US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, MOBILE DISTRICT

Review Plan

Bayou Casotte Harbor Channel Improvement Project, Pascagoula Harbor Mississippi Feasibility Study

Mobile District
06/21/11

Revised by SAD
10/4/2011

Revised by SAM
02/17/12

US Army Corps of Engineers
Mobile District

BAYOU CASOTTE HARBOR CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MISSISSIPPI
FEASIBILITY STUDY
REVIEW PLAN

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

BAYOU CASOTTE HARBOR CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MISSISSIPPI
FEASIBILITY STUDY
REVIEW PLAN

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

This Review Plan (RP) defines the scope and level of peer review for the Bayou Casotte Harbor Channel Improvement Project Feasibility Study, Pascagoula Harbor, MS. In compliance with EC 1165-2-209, this RP identifies the review processes for all work performed as part of the study, including in-house, non-Federal sponsor, and contract work efforts. This RP is part of the project management plan (PMP).

A. References

EC 1165-2-209 "Civil Works Review Policy" dated 31 January 2010
EC 1105-2-412 "Quality Assurance of Planning Models" dated 31 March 2011
ER 1105-2-100 "Planning Guidance Notebook" dated 22 April 2000
Major General Riley Memorandum on Peer Review Process, dated 30 May 2007
ECB 2007-6 "Model Certification Issues for Engineering Software in Planning Studies" dated 10 April 2007

B. Requirements

This review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, which establishes an accountable, comprehensive, life-cycle review strategy for Civil Works products. The EC outlines four general levels of review that will be discussed in greater detail in the document sections that follow: 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 1165-2-209) and planning model certification/approval (per EC 1105-2-412).

1) District Quality Control

DQC is the review of basic science and engineering work products and is focused on fulfilling project quality requirements. Basic quality control tools include quality checks and reviews, supervisory reviews, project delivery team (PDT) reviews, etc. DQC will be managed by the Mobile District and will be documented in accordance with the Major Subordinate Command (MSC) and District Quality Management Plans. The DQC will be performed by staff in the District not doing the work involved in the study. For the Bayou Casotte Feasibility Study, non-PDT members and/or supervisory staff will perform DQC review for major draft and final products. These in-house reviewers will also review any products provided by the non-federal sponsor as in-kind services. Their review of all products will follow that performed by the PDT

(i.e., the PDT is responsible for reading the entire report, technical appendices and recommendations to insure its overall integrity prior to endorsement by the District Commander). DQC will be documented in DrChecks.

2) **Agency Technical Review**

ATR is an in-depth review, managed within USACE and performed by a qualified team outside of the home district. The purpose of the ATR is to insure the proper application of clearly established criteria, regulations, laws, codes, principles and professional practices. The ATR team will review the various work products and insure their technical adequacy. Additionally, any products provided by the non-Federal sponsor as in-kind services that are incorporated into the overall product/report will be subject to ATR. ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel (Regional Technical Specialists, etc.), and may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate. To assure independence, the ATR team will be comprised of individuals outside the Mobile District. EC 1165-2-209 requires that DrChecks be used to document all ATR comments, responses, and resolution. This RP outlines the planned ATR approach for meeting this requirement for the Bayou Casotte Feasibility Study (Section 4.B.).

3) Independent External Peer Review

The IEPR is the most independent level of review and is applied in cases that meet certain criteria (i.e., 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 1165-2-209, is made as to whether IEPR is appropriate. Type I IEPR is managed by an outside eligible organization (OEO) that is described in Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3) as: exempt from Federal tax under section 501(a), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; independent; free from conflicts of interest; not carrying out or advocating for or against Federal water resources projects; and having experience in establishing and administering IEPR panels. The scope of review will address all of the underlying planning and engineering analyses performed for the project. Section 4.C. of this Review Plan outlines the planned approach for meeting the IEPR requirement for the Bayou Casotte Feasibility Study. There are two types of IEPR: Type I is generally for decision documents and Type II is generally for implementation products.

a) Type I IEPR. Type I IEPRs are managed outside the USACE and are performed on project studies. Type I IEPR covers the entire decision document or action and addresses all of the underlying engineering, economics, and environmental work, not just one aspect of the study.
b) Type II IEPR. Type II IEPRs are managed outside the USACE and are performed 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 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 consider the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities in assuring public health, safety, and welfare. However, since this project is a channel

improvement project and there is not an existing or potential hazard to pose a significant threat to human life, the safety assurance review requirement is not applicable (See Section 3.B. of this Review Plan - Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review).

4) Policy and Legal Compliance Review

In addition to the technical reviews described above, 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 further in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. These reviews culminate in determinations that the report recommendations and supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority. The technical review efforts (i.e., DQC, ATR, and IEPR) addressed in EC 1165-2-209 are to augment and compliment the policy review processes by addressing compliance with published Army policies pertinent to planning products, particularly policies on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents.

5) Cost Engineering Review and Coordination

Coordination with the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX), located in Walla Walla District, will be performed by the RMO, in this case the Deep Draft Navigation Center of Expertise. The DX, or in some circumstances cost RTS that are pre-certified by the DX, will conduct the cost ATR. The DX will provide certification of the final total project cost.

6) Model Certification/Approval

EC-1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, establishes the process and requirements for certification of planning models. This circular pertains specifically to software used in Corps' planning studies to insure that only high quality software is being used for key planning decisions. Planning models are defined as any models and analytical tools that planners use to define water resources management problems and opportunities, to formulate potential alternatives, to address the identified problems and opportunities, to evaluate potential effects of alternatives, and to support decision making. It includes all models used for planning regardless of their scope or source.

The computational models to be used in the Bayou Casotte Feasibility Study will be developed by or for the USACE. Model certification and approval for all identified planning models will be coordinated through the Deep Draft Navigation Project Center of Expertise (DDNPCX). Project schedules and resources will be adjusted to address this process for certification and PCX coordination. Additionally, spreadsheet models developed for economic and environmental use may need approval for use. The planning model to be used is:

- HarborSym Economics Model – A planning-level simulation model designed to assist in economic analysis of coastal harbors by calculating vessel interactions within the harbor and analyzing delays. The model output can be used to calculate the cost of these delays and any changes in overall transportation costs resulting from proposed modifications to the channel's physical dimensions or restrictions. HarborSym has

been certified for use on Deep Draft navigation studies nationally.

The following engineering models will be utilized in the study. The request for Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Coastal models review/approval will be coordinated through the SAD Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Coastal Principal to be endorsed and forwarded for review by the Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Coastal Community of Practice. Since engineering models undergo a different review and approval process for usage, their certification is not addressed in this RP. These models include:

a) Cost Engineering Dredge Estimating Programs (CEDEP)
b) Advanced Circulation (ADCIRC) Large Domain Modeling – Enhance existing grid, calibrate two-dimensional boundary conditions, and develop near field boundary conditions in support of CH3D modeling. ADCIRC is a certified USACE Coastal Community of Practice Preferred Modeling Platform.
c) Curvilinear Hydrodynamics in Three Dimensions (CH3D) Modeling. Calibrated and validated to historic events, used for refined near-field three-dimensional modeling of existing and alternative channels. The use of CH3D is approved for use by the USACE Coastal Community of Practice.
d) Integrated Compartment Model (ICM). A water quality model linked to output from the CH3D hydrodynamic modeling platform. The use of ICM is approved for use by the USACE Water Quality Community of Practice.
e) SEDZLJ Sediment transport module used to predict process-based and event-based sediment transport tendencies and changes in shoaling for ship channel.
f) ERDC Ship/Tow Simulator. This model will simulate ship movement through various alternative scenarios.

The ADCIRC, CH3D, and ICM models are approved for use by the Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Coastal Community of Practice. The Coastal CoP or Coastal Working Group consists of members across several functional areas that include Engineering, Planning and Operations.

2. PLANNING CENTER OF EXPERTISE COORDINATION

This project is a deep-draft navigation project. Pursuant to EC 1165-2-209, the District will coordinate with the Deep Draft Navigation PCX (DDNPCX) in Mobile District the Review Management Organization (RMO). As the RMO, the DDNPCX will organize teams to perform the reviews at various stages throughout the study. The DDNPCX is responsible for the accomplishment and quality of ATR and IEPR for this study. The PCX will also coordinate with Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise at Walla Walla for the ATR of the CEDEP estimate, construction schedules and contingencies.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

A. Authority and Project Description

1) Authority

The study is being conducted under authority of Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 33 U.S.C. 2232, as amended). Section 204(a) authorizes the non-Federal sponsor to undertake navigational improvements; Section 204(b) authorizes the USACE to undertake all necessary studies and engineering for construction and provide technical assistance in obtaining necessary permits; and Section 204(f) directs the Government to assume responsibility for maintenance of such improvements, if (1) Prior to construction of the improvements the Secretary determines the improvements are economically justified, environmentally acceptable and are consistent with the purposes of Title II of WRDA86; (2) the Secretary certifies that the project is constructed in accordance with applicable permits and appropriate engineering and design standards; and (3) the Secretary does not find the project or element is no longer economically justified or environmentally acceptable. In summary, the non-Federal sponsor, the Jackson County Port Authority (JCPA), has funded the USACE Mobile District to perform the feasibility study. The non-Federal sponsor has indicated its preferred alternative. If the National Economic Development (NED) plan exceeds the aforementioned sponsor preferred plan, it is anticipated that the non-Federal sponsor will request a locally preferred plan. Further, the non-Federal sponsor intends to pay for construction of channel improvements. Ultimately, it is the sponsor's intent to seek Federal assumption of maintenance.

2) Project Description

The Bayou Casotte feasibility study, initiated on January 6, 2010, investigates the need to widen the Bayou Casotte portion of the Pascagoula Harbor Federal navigation project. The proposed widening within the Mississippi Sound extends from the Horn Island Pass to the Lower Bayou Casotte Turning Basin. The study will be used to determine whether proposed modification to the Federal project is economically justified and environmentally acceptable.

The work consists of studying various alternatives including their engineering features, economic benefits, environmental impacts, project costs, and navigation impacts. A number of plans will be evaluated to address the identified problems. The study will result in a decision document that is a Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Since the study is being performed under Section 204 of WRDA86, it is anticipated that the Secretary will be the approving official.

B. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review

This section presents the factors affecting the risk informed decisions on the appropriate scope and level of review. The discussion is intended to be detailed enough to assess the level and focus of review and support the PDT, PCX, and vertical team decisions on the appropriate level

of review and types of expertise represented on the various review teams. Factors affecting the risk informed decisions on the appropriate scope and level of review include the following:

- *If parts of the study will likely be challenging (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways – consider technical, institutional, and social challenges, etc.);*
  There are no challenging aspects of this study. It consists of widening a segment of the existing Federal navigation project to improve the efficiency of vessel operations. Accordingly, the project does not have any significant technical, institutional, or social challenges.
- *A preliminary assessment of where the project risks are likely to occur and what the magnitude of those risks might be (e.g., what are the uncertainties and how might they affect the success of the project);*
  There are no known risks to the proposed channel modification. All technical areas have methods to indentify and mitigate inherit risks.
- *If the project is likely to have significant economic, environmental, and/or social effects to the Nation (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways);*
  The project consists of widening a segment of the existing Federal navigation project. Since improvements are located in the Mississippi Sound, significant economic and social effects are not likely. Furthermore, preliminary environmental evaluations do not indicate that proposed modifications will result in significant environmental impacts.
- *If the project/study is likely to have significant interagency interest (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways);*
  Modification to the existing navigation project is not likely to have any significant interagency interest. The feasibility study is being coordinated with the appropriate agencies, and to date no objection has been raised.
- *If the project/study will be highly controversial (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways);*
  The feasibility study/project is not controversial as it consists of widening a segment of the existing navigation project to accommodate existing harbor taffic. Disposal of dredged material will include placement in approved disposal sites and beneficial use for those sediments that are suitable for such use.
- *If the project report is likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways);*
  The project does not contain influential scientific information and will not include any highly influential scientific assessments.
- *If the information in the decision document or proposed project design will likely 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 (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways);*
  The Bayou Casotte Widening Project is a typical channel improvement project involving traditional methods of dredging, traditional placement of dredged material, and beneficial use of dredged material where possible. Therefore, it is anticipated that there is a minimal risk involved with the project. The final Feasibility Report and supporting documentation will contain standard engineering, economic, and environmental analyses and information.

Novel methods will not be utilized and methods, models or conclusions will not be precedence setting or likely to change policy decisions.

C. Project Delivery Team

The Project Delivery Team (PDT) is comprised of those individuals directly involved in the development of the decision document and includes the Corps of Engineers' technical and management staff and the non-Federal sponsor.

D. In-Kind Contributions

Any In-Kind contributions the non-federal sponsor provides to assist in study project execution (ie: project management; public involvement, coordination and outreach; data collection; and periodic project review) will undergo DQC, ATR and IEPR as defined in Sections 1 and 4 of this RP.

4. REVIEW PROCESS

A. Documents to be Reviewed

The decision documents that will undergo peer review are the Feasibility Report (including the Economic and Engineering Appendices) and the Environmental Impact Statement.

B. Agency Technical Review

1) General

ATR will be performed throughout the study process. The Pre-Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM) ATR began in mid-December 2010. The PDT responded to comments, revised FSM documents and completed the ATR back check in early February 2011. The second ATR will be held in February 2012 when the ATR Team will review the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) package. The PDT will then respond to comments and resolve the ATR issues prior to an AFB in spring of 2012. The third ATR will be held in December 2012 prior to the District completing the Draft Feasibility Report and EIS. This ATR will include the review and changes being made, the OWPR Policy Review, Policy Review and Memo Preparation and PDT revisions to project documents to address policy review comments. The final ATR is scheduled for January 2014 following the Final Public/Agency Review.

The ATR will focus on the following:

- Review of the methods of analysis; design of alternatives; and recommended plan;
- Review of all models used for economic, engineering, and environmental purposes;
- Compliance with program and NEPA requirements; and
- Completeness of study and support documentation.

All ATR comments and responses will be formalized in DrChecks. Draft report documents will

be modified based on the ATR comments and responses. The revised report will be reviewed again by the ATR team for completeness. The PCX will provide a formal ATR certification.

2) ATR Team

The ATR is best conducted by experienced peers within the same discipline who are not directly involved with the development of the study or project being reviewed. The ATR will be managed by the DDNPCX with appropriate consultation with the allied Communities of Practice such as engineering and real estate. It is anticipated that the final ATR review team will consist of 7 reviewers and will represent each of the following disciplines: hydraulics and hydrology, geotechnical engineering, economics, environmental, real estate, plan formulation, and cost engineering. A brief description of the disciplines required for the ATR team are identified below:

a) Hydraulics and Hydrology – the reviewer(s) should have knowledge of channel design, hydrodynamic-salinity, ship simulation, sediment, erosion and coastal shoreline models/studies.

b) Geotechnical – the reviewer(s) should have knowledge of coastal geomorphology.

c) Economics – the reviewer(s) should have a strong understanding of economic models or studies relative to deep draft navigation.

d) Environmental – the reviewer(s) should have a strong background in coastal ecosystems and Mississippi environmental laws and regulations.

e) Real Estate – the reviewer(s) should have knowledge in reviewing RE Plans for feasibility studies (e.g. navigation servitude).

f) Plan Formulation – the reviewer(s) should have a strong knowledge in current planning policies and guidance related to feasibility studies.

g) Cost Engineering – the reviewer(s) should have a knowledge of the cost estimating practices for deep draft navigation projects.

3) Review Cost

The total cost of ATR is estimated at approximately $150,000.

4) Review Schedule

TASK	Proposed Start Date	Proposed End Date
Feasibility Scoping Meeting		
1st ATR- Pre-FSM ATR	**December 13, 2010**	**December 17, 2010**
PDT responds to cmts, revises FSM docs, and ATR backcheck	December 20, 2010	March 9, 2012
FSM (week of)	April 9, 2012	April 13, 2012
PGM Preparation	April 16, 2012	May 3, 2012

PGM Response and Resolution	May 4, 2012	May 17, 2012
2nd DQC and ATR- Draft Feasibility Report	July 17, 2012	December 3, 2012
Alternative Formulation Briefing		
Prepare AFB Documents	May 18, 2012	July 11, 2012
Print/collate/ship AFB Documents	December 18, 2012	December 26, 2012
HQUACE Review of AFB Documents	January 3, 2012	February 13, 2013
Alternative Formulation Briefing (week of 02/14)	February 14, 2013	February 20, 2013
PGM Preparation	December 17, 2012	January 4, 2013
PGM comment/resolution	February 21, 2013	March 13, 2013
Revise Draft Feasibility Report and EIS	April 25, 2013	June 19, 2013
DQC	June 20, 2013	July 3, 2013
3rd ATR (includes review and changes being made)	**July 4, 2013**	**July 17, 2013**
Cooperative Agency Review PDEIS	November 1, 2013	December 3, 2013
Public/Agency Review of Draft Report and EIS	December 16, 2013	January 15, 2014
Preparation of Public/Agency comment Matrix	January 16, 2014	February 6, 2014
Public Hearing	December 16, 2013	December 26, 2013
Type I Independent External Peer Review	January 16, 2014	April 29, 2014
EPR Review	January 16, 2014	March 18, 2014
PDT prepare response to IEPR comments	March 19, 2014	April 29, 2014
PDT Modifies Report based upon Public and IEPR comments	March 19, 2014	April 29, 2014
4th ATR – Final Report	**July 25, 2014**	**August 7, 2014**

C. Independent External Peer Review

1) General

The Bayou Casotte Project is a typical navigation study for widening an existing navigation channel. According to EC 1165-2-209, Type I IEPR is mandatory if any of the following are true:

- Significant threat to human life;
- Where the estimated total cost of the project, including mitigation costs, is greater than $45 million based on a reasonable estimate at the end of the reconnaissance phase;
- Where the Governor of an affected State requests a peer review by independent experts; or
- Where the DCW or the Chief of Engineers determines that the project is controversial due to significant public dispute over either the size, nature, or effects of the project or the economic or environmental costs or benefits of the project.

When a decision document does not trigger a mandatory Type I IEPR, a risk informed recommendation is utilized. This process explicitly considers the consequences of non-performance on project economics, the environment, and social well-being (public safety and social justice), as well as indicated whether the product is likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment; or involve any other issues that provide a rationale for determining the appropriate level of review. Furthermore, the recommendation must make a case that the study is so limited in scope or impact that it would not significantly benefit from IEPR.

Although an EIS is being prepared, it should be noted that the aforementioned triggers for a Type I IEPR are not anticipated: there is no significant threat to human life; the estimated project costs range from $9-$37 million, depending upon the project alternative; it is not anticipated that the Governor of Mississippi will request an IEPR; and the project is not controversial and is not anticipated to result in public dispute over either the size, nature, or effects of the project or the economic or environmental costs or benefits of the project. It is anticipated, however, that an IEPR will be required due to the inclusion of an EIS.

2) Type I IEPR Review Process

DrChecks will be used to document comments and aid in the preparation of the Review Report to be prepared by the IEPR Panel. The District, with assistance from the PCX, will prepare a written response to the IEPR Review Report, whether the views expressed in the report are adopted or not adopted. Responses will include documentation of the actions taken or to be undertaken in response to the report, and the reasons those actions are believed to satisfy the key concerns stated in the report (if applicable). The proposed response will be coordinated with CESAD and HQUSACE to insure consistency with law, policy, project guidance, ongoing policy and legal compliance review, and other USACE or National considerations. Upon satisfying its concerns, HQUSACE will determine the appropriate command level for issuing the formal USACE response to the IEPR Review Report. When the USACE response is issued, the District shall post the final IEPR Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the review on its website. Additionally this information will be included in the applicable decision document.

3) IEPR Panel

IEPR panels are made up of recognized independent experts from outside of USACE. The panels are comprised of individuals from those disciplines appropriate for the type of review being conducted. The DDNPCX will contract with an appropriate OEO to manage the review. IEPR panel members will be selected by an OEO using the National Academy of Science's policy for selecting reviewers. Since this feasibility study is a navigation study to widen the existing channel, anticipated disciplines of IEPR reviewers are engineering (hydrology and hydraulics and geotechnical), economics and environmental. The IEPR panel should have a minimum of three members. The IEPR panel review and PDT responses will be federally funded, including the costs associated with obtaining the IEPR panel contract. Once the panel has been identified, the IEPR Panel members' names and disciplines will be included in this document.

4) IEPR Cost

The cost for IEPR is estimated at $225,000.

5) IEPR Timing and Sequencing

The estimated timeline for IEPR is as follows:

TASK	Date Conducted/Proposed	Date Completed
IEPR Review	January 16, 2014	March 18, 2014

D. Timing

The ATR process began at the initiation of the study and is projected to end once the Draft Report is acceptable for public and agency review. The IEPR process will be initiated after AFB comments are incorporated into the draft report. The IEPR process is expected to be completed prior to public and agency review of the draft report.

E. Public Comment

The USACE and non-Federal sponsor will develop a public involvement plan to be used during the feasibility phase. The goal of the public involvement plan is to insure that USACE and the non-Federal Sponsor are responsive to the needs and concerns of all stakeholders and to insure public involvement through an open, interactive process.

Coordination with resource agencies will be performed primarily through various, regularly scheduled meetings that will occur throughout the study process. A pro-active outreach program will be initiated to insure that the public, resource agencies, industry, local government, and other interested parties are informed about the project and that any concerns are identified and addressed. Public review is scheduled after the AFB and those comments will be summarized in the EIS with responses provided.

Proceedings from all public meetings, minutes from the monthly sponsor meetings, or minutes from any other public involvement meetings will be available by contacting the senior planner (contact information below).

TASK	DATE CONDUCTED/PROPOSED
Public Scoping Meeting	February 25, 2010
Public Hearing	December 16, 2013
Teleconference Sponsor Meetings	2nd Tuesday of each month
Face to face meetings with Sponsor	Quarterly
Final Public and Agency Review	June 23, 2014

5. POINTS OF CONTACT

Questions about this Review Plan may be directed to Ms. Kim Otto, Mobile District PDT Planning contact at (251) 694-3842 or Kimberly.P.Otto@usace.army.mil.

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM

NAME	TITLE/ORG.	PHONE	EMAIL
John Crane	Project Manager CESAM-PM	251-690-3257	john.f.crane@usace.army.mil
Kim Otto	Planning Study Lead CESAM-PD-FP	251-694-3842	kimberly.p.otto@usace.army.mil
Greg Miller	Project Engineer (PAE)	251-690-3115	greg.miller@usace.army.mil

	CESAM-EN-HH		
Kelly McElhenney	Civil Engineer CESAM-OP-TN	251-694-3722	kelly.n.mcelhenney@usace.army.mil
Joshua Blevins	Geotechnical Engineer CESAM-EN-GG	251-694-3625	Joshua.c.blevins@usace.army.mil
Jenny Jacobson	Environmental Lead CESAM-PD-EC	251-690-2724	jennifer.l.jacobson@usace.army.mil
Caree Kovacevich	Environmental CESAM-PD-EC	251-690-3026	caree.a.kovacevich@usace.army.mil
Linda Brown	Environmental CESAM-PD-EC	251-694-3786	linda.t.brown@usace.army.mil
Joe Giliberti	Archeologist CESAM-PD-EI	251-694-4114	joseph.a.giliberti@usace.army.mil
Todd Nettles	Economist CESAM-PD-FE	251-694-3841	todd.a.nettles@usace.army.mil
Philip Hegji	CESAM-RD-I	251-690-3222	Philip.a.hegji@usace.army.mil
Joe Ellsworth	Cost Engineer CESAM-EN-E	251-690-2628	joseph.h.ellsworth@usace.army.mil
Russell Blount III	Realty Specialist CESAM-RE-P	251-694-3675	russell.w.blountIII@usace.army.mil
Dennis Mekkers	Hydraulic Engineer CESAM-EN-HH	251-690-3055	dennis.e.mekkers@usace.army.mil
Ray Chapman	ERDC	601-634-3178	raymond.s.chapman@usace.army.mil
Joe Gailani	ERDC	601-634-4851	Joe.z.gailani@usace.army.mil
Barry Bunch	ERDC	601-634-3617	Barry.w.bunch@usace.army.mil
Dennis Webb	ERDC	601-634-2455	Dennis.w.webb@usace.army.mil
Allen Moeller	Jackson County Port Authority	228-762-4041	amoeller@portofpascagoula.com

AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM

A preliminary ATR team has been identified and is shown in the table. This team will be expanded as future document versions warrant.

NAME[1]	TITLE/ORG	PHONE	EMAIL
Jeff Strahan	ATR Review Team Leader and Economics Reviewer CENAO-WR-PR	757-201-7195	Jeffery.p.strahan@usace.army.mil
Dave Schulte	Environmental Resources CENAO-WR-PE	757-201-7007	David.m.schulte@usace.army.mil
Meade Stith	Hydraulics & Hydrology/OP	757-201-7594	William.m.stith@usace.army.mil

[1] A preliminary ATR team has been identified and is shown in the table. This team will be expanded as future document versions warrant.

	CENAO-WR-OD		
Frank Reynolds	Plan Formulation CESAW-TS-PS	910-251-4773	Frank.r.reynolds@usace.army.mil
	Real Estate/Lands		
	DX Cost Engineering		
	Geotechnical		

OFFICE OF COUNSEL

Michael Creswell	Office of Counsel CESAM-OC	251-690-2493	Michael.w.creswell@usace.army.mil

PLANNING CENTER OF EXPERTISE
DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION

NAME	TITLE/ORG	PHONE	EMAIL
Bernard Moseby	Program Manager, PCX Deep Draft Navigation	251-694-3884	bernard.e.moseby@usace.army.mil