

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Mississippi Valley Division
New Orleans District**

**Review Plan for
Alteration to WBV
HSDRRS Project
(Restoration of Levee
Section)**

**WBV-16.2
West Bank and Vicinity, LA**

Pursuant to 33 USC § 408



**US Army Corps
of Engineers®**

APPROVED
BY:

 17DEC '15

(Division Commander full name, typed)
Commanding

DATE

Contents

- 1. Introduction 1**
 - a. Purpose of This Review Plan..... 1
 - b. Description and Information 1
- 2. Review Requirements 3**
 - a. Level of Review Required by the Requester 3
 - b. Level of Review Required by the District 6
 - c. Decision-Level Determination 6
 - d. District Review Purpose 8
- 3. District-led Agency Technical Review Team 8**
- 4. Execution Plan 10**
 - a. Review Procedures 10
 - b. Review Schedule..... 13
 - c. Review Cost 13
- 5. Review Plan Points of Contact..... 13**

1. Introduction

a. Purpose of This Review Plan

This Alteration-Specific Review Plan is intended to ensure quality of the review by the New Orleans District for the request to alter a US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) civil works project within the New Orleans District's area of responsibility. This review plan was prepared in accordance with Engineer Circular (EC) 1165-2-216, "Policy and Procedural Guidance for Processing Requests to Alter US Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works Projects Pursuant to 33 USC 408" (reference paragraph 7.c.(4) in EC 1165-2-216). This review plan provides the review guidelines associated with a specific alteration request pursuant to 33 USC 408 (Section 408).

b. Description and Information

This Review Plan covers the proposed alteration of the West Bank and Vicinity, LA, Project (WBV), a portion of the Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS), specifically the WBV-16.2 reach. The WBV 16.2 reach is physically located within Bayou Segnette Complex (reach 3) of the Company Canal Floodwall project in Jefferson Parish, LA. This proposed alteration consist of restoring the levee and berm to the Federal project geotechnical design/constructed grade and section plus 6-inches and staying within the footprint of the existing levee section at the Bayou Segnette Complex (reach 3), referred to as WBV 16.2 in the Hurricane Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) previously constructed by CEMVN and environmentally assessed in I ER #17.

The purpose of the WBV-16.2 earthen levee is to provide the required level of risk reduction associated with the WBV portion of the HSDRRS project. The elevation required for this earthen levee section to provide the required level of risk reduction is Elev. 10.5-ft. (NAVD88 2004.65) in year 2007 and Elev. 14.0-ft. (NAVD88 2004.65) in year 2057. This change in elevation accounts for projected subsidence, and sea level rise for the project's 50-yr. period of evaluation. The applicant has proposed to restore the levee crown elevation to 14.5-feet for the levee section. The current (2015) crown elevation varies in height with an approximate average elevation of 10.5 with a low area of elevation 9.5. The current levee elevation is at or below the 100-year risk reduction elevation and the levee continues to settle. If the proposed levee lift is not performed within the next few years, the levee may not provide the required level of risk reduction

and meet FEMA accreditation requirements for the 1% annual exceedance probability flood. The proposed work will reduce the risk to overtopping in the near future.

- The WBV-16.2 levee was originally constructed to Elevation 14.0-ft (NAVD88 2004.65) in 2012.
- The maximum height of fill that will be place as part of this Section 408 permit is 5.0-ft.
- The limits of the maximum height of fill are approximately 100-ft., between C/L Sta 2+12 and C/L Sta 3+06.

This proposed levee raise would require approximately 21,000 cubic yards of contractor furnished borrow material to be hauled onto the site. The project would also include grouted rip rap scour protection at each end of the levee to flood wall tie-ins, as well as turf establishment on the approximately 5 acre area, once construction is complete. Prior to adding embankment, the existing vegetation and associated organic material would be cleared and grubbed and waste material would either be disposed of in compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws or temporarily stockpiled for reuse at the Drake Stockyard. No trees or vegetation outside of the currently maintained levee section and staging areas would be disturbed. The existing gravel roads would be removed (approx. 850 cubic yards) and temporarily stockpiled for reuse at the Drake Stockyard. Once the levee and berm have been lifted to the design elevation, the gravel roadways would be put back with a combination of suitable stockpile material and new material (approx. 425 cubic yards) hauled to the site. The applicant plans to use contractor furnished borrow.

The purpose of the WBV-16.2 earthen levee is to provide the required level of risk reduction associated with the WBV portion of the HSDRRS project. The project's joint requesters are Southeast Louisiana Flood Protection Authority – West and the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Board of Louisiana (CPRAB). The joint requesters have estimated the quantity of material to for this work to be approximately 21,000 cu. yds. of embankment material and has estimated the cost to be between \$600,000 and \$800,000. It is estimated that the proposed duration of this work will be 6 to 9-months. Note that this levee reach is approximately 800 feet in length. The levee will not be degraded during construction, however, it will be cleared and grubbed. As bare earth has more erosion potential than turf, should it be subject to an overtopping event, detailed contingency plans will be included in the final plans and specifications to minimize risk, should an overtopping event occur. Note that as this levee reach is only 800 feet in length, as such, risk is limited.

Location of the proposed project is below.



2. Review Requirements

a. Level of Review Required by the Requester

Rationale determining the need for a Type II IEPR should follow procedures in EC 1165-2-214, "Civil Works Review Policy.", and is included in the chart below.

Rationale for Type II IEPR Recommendation

Per EC 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review, two factors mandate a Type II IEPR and three additional factors should be considered in determination whether or not a Type II IEPR should be conducted. These factors and their relevancy to this project are discussed below.

Factor		Relevancy to this project
1) Is the project justified by life safety?	Mandate	("Yes" or "No". State the justification for building this project.) NO – Local levee authorities are restoring the levee to design grade prior to USACE armoring the levee.
2) Would the project's failure pose a significant threat to human life?	Mandate	("Yes" or "No". Explain in paragraph following this table.) NO, the risk characteristics of the authorized levee system will not be impacted by construction of the proposed 408 alteration.
3) Does the project involve the use of innovative materials or techniques where the engineering is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretations, contains precedent-setting methods or models, or presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices?	Consider	("Yes" or "No". Explain.) NO
4) Does the project design require redundancy, resiliency, or robustness?	Consider	("Yes" or "No". Explain.) NO
5) Does the project have unique construction sequencing or a reduction or overlapping design construction schedule?	Consider	("Yes" or "No". Explain.) NO

Information about Alteration:

The Section 408 request, to be reviewed in accordance with this review plan, is being proposed to restore levee constructed height and levee section plus 6 inches, which does not impair usefulness of the levee project. The 408 alteration is to restore the levee height due to foundation settlement since levee construction and the construction will be completed before levee armoring. The alteration does not increase the risk associated with the authorized levee system and has the benefit of ensuring that the level of risk reduction is extended into the future. If the levee grade is not restored, the risk to overtopping increases. For these reasons, the proposed 408 alteration is not injurious to the Public Interest.

The Acting Chief, Engineering Div., New Orleans District (MVN) recommends that a Type II IEPR is not required for this proposed 408 alteration. Part of the risk-informed decision is based on the fact that the proposed alteration consists of rebuilding the levee to the original USACE construction grade plus 6 inches. USACE originally constructed this levee system to the design grade and section in 2012. Since construction, the levee subgrade soils have consolidated, resulting in a decrease in the level of flood risk reduction provided to the leveed area. The proposed modification will restore the construction levee grade and section and help maintain the intended level of flood risk reduction. The HSDRRS guidelines (design and construction) that controlled the original USACE levee design which will be restored by this proposed 408 alteration underwent an IEPR in June 2010.

The Acting Chief, Engineering Division, has determined that this is in agreement with the Greater New Orleans (GNO) HSDRRS – Peer Review Plan dated 6 Dec 2012 (revised plan date). The GNO HSDRRS Review Plan was reviewed by National Planning Center of Expertise for Coastal and Storm Damage Reduction and was founded acceptable and the Review Plan was subsequently approved by MVD. HQ-USACE has also approved the initial GNO HSDRRS Review Plan.

The GNO HSDRRS Review Plan considered that the cornerstone of the Section 2035 IEPR consists of the HSDRRS Design Guidelines (and major changes). IEPR of the design guidelines satisfies Section 2035 IEPR compliance for all HSDRRS features that are designed and constructed in accordance with these design guidelines. In addition, individual features will require separate IEPR when any of the following exist: the features are unique or one-of-a-kind (never been built before), not captured under the

HSDRRS Design Guidelines, or when innovative or non-conventional design or construction techniques/methods will be used.

This proposed 408 alteration to restore the levee grade is not unique and/or one-of-a kind and design and construction will be in accordance with the HSDRRS guidelines.

The original IEPR of the HSDRRS guidelines and GNO HSDRRS Review Plan are available at the following link:

<http://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Offices/ProgramsProjectManagement/ProjectReviewPlans.aspx>

The non-Federal Sponsor is restoring the federally designed levee to previously constructed grade and section (levee proper and berms) plus 6 inches. Based upon MVN 50+ years of experience for designing and constructing new levees in South Louisiana, this restored mini levee lift poses very little risk due to foundation strength gains which have taken place during and since USACE construction of the initial levee. In other words, the restored sections will maintain the factor of safety as required by the HSDRRS design criteria.

MVN's Levee Safety Officer and Levee Safety Program Manager will review this project to ensure all requirements of EC1165-2-216 are met by the requestor and will ensure the Project is accomplished in accordance with the Geotechnical procedures previously approved by HQUSACE.

b. Level of Review Required by the District

The review of this alteration request shall include a district-led Agency Technical Review (ATR), reference paragraph 7.c. (4) in EC 1165-2-216.

c. Decision-Level Determination

The rationale related to whether or not this proposed alteration would require review and decision by HQUSACE, reference paragraph 6.t. in EC 1165-2-216, is included in the chart below. This determination was made as part of the district-led ATR.

Documentation of Review Level Recommendation

Per EC 1165-2-216, Policy and Procedural Guidance for Processing Request to Alter US Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works Projects Pursuant to 33 USC 408, seven questions must be addressed to determine required review and decision level. If the answer to any of the following questions is “yes”, and the District and Division recommend approval of the alterations, then the Section 408 request requires HQUSACE level review and decision. The answer to question #5 is yes, the Applicant is seeking credit for the work covered by this proposed 408 Alteration. Therefore HQ USACE review and approval will be required.

Factor	Relevancy to this Project
1) Does the proposed alteration require a Type II IEPR, reference EC 1165-2-214?	Complete the “Rationale for Type II IEPR (SAR) Recommendation”. Respond “yes” or “no” based on outcome. NO
2) Does the alteration require an EIS in which USACE is the lead agency?	(“Yes” or “No”. Provide additional information for “yes” answers in paragraph below.) - NO
3) Does the proposed alteration change how the USACE project will meet its authorized purpose?	(“Yes” or “No”. Provide additional information for “yes” answers in paragraph below.) - NO
4) Does the proposed alteration preclude or negatively impact alternatives for a current General Investigation or other study?	(“Yes” or “No”. Provide additional information for “yes” answers in paragraph below.) - NO
5) Is the non-Federal sponsor for a USACE project proposing to undertake the alteration as in-kind contributions eligible for credit under Section 221 of the Flood Control Act 1970, as amended?	(“Yes” or “No”. Provide additional information for “yes” answers in paragraph below.) – YES. The requesters have requested to execute a Section 221 in-kind MOU to preserve their ability to seek in-kind credit for this work in association with the levee restoration work authorized in Section 3017 of WRRDA 2014.
6) Is the proposed alteration for installation of hydropower facilities?	(“Yes” or “No”. Provide additional information for “yes” answers in paragraph below.)- NO
7) Is there a desire for USACE to assume operations and maintenance responsibilities of the proposed navigation alterations pursuant to Section 204 (f) of Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986?	(“Yes” or “No”. Provide additional information for “yes” answers in paragraph below.) - NO

d. District Review Purpose

The review of all work products will be in accordance with the guidelines established within this review plan. The purpose of this review is to ensure the proper application of established criteria, regulations, laws, codes, principles and professional practices.

For the purposes of Section 408, the ATR team will make the following determinations:

- 1) Impair the Usefulness of the Project Determination. The objective of this determination is to ensure that the proposed alteration will not limit the ability of the project to function as authorized and will not compromise or change any authorized project conditions, purposes or outputs.
- 2) Injurious to the Public Interest Determination. Proposed alterations will be reviewed to determine the probable impacts, including cumulative impacts, on the public interest. The decision whether to approve an alteration will be determined by the consideration of whether benefits are commensurate with risks.
- 3) Legal and Policy Compliance Determination. A determination will be made as to whether the proposed alteration meets all applicable legal and policy requirements.
- 4) Verify Appropriate Decision Level. Verify whether or not HQUSACE review and decision is required.

3. District-led Agency Technical Review Team

The District-led Agency Technical Review Team is comprised of reviewers with the appropriate independence and expertise to conduct a comprehensive review in a manner commensurate with the type of proposed alteration described in Section 1.b of this review plan.

ATR Reviewers are from the New Orleans District. ATR team members were chosen based on each individual's qualifications and experience with similar Section 408 requests. The New Orleans District ATR team expertise required for this review plan are provided in Attachment 2. Each team member has the necessary experience to provide a comprehensive review that is commensurate with the risk associated with the alteration.

Because all ATR members are very familiar with the WBV 16.2 levee project and most of the team members are designers for the upcoming Armoring project for this reach, a formal site visit was not required for this 408 permission.

a. Products to Undergo ATR

The ATR team will review the following products:

- Written Request
- Plans and Specifications
- All NEPA documentation.

b. Required ATR Team Expertise and Requirements

The following provides an estimate of the ATR members and the types of expertise that are represented on the review panel. See Attachment 2 for specific team member. All ATR team members are MVN employees who are familiar with the HSDRRS design criteria and levee construction over soft foundations in south Louisiana. ATR members include individuals from the following area of expertise:

Chief, Engineering Division
Chief, Geotechnical Branch and MVN Levee Safety Officer
Levee Safety Program Manager
Chief, Hydraulics Branch
Chief, Civil Branch
Assistant Chief, Civil Branch
New Orleans District Real Estate Chief/Deputy Chief, Real Estate Region South
Division
Assistant Chief, Environmental Planning Branch
Regulatory Branch, Eastern Evaluation, Section Chief
Office of Counsel
Sr. PM Armoring Project Manager
Operations, Completed Works Manager, 408 Coordinator
Emergency Management, Project Engineer
Construction Division, Area Engineer

If the above team is not available to review the Section 408 permit request, each reviewer may delegate their review authority to another qualified person. If necessary, any changes to the review team will be documented in Attachment 2.

Acting Chief of Engineering Div. has the direct responsibility for assign ATR reviewer for the Second Lift Section 408 Permits from the NFS. As such, the ATR review team will consist of current Engineer Division Branch Chiefs. ATR comments will be sent to Acting Chief, Engineering Div. for final approval before submission.

c. Completion and Certification of the ATR

At the conclusion of the 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 include:

- (1) Identify the document(s) reviewed and the purpose of the review;
- (2) Disclose the names of the reviewers, their organizational affiliations, and include a short paragraph on both the credentials and relevant experiences of each reviewer;
- (3) Include the charge to the reviewers;
- (4) Describe the nature of their review and their findings and conclusions;
- (5) Identify and summarize each unresolved issue (if any); and
- (6) Include a verbatim copy of each reviewer's comments (either with or without specific attributions), or represent the views of the group as a whole, including any disparate and dissenting views.

ATR may be certified when all ATR concerns are resolved and ATR documentation is complete. The ATR lead will prepare a completion of ATR and Certification of ATR. It will certify that the issues raised by the ATR team have been resolved. The Completion of ATR and Certification of ATR are included in Attachment 1.

4. Execution Plan

a. Review Procedures

Reviews will be conducted in a fashion which promotes dialogue regarding the quality and adequacy of the required documentation. The ATR team will review the documents provided.

The four key parts of a review comment will normally include:

- 1) The review concern – identify the 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 district’s ability to make a decision as to whether to approve or deny the Section 408 request.
- 4) The probable specific action needed to resolve the concern – identify the action(s) that the requester 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 must include the text of each ATR concern, a brief summary of the pertinent points in any discussion, including any vertical coordination, and the agreed upon resolution.

The review may require the following information to determine whether the proposed alteration will impair the usefulness of the project to be injurious to the public interest.

1. Technical Analysis and Design. The minimum level of detail will be 60% complete plans and specifications and supporting analysis.
2. Hydrologic and Hydraulics System Performance Analysis. The District will determine if such an analysis is needed and, if so, determine the appropriate scope of analysis based on the alteration’s complexity.
3. Environmental Compliance. A decision on a Section 408 request is a federal action and therefore subject to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other environmental compliance requirements. The requesters are responsible for providing all information that the District identifies as necessary to satisfy all applicable federal laws, executive orders, regulations, policies, and ordinances. MVN is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed 408 project for WBV-16.2. To evaluate prospective borrow sites in that EA, PM will request that the requesters identify the Borrow Area(s) it intends to use and submit all required contractor-furnished borrow Environmental Compliance checklist items, including the map of proposed site to be excavated. The requesters will obtain all environmental compliance for all evaluated sites and will document the environmental compliance in the Environmental Assessment (EA). Once complete environmental compliance is demonstrated, MVN-OC may provide legal sufficiency for the Draft EA/FONSI. Any Section 408 approval is

conditioned on the requesters' use of the borrow sites evaluated in the EA and for which there is full Environmental Compliance evidenced in the Sec. 408 package. In the event the requester's contractor wishes to use a borrow site for which there wasn't full Environmental Compliance in the Sec. 408 approval, a supplemental EA evaluating the requested site and completion of the Environmental Compliance thereon will be required, which will require routing through MVD and HQ for approval by the Director of Civil Works. Future 408 Requests will include an EA/EIS prepared by the requesters that includes NEPA evaluation of and complete environmental compliance for proposed borrow sources.

The 408 Permission, if granted, will contain "special conditions" stating that use of a borrow site other than the sites evaluated in the EA will require a modification to the 408 approval (and supplemental NEPA) and prohibiting impacts to wetlands (except where a Section 404 permit has been obtained), to upland bottomland hardwood forests, to cultural resources, and to endangered and threatened species and/or to other resources as deemed appropriate.

4. Real Estate Requirements. The requesters should provide a list of all real property interests required to support the proposed work/alteration. This should be supported by a map which clearly depicts both the existing real estate rights and the additional real estate required (existing right-of-way and new right-of-way required, if any). This should include both permanent and temporary real property rights needed. Alternatively, if all work will be constructed within existing rights-of-way, the requesters may so state. If the project requires the acquisition of new right-of-way, USACE approved standard estates should be utilized for project purposes by the requesters. If the requesters should propose a non-standard estate, approval requirements as outlined in EC 405-1-11 and Chapter 12, ER 405-1-12 will be followed. Both requesters for this levee lift work were so advised by letter dated 23 July 2015. No use of lands under the control of the Army/USACE is anticipated.

5. Discussions of Executive Order 11988 Considerations.

6. Requester Review Plan Requirement. For the proposed levee lift project, it has been determined that a Type II IEPR is not required. See paragraph 2a above.

7. Operations and Maintenance. Requesters must identify any operations and maintenance requirements needed throughout the life of the proposed alteration.

The District 408 Coordinator will ensure that the alteration request is submitted by the requester to the District Commander in writing. Once a complete package is submitted, which includes at least 60% plans and specifications, the District 408 Coordinator will

distribute the proposed alteration submittals from the requester to the ATR team members for their review. The ATR team members will determine whether the proposed alteration would impair the usefulness of the federal project, be injurious to the public interest, or meets legal and policy requirements. ATR team members will provide their comments according to the “four key parts” described in the preceding paragraphs to the District 408 Coordinator in a timely manner. Comments will be organized and compiled by the ATR lead and submitted to requestor within 2-3 days of ATR completion.

Following ATR and comment resolution, the District 408 Coordinator will compile a Summary of Findings (with an appendix of ATR Comments and Resolution) and obtain the endorsement from the MVN Levee Safety Program Manager, the MVN District Levee Safety Officer, and other District Leadership before recommending to the District Commander that the proposed requested alteration be denied or recommend granting permission.

If the District Commander’s decision is to recommend granting permission for the alteration request, then the Section 408 request package and such recommendation will be transmitted for review and decision to either deny the request or recommend the granting of permission for the alteration to HQUSACE.

b. Review Schedule

Review schedules are commensurate with the scale and complexity of review. The District 408 Coordinator will work with the ATR team to achieve timely reviews and will maintain contact with the requestor and/or the non-Federal sponsor to keep them informed about the review time. Include an anticipated timeline. If a timelines is included in the Review Procedures, Section 4.a. of this review plan then this paragraph may be removed.

c. Review Cost

This WBV 16.2 408 review will be funded with the New Orleans District’s Inspection of Completed Works (ICW) funds.

5. Review Plan Points of Contact

Name/Title	Organization	Email/Phone
District Section 408 Coordinator	Amy Powell	Amy.e.powell@usace.army.mil

ATTACHMENT 1

COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the <short description of proposed alteration> for <project name and location>. The ATR was conducted as defined in the Alteration-Specific Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-216. During the ATR, compliance with established policy principles and procedures and legal requirements was verified. This included the determination whether the proposed alteration would impair the usefulness of the federal project or was injurious to the public interest. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved.

SIGNATURE

John Bivona, Chief Engineering Division
ATR Team Leader
ED

Date

SIGNATURE

Amy Powell
District Section 408 Coordinator
OD-W

Date

SIGNATURE

Richard Pinner
MVN Levee Safety Officer
ED-F

Date

SIGNATURE

Mark Woodward
MVN Levee Safety Program Manager
ED-F

Date

ATTACHMENT 2

Agency Technical Review Team POCs

Name	Discipline/Role	Phone	E-Mail Address
John Bivona	ATR Lead	504-862-2730	John.C.Bivona@usace.army.mil
Amy Powell	Operations, 408 Coordinator	504-862-2241	Amy.E.Powell@usace.army.mil
Richard Pinner	Levee Safety Officer/Geotech Engr	504-862-1033	Richard.B.Pinner@usace.army.mil
Daryl Glorioso	Office of Council	504-862-1941	Daryl.G.Glorioso@usace.army.mil
Julie LeBlanc	Hydrology and Hydraulics	504-862-1597	Julie.Z.LeBlanc@usace.army.mil
Sandy Stiles	NEPA Compliance	504-862-1583	Sandra.E.Stiles@usace.army.mil
Heath Jones	Emergency Management	504-862-2426	Heath.E.Jones@usace.army.mil
Jean Vossen	Civil Engineer	504-862-2404	Jean.Vossen@usace.army.mil
Dave Beck	Civil Engineer	504-862-2406	David.A.Beck@usace.army.mil
Mark Woodward	Geotechnical Engineer	504-862-1006	Mark.L.Woodward@usace.army.mil
Linda LaBure	Real Estate Specialist	504-862-1295	Linda.C.Labure@usace.army.mil
Mike Farabee	Regulatory	504-862-2292	Michael.V.Farabee@usace.army.mil
Pierre Hingle	Construction Engineer	504-862-2738	Pierre.M.Hingle@usace.army.mil



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
RISK MANAGEMENT CENTER
12596 WEST BAYAUD AVE., SUITE 400
LAKEWOOD, CO 80228

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CEIWR-RMC

1 December 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR: Melissa Mullen, ATTN: CEMVD-RB-T

SUBJECT: Minor Alteration to WBV HSDRRS Project (Restoration of Levee Section), WBV-16.2, West Bank and Vicinity, LA Pursuant to 33 USC § 408 - RMC Concurrence with MVN and MVD for no Type II IEPR

1. This memorandum is in response to an email request from Brian Chewning and Melissa Mullen on 30 November for a memo agreeing that a Type II IEPR was not required for this project. This memo supplements the enclosed concurrence from the RMC on 21 October 2015(encl 1).
2. The Review Plan (RP) for the subject project was signed by Colonel Richard Hansen. In the RP it is stated that the Chief of Engineering in MVN recommends that a Type II IEPR not be performed. Separately, the Chief of Engineering in MVN, made the determination that this project does not pose a significant threat to life safety. This project consists of the sponsor raising the level to the previously constructed grade in anticipation of a USACE project to construct levee armoring. RMC also coordinated with the director of the MVD Dam and Levee Safety Production Center for concurrence on the life safety determination. Based on the above assessment, the RMC concurs that a Type II IEPR (SAR) is not required. The Major Subordinate Command (MSC) can assume Review Management Organization responsibilities for the implementation phase of this project.
3. Thank you for the opportunity to review this decision. For further information, please contact me at 304-399-5217.

Sincerely,

HERR.DUSTIN.CHAR
LES.1384614082

Digitally signed by HERR.DUSTIN.CHARLES.1384614082
DN: cn=US, ou=US Government, ou=DOD, ou=PAE, ou=USA,
c=US, email=HERR.DUSTIN.CHARLES.1384614082
Date: 2015.12.01 10:02:00 -0500

Dustin C. Herr, P.E.
Review Manager
Risk Management Center

Encl 1

CF:
CEIWR-RMC (Mr. Snorteland)
CEMVD-RBT (Division Quality Manager)

ENCL 2

CEMVD-RB-T

10 Nov 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR CEMVD-PD-N (Rayford Wilbanks)

SUBJECT: Section 408 permit, WBV 16.2 Alteration Specific
District review plan for HSDRRS Levee Lift Prior to Armoring -
Revised 26 October 2015

1. Reference memorandum, CEMVS-OD-R, 6 Nov 2015, subject as above.
2. This office concurs with subject Review Plan.
3. The RB-T point of contact is Ms. Melissa Mullen, 901-544-0716.


MICHAEL A. TURNER, P.E.
Chief, Business Technical
Division

ENCL 3