should be removed.

4. The point of contact for this action is Mr. Patrick O'Donnell at (404) 562-5226.

Encl

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Donald E. Jackson, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

DONALD E. JACKSON, JR.  
COL, EN  
Commanding

**REVIEW PLAN**

**for**

**ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (AIWW)  
DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (DMMP)**

**Savannah District**

**P2: 112987**

**MSC Approval Date: 13 Dec 2012  
Last Revision Date: December 2012**



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers ®**

**REVIEW PLAN  
AIWW DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3. STUDY INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC).....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR).....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>7. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>8. COST ENGINEERING DIRECTORY OF EXPERTISE (DX) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 3: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....</b>	<b>15</b>

## 1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

**a. Purpose.** This Review Plan (RP) defines the scope and level of peer review for the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW) Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), for the Savannah District portion of the AIWW. This project is funded using Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funding.

This study is being conducted to update the 20-year maintenance plan and update the environmental approvals for maintenance of the AIWW within Savannah District to allow for continuation of USACE Operation and Maintenance of the waterway. The primary objective is to update the maintenance and dredged material disposal plan to allow continued use of the waterway.

### b. References

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
- (2) EC 1105-2-412, Model Certification, 31 March 2011
- (3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 21 July 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 200-2-2, Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- (6) ER 1110-2-1150, Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects, 31 August 1999
- (7) CECW-CP Memorandum, Subject: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works Feasibility Study Program Execution and Delivery, 08 Feb 2012

**c. Requirements.** This 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 models are subject to certification/approval (per EC 1105-2-412).

## 2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION

In general, the RMO is responsible for:

- Coordinating all Review Plans, including agreement on scope and details of effort
- Assigning the ATR team and ensuring that lead is outside the home MSC
- Obtaining the services of the Cost Engineering DX for review and certification of cost estimates
- Managing the ATR

- For Type I IEPR, contracting with an Outside Eligible Organization (OEO), and for Type II IEPR, contracting with an A/E contractor or arranging with another government agency to manage IEPRs
- Assisting the District with preparing written responses to the IEPR review report
- For Type I, participating in the Civil Works Review Board (CWRB)

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 AIWW Dredged Material Management Plan will be the Deep-Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise (DDN-PCX). The RMO will coordinate with the Civil Works Cost Engineering DX to ensure the appropriate expertise is included on the review teams to assess the adequacy of cost estimates, construction schedules and contingencies.

### 3. STUDY INFORMATION

- Decision Document.** The AIWW Dredged Material Management Plan decision document will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100. The final approver of the decision document will be the Major Subordinate Command (MSC), which in this case is the South Atlantic Division (SAD) Commander.
- Authorization.** The AIWW between Savannah, Georgia, and Fernandina, Florida, was initially authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 2 August 1882, House Document 19,46<sup>th</sup> Congress, which provided improvements in portions of the waterway. Additional sections of the AIWW that were not included in the 1882 Act were incorporated into the project in 1892. The River and Harbor Act of 13 July 1892, House Document 41, 52<sup>d</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, provided for a 7-foot channel between Savannah and Fernandina. The AIWW between Beaufort, South Carolina, and Savannah, Georgia, was originally authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 3 June 1896, House Document 295, 53<sup>d</sup> Congress, 3<sup>d</sup> Session. It also provided for a 7-foot channel. After authorization and construction, several other Acts modified the route of the waterway to abandon old sections and include new ones which were either more convenient to traffic or easier to maintain. In 1936, the authorized project consisted of a channel 7 feet deep at Mean Low Water (MLW) with a width of 75-feet between Beaufort, South Carolina, and Savannah, Georgia, and a width of 150-feet between Savannah, Georgia, and Fernandina, Florida.

In 1937 the first piece of legislation that would create the waterway with the dimensions authorized today was passed. The River and Harbor Act of August 26, 1937, provided for a 7-foot protected route around St. Andrew Sound (Senate Committee Print, 74<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Sess.) and for a 12-foot channel between Beaufort, South Carolina, and Savannah, Georgia (Rivers and Harbors Committee Doc. No. 6, 75<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Sess.). On 20 June 1938, a 12-foot channel between Savannah, Georgia, and Fernandina, Florida, with various cut-offs, and an anchorage basin at Thunderbolt was authorized (House Doc. No. 611B, 75<sup>th</sup> Congress, 3<sup>d</sup> Sess.). The widths of the AIWW were to be 90 feet in land cuts and narrow streams and 150 feet in open waters. Dredging of the 12-foot channel between Beaufort, South Carolina, and Fernandina, Florida, was initiated in 1940 with the excavation of 507,275 cubic yards (CY) and completed in 1941 with the removal of 6,168,556 CY.

In addition to the main route and the protected route around St. Andrews, the project provides for two other alternate channels. An alternate and more protected route of 7 feet deep MLW from Dobby Sound to Brunswick, Georgia, was incorporated into the project in 1912. The River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, approved an alternate route 9 feet deep and 150 feet wide in Frederica River. This alternate route did not require dredging since it had formerly been the main route prior to its abandonment in 1938 for a new route via Mackay River. Although all three of these routes are part of the AIWW project today, maintenance is only performed in the protected route around St. Andrews Sound.

In addition to providing for the 12-foot deep channel between Beaufort, South Carolina, and Fernandina, Florida, the River and Harbor Acts of 1937 and 1938, imposed upon local interests the responsibility to furnish free of cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way and, spoil disposal areas; needed for the project.

Titles to all lands and easements needed for the 7-foot protected route around St. Andrews Sound were accepted as satisfactory by the Chief of Engineers on March 28, 1939. Titles to all necessary rights-of-way and spoil-disposal areas for the 12-foot channel between Savannah, Georgia, and Beaufort, South Carolina, were accepted as satisfactory on March 27, 1939. Rights-of-way and disposal areas needed for initial work and for subsequent maintenance of the 12-foot channel between Savannah, Georgia, and Fernandina, Florida, were approved by the Chief of Engineers on April 4, 1940.

- c. **Study/Project Description.** The Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AIWW) is a 739-mile inland waterway system between Norfolk, Virginia, and St. John's River, Florida, which offers a continuous, sheltered passage between these two destinations. The portion of the AIWW within Savannah District is situated between Port Royal Sound, South Carolina, (mile 552) on the north and Cumberland Sound (mile 713) on the South, which is located at the Georgia-Florida border. Thus, Savannah District's portion of the waterway constitutes approximately 22 percent of the AIWW. The 161-mile section of the AIWW within Savannah District includes a 24-mile section in the State of South Carolina with the remaining 137 miles located in Georgia. The non-Federal sponsor is the Georgia Department of Transportation (GA DOT).

**Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review.** This study is focused on updating the 20-year plan for maintenance of the AIWW within the Savannah District. The report will describe the existing operations and identify alternatives. Based on the analysis of studies and collaboration with other agencies, the document will identify an alternative that allows continued use of the waterway and reduces adverse environmental impacts.

- d. **In-Kind Contributions.** The study includes no in-kind products from the non-Federal sponsor.

#### 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 the DQC.

A DQC review is a standard requirement for all studies. All DQC comments will be formally answered in a normal comment/response format and compiled together in Dr. Checks. The DQC comments and responses and the back-check will be provided to the ATR team and will become a permanent part of the study documentation.

## 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.** At the time of this RP, there are two anticipated ATRs. Certification of the ATRs will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. Products to undergo ATR are the Draft EIS and Draft DMMP, and Final EIS and Final DMMP. The ATR team will be from outside the home MSC. Prior to the completion of the Draft EIS and DMMP, the ATR Team will be formed in accordance with the following guidelines:

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead must be a senior professional preferably with experience in preparing Dredged Material Management Plans (DMMP) and conducting ATRs. The ATR lead must have a minimum of 5 years experience in corps civil works. Typically, the ATR lead will also serve as a reviewer for a specific discipline (such as planning, economics, environmental resources, etc). The ATR Lead MUST be from outside Savannah District’s MSC.
Planner	The Planner must be a senior planner, preferably one who has had experience in preparing DMMPs. The Planner must have a minimum of 5 years experience as a Plan Formulator.
Economist	The ATR team member must be an Economist and have recent experience with DMMPs.
Environmental Resources/Cultural Resource Planner	The ATR team member must be a senior biologist and have recent experience in preparing DMMPs. This person must have recent experience in compliance with environmental laws (NEPA, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, National Historic Preservation Act, etc) and be able

	to review the cultural resources portion of the report.
Civil Engineer	The ATR team member must be a civil engineer with experience in dredging and dredged material disposal.
Cost Engineer	The Team member must be familiar with the most recent version of MII software and total project cost summary. This ATR member must be able to review the cost estimates and have recent experience with cost estimating for navigation projects and disposal area construction. The cost engineer will review Rough Order Magnitudes (ROM) of the alternatives and also the final costs for the selected plan. A Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) located in the USACE Walla Walla District (NWW) will provide the cost engineering reviews and will sign off on the ATR certification.
Real Estate Specialist	The Real Estate reviewer is to have expertise in the real estate planning process for cost shared and full federal civil works projects, relocations, report preparation and acquisition of real estate interests including Coastal Storm Damage Reduction projects. The reviewer must have a full working knowledge of EC 405-2-12, Real Estate Planning and Acquisition Responsibilities for Civil Works Projects and Public Law 91-646. The reviewer must be able to identify areas of the REP that are not in compliance with the guidance set forth in EC405-2-12 and will make recommendations for bringing the report into compliance. All estates suggested for use will be reviewed to assure they are sufficient to allow project construction, and the real estate cost estimate will be validated as being adequate to allow for real estate acquisition.

To minimize review costs, the District will likely request one of the technical reviewers on the ATR team to also serve as the ATR Lead.

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 will 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 to address incomplete or unclear information, ATR team members 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, and MSC), 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 will be completed prior to the District Commander signing the final report.

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

Type I IEPR is required for all decision documents except where no mandatory triggers apply, criteria for an exclusion are met, and a risk-informed recommendation justifies exclusion. An IEPR is the most independent level of review, and is applied in cases that meet certain criteria where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of USACE is warranted. A risk-informed decision, as described in EC 1165-2-209, is made as to whether IEPR is appropriate. IEPR panels will consist of independent, recognized experts from outside of the USACE in the appropriate disciplines, representing a balance of areas of expertise suitable for the review being conducted. There are two types of IEPR:

**Type I 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 - SAR) is anticipated during project implementation, safety assurance shall also be addressed during the Type I IEPR per EC 1165-2-209.

This AIWW Dredged Material Management Plan decision document will undergo an IEPR. As the study progresses, the PDT will review the Type I IEPR decision. If an IEPR exclusion appears appropriate, the PDT will then request an IEPR exclusion. This will be done when the preferred alternatives are determined. At that point in the study, the PDT will assess the added value of performing an IEPR versus the risk to the PDT decision of not performing the IEPR, and SAD will be consulted at that point. The DMMP will include a discussion of the IEPR assessment. If the Savannah District PDT determines that an exclusion to the IEPR Type I is warranted, then a request for an exclusion will be prepared during the study and sent to SAD for their concurrence and then forwarded to HQUSACE. Thus the DMMP will be the vehicle to demonstrate if an IEPR Type I would be an added value.

For this study the mandatory triggers that warrant Type I IEPR were reviewed and the following conclusions were reached:

- (1) Significant threat to human life. The project does not involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance;
- (2) Total Project Cost > \$45 M. The total project cost may be less than \$45 million, however, this depends on which alternative is selected;
- (3) A request by a State Governor of an affected state. There is no request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts;
- (4) A request by the head of a Federal or state agency charged with reviewing the project study if he/she determines that the project is likely to have a significant adverse impact on environmental, cultural, or other resources under the jurisdiction of the agency after implementation of proposed mitigation plans. There has been no request by a Federal or state agency. The project currently has a 1976 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), however, because it is outdated, a new EIS is being prepared to update the environmental clearances for the project.
- (5) Significant public dispute as to the size, nature or effects of the project. The project is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project;
- (6) Significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project. The project is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project;
- (7) Cases where information is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretation, contains precedent-setting methods, or presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices. The information in the decision document or anticipated 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. The project design is not anticipated to require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction

sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule; and any encroachments resulting from past disposal will be addressed in the Real Estate planning report.

(8) Any other circumstance where the Chief of Engineers determines Type I IEPR is warranted.

<b>IEPR Panel Members/Disciplines</b>	<b>Expertise Required</b>
Economics	The Economics Panel member will be a scientist from academia, a public agency, non-governmental entity, or an Architect-Engineer or Consulting Firm and hold a M.S. in the field of economics with a specialty, or at least five years experience, in navigation economics.
Environmental	The environmental panel member will be a scientist from academia, public agency, non-governmental entity, or an Architect-Engineer or Consulting Firm with a minimum 5 years demonstrated experience with environmental resources on the southern Atlantic coast of the United States.
Hydraulic Engineering	Hydraulic Engineer. Member will be a hydraulic engineer with a minimum of 7 years experience in coastal hydraulics and hydrology. The panel member must also be familiar with standard USACE hydraulic and hydrologic computer models.

**Type II IEPR.** Type II IEPRs 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. Type II IEPR panels will conduct reviews of the design and construction activities prior to initiation of physical construction and, until construction activities are completed, periodically thereafter on a regular schedule. The reviews shall consider the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities in assuring public health safety and welfare.

For this AIWW study, there is no known population living on or adjacent to the project disposal areas therefore, there are no existing or potential hazards posing a significant threat to human life, health, safety, or welfare for this project. Failure of the project, as currently envisioned, will not pose a significant threat to human life. Thus, the PDT believes that all stages of this project do not require a Type II IEPR. A risk-informed decision concerning the timing and the appropriate level of reviews for the project implementation phase will be prepared and submitted for approval in an updated Review Plan prior to initiation of the design/implementation phase of this project.

## 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. COST ENGINEERING DIRECTORY OF EXPERTISE (DX) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION**

All decision documents shall be coordinated with the Cost Engineering DX, located in the Walla Walla District. For decision documents prepared under this RP, personnel that are pre-certified by the DX will conduct the cost engineering ATR and sign off on the ATR certification. The RMO will coordinate with the Cost Engineering DX on the selection of the cost engineering ATR team member.

## **9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL**

EC 1105-2-412 mandates the use of certified or approved models for all planning activities to ensure the models are technically and theoretically sound, compliant with USACE policy, computationally accurate, and based on reasonable assumptions. Planning models, for the purposes of the EC, are defined as any models and analytical tools that planners use to define water resources management problems and opportunities, to formulate potential alternatives to address the problems and take advantage of the opportunities, to evaluate potential effects of alternatives and to support decision making. The use of a certified/approved planning model does not constitute technical review of the planning product. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC, ATR and IEPR.

EC 1105-2-412 does not cover engineering models used in planning. The process the Hydrology, Hydraulics and Coastal Community of Practice (HH&C CoP) of USACE follows to validate engineering software for use in planning studies and to satisfy the requirements of the Corps' Scientific and Engineering Technology (SET) initiative is provided in Enterprise Standard (ES)-08101 Software Validation for the Hydrology, Hydraulics and Coastal Community of Practice. 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 will 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).

All software used to develop project designs will comply with the USACE Enterprise Standard (ES)-08101 *Software Validation for the Hydrology, Hydraulics and Coastal Community of Practice*.

**a. Planning Models.** At the time of this RP, no Planning models are anticipated to be used.

**b. Engineering Models.** At the time of this RP, no Engineering models are anticipated to be used.

## 10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

### a. ATR and IEPR Schedule and Costs.

The following table shows the present schedule for the ATR reviews and their estimated costs, which includes ATR work by 7 ATR team members.

Study Element	Type of Review	Approximate Dates	Approximate Cost
ATR Draft DMMP and Draft EIS	ATR 1 week per team member	27 Feb 2013 – 19 Mar 2013	\$35,000
IEPR Type I	IEPR	20 May 2013 - 19 Aug 2013	\$150,000
ATR Final DMMP and Final EIS	ATR	3 Sept 2013 – 16 Sept 2013	\$10,000

**b. Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost.** For decision documents, use of existing certified or approved planning models is encouraged. If models are used, the ATR team will apply the principles of EC 1105-2-407 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.

## 11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

State and Federal resource agencies are involved 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 for the final draft report will be provided copies of agency comments.

The public and State and Federal agencies will be provided the Draft EIS and Draft DMMP for comment. This public and agencies review time (45 days) is scheduled for 31 May through 15 July 2013. When the draft reports are available for review by the public, joint public notices will be sent out to the public residing in the general project area, and to the individuals, organizations and agencies that are on the Savannah District Regulatory mailing list. Notices will be published in the newspaper and Federal Register. A public meeting (which will include all pertinent

agencies) for the Draft EIS and DMMP may be held. The PDT will consider all public comments as it prepares the report.

## **12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES**

The home MSC Commander is responsible for approving this review. The review plan is a living document and may change as the study progresses. The home district is responsible for keeping the review plan current. Minor changes to the review plan since the last MSC Commander approval will be documented and included in the latest Review Plan. Significant changes to the review plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) must 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, will be posted on the home district's webpage at [www.sas.usace.army.mil](http://www.sas.usace.army.mil).

## **13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT**

Public questions and/or comments on this review plan can be directed to the following points of contact: Savannah District Project Manager, at (912)652-5388; and South Atlantic Division Planning Manager at (404) 562-5229.

## **ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS**

### **PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM**

Roger Lafond	Operations PM	CESAS-OP-N	(912)652-5326
Tom Jester	Plan Formulator	CESAS-PD	(912)652-5492
Jeff Morris	Economist	CESAS-PD	(912)652-5008
Win Seyle	Biologist	CESAS-PD	(912)652-6017
Julie Morgan	Archaeologist	CESAS-PD	(706)856-0378
Carol Abercrombie	Project Engineer	CESAS-EN-H	(912)652-5514
Lucia Newberry	Geotechnical Engineer	CESAS-EN-GS	(912)652-5588
John Caldwell	Cost Engineer	CESAW-TS-ED	(910)251-4586
Stephen Bruce	Real Estate	CESAS-RE-AP	(912)652-5201

### **MAJOR SUBORDINATE COMMAND**

Kenitra Myles	Plan Formulator	CESAD-PDP	(404)562-5229
Terry Stratton	Economist & Plan Formulator	CESAD-PDP	(404)562-5228

\*Once selected, the ATR team will be identified in the next revision of the review plan.

**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 AIWW Dredged Material Management Plan. 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<sup>sm</sup>.

*SIGNATURE*

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

*SIGNATURE*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Project Manager Savannah District

\_\_\_\_\_  
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

Chief, Engineering Division (home district)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SIGNATURE

Chief, Planning Division (home district)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SIGNATURE

RMO Representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**ATTACHMENT 3: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>	<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>
AIWW	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway		
ATR	Agency Technical Review	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
CWRB	Civil Works Review Board		
DDN-PCX	Deep Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise	OEO	Outside Eligible Organization
DMMP	Dredged Material Management Plan	O&M	Operations & Maintenance
		OMRR&R	Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation
DQC	District Quality Control/Quality Assurance		
DX	Directory of Expertise		
EA	Environmental Assessment	PCX	Planning Center of Expertise
EC	Engineer Circular	PDT	Project Delivery Team
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement		
FSM	Feasibility Scoping Meeting	RED	Regional Economic Development
		RP	Review Plan
GA DOT	GA Department of Transportation		
HQUSACE	Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	RMO	Review Management Organization
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review	SAD	South Atlantic Division
		SET	Scientific and Engineering Technology
		SAR	Safety Assurance Review
MSC	Major Subordinate Command	USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers