



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIVISION, GREAT LAKES AND OHIO RIVER  
CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
550 MAIN STREET  
CINCINNATI, OH 45202-3222

CELRD-PD-G

6 FEB 13

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, U.S. Army Engineer District, Buffalo, Attention, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] CELRB-PM-PA), Buffalo District, Corps of Engineers, 1776 Niagara Street, Buffalo NY  
14207-3199

SUBJECT: Review Plan for Port Clinton, Ohio, Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration Program (GLFER) Coastal Wetland Restoration Project

1. The attached decision document Review Plan (RP) for Port Clinton was presented to the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division for approval in accordance with EC 1165-2-214 "Civil Works Review" dated 15 Dec 2012.
2. The project area is a coastal wetland/beach resting on the southern shoreline of Lake Erie. The shoreline reach of the study area is approximately 0.8 miles in length and the entire site is approximately 47 acres in area, located just outside the city of Port Clinton, Ohio.
3. Currently, the habitat present at the Port Clinton project area provides very little quality habitat for coastal species. The project site is characterized by an abundance of non-native and invasive plant species. In addition, there is no hydrologic connection between the lake and the existing coastal wetland to provide access to fish species. A significant portion of the Lakeshore Preserve parcel consists of a maintained lawn that provides little in the way of suitable habitat.
4. The proposed project would include the expansion and restoration of the coastal wetland habitat would include the clearing of obstructions, such as rocks or other large debris. Any suitable material would be reused for other portions of the project, such as rock for lacustrine habitat enhancement. All invasive plant species would be physically, chemically or mechanically removed. Site grading and topographical manipulation would be conducted throughout the site to diversify the microhabitat in the coastal wetland area. A permanent and sustainable hydrologic connection would be established between the lake and the coastal wetland area through the construction of a weir or culvert structure. The final step would be to plant native vegetation typical of a southern great lakes emergent/submergent marsh. A post construction monitoring plan would be prepared during the feasibility phase.
5. The local sponsor for the Port Clinton project is the City of Port Clinton. The preliminary cost estimates for restoration alternatives include cost of needed studies, engineering, permitting and implementation. Preliminary planning estimates indicate that the total cost of the preferred alternative would be about \$1.925 million.

CELRD-PD-G

SUBJECT: Review Plan for Port Clinton, Ohio, Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration Program (GLFER) Coastal Wetland Restoration Project

6. The RP defines the scope and level of peer review for the activities to be performed for the subject project. The USACE LRD Review Management Organization (RMO) has reviewed the attached RP and concurs that it describes the scope of review for work phases and addresses all appropriate levels of review consistent with the requirements described in EC 1165-2-209.

7. I concur with the recommendations of the RMO and approve the enclosed RP for the Port Clinton GLFER project.

8. The District is requested to post the RP to its website. Prior to posting, the names of all individuals identified in the RP should be removed.

9. If you have any questions please contact [REDACTED] at (513) 684-6050.

[REDACTED]

Acting Commander

Encl

1. Review Plan



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

BUFFALO DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
1776 NIAGARA STREET  
BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14207-3199

CELRB-PM-PL

19 December 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, U.S. Army Division, Great Lakes and Ohio River,  
ATTN: CELRD-CM [REDACTED] 550 Main Street RM 10-524, Cincinnati, OH  
45202-3222

SUBJECT: District Transmittal Letter – Review Plan for Port Clinton, OH Great Lakes Fishery  
and Ecosystem Restoration Program (GLFER) Coastal Wetland Restoration Project

1. The enclosed Review Plan (RP) is presented for approval.
2. Port Clinton is located in ton the southern shore of Lake Erie approximately 33 miles southeast of Toledo, OH and 65 miles west of Cleveland, OH. The study area consists of a 0,8-mile stretch of waterfront just outside of the city of Port Clinton, OH. The potential restoration site is located just east of the Port Clinton Harbor and Federal navigation channel. The goal of the proposed project is to restore and expand coastal wetland habitat along the Lake Erie shoreline to support a diverse array of native plant species, and in turn migratory and resident birds.
3. The review plan contained herein has undergone District Quality Control (DQC) review by CELRB-PM-PA/[REDACTED] It has been determined by [REDACTED] that the review plan is technically correct and policy compliant. I recommend approval of the review plan.

2. The point of contact for this subject is [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Encl

[REDACTED]  
Chief, Planning Branch

**Great Lakes Fisheries and Ecosystem Restoration (GLFER) Program  
Section 506, Water Resources Development Act of 2000, as amended**

**DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN  
USING THE REGIONAL REVIEW PLAN MODEL**

COASTAL WETLAND RESTORATION  
PORT CLINTON, OHIO

Project No.: 369862

Buffalo District

**MSC Approval Date:** Pending

**Last Revision Date:** None



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers** ®

**DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN  
USING THE REGIONAL REVIEW PLAN MODEL**

**Great Lakes Fisheries and Ecosystem Restoration (GLFER) Program  
Section 506, Water Resources Development Act of 2000, as amended**

**COASTAL WETLAND RESTORATION  
PORT CLINTON, OHIO**

**PROJECT NO.: 369862**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. STUDY INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC).....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR).....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>7. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>8. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>10. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>11. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>17</b>

## 1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

- a. **Purpose.** This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Port Clinton, Ohio Coastal Wetland Restoration project decision document.

Section 506 of the WRDA of 2000 provides authority for restoration of the Great Lakes fishery and ecosystem. Section 506 called for the Secretary to develop a plan to support the management of Great Lakes fisheries not later than one year after the date of enactment of the legislation. That plan, coined the "Support Plan", provides the guidance for the planning, design, construction, and evaluation of projects to restore, the fishery, ecosystem, and beneficial uses of the Great Lakes in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies and the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission. Costs for the planning, design, construction, and evaluation of restoration projects are cost-shared 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. Non-Federal interests may contribute up to 100 percent of their share for projects in the form of services, materials, supplies, or other in-kind contributions. Non-Federal interests will receive credit for lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas needed for project construction and must be responsible of the operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement of projects. Non-Federal interests may include private and non-profit entities.

The planning process of the GLFER program was closely modeled after planning and implementation program described for section 206 of the WRDA 1996 in the Continuing Authorities Program. Generally projects for study are selected by an integrated panel of Federal and non-Federal Great Lakes ecosystem restoration experts. Projects selected for further study go through a Federally funded reconnaissance phase that results in a document called a "Preliminary Restoration Plan" (PRP). Projects are approved for feasibility level studies based on factors such as benefits to the Great Lakes fisheries and ecosystem, applicability to the GLFER program, implementation costs, and level of sponsorship. The studies are classified as either a Planning Design Analysis (PDA) or Detailed Project Report (DPR) based on estimated total Federal project costs. Projects utilizing a PDA format have an estimated Federal cost of \$1,500,000 or less, and projects that require a DPR have estimated Federal costs which exceed \$1,500,000. In cases where the total Federal cost of the project is expected to exceed \$10,000,000, the Support Plan recommends the procedures for specifically authorized projects be followed which require an individual review plan.

- b. **Applicability.** This review plan is based on the model Regional Review Plan for GLFER project decision documents, which is applicable to projects that do not require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), as defined in EC 1165-2-214 Civil Works Review Policy. A Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 project does not require IEPR if ALL of the following specific criteria are met:

- The project does not involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance;
- The total project cost is less than \$45 million;
- There is no request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts;
- The project does not require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS),
- The project/study is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project;
- The project/study 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 or 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;
- The project design is not anticipated to require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule; and
- There are no other circumstances where the Chief of Engineers or Director of Civil Works determines Type I IEPR is warranted.

If any of the above criteria are not met, the model Regional Review Plan is not applicable and a study specific review plan must be prepared by the home district, coordinated with the appropriate Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) and approved by the home Major Subordinate Command (MSC) in accordance with EC 1165-2-214.

Applicability of the model GLFER Regional Review Plan for a specific project is determined by the home MSC. If the MSC determines that the model plan is applicable for a specific study, the MSC Commander may approve the plan (including exclusion from IEPR) without additional coordination with the ECO-PCX or Headquarters, USACE. The initial decision as to the applicability of the model plan should be made no later than the completion of the Preliminary Restoration Plan.

This regional review plan may be used to cover implementation products. Following the format of the regional model review plan, the project review plan may be modified to incorporate information for the review of the design and implementation phases of the project.

**c. References**

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
- (2) Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, Jan 19, 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 F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007
- (6) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007

**d. Requirements.** This review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-214, 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 1165-2-214) and planning model certification/approval (per EC 1105-2-412).

- (1) District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC). All 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 Major Subordinate Command (MSC).

- (2) Agency Technical Review (ATR). ATR is mandatory for all 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 US Army Corps of Engineers (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 a designated Review Management Organization (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.

For documents prepared under the model GLFER Regional Review Plan, the leader of the ATR team shall be from outside the home MSC.

- (3) Independent External Peer Review (IEPR). IEPR may be required for 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 1165-2-214, 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 is generally for decision documents and Type II is generally for implementation products.

- 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 1165-2-214.

For decision documents prepared under the model GLFER Regional Review Plan, Type I IEPR is not required.

- 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.

For documents prepared under the model GLFER Regional Review Plan, Type II IEPR is not required except where public safety issues are present.

- (4) Policy and Legal Compliance Review. All 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.
- (5) Cost Engineering DX Review and Certification. All documents shall be coordinated with the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX), located in the Walla Walla District.

For documents prepared under the GLFER Regional Review Plan model, Regional cost personnel that are pre-certified by the DX will conduct the cost estimate ATR. The DX will provide the Cost Engineering DX certification.

- (6) Model Certification/Approval. EC 1105-2-412 mandates the use of certified or approved models for all planning activities to ensure the models are technically and theoretically sound, compliant with USACE policy, computationally accurate, and based on reasonable assumptions. Planning models, for the purposes of the EC, are defined as any models and analytical tools that planners use to define water resources management problems and opportunities, to formulate potential alternatives to address the problems and take advantage of the opportunities, to evaluate potential effects of alternatives and to support decision making. The use of a certified/approved planning model does not constitute technical review of the planning product. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required). EC 1105-2-412 does not cover engineering models used in planning. The responsible use of well-known and proven USACE developed and commercial engineering software will continue and the professional practice of documenting the application of the software and modeling results will be followed. The use of engineering models is also subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

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

within a specific district or region, the appropriate PCX, MSC(s), and home District(s) will identify a unified approach to seek certification of these models.

## 2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION

The RMO is responsible for managing the overall peer review effort described in this review plan. The RMO for GLFER decision documents is the home MSC. The MSC will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the ATR. The home District will post the approved review plan on its public website. A copy of the approved review plan (and any updates) will be provided to the National Ecosystem Planning Center of Expertise (ECO-PCX) to keep the PCX apprised of requirements and review schedules.

## 3. STUDY INFORMATION

- a. **Decision Document.** The Port Clinton, Ohio Coastal Wetland Restoration decision document will be prepared in accordance with the Great Lakes Fisheries Support Plan (April 2006). The approval level of the decision document (if policy compliant) is the home MSC. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document.

### Study/Project Description.

Port Clinton lies on the southern shore of Lake Erie approximately 33 miles southeast of Toledo, Ohio and 65 miles west of Cleveland, Ohio. The study area consists of a 0.8-mile stretch of waterfront just outside of the city of Port Clinton, Ohio.

Map of Project Area



The project area is a coastal wetland/beach resting on the southern shoreline of Lake Erie. The shoreline reach of the study area is approximately 0.8 miles in length and the entire site is approximately 47 acres in area. Sand and gravel beach habitat runs the entire length of the shoreline and an emergent semi-permanently flooded wetland with an adjacent maintained lawn rests within the Lakeshore Preserve portion of the site. The City Beach portion of the project area consists of a bathing beach and a maintained lawn area. Also, three storm sewer discharge facilities maintained by the city are located on the City Beach portion of the project area. The Waterworks Park portion of the project area serves many functions and is characterized by parking areas, maintained lawn and an excavated pond.

Currently, the habitat present at the Port Clinton project area provides very little quality habitat for coastal species. The project site is characterized by an abundance of non-native and invasive plant species. In addition, there is no hydrologic connection between the lake and the existing coastal wetland to provide access to fish species. A significant portion of the Lakeshore Preserve parcel consists of a maintained lawn that provides little in the way of suitable habitat. The proposed restoration site therefore provides very few of the required habitat qualities sought by coastal and migratory species. To remedy these problems, the proposed project would:

- Remove invasive plant species throughout the project area
- Enhance the coastal wetland habitat through expansion and implementation of microtopography and placement of woody debris
- Provide for the planting and establishment of native coastal wetland plant communities
- Create and maintain a sustainable hydrologic connection between the lake and coastal wetland habitat

The expansion and restoration of the coastal wetland habitat would include the clearing of obstructions, such as rocks or other large debris. Any suitable material would be reused for other portions of the project, such as rock for lacustrine habitat enhancement. All invasive plant species would be physically, chemically or mechanically removed. Site grading and topographical manipulation would be conducted throughout the site to diversify the microhabitat in the coastal wetland area. A permanent and sustainable hydrologic connection would be established between the lake and the coastal wetland area through the construction of a weir or culvert structure. The final step would be to plant native vegetation typical of a southern great lakes emergent/submergent marsh. A post construction monitoring plan would be prepared during the feasibility phase.

The Detailed Project Report/Environmental Assessment (DPR/EA) will present the findings of the feasibility study. The feasibility study will document the plan formulation process and potential environmental effects associated with the implementation of restoration alternatives for the proposed site. This DPR/EA summarizes baseline existing conditions in the study area. It also develops and discusses potential solutions as a guide to potential Federal and non-Federal involvement in the project and serves as a resource to assist in the decision-making of local government and others. This report provides a description and discussion of the likely array of alternative plans, including their benefits, costs, and environmental effects and outputs. This report also identifies, evaluates, and recommends a solution (the Preferred Action Alternative) that best meets the planning objectives. There are no existing or anticipated policy waiver requests.

The local sponsor for the Port Clinton project is the City of Port Clinton. This project is consistent with the local sponsor's views that the restoration of lakes, streams, wetlands and other natural communities

throughout the Great Lakes Basin are of concern and importance. The non-Federal sponsor fully supports the project.

The preliminary cost estimates for restoration alternatives include cost of needed studies, engineering, permitting and implementation. Preliminary planning estimates indicate that the total cost of the preferred alternative would be about \$1.925 million.

**b. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review.**

**Challenges:** The measures involved in the project are not expected to generate significant technical, institutional, or social challenges. The Buffalo District has in-house expertise and experience constructing measures such as those that will be used for this project.

**Project Risks:** The major risk is that environmental outputs may not be achieved to the extent desired. In addition, unfavorable weather or physical conditions may cause the project to not perform as expected. An adaptive management plan will be developed and implemented as a method to mitigate ecological challenges.

**Life Safety:** The project will neither be justified by life safety or will involve significant threat to human life/safety assurance. There is no reason to believe that any measures involved in the project are associated with a significant threat to human life.

**Governor Request for Peer Review:** The Governor **has not** requested peer review by independent experts.

**Public Dispute:** The project/study is not anticipated to be controversial nor result in significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project or to the economic or environmental costs or benefits of the project.

**Project Design/Construction:** The anticipated project design will take advantage of prevailing practices and methodologies. It is not expected to be based on novel methods or involve the use of innovative techniques, or present complex challenges for interpretation. It also not anticipated that the project will require unique construction sequencing or redundancy.

**c. In-Kind Contributions.** Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC and ATR, similar to any products developed by USACE. No in-kind contributions are anticipated.

**4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)**

District Quality Control will be completed following the guidelines set forth in Section 7.2 District Quality Control (DQC) and Agency Technical Review (ATR) of the 14 February 2011 CELRD Quality Management System (QMS) Document ID: 4921: QC / QA Procedures for Civil Works.

Following the completion of the DQC review by the PDT members and their respective counterparts as necessary, the PDT will sign a certification sheet documenting DQC. The Chief of Planning will also sign a certification sheet documenting that District Quality Control has been completed.

**a. Products to Undergo DQC.**

- (1) Review Plan
- (2) Alternative Formulation Briefing Documentation
- (3) Draft Feasibility Study Report and Draft Environmental Assessment Documentation
- (4) Final Feasibility Study Report and Final Environmental Assessment Documentation

**b. Required DQC Expertise.** Additional DQC of all products will be accomplished by senior (GS-12 or above) staff not directly involved in preparation of the products from the following disciplines:

- (1) Planning
- (2) Economics
- (3) Environmental
- (4) Design
- (5) Programs and Project Management
- (6) Operations
- (7) Office of Counsel
- (8) Real Estate

**5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)**

**a. Products to Undergo ATR.**

ATR will be performed throughout the study in accordance with the District and MSC Quality Management Plans. The ATR shall be documented and discussed at the AFB milestone. Certification of the ATR will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. Products to undergo ATR include supporting analysis and documents, including but not limited to:

- (1) Detailed Project Report and appendices
- (2) Cost estimates
- (3) Supporting environmental analysis (cultural resources, resource inventories, etc.)

Supporting Analysis and Documents provided as work in-kind will also be subject to Agency Technical Review.

**b. Required ATR Team Expertise.** The expertise/disciplines represented on the ATR team should reflect the significant disciplines involved in the planning effort. The PDT has determined that the expertise needed for review shall include Environmental Planning and Analysis, Inland Navigation & Economics, Coastal Engineering, Geotechnical Engineering, and Real Estate. The roster of the ATR and the expertise required is outline in the table that follows.

Name	Organization	Discipline	Expertise Required
[REDACTED]	CESAW-TS-PF	ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional with extensive experience in preparing Civil Works decision documents and conducting ATR's with ecosystem restoration projects. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process.

[REDACTED]	CESAW-TS-PF	Plan Formulation	Team Member should be a senior water resources planner with experience in preparing ecosystem restoration decision documents.
[REDACTED]	CESAW-TS-PE	Environmental Analysis	Team member will be experienced in the NEPA process and analysis, and have a biological or environmental background that is familiar with the project area and ecosystem restoration. Team member should be familiar with cultural/historic resource and coastal wetland restoration projects.
[REDACTED]	CESPA-PM-LP	Economics	Technical specialist for economic evaluation. Familiar with ecosystem restoration projects and cost-effectiveness/incremental cost analysis using IWR Plan.
[REDACTED]	CESAW-TS-EW	Civil Engineering	Team member will be experienced in the design and construction of coastal wetland restoration projects.
[REDACTED]	CENWW=EC-X	Cost Engineering DX	Team member will be experienced in design and construction of coastal wetland restoration projects. In addition the Team member will be familiar with cost estimating for similar civil works projects using MCACES.
[REDACTED]	CESAS-RE-AP	Real Estate	Team member will be experienced with lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocation, and disposal real estate processes.

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

## **6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)**

- a. **Decision on IEPR.** Based on the information and analysis provided in the preceding paragraphs of this review plan, the project covered under this plan is excluded from IEPR because it does not meet the mandatory IEPR triggers and does not warrant IEPR based on a risk-informed analysis. If any of the criteria outlined in paragraph 1(b) are not met, this model Regional Review Plan is not applicable and a study specific review plan must be prepared by the home district, coordinated with the National Ecosystem Planning Center of Expertise (ECO- PCX) and approved by the home MSC in accordance with EC 1165-2-214.
- b. **Products to Undergo Type I IEPR.** Not applicable.
- c. **Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise.** Not Applicable.
- d. **Documentation of Type I IEPR.** Not Applicable.

**7. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL**

**Planning Models.** The following planning models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document:

<b>Model Name and Version</b>	<b>Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study</b>	<b>Certification / Approval Status</b>
IWR Planning Suite Version 1.0.11.0 and/or Version 2.0	Cost Effectiveness, Incremental Cost Analysis. The Institute for Water Resources Planning Suite (IWR-PLAN) is a decision support software package that is designed to assist with the formulation and comparison of alternative plans. While IWR-PLAN was initially developed to assist with environmental restoration and watershed planning studies, the program can be useful in planning studies addressing a wide variety of problems. IWRPLAN can assist with plan formulation by combining solutions to planning problems and calculating the additive effects of each combination, or "plan." IWR-PLAN can assist with plan comparison by conducting cost effectiveness and incremental cost analyses, identifying the plans which are the best financial investments and displaying the effects of each on a range of decision variables. The ecological habitat units calculated using the Habitat Evaluation Process will be used as inputs in IWR-PLAN to evaluate the effects alternatives.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Certified</b></p>
Lake Erie Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (L-QHEI) Version 2.1	The Lake Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI) is designed to provide a measure of habitat quality that generally corresponds to those physical factors that affect fish communities and which are generally important to other aquatic life (e.g. invertebrates). . A QHEI measurement can have a maximum score of 100 with scores less than 30 identifying a very poor quality stream and scores of 70 or higher characterizing excellent quality streams. The standard QHEI was adjusted for use in evaluating lake shore environment. This index will be one of the metrics used to characterize existing conditions and evaluate ecosystem restoration plans. The index is under review by the ECO-PCX. It is anticipated that it will be approved for use in its appropriate range (i.e. Ohio, New York) however final Headquarters approval has not been granted at this time. The study area for this project is included in the range of this model. Therefore, a specific model approval plan is not required. Agency Technical Reviews (ATR) of the study should include the review the model's application on this study."	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Regional Approval under review by HQ</b></p>

**a. 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
MCACES	Microcomputer-Aided Cost Estimation System; Used to generate detailed cost estimates for each alternatives.	Approved

**8. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS**

**a. ATR Schedule and Cost.**

Item to Undergo ATR	Schedule	Estimated Cost (by PDT) for ATR
Draft DPR and Appendices	To Be Determined (30 days for review of 75% DPR, 30 days for response to ATR comments and ATR certification)	\$15,000

**b. Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost.** Not applicable.

**c. Model Review Schedule and Cost.** For decision documents prepared under the model Programmatic Review Plan, use of existing certified or approved planning models is encouraged. Where uncertified or unapproved model are used, review of the model for use will be accomplished through the ATR process. The ATR team should apply the principles of EC 1105-2-412 during the ATR to ensure the model is theoretically and computationally sound, consistent with USACE policies, and adequately documented. If specific uncertified models are identified for repetitive use within a specific district or region, the appropriate PCX, MSC(s), and home District(s) will identify a unified approach to seek certification of these models.

**9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

State and Federal resource agencies may be invited to participate in the study covered by this review plan as partner agencies or as technical members of the PDT, as appropriate. Agencies with regulatory review responsibilities will be contacted for coordination as required by applicable laws and procedures. The ATR team will be provided copies of public and agency comments. It is anticipated that coordination with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) would be necessary in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and the Endangered Species Act.

The public involvement process will include public meetings throughout the study period, and study briefings for interested and affected parties and agencies. There will be multiple opportunities for public review and comment during the NEPA process. Several agency coordination meetings are also anticipated. Detailed information on the study will be posted on the public webpage. This information will include public meeting presentation, technical information and reports, study schedule, and other pertinent information about the study. Additional project information will be posted to an internal project webpage (SharePoint) for USACE use. Outreach will be coordinated with individuals and groups concerned.

## 10. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The home MSC Commander is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan is appropriate for the specific project covered by the plan. The review plan is a living document and may change as the study progresses. The 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. Significant changes may result in the MSC Commander determining that use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-214 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1. The latest version of the review plan, along with the Commanders' approval memorandum, will be posted on the home district's webpage.

## 11. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

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

### USACE Buffalo District (LRB) Points of Contact

- [REDACTED]

### Great Lakes and Ohio River Division Points of Contact

- [REDACTED]

### Review Management Organization Points of Contact

- [REDACTED]

**ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS.**

**Project Development Team**

Name	Function	Organization	Phone	Email
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

**ATR TEAM**

Name,	Discipline	Organization	Phone	Email
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

**VERTICAL TEAM**

Name	Location	Phone	Email
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

**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 1165-2-214. 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<sup>sm</sup>.

SIGNATURE

Name

ATR Team Leader

Office Symbol/Company

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SIGNATURE

Name

Project Manager (home district)

Office Symbol

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SIGNATURE

Name

Architect Engineer Project Manager<sup>1</sup>

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 (home district)

Office Symbol

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SIGNATURE

Name

Chief, Planning Division (home district)

Office Symbol

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

<sup>1</sup> 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**

<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
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
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
MSC	Major Subordinate Command	WRDA	Water Resources Development Act