
GENERAL RE-EVALUATION REPORT

APPENDIX E: QUALITY CONTROL

SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT

Chatham County, Georgia and Jasper County, South Carolina

January 2012



**US Army Corps
of Engineers**
*Savannah District
South Atlantic Division*

This page intentionally blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. AUTHORITY AND GUIDANCE.....	1
3. QUALITY CONTROL OVERVIEW	2
A. Responsibility.....	2
B. Objectives.....	2
4. QUALITY CONTROL CONCEPTS	2
A. General Concepts	2
B. Measures.....	4
5. REVIEW	5
A. Agency Technical Review	6
B. Independent External Peer Review	9
C. Public Participation	13
6. PARTICIPATION BY THE NON-FEDERAL INTEREST	13
7. ENDORSEMENTS BY OFFICE CHIEFS	14

This page intentionally blank

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT
WRDA 1999 POST-AUTHORIZATION
GENERAL REEVALUATION REPORT
AND
TIER II ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

This Quality Control (QC) plan provides the process, methods, and technical review activities for the Savannah Harbor Expansion project, Georgia and South Carolina, General Reevaluation Report (GRR) and Tier II Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The procedures that will be employed to insure quality products and compliance with all technical and policy requirements throughout the development of the GRR and Tier II EIS are described in this QC plan. This QC plan was previously updated in February 2006. Since that time, the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (WRDA 2007) was passed, and EC 1165-2-209 (Civil Works Review Policy) was signed. Accordingly, the plan has been updated again to address the requirements of WRDA 2007 and EC 1165-2-209.

2. AUTHORITY AND GUIDANCE

This QC plan has been accomplished in accordance with the following:

- A.** DR 5-1-2, CESAS-PM, 20 May 02, subject: Management – Quality Management Plan.
- B.** ER 5-1-11, CECS, 17 Aug 01, subject: USACE Business Process.
- C.** ER 1105-2-100, CECW-P, 22 Apr 00, subject: Planning Guidance Notebook.
- D.** ER 1110-1-12, 1 Jun 93, subject: Quality Management.
- E.** AR 5-1, 15 Mar 02, subject: Total Army Quality Management.
- F.** Interim Draft ER (unnumbered), CEMP/CECW, 13 Apr 00, subject: Quality Management.
- G.** EC 1165-2-203, CECW-A, 15 Oct 96, Water Resources Policies and Authorities, Technical and Policy Compliance Review (historical purposes only).
- H.** CECW-A Policy Memorandum No. 2, 6 Apr 95, subject: Civil Works Decision Document Review Policy Guidance.
- I.** CECG/AASA (CW) Joint Memorandum, 31 Mar 95, subject: Technical Review Process.
- J.** Quality Control Concepts Rev2.doc dated 22 Apr 05.
- K.** EC 1105-2-407, CECW-CP, 31 May 2005, Planning Models Improvement Program: Model Certification.

- L. EC 1105-2-408, CECW-CP, 31 May 2005, Peer Review of Decision Document.
- M. ER 1105-2-100, CECW-CP, 20 Nov 2007, subject: Appendix H Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents.
- N. Water Resources Development Act of 2007.
- O. EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2010.

3. QUALITY CONTROL OVERVIEW

A. Responsibility. The Savannah District (the District) is responsible and accountable for the quality of its projects and products. Accordingly, the District shall maintain a Quality Control Manager (QCM) that will continually monitor study activities to insure that the requirements of this Quality Control Plan are met. Additionally, South Atlantic Division personnel will monitor the QC activities involved with this study as a part of its Quality Assurance (QA) commitment.

B. Objectives. The objectives of this quality control plan are to:

- Provide quality technical products by providing an effective, comprehensive technical review of work or work products used as a basis for decision making.
- Verify that functional, legal, safety, health, and environmental requirements are met.
- Achieve cost-effective solutions consistent with product requirements.
- Obtain process efficiency by integrating technical review throughout product development.
- Resolution of document issues and concerns.
- Assure accountability for the technical quality of the products.
- Avoid start-overs and redesign.
- Provide continued development of District technical expertise.
- Achieve a seamless review process that includes early identification and resolution of both technical and policy issues.

4. QUALITY CONTROL CONCEPTS

A. General Concepts

1. In accordance with EC 1165-2-209, an Agency Technical Review (ATR) will be conducted by a team developed in collaboration with the Deep Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise. ATR will be conducted on a variety of specific reports, and the draft decision document (GRR/EIS Report).

All appendices and supporting reference documents will undergo an internal review in the District at the time they are completed. Quality checks of completed products will be performed by staff responsible for the work, supervisors, team leaders, and senior staff. Among the supporting reference documents are the reports of specific analyses, either

conducted by USACE personnel or outside contractors, which will be used in the plan evaluation and selection process by the PDT. Examples of these documents include:

- Aquifer Analysis Report
- Environmental Fluid Dynamic Computer Code (EFDC) and Water Quality Analysis Simulation Program (WASP) model calibration reports
- Sediment Quality Analysis Report
- Sedimentation and Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP)
- Economic Analyses Report

2. Management of the ATR process will be provided by the National Deep Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise (DDNPCX).

3. A number of Independent Technical Reviews (ITR) and External Peer Reviews (EPR) were accomplished for supporting study documents prior to the signing of EC 1105-2-410 and EC 1165-2-209. These reviews were conducted by subject matter 'experts' who were not involved in the study development. The Project Review Plan (RP) that contains a matrix listing these supporting documents is provided on the Savannah District web site.

4. The ATR will be a formal process with documentation of reviewer comments, documentation of responses to the comments, and documentation of the resolution of each comment. Provisions for documentation will include:

- a) The goal to resolve each comment to the satisfaction of the reviewer. For each comment, the reviewer should provide a basis for the comment, whether it is from law or policy, and an indication of the significance of the comment. For each comment, the reviewer should also provide some specific action that needs to be accomplished to satisfy or resolve the comment. Each comment that is resolved should contain a definitive statement of acceptance by the reviewer.
- b) Only the reviewer can withdraw or cancel a comment.
- c) A complete record of the interactions, from comment to resolution, will be maintained. This will be accomplished by the use of DrChecks software for the ATR. The use of the DrChecks software is intended to provide an efficient means of assuring proper documentation of the review process. The use of the DrChecks software will also be used the IEPR.

5. Dispute Resolution. The ATR Lead, who must be from outside South Atlantic Division (SAD), will identify any outstanding disagreements between members of the PDT and the ATR team. Any technical disagreements that cannot be resolved by the parties within a reasonable amount of time will be brought to the attention of the appropriate functional chief in the District (i.e. Chief, Planning Division, Chief, Engineering Division, etc.) to facilitate resolution. The functional chief is responsible for making the final decision on the disagreement. The functional chief may consult with other resources as appropriate, including knowledgeable experts from the Corps Labs, SAD or Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (HQUSACE), which may serve as

an unbiased sounding board. Major policy issues may be forwarded to HQUSACE for resolution, with proper coordination with SAD.

6. Technical and Policy Issue Resolution. Issues involving technical or policy interpretation will be brought to the attention of the chief of the responsible functional element for resolution. In some cases, the chief of the responsible functional element may hold an Issue Resolution Conference (IRC) to resolve major policy or technical issues. SAD and HQUSACE personnel may be requested to participate in the IRC.

B. Measures

Specific measures will be utilized, in addition to the overall quality control provided through chain-of-command review and supervisory guidance, to evaluate progress and ensure compliance with current policy and procedures.

1. Overall Progress. The overall progress of the study effort will be measured through several means including Planning Division, Programs and Project Management Division, and the Project Study Plan (PSP) that includes work plans, study schedules, and budget milestones. The PSP will be reviewed on a monthly basis to identify any changes to the resources designated for any portion of the study. Any changes will be analyzed for their impact upon other critical functions as well as the completion date of the project. Significant changes will be elevated to higher administrative levels to coordinate impacts and ensure minimal effect on the study.

2. Project Review Board. Progress reports will be made monthly to the District Project Review Board (PRB). Early decisions on competing resources and priorities will be addressed in this forum as well as upward reporting to SAD and HQUSACE via normal PRB procedures.

3. Project Delivery Team Meetings. The PDT is an organized multi-agency, multi-disciplinary group, consisting at least of the affected functional elements in the district. Under team management, the Project Manager (PM) will coordinate with the other functional managers and technical staff on the PDT. The PM will ensure that the study accomplishes the established goals at the anticipated rate, and that all items of the study schedule are accomplished.

4. Issue Resolution Conferences. Review meetings and conferences will be held to maintain continuous support and guidance from higher review levels within USACE. Two specific issue resolution conferences (IRCs) are expected to be conducted. Other IRCs will be held as needed. Meetings and conferences will utilize the most cost effective methods including, but not limited to, televideo conferences, teleconferences, or face-to-face meetings.

5. Technical Review Conferences. A Technical Review Conference (TRC) will be held to review ongoing studies and ensure that future studies are on-track. The primary purpose of the TRC is to resolve issues, which will affect schedules and costs for the remaining study period. Field investigations and design studies conducted prior to the

conference will be reviewed for appropriateness and progress. Guidance on the TRC is contained in “Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects,” ER 1110-2-1150, dated 31 Mar 94. Meetings and conferences will also utilize the most cost effective methods including, but not limited to, televideo conferences, teleconferences, or face-to-face meetings.

6. General Reevaluation Scoping Meeting. The General Reevaluation Scoping Meeting (GRSM) will be convened early in the study to provide feedback to the PDT from SAD, HQUSACE, and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works (ASA-CW). In addition, appropriate Federal and non-Federal agencies shall be invited to participate in the GRSM. This meeting is to ensure that the general reevaluation studies are tailored to meet specific objectives, and focus the General Reevaluation Study on key alternatives, to further define the depth of analysis required and to refine study/project constraints. Accordingly, the PSP may require revision to document changes agreed to at the GRSM. The revised PSP will then form the basis for subsequent conduct and review of the GRR/EIS.

7. Alternative Formulation Briefing. The Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) will be used to provide feedback to the PDT from SAD, HQUSACE, and ASA-CW. In addition, appropriate Federal and non-Federal agencies shall be invited to participate in the AFB. The AFB will be scheduled when the PDT has identified a selected plan and is prepared to present the formulation and evaluation of alternatives. The Washington level participants will seek to confirm that the plan formulation and selection process, the tentative identified preferred plan, and definition of Federal and non-Federal responsibilities, conform to current policy guidance. The goal is to identify and resolve any policy concerns that would otherwise delay or preclude approval of the draft report.

8. Feasibility Review Conference. The Feasibility Review Conference (FRC) is scheduled to be held just prior to release of the draft report to the public. This conference, however, may be waived if no major issues are identified in the AFB.

5. REVIEW

Reviews will be accomplished to assure conformance with Corps technical requirements through the application of the ATR and IEPR processes. Careful coordination and integration of planning, economics, environmental, and plan formulation with engineering, real estate, and technical considerations during this phase are imperative. Review will focus on compliance with established policy, principles, and procedures using clearly justified and valid assumptions. It includes the verification of assumptions, methods, procedures, and materials used in analyses based on the level of data obtained, alternatives evaluated, appropriateness of data used, functionality of the product and verifies the reasonableness of the results including whether the product meets the project needs consistent with law and existing policy and engineering and scientific principles.

In accordance with EC 1105-2-209 dated 31 January 2010, the ATR team will also focus on those planning models being used in the project development that are not certified. Through coordination with the District, the DDNPCX will conduct an ATR on the non-certified planning models and provide “certification for use” in the study. The ATR review of certified models will insure that their application in the studies and analysis are appropriately applied.

A. Agency Technical Review

As defined in EC 1165-2-209, ATR is a critical examination by a qualified person or team not involved in the day-to-day production of a technical product, ensuring the continued independence of reviewers. The purpose is to confirm that technical work was done in accordance with clearly established professional principles, practices, codes and criteria. It will involve participation by experts within the Corps, other agencies, universities and consultants.

1. Agency Technical Review Team (ATR)

The DDNPCX (Center) will manage the ATR process. The Center will form an ATR team from qualified individuals in corresponding specialties within SAD, other USACE districts, and Corps laboratories that might include contracted and/or private consultants. Selection of the appropriate individual to review a specific decision document, report, and/or study will be made by the ATR in coordination with the DDNPCX based upon cost, timeliness, technical capabilities, and project need from one of the following resources:

- a) The “Within District” alternative identifies a reviewer through the lead functional chief. This alternative will use existing senior technical staff that perform other technical work but are not involved in the technical products under review. Generally, reviewers will not be selected from the District that prepared the product under review, except in unusual circumstances when no qualified reviewers are available from other sources.
- b) The “Other Districts within the Division” alternative involves review work by personnel in one of the other four SAD districts (excluding Savannah District). These districts are the most familiar with navigation within the Southeast United States.
- c) The “Other Districts outside the Division” alternative involves review by personnel in a USACE district outside of SAD. This alternative may be necessary when workloads at other districts within SAD preclude their taking on additional work effort and/or in order to obtain specialized expertise not available at SAD districts.
- d) The “Contracted and/or Consultant” alternative would utilize outside expertise, other Federal and/or State agencies, academia and individuals. This alternative may be obtained via a Savannah District contract or via a contract through another USACE district.

2. The objectives of the Agency Technical Review are as follows:

- a) Insure quality technical products by providing an effective, comprehensive technical review as a basis for decision-making.
- b) Verify that functional, legal, safety, health and environmental requirements are met.
- c) Achieve cost effective solutions.
- d) Obtain process efficiency by integrating technical review throughout product development.
- e) Document issues, concerns and their resolution.
- f) Assure accountability for the technical quality of the product.
- g) Minimize lost effort and redesign.
- h) Provide continued development of Corps technical expertise.
- i) Achieve a seamless review process that includes early identification and resolution of both technical and policy issues.

3. Documentation

- a) Technical Review Comments
- b) Technical Review Responses
- c) Technical Review Annotations
- d) Statement of Technical and Legal Review

4. Team Formation and In-progress Review Process

- a) The ATR will be coordinated by the DDNPCX (the Center). The Center will appoint an ATR Lead to manage and direct the ATR. A technical reviewer will be assigned for each discipline involved in the study, such as Engineering, Economics, Plan Formulation, Environmental, etc.
- b) The ATR team will be provided the Project Review Plan (RP) and this Quality Control Plan (QCP). They will document any concerns in writing and provide them to the ATR Lead.
- c) The ATR Lead will consolidate the concerns and provides them to the Project Manager (PM). The consolidated documented concerns/comments are then distributed to all of the PDT members.
- d) The PDT will develop responses to the concerns/comments and provide them to the PDT leader, who will in turn provide them to the ATR Lead. An initial technical review teleconference will be held between the ATR team and the PDT to discuss the comments and develop responses. The PM will document the proceedings of the technical review teleconference in a memorandum for record (MFR) that incorporates the comments and responses.

- e) The PM will distribute the MFR to all meeting attendees, their supervisors and the remainder of the PDT. The PM will then file the MFR to document the technical review process. The DDNPCX will look for opportunities to use the DrChecks online software to document the proceedings.
- f) During the ATR should uncertainty or concerns involving the documentation result, a teleconference between the ATR and the PDT will be conducted by the PM in coordination with the Center. The teleconference will seek to discuss and resolve the concerns and develop responses. The PM will document the proceedings of the teleconference in an MFR that will be distributed to those involved and the vertical team (the vertical team includes the district, MSC, and HQUSACE).
- g) If the ATR team and the PDT are unable to resolve any concern the Center will immediately initiate the dispute resolution process described in ER 1110-2-12 or ER 1105-2-100, Appendix H.
- h) Once all issues are resolved, the PM will prepare and distribute a MFR to all meeting attendees, their supervisors, and the vertical team. The PM will file the MFR to document the resolution of the concerns and the technical review process.

5. ATR of the Draft Report

- a) The PM will deliver the draft report (GRR\Tier II EIS and supporting documents) to the ATR team via file transfer program (FTP) in a timely manner, allowing at least two weeks for review.
- b) Each member of the ATR team is encouraged to read the entire draft report and focus review on their respective disciplines.
- c) Once the review of the draft report is complete, the ATR team members will post their comments in DrChecks review software. The PDT will evaluate the ATR comments and place their responses in DrChecks. 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 include:
 - (i) The review concern – identify the product’s information deficiency or incorrect application of policy, guidance, or procedures;
 - (ii) The basis for the concern – cite the appropriate law, policy, guidance, or procedure that has not be properly followed;
 - (iii)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
 - (iv)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, 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.
- f) At the conclusion of the ATR, the ATR Lead will prepare and provide to the DDNPCX 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.
- g). The DDNPCX will prepare a Statement of Technical Review certifying that the ATR has been completed and that the issues raised by the ATR team have been resolved (or elevated to the vertical team). The Statement of Technical Review will be submitted to Savannah District prior to the District Commander signing the draft report. The Savannah District Office of Counsel will sign the Certification of Legal Review.

B. Independent External Peer Review

IEPR will be conducted on the entire final draft decision document (Draft GRR/EIS) including the supporting documents. This review will be conducted by a team assembled by the DDNPCX through an Outside Eligible Organization (OEO).

6. External Peer Review

As required by EC 1165-2-209, External Peer Review (IEPR) of the draft report (GRR\Tier II EIS and all supporting documentation) will be conducted.

IEPR Process. The DDNPCX will manage the IEPR process. The DDNPCX will engage an Outside Eligible Organization (OEO) to conduct the IEPR, and assess the output of the review panel selected to perform the IEPR. The OEO will develop a work plan to describe, in detail, the process that will be used to identify and select the IEPR panel, conduct the review, and prepare the IEPR report. The OEO will select the reviewers who will be recognized national experts in their disciplines drawn from academia, the private sector, as well as other federal and state agencies. These reviewers may not be current employees of USACE, but must be familiar with USACE policies and guidance.

Potential candidates for the IEPR panel will be recruited, screened for availability, interest, and technical experience in defined areas of expertise. Ultimately, seven (7) experts will be selected for the final IEPR panel using predetermined criteria related to technical expertise and credentials, relevance to the major disciplines involved in development of the GRR/EIS, and overall balance. A link to an FTP site will be used to provide reviewers with electronic copies of the study documents to be reviewed. Sufficient time will be allocated so that the documents could be read thoroughly. Reviewers will provide written comment; however, individual review comments will not be publicly attributed to a specific reviewer. The OEO will read all comments provided by the review panel and assess them for pertinence, validity and applicability. The OEO in conjunction with the review panel will consolidate the comments before they are placed in DrChecks.

Appropriate individuals from the PDT will evaluate the comments and provide written responses in Dr. Checks. Concurrences with review comments will be noted. When provision of additional information is suggested by the panel, that information will be developed by the PDT, and a notation of where the information will be placed in the study documentation will be placed in DrChecks.

Where the PDT member does not concur with a panel comment, they will provide an explanation of why they do not concur. The OEO and the DDNPCX will make a reasonable attempt to resolve any outstanding issues. If an IEPR concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the Panel 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.

(1) Documentation of IEPR. DrChecks review software will be used to document IEPR comments and aid in the preparation of the IEPR Review Report. Comments should address the adequacy and acceptability of the economic, engineering and environmental methods, models, and analyses used. IEPR comments should generally include the same four key parts as described for ATR comments. The OEO will be responsible for compiling and entering comments into DrChecks. The OEO shall prepare and deliver to the DDNPCX an IEPR Review Report that will accompany the IEPR Final Report for the project. The Final Report shall:

- a) Disclose the names of the reviewers, their organizational affiliations, and include a short paragraph on both the credentials and relevant experiences of each reviewer;
- b) Include the charge to the reviewers;
- c) Describe the nature of their review and their findings and conclusions; and
- d) Include a copy of the consolidated review comments (either with or without specific attributions), or represent the views of the group as a whole, including any disparate and dissenting views.

The final IEPR Review Report will be submitted by the OEO no later than 60 calendar days following the start of the public comment period for the draft Savannah Harbor Expansion General Re-evaluation Report and Tier II EIS. The report will be considered and documentation prepared on how issues were resolved or will be resolved. The recommendations and responses will be presented to the Civil Works Review Board by the District Commander with an IEPR panel member or OEO representative participating, preferably in person. The review documentation and certification will be provided to the PM by the DDNPCX for posting on the District's web site.

Savannah District, with assistance from the DDNPCX, shall prepare a written proposed response to the report, detailing any actions undertaken or to be undertaken in response to the report, and the reasons those actions are believed to satisfy the key concerns stated in the review report (if applicable). The proposed response will be coordinated with the MSC District Support Teams and HQUSACE to ensure consistency with law, policy, project guidance, ongoing policy and legal compliance review, and other USACE or National considerations.

(2) IEPR Schedule - The implementation schedule for the IEPR is provided below:

IEPR Implementation Schedule

ACTION	DATE
Complete subcontracts for panel members	19 Jul 2010
Submit Draft Charge (combine with Draft Work Plan – Task 1)	19 Jul 2010
USACE provides comments on draft charge	21 Jul 2010
Submit Final Charge (combined with Final Work Plan – Task 1)	22 Jul 2010
USACE approves Final Charge	22 Jul 2010
USACE/OEO Kick-off Meeting	23 Jul 2010
Review documents sent to panel members	23 Jul 2010
OEO/panel Orientation Meeting	30 Aug 2010
Panel members initiate their review	7 Sep 2010
Convene panel review teleconference	21 Sep 2010
External panel members provide draft final panel comments to OEO	30 Sep 2010
Submit Final IEPR Report	8 Oct 2010
Input final panel comments in DrChecks, Battelle provides final panel comment response template to USACE	15 Oct 2010
USACE PDT provides draft Evaluator responses and clarifying questions to OEO	22 Oct 2010
Final Panel Comment Teleconference between OEO, IEPR team, and PDT to discuss final panel comments, draft responses and clarifying questions	29 Oct 2010
USACE inputs final Evaluator responses in DrChecks	5 Nov 2010
OEO inputs BackCheck responses in DrChecks	12 Nov 2010
OEO submits pdf printout of DrChecks project file	15 Nov 2010
Project Closeout	22 Jan 2010

Model Certification/Approval. EC 1105-2-407 requires certification (for Corps models) or approval (for non-Corps models) of planning models used for all planning activities. The EC defines planning models as any models and analytical tools that planners use to define water resource 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 EC does not cover engineering models used in planning. Engineering software is being address under the Engineering and Construction (E&C) Science and Engineering Technology (SET) initiative. Until an appropriate process that documents the quality of commonly used engineering software is developed through the SET initiative, engineering activities in support of planning studies shall proceed as in the past. 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.

C. Public Participation

A complete public participation plan has been developed by Savannah District and is available on the district website.

6. PARTICIPATION BY NON-FEDERAL INTEREST

The Georgia Ports Authority as well as three Federal Cooperating Agencies involved in the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project shall provide input to be used to monitor the quality and process during study development. The PDT shall consider their feedback as a quality indicator.

7. ENDORSEMENTS BY THE OFFICE CHIEFS

I certify that the study and review process required to be performed under my responsibility has been completed and the technical work is in accord with Corps regulations, standard report requirements, and customer expectations.

_____ District Commander	_____ Date
_____ Chief, Programs and Project Management Division	_____ Date
_____ Chief, Planning and Environmental Division	_____ Date
_____ Chief, Engineering Division	_____ Date
_____ District Counsel	_____ Date
_____ Chief, Operations Division	_____ Date
_____ Chief, Contracting Division	_____ Date
_____ Chief, Real Estate Division	_____ Date