



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

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

CEMVD-PD-KM

DEC 3 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Vicksburg District

SUBJECT: Approval of Review Plan for Big Sunflower-Quiver River Feasibility Study

1. References:

- a. EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2012.
- b. Memorandum, CEMVK-PP-D, 19 November 2012, subject as above (encl).

2. The subject Review Plan (RP) as enclosed is approved, and MVD concurs in the conclusion that an independent external peer review of this project is necessary. The proposed RP has been coordinated with the Ecosystem Restoration Planning Center of Expertise (ECO-PCX), which recommends approval. In accordance with reference 1.a., the RP complies with all applicable policy and provides an adequate independent technical review of the plan formulation, engineering and environmental analyses, and other aspects of the plan development. As the RP is a living document, it should be monitored and amended as appropriate to incorporate additional review requirements if the project moves into the implementation phase. Non-substantive changes to this RP do not require further approval.

3. The District should post the RP to its website and provide a link to the ECO-PCX for its use.

4. The MVD point of contact for this action is Jamie Triplett, (601) 634-5075.

EDWARD E. BELK, JR., SES
Director of Programs

Encl

CF (wo encl):

CEMVK-PP-D, Mr. Brister
CEMVK-PP-D, Ms. Porter
CEMVD-PD-N, Ms. Creswell

REVIEW PLAN

**Big Sunflower River Watershed (Quiver River), Mississippi
Feasibility Report**

Vicksburg District

**MSC Approval Date: 3 Dec 12
Last Revision Date: None**



**US Army Corps
of Engineers®**

Review Plan

Big Sunflower River Watershed (Quiver River), Mississippi Feasibility Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Purpose and Requirements	1
2. Review Management Organization (RMO) Coordination	1
3. Study Information	1
4. District Quality Control (DQC)	3
5. Agency Technical Review (ATR)	3
6. Independent External Peer Review (IEPR)	6
7. Policy and Legal Compliance Review	8
8. Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) Review and Certification	8
9. Model Certification and Approval	8
10. Review Schedules and Costs	9
11. Public Participation	10
12. Review Plan Approval and Updates	10
13. Review Plan Points of Contact	10

Attachment 1: Team Rosters

Attachment 2: Sample Statement of Technical Review for Decision Documents

Attachment 3: Review Plan Revisions

Attachment 4: Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Purpose and Requirements.

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Big Sunflower River Watershed (Quiver River) Feasibility Report.

b. 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, 31 Mar 2011
- (3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
- (4) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007
- (5) PMP for study
- (6) 03501-MVD, MSC Review of Planning Products

c. 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 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, 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).

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 decision documents is typically either a Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) or the Risk Management Center (RMC), depending on the primary purpose of the decision document. The RMO for the peer review effort described in this Review Plan is the National Ecosystem Planning Center of Expertise (ECO-PCX).

The RMO will coordinate with the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) 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 Big Sunflower River Watershed (Quiver River) Feasibility Study as authorized by Congress will generate an integrated Feasibility Report/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document that presents the analysis of a range of alternatives developed to solve several inter-dependent water resource related issues within the Yazoo Mississippi Delta. The predominant emphasis of the study is the restoration of the degraded aquatic ecosystems in the study area. The report will be submitted to Congress for potential implementation.

The study is being conducted in further response to a Senate Resolution adopted 29 June 1973 by the Committee on Public Works of the US Senate. It reads as follows:

“Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, That the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, is hereby requested to review the report on the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project contained in House Document No. 308, 88th Congress, 2d Session, and other reports with a view to determining whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time with reference to providing a plan for the development, utilization and conservation of water related land resources of the Yazoo Basin, including the backwater areas of the Mississippi and Yazoo Rivers. Such study should include appropriate considerations of the needs for flood protection, wise use of flood plain lands, bank stabilization, navigation facilities, regional water supply and waste water management facilities systems, general recreation facilities, enhancement and control of water quality, enhancement and conservation of fish and wildlife and other measures for the protection and enhancement of the environment.”

b. Study/Project Description. The study area is part of the Big Sunflower River and Yazoo River Watersheds located in the Mississippi Delta. The Tallahatchie River originates in western Tippah County and flows west and then south for approximately 230 miles into Leflore County. North of Greenwood, Mississippi, the Tallahatchie River converges with the Yalobusha River to form the Yazoo River. In its course, the Tallahatchie River flows from the hills of eastern and central Mississippi into the Delta region of the state. The Quiver River originates in west-central Tallahatchie County and meanders more than 60 miles south through Tallahatchie and Leflore Counties before its confluence with the Big Sunflower River just north of U.S. Highway 82 in Sunflower County. Major streams located in the study area include the Tallahatchie and Quiver Rivers and Sandy, Black, and Parks Bayous.

The feasibility study for the Quiver River will be conducted to evaluate a range of alternatives to provide a plan for a single purpose ecosystem restoration with related and compatible water quality, and water resource management measures. Working with the non-Federal sponsor (Yazoo-Mississippi Delta Joint Water Management District (YMDJWMD)), alternatives will be developed and analyzed to the extent required to identify the plan that best meets the needs of the study area based on Federal planning criteria. The evaluation of possible alternatives during the reconnaissance phase yielded measures that could improve existing conditions as well as address impacts from future development in the area. The implementation of weirs/grade control structures, channel improvements, pump stations, and stream flow augmentation provide the opportunities to enhance the functions of the ecosystems. The implementation of a combination of measures will be required to fully realize potential of alternative measures to address the problems and opportunities, including the extent and scale of the measures proposed, will be according to their ability to meet project objectives, taking into account cost effectiveness, economics and environmental benefits and sustainability.

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review. Prior to development of the final array of alternatives, it is not possible to accurately predict which factors will ultimately present the greatest challenges. However, based on analysis conducted to date on measures developed for the Section 905(b) report, the most controversial portions of the study are likely to be associated with the interbasin transfer of water, invasive species, and control of agricultural withdrawals of groundwater and surface water from streams (including associated authority and policy implications). The cost estimates for the plans generated for the Section 905(b) analysis ranged from \$9 million to \$17 million. No precedent-setting approaches, life safety, or unusually complex or controversial economic or environmental issues are anticipated.

d. In-Kind Contributions. Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR. The in-kind products and analyses to be provided by the non-Federal sponsor include:

- Assessment of Historical, existing, and anticipated Water Quality Conditions
- Post-project monitoring/adaptive management program
- GIS system presentation, mapping, and illustrations
- Surveys

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.

Documentation of DQC. DQC is the review of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the review of project quality requirements. It will be managed by the Vicksburg District in accordance with the Major Subordinate Command (MSC) and district Quality Management Plan (QMP). The DQC may be conducted by Vicksburg District as long as the reviewers are not involved in the study. Basic quality control tools provided will include quality checks and reviews, supervisory reviews, PDT reviews, etc. Additionally, the PDT will be responsible for a complete review of the documents to assure overall integrity of the report, technical appendices, and the recommendations before approval by the District Commander. Signed DQC Certification will be provided to the Agency Technical Review (ATR) Team members.

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 (ECO-PCX) 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 identified by the RMO and 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. The home district/MSD may nominate members of the ATR team.

a. Products to Undergo ATR. The USACE SMART planning process will be utilized for this study. ATR will be performed for the Draft Report (including NEPA and supporting documentation), the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) and Final Report (including NEPA and supporting documentation). Where practicable, technical products that support subsequent analyses will undergo ATR prior to being presented in draft reports. These documents may include: surveys and mapping products, hydrology & hydraulics, geotechnical investigations, economic, environmental, cultural, and social inventories, annual damage and benefit estimates, cost estimates, etc.

b. Required ATR Team Expertise.

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, economics, environmental resources, etc).
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in water resources policy issues and ecosystem restoration projects involving inter-basin transfers.
Economics	The Economics reviewer should have strong experience involving ecosystem restoration projects in agricultural areas.
Environmental Resources	The Environmental reviewer should have strong experience involving ecosystem restoration projects involving fish habitat, invasive species, and water quality and water quantity/flow issues.
Engineering/Hydrology	The reviewer should have extensive experience applying HEC-RAS to streams with highly variable flows and design of water and erosion control structures.
Cost Engineering	The reviewer should have significant experience in estimating costs for work on ecosystem restoration projects in agricultural areas.
Real Estate	The reviewer should have a strong background in Real Estate issues involving ecosystem restoration projects in Agricultural areas.

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 draft and final report. A sample Statement of Technical Review is included in Attachment 2.

6. Independent External Peer Review (IEPR).

IEPR may be required for 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 has the potential to generate considerable interagency interest and/or important economic, environmental, or social effects. It is anticipated that the study will require the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS). For these reasons, an IEPR will be conducted. No innovative materials or techniques or precedent-setting science or approaches are currently being proposed and no significant controversy is expected. The ecosystem restoration and related measures being considered are not expected to have any significant adverse health, safety, environmental, or social consequences. Construction would be expected to be straight forward and consistent with other projects constructed by the Corps and others. The need for IEPR will be reconsidered by the PDT periodically and when/if new measures are considered or if opposition or controversy arises.

b. Products to Undergo Type I IEPR. The Type I IEPR will be performed for the entire decision document (including supporting documentation), including key interim technical products and major milestone documents (e.g., TSP).

c. Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise. Disciplines that are anticipated to conduct the IEPR are listed in below with experience and qualifications equal or above the ATR member requirements.

IEPR Panel Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
Economics	The Economics reviewer should have strong experience involving ecosystem restoration projects in agricultural areas.
Environmental Resources	The Environmental reviewer should have strong experience involving ecosystem restoration projects involving fish habitat, invasive species, and water quality and water quantity/flow issues.
Hydrology /Hydraulics	The reviewer should have extensive experience applying HEC-RAS to streams with highly variable flows and design of water and erosion control structures.
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in water resources policy issues and ecosystem restoration projects involving inter-basin transfers.

d. Documentation of Type I IEPR. The IEPR panel will be selected and managed by an Outside Eligible Organization (OEO) per EC 1165-2-209, Appendix D. Panel comments will be compiled by the OEO and should address the adequacy and acceptability of the economic, engineering and environmental methods, models, and analyses used. IEPR comments should generally include the same four key parts as described for ATR comments in Section 5.b above. The OEO will prepare a final Review Report that will accompany the publication of the final decision document and shall:

- 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; 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.

The final Review Report will be submitted by the OEO no later than 60 days following the close of the public comment period for the draft decision document. USACE shall consider all recommendations contained in the Review Report and prepare a written response for all recommendations adopted or not adopted. The final decision document will summarize the Review Report and USACE response. The Review Report and USACE response will be made available to the public, including through electronic means on the internet.

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.

All decision documents shall be coordinated with the Cost Engineering DX, located in the Walla Walla District. The DX will assist in determining the expertise needed on the ATR team and Type I IEPR team (if required) and in the development of the review charge(s). The DX will also provide the Cost Engineering DX certification. The RMO is responsible for coordination with the Cost Engineering DX.

9. Model Certification and 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. 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:

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Certification / Approval Status
HEC-FDA 1.2.4 (Flood Damage Analysis)	The Hydrologic Engineering Center's Flood Damage Reduction Analysis (HEC-FDA) program provides the capability for integrated hydrologic engineering and economic analysis for formulating and evaluating flood risk management plans using risk-based analysis methods. The program will be used to evaluate and compare the future without- and with-project plans along the Wild River near River City to aid in the selection of a recommended plan to manage flood risk.	Certified
Environmental Output Model (To be determined (TBD))	The environmental model will be selected when more information about environmental outputs is available. It will be used to quantify environmental benefits of the various alternatives.	TBD, Anticipate use of certified model
IWR-Plan	The model will be used to present cost effectiveness and incremental cost analysis information.	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	Approval Status
HEC-RAS 4.0 (River Analysis System)	The model will be used for steady flow analysis to evaluate the future without- and with-project conditions along the	HH&C CoP Preferred Model

10. Review Schedules and Costs.

Milestone	Description	Date	Review
Milestone F1	Alternatives Milestone	March 2013	DQC
Milestone F2	TSP Milestone	September 2013	ATR, IEPR
Milestone F3	Agency Decision Milestone	November 2013	
Milestone F4	Final Report Milestone	March 2014	
Milestone F5	Chief's Report	September 2014	

a. **ATR Schedule and Cost.** The ATR schedule is provided in the table, above. The ATR efforts are expected to cost approximately \$30,000.

b. **Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost.** The IEPR schedule is provided in the table, above. The IEPR efforts are expected to cost approximately \$100,000.

c. **Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost.** All the models anticipated to be used are already certified or approved for use. Only basic and commonly used models are needed.

11. Public Participation.

A Public Involvement Plan will be formulated to ensure that the public is provided adequate opportunities to provide input. Relevant public comments will be incorporated and provided to the reviewers before they conduct their review. Public participation will be encouraged throughout the study, but will be promoted during public scoping meetings and public reviews of draft documents. The public, including scientific or professional societies, will be given the opportunity to nominate potential external peer reviewers through the OEO.

Proceedings from all public meetings and comments received during public review will be included in the draft documents with responses included. Comments and corresponding responses will be summarized and provided to the ATR team.

12. Review Plan Approval and Updates.

The Mississippi Valley Division Commander is responsible for approving this Review Plan. The Commander's approval reflects vertical team input (involving district, MSC, RMO, and HQUSACE members) 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.

13. Review Plan Points of Contact.

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

Ben Robinson, Project Manager	601-631-5682 Home District (MVK)
Jamie Triplett, District Support Team	601-634-5836 Home MSC (MVD)
James Baker, RMO (ECO-PCX)	904-232-2698 RMO (ECO-PCX)

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS

PDT Roster

<u>Name</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Telephone</u>
Ben Robinson	Project Manager	CEMVK-PP-D	601-631-5682
Lee Robinson	Economist	CEMVN-PDE-FRR	601-631-5435
Matt Mallard	Plan Formulator	CEMVN-PD-PWS	601-631-5960
Chris Koepfel	Archeologist	CEMVN-PDN- UDP	601-631-5410
Tommy Tucker	Structure Design	CEMVK-EC-DS	601-631-5055
Brian LaBarre	Biologist	CEMVN-PDN- UDP	601-631-5437
Richard Pearce	Cost Engineering	CEMVK-EC-TC	601-631-7139
Katy Breau	Channel Design	CEMVK-EC-HH	601-631-5741
Lanny Barfield	Geotechnical	CEMVK-EC-CQ	601-631-5038
Dave Johnson	Hydraulics	CEMVK-EC-HC	601-631-7221
Matthew Parrish	Water Quality	CEMVK-EC-HW	601-631-5154
Richard Miller	Real Estate Planning	CEMVK-RE-EP	601-631-5224
Robert Hite	Engineering Services	CEMVK-EC-DC	601-631-7223

ATR Team Roster

<u>Name</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Telephone</u>
TBD	ATR Manager	TBD	TBD
TBD	Economist	TBD	TBD
TBD	Biologist	TBD	TBD
TBD	Real Estate	TBD	TBD
TBD	H&H	TBD	TBD
TBD	Cost Engineering	TBD	TBD
TBD	Planner	TBD	TBD

Vertical Team Roster

<u>Name</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Telephone</u>
Susan Smith	Planning/Policy	MVD	601-634-5827
Dave Vigh	Biology	MVD	601-634-5854
Jamie Triplett	DST	MVD	601-634-5075
Brian Chewning	RIT	MVD	601-634-5836
James Baker	RMO	ECO-PCX	904-232-2698
TBD	Cost Engineering	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 <type of product> for <project name and location>. 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.

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

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Term	Definition	Term	Definition
AFB	Alternative Formulation Briefing	NER	National Ecosystem Restoration
ASA(CW)	Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
ATR	Agency Technical Review	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/MSD	The District or MSD 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	SMART	Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Risk-Informed, Timely
LRR	Limited Reevaluation Report	TSP	Tentatively Selected Plan
MR&T	Mississippi River & Tributaries	USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
MSC	Major Subordinate Command	WRDA	Water Resources Development Act
NED	National Economic Development	YMDJWMD	Yazoo Mississippi Delta Joint Water Control District