DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 80 VICKSBURG, MISSISSIPPI 39181-0080

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

CEMVD-PD-N

14 Dec 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, New Orleans District
(ATTN: CEMVN-PM-B)

SUBJECT: Review Plan for CAP Section 204 Barataria Bay Waterway, Mile 0 to -6, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana

1. References:

a. Memorandum, CEMVN-PM-B, 10 December 2012, SAB (encl 1).

b. Memorandum, CEMVD-PD-KM, 5 April 2011, subject: MVD Review Procedures for CAP (encl 2).

c. Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Change 1, Civil Works Review Policy, dated 31 January 2012.

2. The subject RP provided under reference 1.a. was reviewed by the Mississippi Valley Division staff, which concurred with the RP. The RP provides for an adequate level of peer review and complies with current peer review policy requirements outlined in EC 1165-2-209 and to the CAP Model RP approved under reference 1.b.

3. I hereby approve this RP, which is subject to change as circumstances require, consistent with the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this RP or its execution will require new written approval from this office.

4. The RP is to be posted to the District website.

5. The POC for this action is Mr. Mincer Minor, CEMVD-PD-N, at (601) 634-5841.

Rayford Wilbanks

RAYFORD E. WILBANKS,
Chief, Planning and Policy, MVD

2 Encls

CF:
CECW-MVD (J. Redican)

Robert H. Fitzgerald

ROBERT H. FITZGERALD, P.E.
Chief, Business Technical
Division, MVD

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 60267
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70160-0267

December 10, 2012

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CEMVN-PM-B

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Mississippi Valley Division (MVN-DST/R. Wilbanks)

SUBJECT: Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Section 204 Barataria Bay Waterway, Mile 0 to -6, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana– Peer Review Plan

1. The subject Review Plan (RP) (enclosure 1) and RP Checklist (enclosure 2) are hereby submitted for review and approval.

2. The RP and RP Checklist follow the Model RP for CAP implementation documents in accordance with EC 1165-2-209.

3. Due to the majority of the items associated with this project making use of typical designs, the project is not likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment. Nor does the project design require redundancy, resiliency, or robustness. In addition construction features have an estimated cost below $45,000,000. Therefore, Type II IEPR is not anticipated.

4. I recommend that this RP be approved as it has been endorsed and reviewed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209. The POC for this study is Mr. Thomas A. Holden Jr., Deputy District Engineer for Project Management. He can be reached at (504) 862-2204.

For MVFJ

Edward R. Fleming
Colonel, EN
Commanding

Encls
1. Peer Review Plan
2. Review Plan Checklist

Attachment 1: Sample Statement of Technical Review for Decision Documents

Completion of Agency Technical Review

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the *Draft Feasibility Report* for *Barataria Bay Waterway Mile 0 to -6, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana*. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project's Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-209. During the ATR, compliance with established policy principles and procedures utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses, alternatives evaluated, the appropriateness of data used and level obtained, and reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing US Army Corps of Engineers policy. The ATR also assessed the District Quality Control (DQC) documentation and made the determination that the DQC activities employed appear to be appropriate and effective. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved and the comments have been closed in DrChecks[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
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, RPED/or Deputy Chief, RPED (home district)
Office Symbol

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

Attachment 2: MVD CAP Review Plan Checklist

Date:	**4 Dec 2012**
Originating District:	MVN
Project/Study Title:	Barataria Bay Waterway, Mile 0 to -6, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana
P2# and AMSCO#:	108830; 183761
District POC:	Sarah Nash
MSC Reviewer:	Mincer Minor
CAP Authority:	CAP Section 204
Other Program Directed to follow CAP Processes:	

Please fill out this checklist and submit with the draft Review Plan when coordinating with the MSC. Any evaluation boxes checked "No" may indicate the project may not be able to use the MVD Model Review Plan. Further explanation may be needed or a project specific review plan may be required. Additional coordination and issue resolution may be required prior to MSC approval of the Review Plan. Checklist may be limited to Section I or Section II or Both, depending on content of review plan (or subsequent amendments).

Section I - Decision Documents

REQUIREMENT	EVALUATION
1. Is the Review Plan (RP) for a Continuing Authorities Project? **Or Other Program Directed to follow CAP Processes?**	Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐
a. Does it include a cover page identifying it as following the Model RP and listing the project/study title, originating district or office, and date of the plan?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does it include a table of contents?	b. Yes ☒ No ☐
c. Is the purpose of the RP clearly stated?	c. Yes ☒ No ☐
d. Does it reference the Project Management Plan (PMP) of which the RP is a component?	d. Yes ☒ No ☐
e. Does it succinctly describe the levels of review: District Quality Control (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), and Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) if applicable for Sec 103 or Sec 205?	e. Yes ☒ No ☐
f. Does it include a paragraph stating the title, subject, and purpose of the decision document to be reviewed?	f. Yes ☒ No ☐
g. Does it list the names and disciplines of the Project Delivery Team (PDT)?* **Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.* **Comments:**	g. Yes ☒ No ☐

2. Is the RP detailed enough to assess the necessary level and focus of the reviews?	Yes ☒ No ☐
3. Does the RP define the appropriate level of review for the project/study?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it state that DQC will be managed by the home district in accordance with the MVD and district Quality Management Plans? b. Does it state that ATR will be managed by MVD? c. Does it state whether IEPR will be performed? For Sec 103 and Sec 205, see additional questions in 5. below. **Comments:**	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☒ No ☐ c. Yes ☒ No ☐
4. Does the RP explain how ATR will be accomplished?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it identify the anticipated number of reviewers? b. Does it provide a succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed for the review (not simply a list of disciplines)? c. Does it indicate that ATR team members will be from outside the home district? d. Does it indicate where the ATR team leader will be from? e. If the reviewers are listed by name, does the RP describe the qualifications and years of relevant experience of the ATR team members?* **Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.* **Comments:** *Once reviewers are identified, the appendix will be updated to include names, contact information, qualifications, years of experience, etc.*	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☒ No ☐ c. Yes ☒ No ☐ d. Yes ☒ No ☐ e. Yes ☒ No ☐
5. For Sec 103 and Sec 205 projects, does the RP explain how IEPR will be accomplished?	Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒
a. Is an exclusion being requested, requiring CG approval? b. Does it provide a defensible rationale for the decision on IEPR? c. If IEPR is required, does it state that IEPR will be managed by an Outside Eligible Organization, external to the Corps of Engineers? d. If IEPR is required, does the RP indicate which PCX will manage the IEPR and whether any coordination with the PCX has occurred? **Comments:** *In accordance with Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, 19 January 2011, and MVD Review Procedures for CAP Memorandum, dated 5 April 2011, CAP Section 204 projects are excluded from Type I IEPR.*	a. Yes ☐ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐ c. Yes ☐ No ☐ d. Yes ☐ No ☐
6. Does the RP address review of sponsor in-kind contributions?	Yes ☒ No ☐

7. Does the RP address how the review will be documented?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR and IEPR comments using Dr Checks?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does the RP explain how the IEPR will be documented in a Review Report?	b. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒
c. Does the RP document how written responses to the IEPR Review Report will be prepared?	c. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒
c. Does the RP detail how the district will disseminate the final IEPR Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the IEPR on the internet and include them in the applicable decision document? **Comments:** *In accordance with Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, 19 January 2011, and MVD Review Procedures for CAP Memorandum, dated 5 April 2011, CAP Section 204 projects are excluded from Type I IEPR.*	d. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒
8. Does the RP address Policy Compliance and Legal Review?	Yes ☒ No ☐
9. Does the RP present the tasks, timing and sequence (including deferrals), and costs of reviews?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it provide a schedule for ATR including review of the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) materials and final report?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does it present the timing and sequencing for IEPR?	b. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒
c. Does it include cost estimates for the reviews?	c. Yes ☒ No ☐
10. Does the RP indicate the study will address Safety Assurance factors? Factors to be considered include: ● Where failure leads to significant threat to human life ● Novel methods\complexity\ precedent-setting models\policy changing conclusions ● Innovative materials or techniques ● Design lacks redundancy, resiliency of robustness ● Unique construction sequence or acquisition plans ● Reduced\overlapping design construction schedule	Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒ **Comments:** *RP documents the Safety Assurance factors are not anticipated to be encountered based on the simplistic nature of the project.*
11. Does the RP address opportunities for public participation?	Yes ☒ No ☐
12. Does the RP indicate ATR of cost estimates will be conducted by pre-certified district cost personnel who will coordinate with the Walla Walla Cost DX?	Yes ☒ No ☐
13. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?	Yes ☒ No ☐

Section II - Implementation Documents

Please fill out this checklist and submit with the draft Review Plan or subsequent Review Plan amendments when coordinating with the MSC. For DQC, the District is the RMO; for ATR and Type II IEPR, MVD is the RMO. Any evaluation boxes checked "No" indicate the RP possibly may not comply with MVD Model Review Plan and should be explained. Additional coordination and issue resolution may be required prior to MVD approval of the Review Plan.

REQUIREMENT	EVALUATION
1. Are the implementation documents/products described in the review or subsequent amendments?	Yes ☒ No ☐
2. Does the RP contain documentation of risk-informed decisions on which levels of review are appropriate?	Yes ☒ No ☐
3. Does the RP present the tasks, timing, and sequence of the reviews (including deferrals)?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it provide an overall review schedule that shows timing and sequence of all reviews? b. Does the review plan establish a milestone schedule aligned with the critical features of the project design and construction?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☒ No ☐
4. Does the RP address engineering model review requirements?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it list the models and data anticipated to be used in developing recommendations? b. Does the RP identify any areas of risk and uncertainty associated with the use of the proposed models? c. Does it indicate the certification/approval status of those models and if review of any model(s) will be needed? d. If needed, does the RP propose the appropriate level of review for the model(s) and how it will be accomplished?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☒ No ☐ c. Yes ☒ No ☐ d. Yes ☒ No ☐ *Comments: Due to the simplicity of Section 204 projects, no engineering models are anticipated to be used. Therefore there are no areas of risk and uncertainty associated nor will any model certifications/approvals be needed.*
5. Does the RP explain how and when there will be opportunities for the public to comment on the study or project to be reviewed?	Yes ☒ No ☐

6. Does the RP address expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor? If expected in-kind contributions are to be provided by the sponsor, does the RP list the expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor?	Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐
7. Does the RP explain how the reviews will be documented?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR comments using Dr Checks and Type II IEPR published comments and responses pertaining to the design and construction activities summarized in a report reviewed and approved by the MSC and posted on the home district website?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does the RP explain how the Type II IEPR will be documented in a Review Report?	b. Yes ☐ No ☐
c. Does the RP document how written responses to the Type II IEPR Review Report will be prepared?	c. Yes ☐ No ☐
d. Does the RP detail how the district/MVD will disseminate the final Type II IEPR Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the Type II IEPR on the internet?	d. Yes ☐ No ☐ *Comments: Type II IEPR is not applicable*
8. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?	Yes ☒ No ☐

Attachment 3: MVD Model Review Plan for Sections 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 or 1135 or projects in other programs directed to use CAP processes

REVIEW PLAN

Using the MVD Model Review Plan
for
Continuing Authorities Program
Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208, or 1135 Projects,
or Projects directed by Guidance
to use CAP processes

Barataria Bay Waterway Mile 0 to -6, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana
Section *204* Project

New Orleans District

MSC Approval Date: *14 December 2012*
Last Revision Date: *None*

US Army Corps
of Engineers ®

Review Plan
Using the MVD Model Review Plan

Barataria Bay Waterway Mile 0 to -6, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana
Section *204* Project

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REVIEW PLAN
Barataria Bay Waterway Mile 0 to -6, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana

1. Purpose and Requirements.

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the *Barataria Bay Waterway Mile 0 to -6,Jefferson Parish, Louisiana*, Section *204 Project* products. *The review plan is part of the Project Management Plan with anticipated review products to include, but not be limited to, the AFB Submittal Package, Draft Feasibility Report and supporting technical appendices (environmental assessment, cost estimate, real estate plan, and engineering drawings), Final Feasibility Report and supporting technical appendices if significant comments are received during the public comment period, and Plans and Specifications.*

Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, Public Law 102-580, provides the authority to carry out projects to reduce storm damage to property, to protect, restore and create aquatic and ecologically related habitats, including wetlands, and to transport and place suitable sediment, in connection with dredging for construction, operation, or maintenance by the Secretary of an authorized Federal water resources project. This is a Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) which focuses on water resource related projects of relatively smaller scope, cost and complexity. Unlike the traditional Corps' civil works projects that are of wider scope and complexity, 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, Amendment #2.

b. Applicability. This review plan is based on the MVD Model Review Plan for Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208, or 1135 Projects or Programs directed by guidance to follow CAP processes, which is applicable to projects that do not require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), as defined by the mandatory Type I IEPR triggers contained in EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy.

c. References:

(1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2010.
(2) Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, CECW-P, dated 19 January 2011.
(3) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 March 2010.
(4) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 September 2006.
(5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 January 2007.
(6) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 November 2007.

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 Section *204* is MVD. MVD will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the Agency Technical Review (ATR). The home District will post the approved review plan on its public website.

3. Project Information.

a. Decision Document *and Implementation Document*. The *Barataria Bay Waterway Mile 0 to -6, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana* decision document will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F, Amendment #2. The approval level of the decision document (if policy compliant) is MVD. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document. *Plans and Specifications (P&S) will also be prepared for implementation of the project and will undergo ATR review.*

b. Study/Project Description. *The scope of this study is limited to investigating the feasibility of beneficially using material removed from the Barataria Bay Waterway, Louisiana project during routine maintenance dredging between approximately Miles 0.0 and -6.0 to restore and protect saltwater marsh and associated habitat on Fifi Island, located north of Grand Isle. The restoration area is located entirely within Jefferson parish.*

Fifi Island lies along the southern edge of the Barataria Basin. The Basin is an interdistributary estuarine system with a mixture of swamps, marshes, ponds, barrier islands, and bays created by sediment from the Mississippi River and complex coastal processes. Fifi Island is part of a chain of islands situated across the mouth of Barataria Bay that protect the estuary from oceanic waves and storm surges. The island also provides protection for the Bayou Rigaud navigation channel and the developed north shore of Grand Isle. Without this protection, waves could be larger in the navigation channel and along the bulk-headed shoreline. This could have implications for navigational safety, ship moorings, ship loading, and the stability of existing bulkheads.

The area is comprised primarily of intertidal salt marsh, which is a highly productive habitat for a variety of estuarine and marine fishes and invertebrates, and provides a critical role in maintaining productivity of the estuarine ecosystem. However, Fifi Island has been susceptible to chronic erosion in recent years. An analysis of erosion rates on the north side of the island shows that approximately 87 acres of land (18% of land cover) have been lost from Fifi Island between 1945 and 2009. It is estimated that approximately 121 acres of additional land, mostly salt marsh, will be lost from Fifi Island over the next 50 years if the present erosion rate continues.

The project alternatives have been developed from an array of potential restoration measures for the identified dredge placement areas. Structural and nonstructural management measures and various permutations of scales and locations have been considered and include restoration of marsh, construction of terraces, vegetative plantings, construction of containment dikes, and degradation of containment dikes.

Five alternative plans (including the no-action alternative) were identified for further evaluation. The alternative locations consist of various cross-section profiles for marsh restoration, ranging from approximately 80 to 180 acres. The sites are primarily shallow open water, but may contain some portion of subaerial land (eroded emergent marsh, eroded terraces, etc). The estimated incremental cost for these alternatives are in the range of $1,500,000 to $4,500,000.

The Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) is the non-Federal sponsor for this project. A Letter of Intent has been received confirming their understanding of their responsibilities and their commitment to perform these responsibilities, including cost sharing for the design and implementation of the project, should a cost effective alternative be recommended during the feasibility phase.

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and level of Review. *The Model Programmatic Review Plan was used to determine the appropriate scope and level of review for this study. By nature of the authority, CAP Section 204 projects are very simplistic aquatic ecosystem restoration projects. The intent of Section 204 is to place material that is being dredged under the Operation and Maintenance authority in a different location than that required based on the Federal Standard (and to provide the incremental cost of doing so). This change in location or disposal area to benefit the environment does not require any highly challenging analyses. Very simple designs are required with limited real estate acquisition and negligible, if any, environmental impacts.*

There are no significant risks associated with planning or implementation of this project. It is a beneficial use of dredged material project designed to create emergent marsh and protect existing adjacent marsh from further erosion and/or saltwater intrusion. Non-performance of the project would not change the existing site conditions (open water). The project is located in an unpopulated area, so it does not involve a significant threat to human life and/or safety.

An EIS is not anticipated, as the project is not likely to have significant economic, environmental, or social effects to the nation or to have more than negligible adverse impacts on scarce or unique cultural, historic, or tribal resources. The project is not likely to have substantial adverse impacts on fish and wildlife species or their habitat and is not likely to have more than negligible adverse impacts on species listed as endangered or threatened, or to the designated critical habitat of such species, under the Endangered Species Act, prior to implementation of mitigation. An EA is expected to be sufficient for this project. No significant interagency interests are anticipated.

The Feasibility Report is not likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment. It is not likely to be highly controversial; no public dispute is expected. Information in the decision document will not be based on novel methods.

The parts of the study that will be the most challenging include developing a cost estimate for the Federal Standard (since this changes each dredging cycle based on dredging reach and O&M funding availability) and coordinating funding and implementation schedules with Operations Division .

All decision and implementation documents shall undergo district quality control and Agency Technical Review. In accordance with Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, 19 January 2011, and MVD Review Procedures for CAP Memorandum, dated 5 April 2011, CAP Section 204 projects are excluded from Type I IEPR, and a Type II IEPR is not anticipated to be required in the design and implementation phase, but this will be verified and documented in the design and implementation phase of the project.

d. In-Kind Contributions. Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to District Quality Control (DQC) and ATR, similar to any products developed by USACE. *No in-kind products/analyses are anticipated .*

4. District Quality Control (DQC).

All decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC prior to ATR. 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 in accordance with MVD and district Quality Management Plan. Any discrepancies between a reviewer and a Project Delivery Team (PDT) member will be resolved face-to-face. If a concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the DQC team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the section supervisor for further resolution. *DQC will be conducted on the AFB submittal/draft decision document and supporting information (including but not limited to the engineering appendix, environmental assessment, real estate plan, cost estimates, and plan formulation methodology). DQC will also be conducted on the P&S. Each of these products will undergo review by Senior level staff within the appropriate technical division.*

5. Agency Technical Review (ATR).

One ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.), however additional ATRs may be performed if deemed warranted. 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. ATR is managed within USACE by the designated RMO, *which in this case is MVD*, 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. The ATR team lead will be from within the home MSC.

a. Products to Undergo ATR. ATR will be performed throughout the project in accordance with the District and MVD Quality Management Plans. Products to undergo ATR include: *ATR will be conducted on the AFB submittal/draft decision document and supporting information (including but not limited to the engineering appendix, environmental assessment, real estate plan, cost estimates, and plan formulation methodology). ATR will also be conducted on the P&S.*

b. Required ATR Team Expertise.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	***Expertise Required***
ATR Lead	*The ATR lead should be a senior professional preferably with experience in preparing Section 204 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 New Orleans District.*
Planning	*The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in formulation of projects for ecosystem restoration with a particular emphasis on formulation of beneficial use projects and general planning policy.*
Environmental Resources	*The reviewer will have experience in Wetland Value Assessments (WVAs) and in environmental compliance related to Federal, State, and local regulations.*
Civil Engineering	*The reviewer will have experience in beneficial use of dredged material projects and design of confined and unconfined disposal areas.*
Cost Engineering	*Cost DX Staff or Cost DX Pre-Certified Professional with experience preparing cost estimates for beneficial use projects*

	associated with a Federally authorized waterway. The reviewer will also have experience preparing cost estimates for placement of dredged material within the Federal Standard.
Real Estate	*The reviewer will have a comprehensive understanding of real estate acquisition and appraisal for beneficial use projects.*

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. Any editorial comments should be provided informally by email to the PDT.

6. 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 MVD 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.

7. Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) Review And Certification.

For CAP projects, ATR of the costs may be conducted by pre-certified district cost personnel within the region or by the Walla Walla Cost DX. The pre-certified list of cost personnel has been established and is maintained by the Cost DX at https://kme.usace.army.mil/EC/cost/CostAtr/default.aspx. The cost ATR member will coordinate with the Cost DX for execution of cost ATR and cost certification. The Cost DX will be responsible for final cost certification and may be delegated at the discretion of the Cost DX.

8. Model Certification And Approval.

Approval of planning models under EC 1105-2-412 is not required for CAP projects. MSC commanders remain responsible for assuring the quality of the analyses used in these projects. ATR will be used to ensure that models and analyses 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.

EC 1105-2-412 does not cover engineering models used in planning. 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. As part of the USACE Scientific and Engineering Technology (SET) Initiative, many engineering models have been identified as preferred or acceptable for use on Corps studies and these models should be used whenever appropriate. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

Planning and Engineering Models. The following models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document: *Wetland Value Assessment Methodology and IWR Planning Suite. Please note, in accordance with Continuing Authority Program Planning Process Improvements memo dated 19 Jan 11, approval of planning models is not required for CAP projects.*

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study
Wetland Value Assessment Methodology - Coastal Marsh Community Model	*A Wetland Value Assessment (WVA) is a quantitative, habitat-based assessment developed to estimate anticipated environmental impacts and benefits to wetlands. The WVA is a modification of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) Habitat Evaluation Procedure (HEP) which is widely used by the USFWS and other agencies to evaluate the impacts of development projects on fish and wildlife resources. While the HEP utilizes species-specific models, the WVA utilizes a community-level approach. WVA methodology relies on the use of the Coastal Marsh Community Models, which were developed by the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act (CWPPRA) Environmental Working Group to determine the suitability of marsh and open water habitats in the Louisiana coastal zone. Three community-level, mathematical models were developed specifically for each marsh type in coastal Louisiana. The model will be used to evaluate data to determine baseline habitat conditions and predict habitat conditions for future with-project and future without-project scenarios.*
IWR Planning Suite, Cost Effectiveness/Incremental Cost Analysis Software, (CE/ICA)	*The Cost Effectiveness/Incremental Cost Analysis Software (CE/ICA) is used to evaluate alternative plans, determine which plans are cost effective, and to identify a National Ecosystem Restoration (NER) Plan. The model will be used to evaluate the project-specific alternatives developed as part of this Section 204 project.*

9. Review Schedules And Costs.

ATR Schedule and Cost.

Draft Feasibility Report	*1 Jul 2013 – 26 Jul 2013; $15,000 (schedule and cost estimate to be coordinated with RMO and review team)*
Final Feasibility Report	*4 Nov 2013 – 29 Nov 2013; $10,000 (schedule and cost estimate to be coordinated with RMO and review team)*
Design Documentation Report	*4 May 2015 – 29 May 2015; $10,000(schedule and cost estimate to be coordinated with RMO and review team)*
Plans and Specifications	*4 May 2015 – 29 May 2015; $15,000 (schedule and cost estimate to be coordinated with RMO and review team)*

Milestone Schedule:

Alternative Formulation Briefing	*30 Aug 2013*
Feasibility Report Approval	*31 Jan 2014*
PPA Execution	*12 Dec 2014*
P&S Complete	*26 Jun 2015*
BCOE Review Complete	*24 Jul 2015*
Construction Contract Advertise	*21 Aug 2015*
Construction Contract Award	*18 Sep 2015*

Note: All dates are contingent upon funding. Milestones related to the construction contract are contingent upon both CAP funding (Section 204 increment of work) and O&M dredging schedule and funding (base dredging contract and associated cost of disposal within the Federal Standard).

10. 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. *Preparation of the Environmental Assessment (EA) and draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) will be coordinated with appropriate Congressional, Federal, state, and local interests, as well as environmental groups and other interested parties. The interested parties letters and Notice of Availability for the EA and draft FONSI will be mailed out for a 30 day comment period. Final copies of the EA and FONSI will be sent via email, if requested. The review plan and final decision document will also be posted on the district's public website.*

11. Review Plan Approval And Updates.

The *MVD DST Chief and RB-T Chief are* responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the MVD Model Review Plan is appropriate for the specific project covered by the plan. The review plan is a living document and may change as the studies progresses. The home district is responsible for keeping the review plan up to date. Minor changes to the review plan since the last MVD approval are documented in Attachment 2. Significant changes to the review plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) should be reapproved by MVD following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in MVD determining that use of the MVD Model Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-209. The latest version of the review plan, along with the MVD approval memorandum, will be posted on the home district's webpage.

12. Review Plan Points Of Contact.

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

- *Sarah Nash, Project Manager, 504-862-1723*
- *Mincer Minor, District Support Team, 601-634-5841*

Attachment 1: Team Rosters

PDT MEMBERS			
Name	**Role**	**Phone**	**Email**
Brad Inman	Senior Project Manager	504-862-2124	Brad.L.Inman@usace.army.mil
Sarah Nash	Project Manager	504-862-1723	Sarah.C.Nash@usace.army.mil
Danielle Tommaso	Plan Formulator	504-862-1967	Danielle.M.Tommaso@usace.army.mil
Jason Binet	Engineering - Civil	504-862-2127	Jason.A.Binet@usace.army.mil
Kristin Johnson	Engineering - Civil	504-862-2267	Kristin.M.Johnson@usace.army.mil
Pam Deloach	Engineering - Control	504-862-2621	Pamela.A.Deloach@usace.army.mil
Bich Quach	Engineering - Geotech	504-862-1504	Bich.N.Quach@usace.army.mil
Eric Salamone	Engineering - Cost	504-862-1676	Benjamin.E.Salamone@usace.army.mil
Michael Brown	Environmental Manager	504-862-1570	Michael.T.Brown@usace.army.mil
Eric Williams	Environmental - Cultural	504-862-2862	Eric.Williams@usace.army.mil
Karen Vance	Real Estate Manager	504-862-1349	Karen.E.Vance@usace.army.mil
Ed Creef	Operations Division	504-862-2521	Edward.D.Creef@usace.army.mil
Mary Kinsey	Office of Counsel	504-862-2828	Mary.V.Kinsey@usace.army.mil

MVD MEMBERS			
Name	**Role**	**Phone**	**Email**
Mincer Minor	District Support Team	601-634-5841	Mincer.Minor@usace.army.mil

ATR MEMBERS			
Name	**Role**	**Phone**	**Email**
	Plan Formulator		
	Civil Design		
	Cost Engineering		
	Environmental Manager		
	Real Estate Manager		

Attachment 2: Review Plan Revisions

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page/Paragraph Number