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

CELRD-PDM-M

OCT 16 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR Pittsburgh District Commander, (CELRP-PM-EF, [redacted]), 1000 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15222-4186

SUBJECT: Approval of Review Plan, Section 1135 Ecosystem Restoration Project, Seneca Nation of Indians, Cattaraugus County, New York – Project #447448

1. Reference CELRP-PM-EF Memorandum, Request for Review Plan Approval, Seneca Nations of Indians Ecosystem Restoration, Cattaraugus County, New York – Project #447448, undated with attachment, enclosed.

2. The subject Review Plan has been prepared in accordance with EC 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review and dated 15 December 2012. The review plan was reviewed for policy compliance and MSC comments and the district's resolution are posted in DrChecks. All comments have been satisfactorily resolved and are closed.

3. I approve the enclosed Review Plan. Subsequent revisions to this review plan or its execution will require new written approval from this office and is subject to change as circumstances require, consistent with the Project Management Business Process.

4. The District is requested to post the review plan to its website. Prior to posting, the names of all individuals identified in the review plan should be removed.

5. The point of contact for the MSC's approval is [redacted]; he can be reached at [redacted].

Encls

RICHARD G. KAISER
Brigadier General, USA
Commanding

CF:
CECW-LRD (Prettyman)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
PITTSBURGH DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD FEDERAL BUILDING
1000 LIBERTY AVENUE
PITTSBURGH, PA 15222-4186

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CELRP-PME-F

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Great Lakes and Ohio River Division, Federal Building, 550 Main Street, Cincinnati, OH 45202
ATTN: CELRD-PD-PDM, Mr. [redacted]

SUBJECT: Request for Review Plan Approval, Seneca Nation of Indians Ecosystem Restoration, Cattaraugus County, New York, Section 1135 Project – Project #447448

1. This memorandum requests LRD's approval of the enclosed Review Plan (RP) for the Seneca Nation of Indians (SNI) Territory Section 1135 Ecosystem Restoration Project.

2. The Pittsburgh District, along with SNI, proposes to restore the quality and connectivity of fisheries habitat within the Allegheny Reservoir. Problems in this area include the proliferation of Harmful Algal Blooms, sedimentation, loss of fisheries habitat, and erosion. Alternatives include dredging or excavating of sediment, reservoir management, use of mechanical mixers, development of a sediment management plan, restoration of fisheries habitat, and combinations of these measures. Proceeding to the feasibility phase and conducting an analysis of these alternatives is recommended based on the findings of the Federal Interest Determination (FID).

3. The attached RP has been reviewed by district staff and has been found to be in compliance with applicable guidance and incorporates the appropriate levels of review for this project including both District Quality Control and Agency Technical Review (ATR). An ATR lead from outside the MSC has been identified.

4. My point-of-contact for this action is Mr. [redacted] who may be reached at [redacted] or by email at [redacted].

Encl

for
BERNARD R. LINDSTROM
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
Commanding

DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN

Seneca Nation of Indians Ecosystem Restoration, Cattaraugus County, NY
Section 1135 Project

Pittsburgh District

MSC Approval Date:
16-October-2015

Last Revision Date:
8-September-2015

US Army Corps
of Engineers ®

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS. 9

ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS 10

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS 11

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS 12

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Seneca Nation of Indians Ecosystem Restoration, Cattaraugus County, NY, Section 1135 project decision document.

Section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Public Law 99-662, provides the authority to modify existing Corps projects to restore the environment and construct new projects to restore areas degraded by Corps projects with the objective of restoring degraded ecosystem structure, function, and dynamic processes to a less degraded, more natural condition considering the ecosystem's natural integrity, productivity, stability and biological diversity. This authority is primarily used for manipulation of the hydrology in and along bodies of water, including wetlands and riparian areas. It is a Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) which focuses on water resource related projects of relatively smaller scope, cost and complexity. Traditional USACE civil works projects are of wider scope and complexity and are specifically authorized by Congress. The Continuing Authorities Program is a delegated authority to plan, design, and construct certain types of water resource and environmental restoration projects without specific Congressional authorization.

Additional Information on this program can be found in Engineering Regulation 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F.

b. Applicability. This review plan is based on the model Programmatic Review Plan for Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 project decision documents, which is applicable to projects that do not require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), as defined in EC 1165-2-214 Civil Works Review Policy. A Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 project does not require IEPR if ALL of the following specific criteria are met:

- The project does not involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance;
- The total project cost is less than $45 million;
- There is no request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts;
- The project does not require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS),
- The project/study is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project;
- The project/study is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project;
- 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
- There are no other circumstances where the Chief of Engineers or Director of Civil Works determines Type I IEPR is warranted.

If any of the above criteria are not met, the model Programmatic Review Plan is not applicable and a study specific review plan must be prepared by the home district, coordinated with the appropriate

Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) and approved by the home Major Subordinate Command (MSC) in accordance with EC 1165-2-214.

Applicability of the model Programmatic Review Plan for a specific project is determined by the home MSC. If the MSC determines that the model plan is applicable for a specific study, the MSC Commander may approve the plan (including exclusion from IEPR) without additional coordination with a PCX or Headquarters, USACE. The initial decision as to the applicability of the model plan should be made no later than the Federal Interest Determination (FID) milestone (as defined in Appendix F of ER 1105-2-100, F-10.e.1) during the feasibility phase of the project. A review plan for the project will subsequently be developed and approved prior to execution of the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) for the study. In addition, per EC 1165-2-214, the home district and MSC should assess at the Alternatives Formulation Briefing (AFB) whether the initial decision on Type I IEPR is still valid based on new information. If the decision on Type I IEPR has changed, the District and MSC should begin coordination with the appropriate PCX immediately.

This programmatic review plan may be used to cover implementation products. Following the format of the model programmatic review plan, the project review plan may be modified to incorporate information for the review of the design and implementation phases of the project.

c. References

(1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review, 15 Dec 2012
(2) Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, Jan 19, 2011
(3) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 Mar 2010
(4) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
(5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007
(6) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007

d. Requirements. This programmatic 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 ensuring that planning models and analysis are compliant with Corps policy, theoretically sound, computationally accurate, transparent, described to address any limitations of the model or its use, and documented in study reports (per EC 1105-2-412).

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 1135 decision documents is the home MSC. The MSC maintains authority and oversight but delegates the coordination and management of decision document ATR to the District. The home District will post the MSC approved review plan on its public website. A copy of the approved review

plan (and any updates) will be provided to the appropriate Planning Center of Expertise to keep the PCX apprised of requirements and review schedules.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

a. Decision Document. The Seneca Nation of Indians Territory Ecosystem Restoration Project, Cattaraugus County NY 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. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document.

b. Study/Project Description. The study area includes portions of Allegheny Reservoir within the Seneca Nation of Indians (SNI) Territory in Cattaraugus County, New York in the vicinity of Salamanca. This reservoir is formed by Kinzua Dam, a Corps project. The SNI will serve as the project sponsor. The project has experienced sedimentation which has reduced available fish spawning habitat, harmful algal blooms that have reduced the overall quantity and connectivity of fish habitat, and ongoing operations negatively affect the availability and reproduction of aquatic vegetation used as juvenile rearing habitat. This study will analyze alternatives to address these problems including the use of mechanical mixers to address HABs, fish habitat restoration, nutrient management and operational changes. The estimated range of costs for the alternatives is between $500,000 and $1,000,000. It is not anticipated that any policy waivers will be required for this project.

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review. This study is considered routine without any significant factors requiring special treatment such as Independent External Peer Review. The Governor of Pennsylvania has not requested any peer review by independent experts. The project is situated away from major population centers and resolves an issue that does not constitute a direct threat to human safety. The project is not likely to involve significant public dispute concerning size, nature or effects. The project has been requested by the SNI who hold sovereignty over the area impacted by a potential project.

d. In-Kind Contributions. Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC and ATR, similar to any products developed by USACE. It is anticipated that the sponsor will provide most of their cost share as in kind services for this project including data collection, contributions to technical analyses and report sections and project coordination.

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)

All decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC. DQC is an internal review process of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the Project Management Plan (PMP). The home district shall manage DQC. Documentation of DQC activities is required and should be in accordance with the Quality Manual of the District and the home MSC.

All DQC will be performed by the immediate supervisors of the Project Delivery Team (PDT). DQC comments will be documented using the DrChecks (Projnet) software.

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. ATR will be performed throughout the study in accordance with the regional Quality Management System. The ATR shall be documented and discussed at the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) milestone. Certification of the ATR will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. Products to undergo ATR include the Detailed Project Report and appendices.

b. Required ATR Team Expertise. Based on the low complexity of the potential measures and the disciplines involved in the planning and initial design of the alternatives, it is estimated that 7 ATR team members will be sufficient to complete this review. Following is a description of the disciplines and specific experience needed for the ATR members.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional preferably with experience in preparing Section 1135 decision documents and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. 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 the home district.
Plan Formulation	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in aquatic habitat restoration and preparing CAP studies.
Economics / CE ICA	The Economic reviewer should have experience with the IWR Planning Suite and conducting cost effectiveness/ incremental cost analysis to determine best buy plans.
Environmental Resources / Biologist	The environmental reviewer should have experience with water quality and freshwater aquatic habitat restoration, preferably with big river fish species including paddlefish and walleye.
Geotechnical Engineering	The Geotechnical engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of geotechnical engineering with experience in aquatic ecosystem restoration projects including bioengineered bank stabilization.
Cost Engineering	Cost MCX Staff or Cost MCX Pre-Certified Professional as assigned by the Walla Walla Cost Engineering Mandatory Center of Expertise with experience preparing cost estimates for ecosystem

	restoration projects.
Real Estate	The real estate reviewer will be a senior level expert with experience in developing real estate plans and estimates for CAP studies.

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, comments 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, MSC, and HQUSACE), and the agreed upon resolution. If an ATR concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the ATR team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the vertical team for further resolution in accordance with the policy issue resolution process described in either EC 1165-2-214 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 should be completed prior to the District Commander signing the final report. A sample Statement of Technical Review is included in Attachment 2.

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

IEPR may be required for decision documents under certain circumstances. IEPR is the most independent level of review, and is applied in cases that meet certain criteria where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of USACE is warranted. A risk-informed decision, as described in EC 1165-2-214, is made as to whether IEPR is appropriate. IEPR panels will consist of independent, recognized experts from outside of the USACE in the appropriate disciplines, representing a balance of areas of expertise suitable for the review being conducted. There are two types of IEPR:

- Type I IEPR. Type I IEPR reviews are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on project studies. Type I IEPR panels assess the adequacy and acceptability of the economic and environmental assumptions and projections, project evaluation data, economic analysis, environmental analyses, engineering analyses, formulation of alternative plans, methods for integrating risk and uncertainty, models used in the evaluation of environmental impacts of proposed projects, and biological opinions of the project study. Type I IEPR will cover the entire decision document or action and will address all underlying engineering, economics, and environmental work, not just one aspect of the study. For decision documents where a Type II IEPR (Safety Assurance Review) is anticipated during project implementation, safety assurance shall also be addressed during the Type I IEPR per EC 1165-2-214.

  For Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 decision documents prepared under the model Programmatic Review Plan, Type I IEPR is not required unless mandatory criteria for Type I IEPR has been triggered.

- Type II IEPR. Type II IEPR, or Safety Assurance Review (SAR), is managed outside the USACE and is 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 Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 decision documents prepared under the model Programmatic Review Plan, Type II IEPR is not anticipated to be required in the design and implementation phase, but this will need to be verified and documented in the review plan prepared for the design and implementation phase of the project.

a. Decision on IEPR. Based on the information and analysis provided in the preceding paragraphs of this review plan, the project covered under this plan is excluded from IEPR because it does not meet the mandatory IEPR triggers and does not warrant IEPR based on a risk-informed analysis. If any of the criteria outlined in paragraph 1(b) are not met, this model Programmatic Review Plan is not

applicable and a study specific review plan must be prepared by the home district, coordinated with the appropriate PCX and approved by the home MSC in accordance with EC 1165-2-214.

b. Products to Undergo Type I IEPR. Not applicable.

c. Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise. Not Applicable.

d. Documentation of Type I 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 Cost Engineering MCX, located in the Walla Walla District. For decision documents prepared under the model Programmatic Review Plan, Regional cost personnel that are pre-certified by the MCX, and assigned by the Cost Engineering MCX, will conduct the cost engineering ATR. The MCX will provide the Cost Engineering MCX certification. The Cost Engineering MCX will make the selection of the cost engineering ATR team member.

9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

The study will use habitat suitability index models that have been previously approved for use by the Corps Ecosystem Restoration Planning Center of Expertise including, but not limited to, models for Paddlefish and Walleye. In addition, the IWR Planning Suite will be used to conduct cost effectiveness / incremental cost analysis.

10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. ATR Schedule and Cost. The ATR results will be evaluated and the report will be revised as appropriate. The revised report will then be reviewed by the ATR team. The cost to complete the ATR is estimated at $22,400 and will take approximately four weeks, estimated to start in December 2016.

b. Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost. Not applicable.

c. Model Review Schedule and Cost. Not applicable.

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

State and Federal resource agencies may be invited to participate 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 will be provided copies of public and agency comments. A scoping meeting will be held on this project once the feasibility study is initiated and state and federal agencies with expertise will be worked with directly.

12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The home MSC Commander is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan is appropriate for the specific project covered by the plan. 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) should be re-approved by the MSC Commander following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in the MSC Commander determining that use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-214 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1. The latest version of the review plan, along with the Commanders' approval memorandum, will be posted on the home district's webpage.

13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

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

[redacted], Chief, Planning and Economics Section, Pittsburgh District, [redacted],
[redacted]

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS.

Include contact information for the PDT, DQC team, ATR team, and MSC. The credential and years of experience for the ATR team should be included when it is available.

PDT			
[redacted]	Team Lead / Plan Formulator / Biologist	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	SNI Lead / Fisheries Manager	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Environmental / Cultural Resources	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Biologist / Water Management / Hydropower Operations	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Civil Engineer	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Real Estate Appraiser	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Cost Engineer	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	GIS Specialist	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Geotechnical Engineer	[redacted]	[redacted]
DQC			
[redacted]	Plan Formulation / Biology	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Environmental / Cultural Resources	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Water Management / H&H Engineer	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Engineering Lead	[redacted]	[redacted]
ATR			
[redacted]	ATR Lead	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Plan Formulation	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Economics / CE ICA	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Environmental / Biology / Water Quality	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Geotechnical Engineering	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Cost Engineering	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	Real Estate	[redacted]	[redacted]

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[sm].

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
ATR Team Leader
Office Symbol/Company

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Project Manager (home district)
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Architect Engineer Project Manager[1]
Company, location

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Review Management Office Representative (or Delegate)
Office Symbol

CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows: *Describe the major technical concerns and their resolution.*

As noted above, all concerns resulting from the ATR of the project have been fully resolved.

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Chief, Engineering Division (home district)
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Chief, Planning Division (home district)
Office Symbol

[1] Only needed if some portion of the ATR was contracted

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Term	Definition	Term	Definition
AFB	Alternative Formulation Briefing	NED	National Economic Development
ASA(CW)	Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works	NER	National Ecosystem Restoration
ATR	Agency Technical Review	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
CAP	Continuing Authorities Program	O&M	Operation and maintenance
CSDR	Coastal Storm Damage Reduction	OMB	Office and Management and Budget
DPR	Detailed Project Report	OMRR&R	Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation
DQC	District Quality Control/Quality Assurance	OEO	Outside Eligible Organization
DX	Directory of Expertise	OSE	Other Social Effects
EA	Environmental Assessment	PCX	Planning Center of Expertise
EC	Engineer Circular	PDT	Project Delivery Team
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	PAC	Post Authorization Change
EO	Executive Order	PMP	Project Management Plan
ER	Ecosystem Restoration	PL	Public Law
FDR	Flood Damage Reduction	QMP	Quality Management Plan
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	QA	Quality Assurance
FRM	Flood Risk Management	QC	Quality Control
FSM	Feasibility Scoping Meeting	RED	Regional Economic Development
GRR	General Reevaluation Report	RMC	Risk Management Center
HQUSACE	Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	RMO	Review Management Organization
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review	RTS	Regional Technical Specialist
LRR	Limited Reevaluation Report	SAR	Safety Assurance Review
MSC	Major Subordinate Command	USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
SNI	Seneca Nation of Indians	WRDA	Water Resources Development Act