

**Continuing Authorities Program
Section 206, Water Resources Development Act of 1996, as Amended
Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Projects**

DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN

Allatoona Creek, Cobb County, Georgia

Mobile District

South Atlantic Division Approval Date: 19 January 2011

Last Revision Date: December 2010

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS REVIEW PLAN IS DISTRIBUTED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PREDISSEMINATION REVIEW UNDER APPLICABLE INFORMATION QUALITY GUIDELINES. IT HAS NOT BEEN FORMALLY DISSEMINATED BY THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, JACKSONVILLE DISTRICT. IT DOES NOT REPRESENT AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO REPRESENT ANY AGENCY DETERMINATION OR POLICY.



**US Army Corps
of Engineers ®**

**DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN
USING THE NATIONAL PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW PLAN MODEL**

**Section 206, Water Resources Development Act of 1996, as amended
Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Decision Documents**

Allatoona Creek, Cobb County, Georgia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS	1
2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION.....	4
3. STUDY INFORMATION	4
4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC).....	5
5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR).....	5
6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR).....	8
7. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL	8
8. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS.....	10
9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	10
10. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES.....	11
11. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT	11
ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS.....	12
ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS.....	13
ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN MINOR REVISIONS.....	14
ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	15

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

- a. **Purpose.** This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Allatoona Creek, Cobb County, Georgia Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Detailed Project Report developed under Section 206, Water Resources Development Act of 1996, as amended.

The Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) consists of a group of ten legislative authorities by which the Chief of Engineers is authorized to plan, design, and construct certain types of water resource and environmental restoration projects of limited size, scope, cost and complexity without additional, project-specific Congressional authorization. Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, Public Law 104-305, authorizes the Secretary of the Army to carry out a program of aquatic ecosystem restoration with the objective of restoring degraded ecosystem structure, function, and dynamic processes to a less degraded, more natural condition considering the ecosystem's natural integrity, productivity, stability and biological diversity. This authority is primarily used for manipulation of the hydrology in and along bodies of water, including wetlands and riparian areas. This authority also allows for dam removal. The Federal share of costs for any one Section 206 project may not exceed \$5,000,000.

- b. **Applicability.** This review plan is based on the model National Programmatic Review Plan for Section 206 project decision documents, which is applicable to projects that do not require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), as defined in EC 1165-2-209 Civil Works Review Policy. A Section 206 project does not require IEPR if ALL of the following specific criteria are met:

- The project does not involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance;
- The total project cost is less than \$45 million;
- There is no request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts;
- The project does not require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS),
- The project is not likely to have significant economic, environmental, and/or social effects to the Nation;
- The project/study is not likely to have significant interagency interest;
- The project/study is not likely highly controversial;
- The decision document is not likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific;
- The information in the decision document or proposed project design is not likely to be based on novel methods, involve the use of innovative materials or techniques, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices; and
- The project has not been deemed by the USACE Director of Civil Works or Chief of Engineers to be controversial nature.

If any of the above criteria are not met, the model National Programmatic Review Plan is not applicable and a study specific review plan must be prepared by the Mobile District, coordinated with the National Ecosystem Planning Center of Expertise (ECO-PCX) and approved by USACE South Atlantic Division (SAD) in accordance with EC 1165-2-209.

Applicability of the model National Programmatic Review Plan for this project will be determined by SAD. If SAD determines that the model plan is applicable for a specific study, the SAD Commander may approve the plan (including exclusion from IEPR) without additional coordination with the ECO-PCX or Headquarters, USACE. The initial decision as to the applicability of the model plan should be made no later than the Federal Interest Determination milestone (as defined in Appendix F of ER 1105-2-100, F-10.e.1) during the feasibility phase of the project. In addition, the Mobile District and SAD should assess at the Alternatives Formulation Briefing (AFB) whether the initial decision on the use of the model plan is still valid or if a project specific review plan should be developed based on new information. If a project specific review plan is required, it must be approved prior to execution of the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) for the study.

This review plan does not cover implementation products. A review plan for the design and implementation phase of the project will be developed prior to approval of the final decision document in accordance with EC 1165-2-209.

c. References

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
- (2) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 14 May 2010
- (3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
- (4) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007
- (5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007

d. Requirements. This programmatic review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, which outlines four general levels of review: District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), and Policy and Legal Compliance Review. In addition to these levels of review, decision documents are subject to cost engineering review and certification (per EC 1165-2-209) and planning model certification/approval (per EC 1105-2-412).

- (1) District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC). All decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC, as provided in EC 1165-2-209.
- (2) Agency Technical Review (ATR). ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.), as provided in EC 1165-2-209.

For review of decision documents under the model National Programmatic Review Plan for Section 206 projects, the leader of the ATR team shall be from outside the Mobile District, but may be from within SAD.

- (3) Independent External Peer Review (IEPR). IEPR may be required for decision documents under certain circumstances, as provided in EC 1165-2-209. 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 IEPR reviews are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on project studies, as provided in EC 1165-2-209.

For review of decision documents under the model National Programmatic Review Plan for Section 206 projects, Type I IEPR is not required.

- (b) Type II IEPR. Type II IEPR, or Safety Assurance Review (SAR), are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on design and construction activities for hurricane, storm, and flood risk management projects or other projects where existing and potential hazards pose a significant threat to human life, as provided in EC 1165-2-209, ¶ 12.

For review of decision documents under the model National Programmatic Review Plan for Section 206 projects, Type II IEPR is not required.

- (4) Policy and Legal Compliance Review. All decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy, as provided in EC 1165-2-209.

- (5) Cost Engineering DX Review and Certification

For review of decision documents under the National Programmatic Review Plan Model for Section 206 projects, Regional cost personnel that are pre-certified by the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX), located in the Walla Walla District will conduct the cost estimate ATR. The DX will provide the Cost Engineering DX certification.

- (6) Model Certification/Approval. EC 1105-2-412 mandates the use of certified or approved models for all planning activities to ensure the models are technically and theoretically sound, compliant with USACE policy, computationally accurate, and based on reasonable assumptions. Planning models, for the purposes of the EC, 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 problems and take advantage of the opportunities, to evaluate potential effects of alternatives and to support decision making. The use of a certified/approved planning model does not constitute technical review of the planning product. 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). 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. The use of engineering models is also subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

For review of decision documents under the model National Programmatic Review Plan for Section 206 projects, use of existing certified or approved planning models is encouraged. Where uncertified or unapproved model are used, approval of the model for use will be accomplished through the ATR process. The ATR team will apply the principles of EC 1105-2-412 during the ATR to ensure the model is theoretically and computationally sound, consistent with USACE policies, and adequately documented. If specific uncertified models

are identified for repetitive use within a specific district or region, the appropriate PCX, SAD, and Mobile District will identify a unified approach to seek certification of these models.

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 206 decision documents is SAD. SAD will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the ATR. The Mobile District will post the approved review plan on its public website. A copy of the approved review plan (and any updates) will be provided to the National Ecosystem Planning Center of Expertise (ECO-PCX) to keep the PCX apprised of requirements and review schedules.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

- a. **Decision Document.** The Allatoona Creek, Cobb County, Georgia Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Detailed Project Report will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F. The approval level of decision documents (if policy compliant) is SAD. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document.
- b. **Study/Project Description.** The Cobb County Water System provided a Letter of Intent to participate as the non-Federal sponsor of the Allatoona Creek ecosystem restoration project in August 2001. A Preliminary Restoration Plan (PRP) was prepared in September 2001. The Feasibility Study of Allatoona Creek was initiated in 2002; however, funding was discontinued early in Fiscal Year 2004. In July 2009, Federal funding to resume the Feasibility Study of Allatoona Creek was provided.

Allatoona Creek and Cobb County are located in the northwestern portion of the Atlanta Metropolitan Area (Figure 1). Allatoona Creek is a tributary within the Etowah River Basin. The Allatoona Creek Watershed contains approximately 11,500 acres. The watershed has undergone physical habitat degradation due to historical channelization, riparian vegetation removal, stream bank erosion, and sedimentation. Impacts to the Allatoona Creek watershed have been noted in previous studies and significant changes in land use over the past two decades have been identified as having contributed to a decline in aquatic ecosystems. Measures being analyzed to address this degradation will include channel reshaping, instream habitat enhancement and streambank stabilization, and riparian buffer enhancements.

The estimated cost (or range of cost) will be determined after alternatives are identified. At present time there are no existing or anticipated policy waiver requests (pursued per paragraph F-10.f.(4) of ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F).

- c. **Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review.** The biggest challenge to providing aquatic ecosystem restoration for Allatoona Creek will be developing the stream measures that will produce the greatest benefit for the least cost. Identifying the resources upon which to measure that benefit is of major importance. Another challenge to developing the stream measures will be accurately determining the likely response of the resources to the proposed measures. Real estate may be a challenge due to the need to acquire real estate interests in private and commercial property for access and staging equipment.

The project is not likely to have significant economic, environmental, or social effects to the Nation or involve a significant threat to human life/safety. The project is an ecosystem restoration project likely to consist of channel reshaping, instream habitat enhancement and streambank stabilization, and riparian buffer enhancements. The project will also provide educational and outreach opportunities. The project is not likely to have significant interagency interest, be highly controversial, contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment due to the relatively small footprint of the watershed (about 18 square miles). The information in the decision document or proposed project design will not 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.

- d. **In-Kind Contributions.** Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC and ATR, similar to any products developed by USACE.

There are no in-kind products anticipated at this time. The non-federal sponsor shall participate with cash reimbursement for 35% of the Feasibility Study cost during the Design and Implementation Phase after execution of a Project Partnership Agreement (PPA).

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)

All documents to be produced will undergo DQC. The DQC review team will be responsible for performing a technical review of the Draft Feasibility Report including the EA, engineering, economics, real estate, cost and environmental appendices. The DQC review will be completed prior to submitting documents for ATR. Duties of the DQC team include the following:

- 1) Reviewing report contents for compliance with established principles and procedures, using clearly justified and valid assumptions.
- 2) Reviewing methods and procedures used to determine appropriateness, correctness and reasonableness of results.
- 3) Providing the review team leader with documentation of comments, issues, and decisions arising out of the DQC review. Comments, and resolutions, will be documented in a Microsoft Word document or by using DrChecks.
- 4) Capturing public input at scoping and public meetings. Public comments are solicited and accepted by various means: United States Postal Service, email, website, fax, or at the public and scoping meetings.

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

- a. **Products to Undergo ATR.** ATR will be performed throughout the study in accordance with the Mobile District and SAD Quality Management Plans. The ATR shall be documented and discussed at the AFB milestone. Certification of the ATR will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. Products to undergo ATR include the Draft Detailed Project Report, Draft EA, Final Detailed Project Report and Final EA.
- b. **Required ATR Team Expertise.** The ATR team will consist of the individuals that represent the significant disciplines involved in the accomplishment of the work. ATR will be managed within the Corps and conducted by a qualified team that may reside in the Mobile District but is not involved in

the day-to-day production of the project. The ATR team lead will reside outside the Mobile District, but may reside within SAD. The RMO, in cooperation with the Project Delivery Team (PDT) and vertical team, will determine the final make-up of the ATR team. The RMO will coordinate with the Cost Engineering Directory PCX in Walla Walla District to provide the cost engineering review and resulting certification. At a minimum, the following disciplines will be represented on the ATR team:

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional with experience in preparing Section 206 decision documents and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. Typically, the ATR lead will also serve as a reviewer for a specific discipline (such as planning, economics, environmental resources, etc).
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in general planning policy and guidance. The team member should also be familiar with the Ecosystem Response Model software used as Plan Formulation tool to evaluate alternatives.
Economics	Team member should have extensive knowledge of the economic software Institute of Water Resources (IWR) Planning Suite Decision Support Software and knowledge of Cost Effective/Incremental Cost Analysis (CE/ICA).
Environmental Resources	Team member should have extensive knowledge of the integration of environmental evaluation and compliance requirements, pursuant to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) statutes, applicable executive orders and other Federal planning requirements, into the planning of Civil Works comprehensive plans and implementation projects. The team member(s) should also have a thorough understanding of the approved environmental software used for this project (Ecosystem Response Model).
Hydrology & Hydraulic Engineering	Team member will have a thorough understanding of open channel dynamics, application of detention/retention basins and computer modeling techniques that will be used such as Hydrologic Engineering Center – River Analysis System (HEC-RAS), Watershed Characterization System (WCS), and Sedimentation Impact Analysis Method(SIAM)
Cost Engineering	Team member should be familiar with the most recent version of Micro-Computer Aided Cost Estimating System II (MCACES II) software and total project cost summary. The Cost Reviewer should be either Walla Walla Cost DX staff or Cost Professional Pre-certified by the Cost DX and is required to coordinate with the Cost DX for further cost engineering review and resulting certification.
Real Estate	Team member(s) should have planning/appraisal/acquisition experience regarding ecosystem restoration type projects. Including, but not limited to, knowledge of estates to be acquired, induced flooding, zoning/buffer ordinances, and NFS acquisition responsibilities.

c. **Documentation of ATR.** DrChecks review software will be used to document all ATR comments, responses and associated resolutions accomplished throughout the review process. Comments should be limited to those that are required to ensure adequacy of the product. The four key parts of a quality review comment will normally include:

- (1) The review concern – identify the product’s information deficiency or incorrect application of policy, guidance, or procedures;
- (2) The basis for the concern – cite the appropriate law, policy, guidance, or procedure that has not been properly followed;
- (3) The significance of the concern – indicate the importance of the concern with regard to its potential impact on the plan selection, recommended plan components, efficiency (cost), effectiveness (function/outputs), implementation responsibilities, safety, Federal interest, or public acceptability; and
- (4) The probable specific action needed to resolve the concern – identify the action(s) that the reporting officers must take to resolve the concern.

In some situations, especially addressing incomplete or unclear information, comments may seek clarification in order to then assess whether further specific concerns may exist.

The ATR documentation in DrChecks will include the text of each ATR concern, the PDT response, a brief summary of the pertinent points in any discussion, including any vertical team coordination (the vertical team includes the Mobile District, RMO, SAD, and HQUSACE), and the agreed upon resolution. If an ATR concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the ATR team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the vertical team for further resolution in accordance with the policy issue resolution process described in either ER 1110-2-12 or ER 1105-2-100, Appendix H, as appropriate. Unresolved concerns can be closed in DrChecks with a notation that the concern has been elevated to the SAD team for resolution.

At the conclusion of each ATR effort, the ATR team will prepare a Review Report summarizing the review. Review Reports will be considered an integral part of the ATR documentation and shall:

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

ATR may be certified when all ATR concerns are either resolved or referred to the vertical team for resolution and the ATR documentation is complete. The ATR Lead will prepare a Statement of Technical Review certifying that the issues raised by the ATR team have been resolved (or elevated to the vertical team). A Statement of Technical Review should be completed prior to the District Commander signing the final report. A sample Statement of Technical Review is included in Attachment 2.

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

- a. **Decision on IEPR.** Based on the information and analysis provided in paragraph 3(c) of this review plan, the project covered under this plan is excluded from IEPR because it does not meet the mandatory IEPR triggers and does not warrant IEPR based on a risk-informed analysis. At this time, all of the criteria outlined in paragraph 1(b) would be met.
- b. **Products to Undergo Type I IEPR.** Not applicable.
- c. **Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise.** Not Applicable.
- d. **Documentation of Type I IEPR.** Not Applicable.

7. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

- a. **Planning Models.** Environmental, economic and engineering planning models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document. All products will undergo ATR. The environmental software to be utilized is the Ecosystem Response Model (ERM). The ERM was created by the NGWRA interagency team led by USACE, with members from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), USEPA, Water Resources Division (WRD) of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GADNR), Environmental Protection Division (EPD) of GADNR, and local sponsors and stakeholders. It was developed as a decision-making tool to assist in the selection of watershed improvement projects by comparing ecosystem benefits of various management measure alternatives, using existing and predicted future biological scores. The ERM uses physical habitat and biological monitoring data, collected using GADNR guidance (GADNR, 2005; 2007), as an indicator of the overall stream ecosystem integrity. The ERM outputs a combined stream health score and Habitat Units, based on biological monitoring data, and a projected future combined stream health score and Habitat Units based on predicted future biological monitoring scores. This allows comparison of outputs under various conditions and provides an indicator of the extent of stream improvement that would result from implementation of restoration alternatives. The Ecosystem Restoration Model was approved for use by the ECO-PCX and endorsed by SAD for the North Georgia Piedmont Region projects.

The economic software that will be used is IWR Planning Suite Decision Support Software developed by the Institute of Water Resources. IWR Planning Suite combines solutions to planning problems and calculates the additive effects of each combination or "plan." IWR Planning Suite assists with plan comparison by conducting cost effectiveness and incremental cost analyses (CE/ICA). For this study IWR Planning Suite will be used to evaluate the cost effectiveness and incremental cost of each potential restoration alternative, based on an estimated cost and projected benefits according to ERM results.

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Certification / Approval Status
Ecosystem Response Model	The ecosystem response model was developed based on interagency team and Independent Technical Review (ITR) recommendations, to quantify existing, "future without project", and "future with project" conditions in North Georgia watersheds in and around the metro-Atlanta area.	Approved
IWR Planning Suite Decision Support Software	The IWR Planning Suite combines solutions to planning problems and calculates the additive effects of each combination or "plan."	Certified

b. Engineering Models. The following engineering models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document:

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Certification/Approval Status
HEC-RAS 4.0 (River Analysis System)	The Hydrologic Engineering Center's River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) program provides the capability to perform one-dimensional steady and unsteady flow river hydraulics calculations. The program will be used for steady flow analysis to evaluate the future without- and with-project conditions along Allatoona Creek.	Approved
WCS	Watershed Characterization System (WCS) provides users an initial set of watershed data along with analysis and reporting tools to process the data. The system can be applied to a broad range of TMDLs since the characterization process is relatively uniform and can be standardized regardless of the water body type and pollutant.	Approved
Sedimentation Impact Analysis Method (SIAM)	Sediment Impact Analysis Methods (SIAM) provides a framework for combining morphological, hydrologic, and hydraulic information. The results develop a quantitative picture of sediment movement through a watershed more detailed than a qualitative geomorphic evaluation and less intensive than a numeric mobile boundary model.	Approved
Micro-Computer Aided Cost Estimating System II	The Micro-Computer Aided Cost Estimating System II (MCACES) will be used to prepare a detailed labor, equipment and material cost estimate.	Approved

REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

- c. **ATR Schedule and Cost.** The cost for the overall ATR effort is estimated to be approximately \$30,000. The documents to be reviewed and scheduled dates for review are as follows:

ATR Review Product	Schedule
AFB Package	February 2011
Draft DPR	June 2011
Final DPR	August 2011

- d. **Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost.** Not applicable.

Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost. Model Certification/Approval. EC 1105-2-407 requires certification (for Corps models) or approval (for non-Corps models) of planning models used for all planning activities. The EC defines planning models as any models and analytical tools that planners use to define water resources management problems and opportunities, to formulate potential alternatives to address the problems and take advantage of the opportunities, to evaluate potential effects of alternatives and to support decision-making. The EC does not cover engineering models used in planning. Engineering software is being address under the Engineering and Construction (E&C) Science and Engineering Technology (SET) initiative. Until an appropriate process that documents the quality of commonly used engineering software is developed through the SET initiative, engineering activities in support of planning studies shall proceed as in the past. The responsible use of well-known and proven USACE developed and commercial engineering software will continue and the professional practice of documenting the application of the software and modeling results will be followed.

8. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

State and Federal resource agencies may be invited to participate in the study covered by this review plan as partner agencies or as technical members of the PDT, as appropriate. Agencies with regulatory review responsibilities will be contacted for coordination as required by applicable laws and procedures. The ATR team will be provided copies of public and agency comments.

The RP will be made accessible to the public through the Mobile District website link <http://www.sam.usace.army.mil/>. Public review of the review plan can begin as soon as it is reviewed and approved by the SAD Commander and posted by the Mobile District. Comments made by the public will be available to the review team. Public and interagency review for the EA will be conducted in accordance with NEPA, as outlined in ER 1105-2-100.

The RP will be available throughout all public and agency scoping and other processes for this project. Public input from the NEPA workshops and the public meetings will be available to the ATR members to ensure that public comments have been considered in the development of reviews and final reports. Public comments will be solicited and accepted by multiple means: United States Postal Service, email, website, fax or at the public and scoping meetings.

9. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The SAD Commander is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan is appropriate for the specific project covered by the plan. The review plan is a living document and may change as the study progresses. The Mobile District is responsible for keeping the review plan up to date. After approved by SAD, minor changes to the review plan since the SAD Commander approval will be documented in Attachment 3 of this RP. Significant changes to the review plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) should be re-approved by the SAD Commander following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in the SAD Commander determining that use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-209. The latest version of the review plan, along with the Commanders' approval memorandum, will be posted on the Mobile District's webpage.

10. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

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

- Project Manager, 251-694-3832
- South Atlantic Division Point of Contact, 404-562-5228

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS

TABLE 1 PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM			
RESOURCE NAME	RESOURCE CODE	LEAD TEAM MEMBERS	PHONE NUMBER
Project Manager	CESAM-PD-FP		
Program Management	CESAM-PM-C		
Plan Formulator	CH2M Hill		
Hydrology & Hydraulic Design (PAE)	CESAM-EN-HH		
Economic Analysis	CESAM-PD-FE		
Inland Environmental	CESAM-PD-EI		
Inland Environmental (Cultural Res)	CESAS-PD-EM		
Hazardous, Toxic Radioactive Waste (HTRW)	CESAM-EN-GE		
Cost Engineering	TBD		
Real Estate Planning	CESAM-RE-P		
Real Estate Appraisal	CESAM-RE-A		
Sponsor Support	Cobb County Water System		

TABLE 2 AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM			
RESOURCE NAME	RESOURCE CODE	LEAD TEAM MEMBERS	PHONE NUMBER
ATR Lead	TBD	TBD	TBD
Planning	TBD	TBD	TBD
Economics	TBD	TBD	TBD
Environmental Resources	TBD	TBD	TBD
Hydrology & Hydraulic Engineering	TBD	TBD	TBD
Cost Engineering	TBD	TBD	TBD
Real Estate	TBD	TBD	TBD

ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS

COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Review Plan for Allatoona Creek, Cobb County, Georgia. 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 DrCheckssm.

_____ TBD ATR Team Leader <u>Office Symbol</u>	_____ Date
_____ Project Manager PD-FP	_____ Date
_____ Project Architect Engineer EN-HH	_____ Date
_____ TBD Review Management Office Representative <u>Office Symbol</u>	_____ Date

CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows: None at this time.

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

_____ <i>SIGNATURE</i>	_____ Date
Chief, CESAM-EN	
_____ <i>SIGNATURE</i>	_____ Date
Chief, CESAM-PD PD	

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN MINOR REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>	<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>
AFB	Alternatives Formulation Briefing	IWR	Institute of Water Resources
ATR	Agency Technical Review	ITR	Independent Technical Review
CAP	Continuing Authorities Program	MCACES	Micro - Computer Aided Cost Estimating System
CE/ICA	Cost Effective/Incremental Cost Analysis	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
DQC	District Quality Control/Quality Assurance	OMRR&R	Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation
DX	Directory of Expertise	PCX	Planning Center of Expertise
EA	Environmental Assessment	PDT	Project Delivery Team
EC	Engineer Circular	PED	Pre Construction Engineering & Design
ECO-PCX	Ecosystem Planning Center of Expertise	PMP	Project Management Plan
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	RMO	Review Management Organization
ER	Engineering Regulation	SAD	USACE South Atlantic Division
ERR	Ecosystem Restoration Report	SAR	Safety Assurance Review
HEC - RAS	Hydrologic Engineering Center – River Analysis System	SIAM	Sedimentation Impact Analysis
HQUSACE	Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review	WCS	Watershed Characterization System