

## **REVIEW PLAN**

Noyes Cut, Georgia  
Section 1135

**Savannah District**

Project Number: 402833

**MSC Approval Date: 16 June 2014**  
**Last Revision Date:**



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers®**

## REVIEW PLAN

### Noyes Cut, Georgia, Project Modifications for the Improvement of the Environment, Section 1135 Feasibility Study

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS.....	1
2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION .....	1
3. STUDY INFORMATION .....	2
4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC) .....	3
5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR).....	3
6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR) .....	8
7. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW .....	9
8. COST ENGINEERING AND ATR MANDATORY CENTER OF EXPERTISE (MCX) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION.....	10
9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL.....	10
10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS .....	11
11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....	12
12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES.....	12
13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT.....	12
ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS.....	13
ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS .....	14
ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS.....	16

## 1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. **Purpose.** This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Noyes Cut, Georgia, Environmental Improvements, Section 1135 Feasibility Study.

b. **References.**

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review, 15 December 2012
- (2) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 Mar 2011
- (3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 21 Jul 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) PMP for study

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

d. **Attachments.** Attachment 1 includes the Project Delivery Team (PDT) members and the Agency Technical Review (ATR) team members. Attachment 2 includes samples of the Completion of Agency Review and also the Certification of the Agency Technical Review. Attachment 3 includes a table of the review plan revisions. Attachment 4 includes a list of acronyms and abbreviations.

## 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 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. Also, in accordance with EC1165-2-214, p. G-2, section 5, "The Review Management Organization (RMO) for ATR for CAP projects may be the home MSC in lieu of a National Planning Center of Expertise (PCX)." Since this study would be performed under the Continuing Authorities Program (CAP), South Atlantic Division (SAD) is the RMO.

Additionally, SAD will coordinate with the Civil Works Cost Engineering and Agency Technical Review Mandatory Center of Expertise (Cost Engineering MCX) located at the Walla Walla District, 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**

#### **a. Decision Document**

The Noyes Cut decision document will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F. The approval level of the decision document (if policy compliant) is the home MSC, South Atlantic Division (SAD). An Environmental Assessment (EA) document will be prepared along with the decision document.

#### **b. Study/Project Description**

The US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) completed construction of Noyes Cut in 1932 as an Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway auxiliary channel to provide small boats a safe inland route from the Satilla River to Brunswick, Georgia and avoid the open waters of St. Andrews Sound. With authorizing dimensions of 50 feet wide by 5 feet deep, Noyes Cut has since grown in size and is now 300 feet wide by 7-10 feet deep. The expanded cut has altered flows in the Satilla River watershed and surrounding tidal creeks, most notably Dover Creek and Umbrella Creek. In Dover Creek, decreased tidal flows have caused creek waters to become more saline and increased shoaling has occurred, thus blocking access for migratory fish, crabs and shrimp to the creek's former reaches. Portions of the creek that were once 100 yards wide have now narrowed to ten (10) yards, and the inland reaches of Dover Creek and adjacent Umbrella Creek go dry at low tide. The siltation has also blocked creek access to commercial fishermen. The study will examine different ways to restore the estuarine conditions critical to maintaining healthy ecosystems in the Satilla River estuary in the vicinity of Noyes Cut. Computer modeling will be used to examine different alternatives that would most benefit the ecosystem, including predicting the changes that would occur if Noyes Cut, Bull Whirl Cut, or other known cuts in the area were closed. The study may also examine other engineering methods to restore the estuarine system. The study will evaluate the alternatives to determine the best combination of closures, dredging, and/or other methods that would have positive benefits to the Satilla River estuarine ecosystem.

### **c. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review.**

This study will examine different alternatives to restore the estuarine conditions critical to maintaining healthy ecosystems in the Satilla River estuary in the vicinity of Noyes Cut. It is anticipated that the total project cost will be less than \$5 million.

- The PDT does not anticipate any project related risks to life safety.
- There has not been a request to study this project by a State Governor or an affected state.
- If the recommended plan includes closing Noyes Cut, there may be a small group of local citizens who complain regarding the loss of recreational vessel access to the Satilla River.
- It is not anticipated that there will be any public disputes concerning economic and environmental costs and benefits.
- This project will not involve novel methods, innovative materials or techniques, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices, and
- It is not anticipated that this project will require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule

### **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. Documentation of DQC activities is required and should be in accordance with the Quality Manual of the District and the home MSC.

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. The DQC will be conducted by senior USACE personnel.

## **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 (Savannah 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 within the home MSC (SAD).

**a. Products to Undergo ATR.**

Certification of the ATRs will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. Products to undergo ATR are the Draft EA and feasibility report and the Final EA and feasibility report. Additionally, the cost estimate will undergo an ATR.

**b. Required ATR Expertise**

<b>ATR Team Members/Disciplines</b>	<b>Expertise Required</b>
ATR Lead	The ATR lead will be a senior professional with extensive 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, economics, environmental resources, etc). For this study, it is anticipated that the planning ATR team member will also act as the ATR lead.
Planning	The Planner will be a senior planner, preferably one who has had experience in Ecosystem Restoration. Additionally, the Planner must have a minimum of 5 years experience.
Economics	The ATR team member must be an Economist certified in Ecosystem Restoration.
Environmental Resources	The ATR team member must be a senior biologist and have recent experience in Ecosystem Restoration. This person must have recent experience in compliance with environmental laws (NEPA, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, National Historic Preservation Act, etc.) and must have a minimum of 10 years of experience.

Cultural Resources	The archaeologist/cultural resources reviewer must be on the list of certified reviewers that was released by HQ.
Hydrology and Hydraulics	<p>This ATR member must have a minimum of 10 years experience in the field of hydraulics and/or hydrology. This ATR reviewer must be a registered Professional Engineer, and must have previously been involved in coastal marsh ecosystem restoration projects.</p> <p>Good understanding of 2-dimensional hydrodynamic models, such as Environmental Fluid Dynamic Code (EFDC) and/or Adaptive Hydraulics (ADH), is required. Reviewer must be able to assess the validity of input data (derived or measured), such as tidal phasing/amplitude, freshwater inflows, and bathymetric data processing. Reviewer must be able to validate or refute assumptions made during the modeling effort, and assess the quality and reasonableness of model output.</p> <p>Good understanding of the dynamics and processes that take place in coastal marsh environments, and construction experience in marsh projects are each a plus.</p> <p>Familiarity with the topics in EM 1110-2-1100 (Coastal Engineering Manual) is required. Familiarity with the topics in EM 1110-2-38 (Environmental Quality in Design of Civil Works Projects), EM 1110-2-1607 (Tidal Hydraulics), EM 1110-2-4000 (Sedimentation Investigations of Rivers and Reservoirs), or EM 1110-2-1810 (Coastal Geology) is desired.</p>
Geotechnical Engineering	The reviewer shall be a Senior Geotechnical Engineer with experience with the design, analysis, and construction of earthen fills used to close dredged cuts in a coastal marsh environment. Experience shall include the following: subsurface investigations, earthwork construction, slope stability evaluation, seepage analysis, settlement evaluation, slope protection, and erosion control in a marine environment. The ATR member must be a registered professional engineer with at least 5 years experience.
Cost Estimating	The ATR Team member should 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

	<p>with cost estimating for ecosystem restorations. The cost engineer will review Rough Order Magnitudes (ROM) of the alternatives and also the final costs for the selected plan. A Civil Works Cost Engineering and Agency Technical Review Mandatory Center of Expertise (Cost Engineering MCX) will provide the cost engineering reviews and will sign off on the ATR certification.</p>
<p>Real Estate</p>	<p>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 Environmental Protection and Restoration Projects under Section 1135 of WRDA 1986. The reviewer should have a full working knowledge of ER 405-1-12, Real Estate Planning and Acquisition Responsibilities for Civil Works Projects and Public Law 91-646. The reviewer should be able to identify areas of the REP that are not in compliance with the guidance set forth in EC405-2-12 and should make recommendation for bringing the report into compliance. All estates suggested for use should be termed sufficient to allow project construction, and the real estate cost estimate should be validated as being adequate to allow for real estate acquisition.</p>



### **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, 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 1110-1-12 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.

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)**

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 1165-2-214, 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. Reference EC 1165-2-214, appendix D and appendix G. "For CAP projects, the review policy is modified as follows: (1) All CAP projects are excluded from Type I Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) except Section 205 and Section 103, or those projects that include an EIS or meet the mandatory triggers for Type I IEPR as stated in Appendix D." This study is a CAP 1135 and therefore does not require an IEPR.
- 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. Paragraph 3c from The Continuing Authority Program Planning Process Improvements dated Jan 19, 2011, states "Type II IEPR is still required for those CAP projects where life safety risk is significant as documented in the approved Review Plan." Failure of the project, as currently envisioned, will not pose a significant threat to human life. Therefore, a Type II IEPR is not planned at this time. A risk-informed decision concerning the timing and 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.

**a. Decision on IEPR Exclusion.**

Because this is a CAP 1135, and none of the following triggers are met, Types I and II IEPRs are not required.

1. Significant threat to human life. No significant risk.
2. Total Project Cost > \$45 M. The total project cost is anticipated to be < \$5 M.
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. Where the Department of Civil Works (DCW) or the Chief of Engineers determines that the project study is controversial due to significant public dispute over either the size, nature, or effects of the project or the economic or environmental costs or benefits of the project. This project is not likely to involve significant public disputes as to size, nature, or effects of the project and is not likely to involve significant public disputes as to the economic or environmental costs and benefits of this project. However, there is a small contingency of locals who may dispute the closing of Noyes Cut.
5. 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.

In conclusion, because this is a CAP 1135, an EIS is not required, and none of the triggers are met, no Type I IEPR is required. There is no safety risk to life, thus no Type II IEPR is required either.

- a. Products to Undergo Type I IEPR and Type II IEPR. None
- b. Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise. Not Applicable
- c. Documentation of Type I IEPR. Not Applicable. Per EC 1165-2-214.
- d. Documentation of Type II IEPR. Not 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. COST ENGINEERING MANDATORY CENTER OF EXPERTISE (MCX) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION**

All decision documents shall be coordinated with the Civil Works Cost Engineering and Agency Technical Review Mandatory Center of Expertise (Cost Engineering MCX), located in the Walla Walla District. The MCX will assist in determining the expertise needed on the ATR team and in the development of the review charge(s). The MCX will also provide the Cost Engineering certification. The RMO is responsible for coordination with the Cost Engineering MCX.

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

### **a. Planning Models.**

The CECW-P Memorandum “Continuing Authority Program Planning Process Improvements”, 19 January 2012, states that approval of planning models under EC 1105-2-412 is not required for CAP projects.

Output from the hydrodynamic model will be used to model ecological responses to identify the extent to which proposed project alternatives will benefit the environment and ecological resources within Dover Creek and surrounding areas. The selection of which specific model will be used for ecological response is dependent on if Environmental Fluid Dynamics Code (EFDC) or Adaptive Hydraulics Model (ADH) is used for the hydrodynamic modeling.

### **b. Engineering Models.**

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. 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).

The Hydraulics and Hydrology branch plans to provide Planning Division with an existing conditions 2-dimensional hydrodynamic model, capable of analyzing salinity and velocity in the system. The existing conditions model will be modified with between 5-7 alternative plan conditions, and the resulting effects to the system and problem

areas in Dover Creek and Umbrella Creek will be evaluated. Possible models that can be used in the area are ADH or EFDC.

Depending on available resources and technical proficiencies required, the model development may be performed within Savannah District, or another Corps District.

GADNR-EPD is currently funding the development of EFDC and LSPC (hydrologic) models for the area. An opportunity may exist to utilize those existing efforts to reduce the modeling costs for the project. If it is feasible to obtain an existing conditions model, it may have to be refined to a finer temporal scale. Analysis of alternatives would have to be performed, regardless of the source of the existing conditions model.

Subsequent to development of hydrodynamic models, there may be a need for a sediment transport model. The sediment transport component could be of the conceptual level, and will be used to analyze the long term effects of project alternatives to the sedimentation patterns in Umbrella Creek and the surround areas.

## **10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS**

- a. **ATR Schedule and Cost.** The cost for the ATRs is estimated to be \$45,000. The documents to be reviewed and scheduled dates for review are as follows:
  - Draft Feasibility Report and EA – ATR – 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter, 2015 - \$20,000
  - Cost Estimate – ATR – 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter, 2015 - \$5,000
  - Final Report and EA – ATR- 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter, 2016 - \$20,000
- b. **Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost.** Not Applicable.
- c. **Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost.** Use of existing certified or approved planning models is encouraged. However, approval of planning models under EC 1105-2-412 is not required for CAP projects. The ATR team will apply the principles of EC 1105-2-412 during the ATR to ensure the model is theoretically and computationally sound, consistent with USACE policies, and adequately documented.

## **11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

State and Federal resource agencies may be invited to participate in the study 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.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations require that Federal, state, and local agencies with jurisdiction or special expertise regarding environmental impacts be consulted and involved in the NEPA process. The draft Environmental Assessment (EA) will be made available for review by the general public, stakeholders, and natural resource agencies. A Joint Public Notice announcing the availability of the draft EA/FONSI will be mailed to all parties and individuals on the USACE Regulatory mailing list in Georgia in compliance with NEPA. The District will also mail copies of the draft EA to all appropriate parties including Federal, state, and local agencies. All comments received in regard to the proposed action will be considered before any decision documents are finalized; and the comments along with USACE responses will be integrated into the final NEPA document.

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

The South Atlantic Division Commander is responsible for approving this Review Plan. The Commander's approval reflects vertical team input as to the appropriate scope and level of review for the decision document. The Review Plan is a living document and may change as the study progresses. The home district is responsible for keeping the Review Plan up to date. Minor changes to the review plan since the last MSC Commander approval are documented in Attachment 3. Significant changes to the Review Plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) will 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. The latest Review Plan will 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: SAS Project Manager, 912-652-5195 and SAD Point of Contact 404-562-5229.

**ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS**

Table 1 – Project Delivery Team

Discipline	Office/Agency
Project manager	CESAS-PM-C
Plan formulator	CESAD-PD
Environmental	CESAS-PD
Economics	CESAS-PD
Cultural Resources	CESAS-PD
Real Estate	CESAS-RE-AP
Hydraulics	CESAS-EN-H
Geotechnical	CESAS-EN-GS
Cost Estimating	CESAS-EN-ET
RMO – SAD	CESAD-PDP

Table 2 – Agency Technical Review Team Members

TBD			
TBD			
TBD			
TBD			
TBD			

## 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

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

[Office Symbol](#)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

*SIGNATURE*

[Name](#)

Chief, Planning Division

[Office Symbol](#)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

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

**ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS**

<b>Revision Date</b>	<b>Description of Change</b>	<b>Page / Paragraph Number</b>