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

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

30 Nov 12

CEMVD-PD-KM

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Vicksburg District

SUBJECT: Approval of Implementation Review Plan for McKinney Bayou Continuing Authorities Program Section 205 Flood Risk Reduction Project Tunica, Mississippi

1. Reference memorandum, CEMVK-PP-D, 6 November 2012, subject as above (encl 1).

2. MVD staff has reviewed the Review Plan and related documents for the subject project. The 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).

3. The subject review plan is approved. The review plan has been coordinated with the Review Management Organization, which concurs (encl 2). Please post the approved Review Plan to your web page.

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

2 Encls

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
VICKSBURG DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
4155 CLAY STREET
VICKSBURG, MISSISSIPPI 39183-3435

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

CEMVK-PP-D (1105-2-10b1)

06 NOV 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR Review Management Office, Mississippi Valley Division (CEMVD-PD-KM/Triplett)

SUBJECT: Approval of Implementation Review Plan for McKinney Bayou Continuing Authorities Program Section 205 Flood Risk Reduction Project Tunica, Mississippi

1. Subject Implementation Review Plan is enclosed for your review and approval (encl 1).

2. CEMVK is requesting an exclusion from Type I Independent External Peer Review per paragraph 3b of the Director of Policy Civil Works' Memorandum #1, "Continuing Authority Program Planning Process Improvements," 19 January 2011. The justification for this exclusion is provided in the review plan.

3. A Memorandum for Record from Vicksburg District Chief of Engineering and Construction, Mr. Henry Dulaney, requesting endorsement of the Implementation Review Plan from the Review Management Organization is enclosed (encl 2).

4. Questions should be directed to Ms. Holly Porter, Senior Project Manager (ext. 5043).

2 Encls

JEFFREY R. ECKSTEIN
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
Commanding

Encl 1

IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW PLAN

MCKINNEY BAYOU CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM
SECTION 205 FLOOD RISK REDUCTION PROJECT
TUNICA, MISSISSIPPI

Vicksburg District

MSC Approval Date: *30 November 2012*
Last Revision Date: *1 December 2012*

US Army Corps
of Engineers ®

IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW PLAN

McKinney Bayou, Continuing Authorities Program,
Section 205 Flood Risk Reduction Project, Tunica, Mississippi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

1. Purpose and Requirements

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the McKinney Bayou Continuing Authorities Program, Section 205 Flood Risk Reduction, Tunica, Mississippi, project. Quality Management activities consist of District Quality Control (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR) and Type II Independent External Peer Review (IEPR). The project is in the Preconstruction, Engineering and Design (PED) Phase. The related documents are Implementation Documents that consist of Plans and Specifications (P&S).

b. References.

(1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2010.

(2) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 March 2011.

(3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 September 2006.

(4) ER 1110-2-1150, Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects, 31 August 1999.

(5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 November 2007.

(6) McKinney Bayou Continuing Authorities Program, Section 205 Flood Risk Reduction, Tunica, Mississippi, Project Management Plan (PMP).

(7) 03501-MVD, MSC Review of Planning Products.

(8) 08502 MVD Review Plans for Technical Products

(9) 08502.1-MVD Review Plan Checklist for Implementation documents (Attachment 1)

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: The DQC/Quality Assurance; ATR; IEPR; and Policy and Legal Compliance Review. In addition to these levels of review, implementation 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 implementation documents is the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mississippi Valley Division (CEMVD).

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. Implementation Document. The McKinney Bayou, Tunica County, Mississippi, Section 205 Flood Risk Reduction Feasibility Study is authorized under Section 205 of the Flood Control Act (FCA) of 1948 (Public Law 80-858), as amended. An Environmental Assessment (EA), which resulted in a Finding of No Significant Impact, has been prepared in accordance with the Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (33 CFR, Part 230) to determine potential environmental impacts of the proposed project on the area. The EA includes a Section 404(b)(1) evaluation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, as well as coordination with various environmental agencies.

b. Study/Project Description. The McKinney Bayou project is a Flood Risk Management (FRM) effort. Although there are no other project purposes, alternatives were formulated to identify an FRM improvement that was economically feasible, engineeringly implementable, and environmentally sustainable. This study was undertaken in response to an initial request from the Tunica County Soil and Water Conservation District (TCSWCD) for Federal flood control assistance from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg District, to address flooding problems in the study area. The McKinney Bayou Detailed Project Report was approved on June 28, 2011. New project surveys were taken in September 2011 and design for the selected alternative began in 2012. The McKinney Bayou project area, or the area affected by the implementation of water resource improvements, is the McKinney Bayou drainage basin for this study. It is located in Tunica County in northwest Mississippi approximately 40 miles north of Clarksdale, Mississippi, and 30 miles south of Memphis, Tennessee. The project area is primarily flat alluvial delta land in the vicinity of Tunica. It is bounded on the west by the Mississippi River mainline levees and on the east by U.S. Highway 61 and the town of Tunica. The McKinney Bayou basin consists of 42.6 square miles that drain on a southerly path for a maximum length of approximately 18 miles. It comprises approximately 27,300 acres, of which 9,425 acres are subject to flooding by the 100-year flood.

Implementation documents included in this Review Plan (RP) are P&S for the selected alternative consisting of enlarging the existing channel to a 30-foot bottom width from river miles (RM) 2.44 to 4.79, 7.16 to 8.99, and 11.18 to the upper end of the reach near RM 16.00. This plan also requires the replacement of three existing box culverts along McKinney Bayou located at RMs 13.53, 14.52, and 15.16.

The total cost of the recommended alternative is approximately $8.2 million. The Federal share of the National Economic Development (NED) plan would be approximately $4.1 million; the non-Federal share would be approximately $4.1 million based upon the general cost allocations established by the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended. The benefit-cost ratio for the NED plan has been calculated at approximately 3.38 for the flood control portion of the project. Therefore, the project would be economically feasible.

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review. Various factors were used to determine the appropriate scope and level of review necessary for the project, including a risk assessment and checklist for the need of an IEPR. This information will also be used by the Project Delivery Team (PDT), RMO, and vertical team to concur with the proposed level of review and types of expertise represented on the review teams. A preliminary assessment of potential project risks, their magnitude, and their potential impact on the success of the project are displayed in Table 1.

TABLE 1
PROJECT RISK ASSESSMENT

Project Risks	Level of Risk			Uncertainties	Impacts
	Low	Medium	High		
Flood Risk Management					
Human Population	X			None identified	No threats to human life
Public Safety	X			None identified	Minimal threat to safety
Environmental Justice	X			No social injustice identified	No disproportionate or adverse impacts to minority and low-income populations.
Local Economic Indicators		X		No uncertainties identified. Developments planned regardless of a project.	No adverse impacts. Project improvements are given a moderate rating in support of local economy.
Regional Economy		X		No uncertainties identified. Developments planned regardless of a project	No adverse impacts. Project improvements are given a moderate rating in support of local economy.
Hydrologic Parameters					
Streamflow Elevations	X			Very low risk of error	Minimum adjustments to damages.
Project Failure	X			Low risk	Increased flooding during high rainfall events; increased damages correlate with event
Economic Parameters					
Structure Values	X			Very low risk of error	Minimum adjustments to damages
Structure Elevations	X			Very low risk of error	Minimum adjustments to damages
Depth-Damage Curves	X			Used IWR curves. Very low risk of error.	Minimum adjustments to damages
Agricultural Practices	X			None identified	Minimal impacts
Harvesting Times	X			None identified	Minimal impacts
Project Costs	X			Low risk of error	Project feasibility
Project Feasibility	X			Use of fill benefit category	Borderline feasible BCR
Environmental Considerations					
Water and Air Quality	X			Very low risk	Minimal and temporary impacts a/
Waterfowl Resources	X			Very low risk	Minimal and temporary impacts a/

Table 2 (Cont.)

Project Risks	Level of Risk			Uncertainties	Impacts
	Low	Medium	High		
Environmental Considerations					
Aquatic Resources		X		Moderate risk	Minimal and temporary impacts a/ b/
Terrestrial Resources		X		Moderate risk	Minimal and temporary impacts a/ b/
Wetland Resources		X		Moderate risk	Minimal and temporary impacts a/ b/
Hazardous, Toxic, and Radiological Waste (HTRW)	X			Very low risk	Minimal and temporary impacts a/
Recreation and Esthetics	X			None identified	Minimal and temporary impacts a/
Cultural Resources	X			None identified	Minimal and temporary impacts a/
Terrestrial and Environmental Species	X			Very low risk	Minimal and temporary impacts. a/

a/ Impacts discussed in EA.
b/ Impacts fully compensated for through mitigation.

d. In-Kind Contributions. Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR. No in-kind products or analyses will be provided by the non-Federal sponsor.

4. District Quality Control (DQC).

All implementation documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC. The DQC will be performed at 65, 90, and 95 percent P&S. The 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 Major Subordinate Command (MSC).

Documentation of DQC. The 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 the 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 P&S 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).

The ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.). The ATR will be performed at 65, 90, and 95 percent P&S. 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 Corps guidance, and 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. The ATR will be performed for the 65 and 95 percent reviews of P&S. Where practicable, technical products that support subsequent analyses will undergo ATR.

b. Required ATR Team Expertise. Table 2 depicts the ATR team members and the expertise required for their position.

TABLE 2
ATR TEAM MEMBERS AND 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).
Hydraulics/Channel Design	Team member will be an expert in the field of urban hydrology and hydraulics, have a thorough understanding of the dynamics of both open channel flow systems, enclosed systems, application of detention/retention basins; effects of Best Management Practices (BMP) and low impact development on hydrology; approaches that can benefit water quality, application of levees and flood walls in an urban environment with space constraints, nonstructural measures especially as related to multipurpose alternatives including ecosystem restoration; nonstructural solutions involving flood warning systems; and nonstructural alternatives related to floodproofing. The team member will have an understanding of computer modeling techniques that will be used for this project (HEC·HMS and HEC·RAS). A certified flood plain manager is recommended, but not required. Team member will have a thorough understanding of channel enlargement and cleanout design. A certified professional engineer is recommended, but not required.

Table 2 (Cont.)

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
Structural	Team member will have a thorough understanding of non-structural measures, levee, floodwall, and retaining wall design and structures typically associated with box culvert design. A certified professional engineer is recommended, but not required.
Geotechnical Engineering	Team member will be experienced in levee and floodwall design, postconstruction evaluation, and rehabilitation. A certified professional engineer is recommended.
Cost Engineering	Team member will be familiar with cost estimating for similar Civil Works projects using MCACES. Team member will be a Certified Cost Technician, Certified Cost Consultant, or Certified Cost Engineer.
Real Estate	Team member will be experienced in Federal Civil Work real estate laws, policies, and guidance. Members shall have experience working with respective sponsor real estate issues. A Real Estate Review Plan will not be available at 65 percent Review, but will be available at 95 percent Review.

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. 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.

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

6. Independent External Peer Review (IEPR).

The IEPR may be required for implementation documents under certain circumstances. The 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 the Corps is warranted. A risk-informed decision, as described in EC 1165-2-209, is made as to whether IEPR is appropriate. The IEPR panels will consist of independent, recognized experts from outside the Corps in the appropriate disciplines, representing a balance of areas of expertise suitable for the review being conducted.

a. Decision on IEPR. For those projects where the PDT is unsure whether IEPR would be required, based primarily on the criteria of significant threats to human life/safety, the following checklist of items has been covered to assist the Vertical Team in the decision making for the need of an IEPR. Based on the items below, it has been determined that an IEPR is not needed for this project.

(1) Project improvements include basic channel improvements. No major challenges are foreseen with implementing the project features.

(a) Based on an evaluation of potential risks and uncertainties with the project, minimal impacts were identified as outlined in Table 1. It was determined that none of the identified factors would jeopardize project implementation. Any environmental impacts would be mitigated for. The only concern for economic feasibility would result from significant unforeseen increases in project cost items.

(2) No influential scientific information has been identified associated with the study or project.

(3) No specific interagency interests or issues have been identified (e.g., with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), etc.).

(4) No threats to human life/safety were identified. There is little probability that the channel improvements would fail resulting in a catastrophic event. Should the project design be exceeded, there could be additional flooding, but based on field reconnaissance surveys during high-water events in 2011, it was determined the biggest threat would be to impassable streets and roadways. Any threat to human life or safety is considered negligible.

(5) Should failure or project design exceedance occur, no major life safety related issues or consequences have been identified. Safety assurance factors are described in Engineer Circular 1165-2-209.

(6) No significant impacts have been identified in regard to economic, environmental, and/or social effects to the Nation.

(a) Additionally, for the CAP level of study, division-level guidance from CEMVD was provided that a Regional Economic Development evaluation or System of Accounts table with Other Social Effects was not necessary. Furthermore, the project sponsor did not request this effort from the Corps as a part of this study because they had previously contracted with a private firm for similar information.

(b) However, this project will provide protection to several areas where future planned developments are occurring. The project alone will not yield economic growth, but, in combination with the thriving gaming industry north of the project area and other economic development plans, positive spinoff effects are expected to occur.

(7) There are no highly controversial components to this project. However, there were a few issues which were addressed in the DPR.

(a) With a project, there are some increased stages in the lower sump which results in a minimum amount of induced flooding to agricultural properties, but no structures are impacted as none are flooded in the lower sump with or without a project. This is explained in the Decision Document. The increase in the average annual number of acres flooded (i.e., 90 acres) are minimal and do not impact project feasibility. Also, flowage easements will be purchased to mitigate for induced damages and potential losses.

(b) The benefit-cost ratio is basically reliant on agricultural FRM benefits; thus, the project will be a low priority for funding. The local sponsor has been informed and has acknowledged it is aware of the low funding priority of this project due to the type of benefits claimed. Statements of these recognitions are documented in the Main Report.

(c) In addition, some controversy could exist with the inclusion of fill benefits. This benefit category is discussed fully and with a great amount of detail in the Economic Appendix of the Decision Document. Project benefit-cost ratios are shown with and without the inclusion of this category and still result in unity. Also, the project sponsor has been informed throughout the study that these would probably have a low budget priority in the funding process.

(8) No changes in methodology or methods were used in evaluating this project. The basic improvements were channel alternatives with features such as culvert replacements. Thus, no unapproved or controversial methodology or procedures were used.

(a) The information in the Decision Document is not based on novel methods, nor does it present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices.

(b) All procedures were based on approved Corps methods based on ER 1105-2-100 and supporting regulations.

7. Policy and Legal Compliance Review.

All implementation documents will be reviewed throughout the 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. The 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 implementation 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 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.

Engineering Circular 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 Corps 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).

Engineering Circular 1105-2-412 does not cover engineering models used in planning. The responsible use of well-known and proven Corps 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 Corps 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).

Engineering Models. Table 3 depicts the engineering models that will be used in the development of the plans and specifications.

TABLE 3
ENGINEERING MODELS

Non-Planning Model	Version	Certified	Approval Date/Status	Description	Use
H&H Models					
HEC-RAS	4.0	X		The HEC's River Analysis System program provides the capability to perform one-dimensional steady and unsteady flow river hydraulics calculations.	Used for steady and unsteady flow analyses for the existing channel and channel alternatives.
Cost Engineering					
MCACES		X		Microcomputer-Aided Cost Estimation System	Used to generate detailed cost estimates for each alternative.

10. Review Schedules and Costs.

a. ATR Schedule and Cost. The ATR schedule and milestones for the project is provided in Table 4. The ATR efforts are expected to cost approximately $105,000.

TABLE 4
REVIEW SCHEDULE (ATR actions are in bold)

Milestone	Initiation Date	Completion Date	Cost ($)
65 percent DQC Review and Comment Incorporation	October 22, 2012	November 8, 2012	35,000
65 percent ATR Review and Comment Incorporation	**January 7, 2013**	**February 4, 2013**	**$70,000**
95 percent DQC Review and Comment Incorporation	April 17, 2013	May 6, 2013	$25,000
95 percent ATR Review and Comment Incorporation	**May 13, 2012**	**June 10, 2013**	**$60,000**
P&S Approval	June 25, 2013	June 28, 2013	--
Request to Advertise	January 15, 2014	January 15, 2014	--
Contract Award	March 19, 2014	March 19, 2014	--
Project Physical Completion	April 19, 2015	April 19, 2015	--
Notice of Project Completion	July 24, 2015	July 24, 2015	--

b. Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost. All models used in the McKinney Bayou study are listed above and are certified. Other models used were approved by Division-level (CEMVD) authority. The level of detail in the McKinney Bayou evaluation was deemed commensurate with the level of risk and complexity inherent in the project.

11. Public Participation.

A Public Involvement Plan will be formulated to ensure 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.

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 CEMVD 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 implementation 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. Any minor changes to the review plan since the last MSC Commander approval will be documented in Attachment 3. Significant changes to the Review Plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) should be reapproved 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.

Questions and/or comments on this review plan can be directed to the points of contact shown in Table 5. The PDT roster, ATR Team roster, and Vertical Team roster are listed in Attachment 4. All acronym and abbreviation definitions are listed in Attachment 5.

TABLE 5
REVIEW PLAN CONTACTS

Responsible Organization	Position	Name	Telephone	E-Mail
Vicksburg District	Senior Project Manager	Holly Porter	(601) 631-5043	holly.g.porter@usace.army.mil
CEMVD	District Support Team	Jamie Triplett	(601) 634-5075	jamie.k.triplett@usace.army.mil
CEMVD	RMO	Robert Fitzgerald	(601) 634-5922	Robert.H.Fitzgerald@usace.army.mil

ATTACHMENT 1: REVIEW PLAN CHECKLIST FOR IMPLEMENTATION DOCUMENTS

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 DrChecks[sm].

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
ATR Team Leader
Office Symbol/Company

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Project Manager
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Review Management Office Representative
Office Symbol

CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows: *Describe the major technical concerns and their resolution.*

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

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Chief, Engineering Division
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Chief, Planning Division
Office Symbol

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

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number
11/27/12	Updated Table 5 Review Schedule and Cost. Took out 90% Reviews	Page 12
11/27/12	Revised Table 2 ATR Team members. Removed Environmental Member and combined H&H/Channel Design Engineer.	Page 5-6
11/27/12	Added ER 1110-2-1150, Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects, 31 August 1999, to references	Page 1
11/27/12	Removed Planning models used in DPR from document	Page 10
11/27/12	Removed IEPR definitions since we are requesting a waiver from IEPR on project.	Page 7

ATTACHMENT 4: TEAM ROSTERS

PDT ROSTER

NAME	FUNCTION	OFFICE	TELEPHONE
Holly Porter	Project Manager	CEMVK-PP-D	(601) 631-5043
Lee Robinson	Economist	CEMVN-PDE-FRR	(601) 631-5435
Matt Mallard	Plan Formulator	CEMVN-PD-PWS	(601)631-5960
Jennifer Ryan	Archeologist	CEMVN-PDN-UDP	(601) 631-5920
Marneshia Richard	Structure Design	CEMVK-EC-DS	(601) 631-7055
Richard Pearce	Cost Engineering	CEMVK-EC-TC	(601) 631-7139
Joelle Handy	Channel Design	CEMVK-EC-DL	(601) 631-5667
Brian Jordan	Geotechnical	CEMVK-EC-GA	(601) 631-5898
Shannon Wells	Hydraulics	CEMVK-EC-HH	(601) 631-7031
Dave Johnson	Water Quality	CEMVK-EC-HW	(601) 631-7221
Richard Miller	Real Estate Planning	CEMVK-RE-EP	(601) 631-5224
Sanford Holliday	Relocations	CEMVK-ED-CE	(601) 631-5674
Randy McAlpin	Civil	CEMVK-EC-DC	(601) 631-5288

DQC ROSTER

NAME	FUNCTION	OFFICE	TELEPHONE
Daniel Sumerall	Biologist/ Archeologist	CEMVN-PDN-UDP	(601)631-5428
Jonathan Bennett	Structure Design	CEMVK-EC-DS	(601) 631-5599
Danny McPhearson	Cost Engineering	CEMVK-EC-TC	(601) 631-5602
Ben Caldwell	Channel Design	CEMVK-EC-DL	(601) 631-5593
Andy Hardy	Geotechnical	CEMVK-EC-GA	(601) 631-7182
Mike Alexander	Hydraulics	CEMVK-EC-HH	(601) 631-5044
Brian Johnson	Water Quality	CEMVK-EC-HW	(601) 631-7519
Tim Riggs	Real Estate Planning	CEMVK-RE-R	(601) 631-7385
Sanford Holliday	Relocations	CEMVK-ED-CE	(601) 631-5674

ATR TEAM ROSTER

NAME	FUNCTION	OFFICE	TELEPHONE
TBD	ATR Manager	TBD	TBD
TBD	Real Estate	TBD	TBD
TBD	H&H	TBD	TBD
TBD	Cost Engineering	TBD	TBD
TBD	Geotechnical	TBD	TBD
TBD	Structural Engineer	TBD	TBD

VERTICAL TEAM ROSTER

NAME	FUNCTION	OFFICE	TELEPHONE
Jamie Triplett	District Support Team	CEMVD	(601) 634-5075
Brian Chewning	RIT	CEMVD	(601) 634-5836
Robert Fitzgerald	RMO	CEMVD	(601) 634-5922
TBD	Cost Engineering	TBD	TBD

ATTACHMENT 5: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Term	Definition	Term	Definition
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
CSDR	Coastal Storm Damage Reduction	O&M	Operation and maintenance
DPR	Detailed Project Report	OMB	Office and Management and Budget
DQC	District Quality Control/Quality Assurance	OMRR&R	Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation
DX	Directory of Expertise	OEO	Outside Eligible Organization
EA	Environmental Assessment	OSE	Other Social Effects
EC	Engineer Circular	PCX	Planning Center of Expertise
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	PDT	Project Delivery Team
EO	Executive Order	PAC	Post Authorization Change
ER	Ecosystem Restoration	PMP	Project Management Plan
FDR	Flood Damage Reduction	PL	Public Law
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	QMP	Quality Management Plan
FRM	Flood Risk Management	QA	Quality Assurance
FSM	Feasibility Scoping Meeting	QC	Quality Control
GRR	General Reevaluation Report	RED	Regional Economic Development
Home District/MSC	The District or MSC responsible for the preparation of the decision document	RMC	Risk Management Center
HQUSACE	Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	RMO	Review Management Organization
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review	RTS	Regional Technical Specialist
ITR	Independent Technical Review	SAR	Safety Assurance Review
LRR	Limited Reevaluation Report	USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
MR&T	Mississippi River & Tributaries	WRDA	Water Resources Development Act
MSC	Major Subordinate Command	YMDJWQD	Yazoo Mississippi Delta Joint Water Control District

PORTER/cjh/5043
CEMVK-PP-D

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
VICKSBURG DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
4155 CLAY STREET
VICKSBURG, MISSISSIPPI 39183-3435

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

22 October 2012

CEMVK-PP-D

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Engineering and Construction Chief's Endorsement of Exclusion from Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) for the McKinney Bayou Section 205 Continuing Authorities Project (CAP)

1. I have reviewed the McKinney Bayou Section 205 CAP project and Implementation Review Plan and determined that the project does not contain risks that would require an IEPR in accordance with EC 1165-2-209. A Safety Assurance Review is also not required for this project. The scope of the project includes basic channel improvements. The project will not pose a significant threat to human life; the cost is approximately $8 million; the Governor does not request a peer review; and the project study is not controversial and does not have significant economic or environmental costs or benefits.

2. The project is not likely to have a significant adverse impact on environmental, cultural, or other resources; does not include an Environmental Impact Statement; is not controversial; has negligible impact on scarce or unique tribal, cultural, or historic resources; has no substantial adverse impacts on fish and wildlife habitat and has negligible adverse impact on threatened and endangered species.

3. I request concurrence of the Implementation Review Plan from the Review Management Organization.

DULANEY
CEMVK-EC

HENRY A. DULANEY, P.E.
Chief, Engineering and
Construction Division

CF:
CEMVK-PP-D (Porter)

encl 2

CEMVD-RB-T 15 Nov 12

MEMORANDUM FOR CEMVD-PD-KM (Dennis Norris)

SUBJECT: Approval of Implementation Review Plan for McKinney Bayou Continuing Authorities Program Section 205 Flood Risk Reduction Project Tunica, Mississippi

1. Reference memorandum, CEMVK-PP-D, 6 Nov 12, subject as above. This is the second document in the referenced chain of correspondence.

2. This office concurs with subject Review Plan.

3. RB-T POC is Mrs. Yolanda Arthur, 601-634-5798.

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

Encl 2