



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NORTH ATLANTIC DIVISION, US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
FORT HAMILTON MILITARY COMMUNITY
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11252-6700

NOV 10 2011


CENAD-PD-PP

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, New York District ATTN: CENAN-PL

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for McClellan Pier, Hudson River Trust, New York, New York Section 14 CAP Study

1. The attached Review Plan for the subject study has been prepared in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy.
2. The Review Plan has been coordinated with Planning and Policy Division of the North Atlantic Division, which is the lead office to execute this plan. For further information, contact Ms. Rena Weichenberg at 347-370-4568. Independent External Peer Review is not planned for this study, as it is not required for Section 14 CAP Studies.
3. I hereby approve this Review Plan, which is subject to change as study circumstances require, consistent with study development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this Review Plan or its execution will require new written approval from this office.

Encl


Joseph R. Vietri
Chief, Planning & Policy Division
Programs Directorate

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM (CAP) REVIEW PLAN

McClellan Pier, Hudson River Trust, New York, New York
Section 14 Initial Appraisal Report

New York District

MSC Approval Date: November 10, 2011

Last Revision Date: *none*

Template Date 02.22.11 (See the PCX page on the Planning and Policy SharePoint site for the latest version of this template: <https://kme.usace.army.mil/CoPs/CivilWorksPlanning-Policy/pcx/default.aspx>)

NOTE: This template is intended to assist in the development of review plans for Civil Works Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) **decision documents** in accordance with EC 1165-2-209 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1. Typical text likely to be common to all review plans is provided in normal black font. Areas where study specific information must be added is shown in underlined blue italic font. Supplemental information is shown in red text in a text box (like this note) and should be deleted in the final review plan. The template is a useful tool, but it does not replace knowledge of applicable Corps guidance or the responsibility of the PDT to prepare a quality and complete review plan that reflects the specific needs of the study and any specific MSC/District quality management requirements. MSCs may use this template as a basis for creating Programmatic or Model Review Plans for CAP studies, which is encouraged in the Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1. **DELETE THIS TEXT BOX BEFORE FINALIZING THE REVIEW PLAN.**



**US Army Corps
of Engineers** ®

**CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM
REVIEW PLAN**

**McClellan Pier, Hudson River Trust, New York, New York
Section 14 Initial Appraisal Report**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

- a. **Purpose.** This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the McClellan Pier, Hudson River Park Trust, New York, New York Section 14 project decision document.

Section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946, as amended, authorizes the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to study, design and construct emergency streambank and shoreline works to protect public services including (but not limited to) streets, bridges, schools, water and sewer lines, National Register sites, and churches from damage or loss by natural erosion. It is a Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) which focuses on water resource related projects of relatively smaller scope, cost and complexity. Traditional USACE civil works projects are of wider scope and complexity and are specifically authorized by Congress. The Continuing Authorities Program is a delegated authority to plan, design, and construct certain types of water resource and environmental restoration projects without specific Congressional authorization.

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

b. References

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
- (2) Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, Continuing Authorities Program Planning Process Improvements, 19 Jan 2011
- (3) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 Mar 2010
- (4) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
- (5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007
- (6) PMP for feasibility phase of this project
- (7) MSC and District Quality Management Plans

- c. **Requirements.** This review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, which establish an accountable, comprehensive, life-cycle review strategy for Civil Works Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) products by providing a seamless process for review of all Civil Works projects from initial planning through design, construction, and operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and rehabilitation (OMRR&R). The EC outlines four general levels of review: District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), and Policy and Legal Compliance Review. In addition to these levels of review, CAP decision documents are subject to cost engineering review and certification (per EC 1165-2-209 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1).

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 CAP decision documents is typically the home MSC. The Flood Risk Management (FRM) Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) is available to provide advice and may serve as the RMO under appropriate agreements with the home MSC. The RMO for the peer review effort described in this Review Plan is North Atlantic Division (NAD).

The RMO will coordinate with the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) as needed to ensure the appropriate expertise is included on the review teams to assess the adequacy of cost estimates, construction schedules and contingencies.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

- a. **Decision Document.** The McClellan Pier, Hudson River Trust, New York, New York decision document will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F. The approval level of the decision document (which will be policy compliant) is the home MSC. No *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)* documentation will be completed along with the decision document. Appropriate NEPA documentation will be completed during the Design and Implementation Phase.
- b. **Study/Project Description.** Within land held by the Hudson River Park Trust along the Hudson River in Manhattan, New York, New York, an identified reach is subjected to erosion threatening a historic structure, pedestrian/bicycle path, and highway and major evacuation route. Measures/alternatives to be considered to address this problem include a revetment, bulkheading, a floodwall, etc. The estimated cost (or range of cost) for the potentially recommended plan will be \$1,000,000 to \$2,500,000. The non-Federal sponsor will be the Hudson River Park Trust.
- c. **Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review.** This project is expected to be typical of FRM projects carried out under the CAP Section 14:
- No parts of the study will likely be challenging;
 - The project risks are likely to occur at and around the proposed FRM structural alternative and the protected historic structure, pedestrian/bicycle path, and highway. The magnitude of these risks will be minimal;
 - The project will likely not be justified by life safety, and the chief of the Engineering Division judges that the project does not likely involve increased threat to human life/safety assurance (no residences are in the study area, and failure of the project which protects infrastructure would be gradual and/or monitored by local authorities). There is risk from project non-performance to project economics and Other Social Effects;
 - There is no request by the Governor of the affected state for a peer review by independent experts;
 - The project is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project;
 - The project is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project;
 - The information in the decision document and anticipated project design is not likely to be based on novel methods, involve the use of innovative materials or techniques, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices; and
 - The project design is not anticipated to require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule.

NOTE: This sub-section supports the decision on whether or not to perform IEPR, but the actual decision is documented in Section 5 – Independent External Technical Review. The information in this sub-section also supports decisions on the scope of ATR/IEPR and the expertise needed on the ATR/IEPR teams. DELETE THIS TEXT BOX BEFORE FINALIZING THE REVIEW PLAN.

- d. **In-Kind Contributions.** Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required). There are no in-kind products or analyses to be provided by the non-Federal sponsor.

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)

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

NOTE: This Section of the review plan should be tailored to meet the requirements of the District/MSD Quality Management Plans for DQC. A possible format is suggested below; however, **AT MINIMUM** this section should identify how DQC will be documented and what DQC documentation will be provided to the ATR team at each review (see sub-section a. below). Per EC 1165-2-209, Paragraph 8d, for each ATR event, the ATR team will examine relevant DQC records and provide written comment in the ATR report as to the apparent adequacy of the DQC effort. **DELETE THIS TEXT BOX BEFORE FINALIZING THE REVIEW PLAN.**

- A. **Documentation of DQC.** DQC will be documented, including by comments and responses in work product files and final sign-off by the management of all involved technical offices. This DQC documentation will be provided to the ATR team.
- B. **Products to Undergo DQC.** Products to undergo DQC include the decision document and all appendices as well as NEPA documentation when prepared later in the project implementation.
- C. **Required DQC Expertise.** The required expertise needed to conduct DQC consistent with the District/MSD Quality Management plans includes plan formulation, economic analysis, and engineering of FRM alternatives as well as expertise in historic structures.

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.). The objective of ATR is to ensure consistency with established criteria, guidance, procedures, and policy. The ATR will assess whether the analyses presented are technically correct and comply with published USACE guidance, and that the document explains the analyses and results in a reasonably clear manner for the public and decision makers. ATR is managed within USACE by the designated RMO and is conducted by a qualified team from outside the home district that is not involved in the day-to-day production of the project/product. ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel and may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate. The ATR team lead will be from outside the home MSC.

- a. **Products to Undergo ATR.** Products to undergo ATR include the decision document and all appendices as well as NEPA documentation when prepared later in the project implementation.

- b. Required ATR Team Expertise.** As described more fully below, the required expertise needed to conduct ATR consistent with the District/MSO Quality Management plans includes plan formulation and engineering of FRM alternatives as well as expertise in historic structures.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional with extensive experience in preparing Civil Works decision documents and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. The ATR lead may also serve as a reviewer for a specific discipline (such as planning, environmental resources, etc.), so that this expert and another below may be the same person.
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a water resources planner with experience in FRM.
Environmental Resources	This should be an environmental specialist with experience in protection of historic structures.
Civil Engineering	This should be an engineer with experience in design of erosion control structures and analysis of hydrologic data.

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

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

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

The ATR documentation in DrChecks will include the text of each ATR concern, the PDT response, a brief summary of the pertinent points in any discussion, including any vertical team coordination (the vertical team includes the district, RMO, MSC, and HQUSACE), and the agreed upon resolution. If an ATR concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the ATR team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the vertical team for further resolution in accordance with the policy issue resolution process described in either ER 1110-1-12 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 vertical team for resolution.

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

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

ATR may be certified when all ATR concerns are either resolved or referred to the vertical team for resolution and the ATR documentation is complete. The ATR Lead will prepare a Statement of Technical Review certifying that the issues raised by the ATR team have been resolved (or elevated to the vertical team). A Statement of Technical Review should be completed, based on work reviewed to date, for the draft Initial Appraisal Report. A sample Statement of Technical Review is included in Attachment 2.

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

IEPR may be required for CAP decision documents under certain circumstances. IEPR is the most independent level of review, and is applied in cases that meet certain criteria where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of USACE is warranted. A risk-informed decision, as described in EC 1165-2-209, is made as to whether IEPR is appropriate. IEPR panels will consist of independent, recognized experts from outside of the USACE in the appropriate disciplines, representing a balance of areas of expertise suitable for the review being conducted. There are two types of IEPR:

- **Type I IEPR.** Type I IEPR reviews are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on project studies. Type I IEPR panels assess the adequacy and acceptability of the economic and environmental assumptions and projections, project evaluation data, economic analysis, environmental analyses, engineering analyses, formulation of alternative plans, methods for integrating risk and uncertainty, models used in the evaluation of environmental impacts of proposed projects, and biological opinions of the project study. Type I IEPR will cover the entire decision document or action and will address all underlying engineering, economics, and environmental work, not just one aspect of the study. For decision documents where a Type II IEPR (Safety Assurance Review) is anticipated during project implementation, safety assurance shall also be addressed during the Type I IEPR per EC 1165-2-209.
- **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. Type II IEPR panels will conduct reviews of the design and construction activities prior to initiation of physical construction and, until construction activities are completed, periodically thereafter on a regular schedule. The reviews shall consider the

adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities in assuring public health safety and welfare.

- a. **Decision on IEPR.** 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.
- The decision document does not meet the mandatory triggers for Type I IEPR described in Paragraph 11.d.(1) and Appendix D of EC 1165-2-209:
 - there are no consequences of non-performance on project economics, minimal consequences on the environment and no significant consequences on social well-being (public safety, in the judgment of the Chief of the Engineering division, as well as social justice);
 - the product is not likely to contain influential scientific information or be highly influential scientific assessment; and
 - the decision document meets all of the possible exclusions described in Paragraph 11.d.(3) and Appendix D of EC 1165-2-209.
 - There is no request to conduct IEPR from a head of a Federal or state agency charged with reviewing the project; and
 - The proposed project does not meet the criteria for conducting Type II IEPR described in Paragraph 2 of Appendix D of EC 1165-2-209, including:
 - the Federal action is not justified by life safety and failure of the project would not pose an increased threat to human life;
 - the project does not involve the use of innovative materials or techniques where the engineering is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretations, contains precedent-setting methods or models, or presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices;
 - the project design does not require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness; and
 - the project does not have unique construction sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule.

Additionally, Type I IEPR is not required for CAP Section 14 reports.

b. **Products to Undergo Type I IEPR.** Not-Applicable

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

d. **Documentation of Type I IEPR.** Not-Applicable

7. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW

All decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. These reviews culminate in determinations that the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy, and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority by the home MSC Commander. DQC and ATR augment and complement the policy review processes by addressing compliance with pertinent published Army policies, particularly policies on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents.

8. COST ENGINEERING DIRECTORY OF EXPERTISE (DX) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION

For CAP projects, ATR of the cost estimate will be conducted by pre-certified district cost personnel within the region or by the Walla Walla Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX). The pre-certified list of cost personnel has been established and is maintained by the Cost Engineering DX. The cost ATR member will coordinate with the Cost Engineering DX for execution of cost ATR and cost certification. The Cost Engineering DX will be responsible for final cost certification and may be delegated at the discretion of the DX.

9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

The approval of planning models under EC 1105-2-412 is not required for CAP projects. MSC Commanders are responsible for assuring models for all planning activities are technically and theoretically sound, compliant with USACE policy, computationally accurate, and based on reasonable assumptions. 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. The use of existing certified/approved planning models is highly recommended and should be used whenever appropriate; however, 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).

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).

- a. **Planning Models.** The following planning models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document: List the planning models (including version number as appropriate) to be used, briefly describe each model and how it will be applied ON THIS STUDY, and indicate the certification/approval status of each model. Planning models could include, but are not limited to: economic damage models (e.g., HEC-FDA, Beach FX, IMPLAN), environmental models for habitat evaluation or mitigation planning (e.g., IWRPlan, HEP HSI models, HGM), transportation or navigation models, and homegrown or spreadsheet models (e.g., excel spreadsheets, @Risk, etc; see EC 1105-2-412 for more information about what constitutes a planning model). Below are some examples of the type of information that might be included in this section (Note: Lesser known models, including local/regional models, will need a more complete description than widely used, nationally recognized models).

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Certification / Approval Status
NONE	N/A	N/A

- b. Engineering Models.** The following engineering models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document: List the engineering models (including version number as appropriate) to be used and briefly describe each model and how it will be applied ON THIS STUDY, and indicate the approval status of each model. (Note that the approval status of many engineering models can be found on the Hydraulics, Hydrology, and Coastal Engineering CoP SharePoint site at <https://kme.usace.army.mil/NTCT/HHC/default.aspx> under shared documents/SET software lists.) Engineering models could include, but are not limited to: hydrologic, hydraulic, geotechnical, civil, structural, cost engineering and similar models. Below is an example of the type of information that might be included in this section (Note: Lesser known models will need a more complete description than widely used, nationally recognized models).

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Approval Status
NONE		

10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

- a. ATR Schedule and Cost.** ATR of the final IAR will take place after it is completed in October 2011 and is expected to take one month and cost \$5,000.
- b. Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost.** Not-Applicable
- Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost.** Not-Applicable

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

NOTE: The schedule and cost for ATR will vary based on the study complexity and the documents being reviewed. In general, major milestone reviews for [REDACTED] should be scheduled for no less than 6 weeks (2 weeks for the ATR team to provide comments, 2 weeks for the PDT to coordinate and provide responses, and 2 weeks for back check and close-out of the ATR) and an estimated cost of from \$ [REDACTED] (e.g., small CAP project) [REDACTED] or more [REDACTED] each, depending on the number of ATR team members engaged. Draft and/or final report reviews may also require 6 weeks and have similar costs if, since the most recent ATR, there have been significant changes to the decision document. If the changes are minor, the draft and/or final report reviews may be significantly shorter and less expensive (since only the changes need to be reviewed). Single discipline interim product reviews (for example, review of a hydrology report) will generally require less time and cost. DELETE THIS TEXT BOX BEFORE [REDACTED]

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. There will be an opportunity for public comment on the development of the decision document and Environmental Assessment (EA) during the finalization of the EA.

12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The NAD Commander is responsible for approving this Review Plan. The Commander's approval reflects vertical team input as to the appropriate scope and level of review for the decision document. Like the PMP, the Review Plan is a living document and may change as the study progresses. The home district is responsible for keeping the Review Plan up to date. Minor changes to the review plan since the last MSC Commander approval are documented in Attachment 3. Significant changes to the Review Plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) should be re-approved by the MSC Commander following the process used for initially approving the plan. The latest version of the Review Plan, along with the Commanders' approval memorandum, should be posted on the Home District's webpage. The latest Review Plan should also be provided to the RMO and home MSC.

NOTE: It is critical that the Review Plan is kept up to date and the latest version (complete with the team rosters) be provided to the RMO and MSC. In particular, the schedule for peer review must be kept updated so that the RMO can provide timely delivery of these services. The PDT should contact the RMO about 8 weeks in advance of any scheduled peer review effort to coordinate the effort.
DELETE THIS TEXT BOX BEFORE FINALIZING THE REVIEW PLAN.

13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

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

- Study Planner, (917) 790-8731
- North Atlantic Division (347) 370-4568

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS

NOTE: Attachment 1 should include rosters and contact information for the PDT, ATR team, vertical team (including RMO, MSC, and RIT), OEO point(s) of contact (if applicable). The credentials and years of experience for the ATR team should also be included when available. DELETE THIS TEXT BOX BEFORE FINALIZING THE REVIEW PLAN.

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 draft Initial Appraisal Report for McClellan Pier, Hudson River Trust, New York, New York. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project's Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-209 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1. 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.

SIGNATURE

Name
ATR Team Leader
Office Symbol/Company

Date

SIGNATURE

Name
Project Manager
Office Symbol

Date

SIGNATURE

Name
Architect Engineer Project Manager¹
Company, location

Date

SIGNATURE

Name
Review Management Office Representative
Office Symbol

Date

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
Chief, Engineering Division
Office Symbol

Date

SIGNATURE

Name
Chief, Planning Division
Office Symbol

Date

¹ Only needed if some portion of the ATR was contracted

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number

NOTE: Revisions to the Review Plan since it was last approved by the MSC Commander should be documented in Attachment 3. Significant changes (such as a change in the level or scope of review) require re-approval by the MSC Commander following the process used for initially approving the plan. DELETE THIS TEXT BOX BEFORE FINALIZING THE REVIEW PLAN.

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

NOTE: This attachment is optional. If included, it should define the acronyms used in the Review Plan. Acronyms used in this template or that might typically be used in a review plan (to be modified as necessary for specific review plans) are provided in the table below. DELETE THIS TEXT BOX BEFORE FINALIZING THE REVIEW PLAN.

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