



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
1455 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103-1398

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CESPN-ET-PF

MEMORANDUM FOR: South Pacific Division District Support Team, ATTN: CESPD-PDC,
(Reed)

SUBJECT: San Francisco District Response to South Pacific Division District Support Team
Comments regarding Request for Approval of Review Plan for the Sacramento River Deep
Water Ship Channel Limited Reevaluation Study

1. In accordance with EC 1105-2-410, Review of Decision Documents, dated 22 August 2008, and EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, dated 31 January 2010, the subject Review Plan is provided for MSC approval by the Commander, South Pacific Division (Enclosure 1). This is the second submittal of this Review Plan for the subject study.
2. This Review Plan is in compliance with the above Engineering Circulars and has been coordinated with the applicable Planning Centers of Expertise (PCX). The PCX for Deep Draft Navigation is designated as the lead PCX. The PCX concurrence memorandum is provided as Enclosure 2.
3. The review plan has been revised in response to comments provided by the South Pacific Division District Support Team, June 2011. Upon approval, please provide notification to this office to facilitate the posting of the Review Plan to the San Francisco District public website. The South Pacific Division District Support Team will be notified when the Review Plan has been posted on the public website.

Encls

1. SRDWSC Review Plan
2. PCX Concurrence Memorandum
3. PCX Review Plan Checklist
4. CESPD Supplemental Review
Plan Checklist
5. SPN Response to SPD Comments

Chief, Planning Branch
San Francisco District

**REVIEW PLAN
SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL
LIMITED REEVALUATION STUDY
SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT**

MARCH 2009

UPDATED AUGUST 2011

**Revision 1
DDN-PCX Review**

**REVIEW PLAN
SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL
LIMITED REEVALUATION STUDY
SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT**

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS	1
A. Purpose.....	1
B. Requirements.....	2
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	5
A. Decision Document.....	5
B. General Site Description	5
C. Project Scope.....	5
D. Problems and Opportunities.....	5
E. Potential Methods.....	5
F. Product Delivery Team.....	6
G. Vertical Team.....	6
H. Model Certification	6
3. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW PLAN	7
A. General.....	7
B. Agency Technical Review Team (ATRT)	7
C. Communication	9
D. Funding	9
E. Timing and Schedule.....	10
F. Review	11
G. Resolution	12
H. Certification	13
I. Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB).....	13
4. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW PLAN	13
A. Project Magnitude	14
B. Project Risk	14
C. Vertical Team Consensus.....	14
D. Products for Review.....	14
E. Communication and Documentation.....	15
F. Funding	16
5. PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW	16
6. PLANNING CENTERS OF EXPERTISE COORDINATION	17
7. APPROVALS	17
8. POINTS OF CONTACT.....	17

APPENDICES

Appendix A Statement of Technical Review

Appendix B Review Plan Teams

**REVIEW PLAN
SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL
LIMITED REEVALUATION STUDY
SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT**

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

Purpose. This document outlines the Review Plan for the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel Limited Reevaluation Study. This Limited Reevaluation Study (LRS) is anticipated to culminate in a decision document with a favorable recommendation to implement a Deep Draft Navigation (DDN) project that is consistent and within the bounds of the existing project authorization; Public Law 99-88, dated 15 August 1985 and the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (WRDA 1986).

A Feasibility Report and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for navigation and related purposes were completed in July of 1980. The Feasibility Report recommended deepening and widening the existing channel. Subsequently, the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel project was authorized for construction by Public Law 99-88, dated 15 August 1985. The Authorization was reiterated in Section 202(a) of Public Law 99-662, the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (WRDA 1986).

A General Design Memorandum (GDM) and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement were prepared in March of 1986. The GDM presented the selected plan for channel modifications between New York Slough and the Port of West Sacramento. Subsequently, a determination was made that the local project sponsor may have difficulty financing its required share of the project cost. As a result of this determination, a Supplement to the 1986 GDM was prepared in May of 1988. The Supplement contained a recommendation to defer the authorized channel widening within the straight portions of the man-made channel with the purpose of reducing the project cost.

In the 1998 Conference Report for Bill Number HR 4060, Congress directed the Corps to complete a reevaluation of the un-constructed project that would serve as a basis for a possible recommendation to resume construction.

The project authorization provided in Section 202(a) of WRDA 1986 was subsequently modified by Section 305 of WRDA 2000. The modification authorized the Secretary to credit toward the non-Federal cost share of the project the value of dredge material purchased by public agencies or non-profit entities for environmental restoration or other beneficial uses if the Secretary determined that the use of such dredged material was technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

At this time, recommendations and any project changes presented in the Limited Reevaluation Report (LRR) are anticipated to be within the Chief of Engineers' discretionary approval authority without the need for Congressional reauthorization. The non-Federal cost share for this project will be set at 25% in accordance with the terms of the existing (1986) Local Cooperation Agreement (LCA) between the Department of the Army and the Sacramento-Yolo Port District (i.e. the Port of West Sacramento).

B. Requirements. Engineering Circular (EC) *Peer Review of Decision Documents* 1105-2-408, dated 31 May 2005, (1) established procedures to ensure the quality and credibility of Corps decision documents by adjusting and supplementing the review process, and (2) required that documents have a review plan. That EC applies to all feasibility studies and reports and any other reports that lead to decision documents that require authorization by Congress.

A subsequent circular, *Review of Decision Documents*, EC 1105-2-410, dated 22 August 2008, revised the technical and overall quality control review processes for decision documents. It formally distinguishes between technical review performed in-district (District Quality Control, "DQC") and out-of-district (Agency Technical Review, "ATR"). It also reaffirms the requirement for Independent External Peer Review (IEPR); this is the most independent level of review and is applied in cases that meet certain criteria where the risk and magnitude of a proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is warranted.

A subsequent circular, *Civil Works Review Policy*, EC 1165-2-209, dated 31 January 2010, reaffirms the requirements for DQC and ATR, and further distinguishes two types of IEPR. Type I IEPR is required for decision documents meeting certain criteria of risk and magnitude. Type II IEPR includes safety assurance review (SAR). It is required for implementation documents for hurricane and storm risk management projects, flood risk management projects, and other projects where potential hazards pose a significant threat to human life.

EC 1165-2-209 outlines the requirements of the three review approaches (DQC, ATR, and IEPR) and provides guidance for the Corps Planning Centers of Expertise (PCX) involvement in the approaches. This Review Plan addresses the review approach and planning coordination with the appropriate PCX for the LRR.

The Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel project is a congressionally-authorized project being implemented by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the Port of West Sacramento. The Corps and the Port of West Sacramento are conducting a Limited Reevaluation Study (LRS) to recommend navigation improvements for Federal funding. The Corps and the non-Federal sponsor are also preparing a joint Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) to evaluate the action of resuming construction of navigational improvements to the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel. Deep Draft Navigation (DDN) is the only purpose of the LRS. Therefore, the DDN-PCX is the appropriate PCX for the coordination of this Review Plan.

(1) District Quality Control. DQC is the review of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel Limited Reevaluation Study, Project Management Plan (PMP), to which this Review Plan will ultimately be appended. It is managed in the San Francisco District and may be conducted by in-house staff as long as the reviewers are not doing the work involved in the study, including contracted work under review. Basic quality control tools include a Quality Management Plan (QMP) providing for seamless review, quality checks and reviews, supervisory reviews, Project Delivery Team (PDT) reviews, etc. Additionally, the PDT is responsible for a complete reading of the report to assure the overall integrity of the report, technical appendices and the recommendations before the approval by the District Commander. Non-PDT members and/or supervisory staff will conduct this review for major draft and final products, including products provided by the non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services, and products provided by contractors following review of those products by the PDT. It is expected that the Major Subordinate Command (MSC)/District QMP will address the conduct and

documentation of this fundamental level of review. A Quality Control Plan (QCP) will be included in the PMP for the subject study. DQC is required for this study and is not addressed further in this Review Plan.

(2) Agency Technical Review. EC 1105-2-410 and EC 1165-2-209 re-characterized ATR (which replaces the level of review formerly known as Independent Technical Review). ATR is an in-depth review, managed within USACE, conducted by a qualified team outside of the home district whom are not involved in the day-to-day production of a project and its associated work products. The purpose of ATR is to ensure the proper application of clearly established criteria, regulations, laws, codes, principles and professional practices. The ATR team reviews the various work products and assures that all the parts fit together in a coherent whole.

ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel, including Regional Technical Specialists (RTS). Team members may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate. To ensure independence, the leader of the ATR team shall be from outside the home MSC. DrChecks will be used to document all ATR comments, responses, and associated resolutions accomplished.

This Review Plan outlines the proposed approach to meeting this requirement for the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel, Limited Reevaluation Report, the accompanying Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, and Subsequent Environmental Impact Report. ATR is required for this study.

(3) Independent External Peer Review. EC 1105-2-410 and EC 1165-2-209 re-characterized the external review process that was originally added to the Corps review process with EC 1105-2-408. EC 1165-2-209 requires that a risk informed decision is documented to determine if a project requires IEPR. The risk informed decision for the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel project is documented in Section 4 of this Review Plan.

EC 1165-2-209 describes two types of IEPR. Type I IEPR 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. Type II IEPR includes safety assurance review (SAR) and is applied to design and construction activities for hurricane, storm and flood risk management projects, as well as projects with existing and potential hazards that pose a significant threat to human life. Exemptions from IEPR requirements must be granted by the Chief of Engineers.

Type I IEPR is managed by an outside eligible organization (OEO) as described in the Internal Review Code Section 501(c) (3), and is exempted from Federal tax under Section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. The OEO shall be independent, free from conflicts of interest, shall not carry out or advocate for or against Federal water resources projects, and has experience in establishing and administering IEPR panels.

Type II IEPR/SAR is managed by a USACE Review Management Office (RMO) or a contractor and may not be exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

This Review Plan outlines the planned approach to meeting these requirements for the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel Limited Reevaluation Report and the joint Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR). Type I IEPR is required for this study.

(4) Policy and Legal Compliance Review. In addition to the technical reviews, decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. These reviews culminate in Washington-level 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 Chief of Engineers. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed further in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. Technical reviews described in EC 1105-2-410 are to augment and complement the policy review processes by addressing compliance with published Army policies pertinent to planning products, particularly policies on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents. DQC and ATR efforts are to include the necessary expertise to address compliance with published planning policy. Counsel will generally not participate on ATR teams but may participate at the discretion of the district or as directed by higher authority. When policy and/or legal concerns arise during DQC or ATR efforts that are not readily and mutually resolved by the PDT and the reviewers, the district will seek issue resolution support from the MSC and HQUSACE in accordance with the procedures outlined in Appendix H ER 1105-2-100. IEPR teams are not expected to be knowledgeable of Army and administration policies, nor are they expected to address such concerns. An IEPR team should be given the flexibility to bring important issues to the attention of decision makers. Legal reviews will be conducted concurrent with ATR of the preliminary, draft, and final feasibility report and environmental impact statement.

(5) Planning Center of Expertise Coordination. EC 1105-2-410 and EC 1165-2-209 outline PCX coordination in conjunction with preparation of the Review Plan. This Review Plan is being coordinated with the DDN-PCX, located in the South Atlantic Division. The PCX for DDN is responsible for the accomplishment and quality of ATR and IEPR for the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel Limited Reevaluation Study, Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR). The PCX may conduct the review or manage the review to be conducted by others.

(6) Review Plan Approval and Posting. In order to ensure the Review Plan is in compliance with the principles of EC 1105-2-410, EC 1165-2-209, and the MSC's QMP, the Review Plan must be approved by the applicable MSC, in this case the Commander, South Pacific Division (SPD). Once the Review Plan is approved, the San Francisco District will post it to its District public website and notify South Pacific Division and the DDN-PCX.

(7) Safety Assurance. This study does not address a hurricane and storm risk management project, or flood risk management project, nor does failure of the project pose a significant threat to human life. Therefore, the project is not required to undergo a safety assurance review.

(8) Value Engineering Study during Planning. Reference CESPDP-CM-P Memorandum, dated 9/30/03, subject: Value Engineering Studies during Planning. A Value Engineering (VE) Study will be performed during the Feasibility Study somewhere between the Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM) and Alternatives Review Conference (ARC). ATR team members are expected to form the core of the feasibility VE team, supplemented as necessary with additional expertise such as the VE officer. This is expected to minimize costs by eliminating the time required to mobilize and acclimate a new team with the study area and purpose as well as the problems and opportunities. While IEPR is not expected to be conducted on the VE study, it will be made available upon request to the IEPR team. The VE study is expected to be limited in scope and expedited due to a previous VE proposal being already done and the expedited project schedule needed to ensure State 1B bond funds.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Decision Document. This is a Construction General project. The single purpose of this Limited Reevaluation Study is to recommend navigation improvements and federal funding for the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel. A joint Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) will be prepared to evaluate the action of resuming construction of navigational improvements to the ship channel. The non-Federal sponsor for this project is the Port of West Sacramento. The cost-sharing agreement for the study is 75% Federal and 25% non-Federal sponsor. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for acquiring Land, Easements, Rights of Way, and Disposal (LERD's).

B. General Site Description. The Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel runs from the Contra Costa county line to the Port of West Sacramento. The channel is located in the Sacramento – San Joaquin Delta region of northern California. The 46.5-mile-long ship channel lies within Contra Costa, Solano, Sacramento, and Yolo Counties and serves the marine terminal facilities at the Port of West Sacramento. The channel joins the existing 35-foot-deep channel at New York Slough, thereby affording the Port of West Sacramento access to San Francisco Bay Area harbors and the Pacific Ocean.

C. Project Scope. The project will focus on deep draft navigation within the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel. The non-Federal sponsor is interested in resuming federally-funded construction of navigational improvements to the Ship Channel.

D. Problems and Opportunities. The problems associated with waterborne transportation in the SRDWSC result from the channel being of a size that is inefficient for many commercial vessels. Existing width of the channel poses safety issues for larger ships. Under current conditions, the channel depth of -30 feet MLLW limits both the load per vessel and vessel type. Shippers must partially or “light” load or await favorable tides to use the SRDWSC. Of all the general and bulk carries calling on the Port of West Sacramento between 1997 and 2009, 99 percent had a maximum design draft of greater than -30 feet MLLW and 82 had a maximum design draft of -35 feet MLLW. Economic growth in Asia is generally expanding at a higher rate than in the rest of the world, and new or prospective trade policies point to the expansion of United States trade in these countries. This trade is significant to the Port of West Sacramento since the majority of cargo moving through the Port from 2004 through 2009 included rice, cement, wood products, steel, fertilizer, and power-generating equipment. Without a deepening and widening, the shippers calling on the Port would be unable to capture the benefits associated with using these larger vessels or increased cargo loads.

There are two main opportunities associated with the SRDWSC project:

- There is an opportunity to improve safety and navigational efficiency associated with vessel traffic along the SRDWSC.
- There may be an opportunity to supply dredged material for beneficial use such as ecosystem restoration and flood-risk-management efforts within the study area.

E. Potential Methods. The study will consider structural and non-structural measures including deepening and widening the existing navigation channel, as well as environmental restoration in accordance with mitigation and resource agency requirements.

F. Product Delivery Team. The PDT is comprised of those individuals directly involved in the development of the decision document. Individual contact information and disciplines are presented in appendix B. In accordance with the PMP, it is not anticipated that the non-Federal sponsors will contribute in-kind services. However the non-Federal sponsor is responsible for acquiring LERDs. If in-kind work were to be performed by the non-Federal sponsor, it would undergo review by the PDT for a determination of adequacy and would ultimately undergo DQC. Some products would undergo Type I IEPR (described later in this Review Plan).

G. Vertical Team. The Vertical Team includes District management, District Support Team (DST) and Regional Integration Team (RIT) staff as well as members of the Planning of Community of Practice (PCoP). Specific points of contact for the Vertical Team can be found in appendix B.

H. Model Certification. The USACE Planning Models Improvement Program (PMIP) was established in 2003 to assess the state of planning models in USACE and to make recommendations to assure that high quality methods and tools are available to enable informed decisions on investments in the Nation's water resources infrastructure and natural environment.

The main objective of the PMIP is to carry out "a process to review, improve and validate analytical tools and models for USACE Civil Works business programs." In carrying out this initiative, a PMIP Task Force was established to examine planning model issues, assess the state of planning models in the Corps, and develop recommendations on improvements to planning models and related analytical tools. The PMIP Task Force collected the views of Corps leaders and recognized technical experts and conducted investigations and numerous discussions and debates on issues related to planning models. It identified an array of model-related problems, conducted a survey of planning models, prepared papers on model-related issues, analyzed numerous options for addressing these issues, formulated recommendations, and issued a final report. The Task Force considered ongoing Corps initiatives to address planning capability and built upon these where possible. Examples include several efforts under the Planning Excellence Program (training, specialized planning centers of expertise, modeling); the Science & Engineering Technology (SET) initiative (an EC publication on the SET initiative models is forthcoming) and associated Technical Excellence Network (TEN), which endeavors to provide uniform Science and Engineering tools and practices to the Corps and share them throughout; and, recognition of existing Quality Assurance/Quality Control programs and internal technical review within the Districts.

For the purposes of this Review Plan, planning models are defined as any models and analytical tools that planners use to define water resources management problems and opportunities, formulate potential alternatives to address the problems and take advantage of the opportunities, evaluate potential effects of alternatives, and support decision making. It includes all models used for planning, regardless of their scope or source, as specified in the following sub-paragraphs.

The computational models to be employed in the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel Limited Reevaluation Study have either been developed by or for USACE. Model certification and approval for all identified planning models will be coordinated through the PCX as needed. Project schedules and resources will be adjusted to address this process for certification and PCX coordination. They are:

1. Various Habitat Evaluation Procedure models. The Ecosystem Restoration Planning Center of Expertise has responsibility for approving ecosystem output methodologies for use in ecosystem restoration planning and mitigation planning. The Ecosystem PCX will need to certify or approve for use each regionally modified version of these methodologies and individual models and guidebooks used in application of these methods. The PDT will coordinate with the Ecosystem PCX during the study to identify appropriate models and certification approval requirements.

The following models are considered to be engineering models as opposed to planning models, and therefore, they undergo a different review and approval process for usage. Engineering tools anticipated to be used in this study are:

1. UTexas4: This model is used to conduct slope stability analysis.
2. SEEP2D: This model is used for seepage and piping analysis in the levees.
3. UnTRIM 3D: This model is a numerical hydrodynamic and salinity model.

3. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW PLAN

Based on a risk informed decision process, it has been determined that ATR is required for the work products covered in this Review Plan. ATR is managed by the appropriate PCX based on the project purpose. For this Limited Reevaluation Study, due to the heavy emphasis on DDN, the DDN-PCX will identify individuals to perform ATR. The San Francisco District can provide suggestions on possible reviewers.

A. General. An ATR Team Leader shall be designated for the ATR process and shall be from outside the home MSC to ensure independence. The ATR Team Leader has project planning expertise and is identified in Appendix B. The ATR Team Leader is responsible for providing information necessary for setting up the review, communicating with the Project Planner, providing a summary of critical review comments, collecting grammatical and editorial comments from the ATR team (ATRT), ensuring that the ATRT has adequate funding to perform the review, facilitating the resolution of the comments, and certifying that the ATR has been conducted and resolved in accordance with policy. ATR will be conducted for plan formulation, environmental compliance, economics, hydrology and hydraulic design, navigation and civil design, geotechnical engineering, cost engineering, real estate, and cultural resources. Reviews of more specific disciplines may be identified if necessary.

B. Agency Technical Review Team (ATRT). The ATRT will be comprised of individuals that have not been involved in the development of the decision document and will be chosen based on expertise, experience, and skills. The members will roughly mirror the composition of the PDT, and to the extent practicable, come from outside of the South Pacific Division region. It is anticipated that the team will consist of about 10 reviewers. The ATRT members are presented in Appendix B.

Discipline	Experience Needed for Review
ATR Manager/Plan Formulation	Plan formulation for multi-purpose projects, familiarity with the “Planning Guidance Notebook” (ER-1105-100) and the Water Resources Council’s Principals and Guidelines.
Environmental Resources	Integration of environmental evaluation and compliance requirements pursuant to the “Procedures for Implementing NEPA” (ER 200-2-2), national environmental statutes, applicable executive orders, and other Federal planning requirements, into the planning of Civil Works projects. Experience with ESA, fishery resources, riparian habitat, and dredged material management.
Cultural Resources	Archaeologist familiar with records searches, cultural resource survey methodology, area of potential effects, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and state and Federal laws/executive orders pertaining to American Indian Tribes.
Hydrology and Hydraulics/Coastal	Hydrologist or hydraulic engineer proficient with river hydraulics, GEO-RAS, HEC-RAS and associated one dimensional models, hydrologic statistics, sediment transport analysis, shoaling mechanics and rates, channel stability analysis, risk and uncertainty analysis, and a number of other closely associated technical subjects.
Geotechnical Engineering	Geotechnical engineer familiar with sampling and laboratory testing, embankment stability and seepage analyses, soils analysis, foundation design, planning analysis, and a number of other closely associated technical subjects.
Economics	Analysis of demographics, land use, recreation analysis, using HEC-FDA, economic justification of projects in accordance with current USACE policy.
Civil Design	Civil engineer with experience in channel modification and design, levee and bank-protection removal or modification, earthen channels, concrete bypasses, and ecosystem restoration techniques.
Cost Engineering	Cost estimating specialist competent in cost estimating for both construction and ecosystem restoration using MCACES/Mii, working knowledge of construction and environmental restoration, capable of making professional determinations based on experience.
Real Estate/Lands	Real estate specialist familiar with real estate valuation, gross appraisal, relocations and relocation assistance benefits, acquisition guidelines, takings and partial takings as needed for implementation of Civil Works projects.

C. Communication. The communication plan for ATR is as follows:

(1) The team will use DrChecks to document the ATR process. The Project Planner will facilitate the creation of a project portfolio in the system to allow access by all PDT and ATRT members. An electronic version of the document, appendices, and any significant and relevant comments shall be posted in Word format at: <ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/> at least one business day prior to the start of the comment period. A secure ftp site will be utilized where practicable.

(2) The PDT shall send the ATR Team Leader one hard copy (with color pages as applicable) of the document and appendices for each ATRT member such that the copies are received at least one business day prior to the start of the comment period.

(3) The PDT shall host an ATR kick-off meeting virtually to orient the ATRT during the first week of the comment period. If funds are not available for an on-site meeting, the PDT shall provide a presentation about the project, including photos of the site, for the team.

(4) The Project Planner shall inform the ATR Team Leader when all responses have been entered into DrChecks and conduct a briefing to summarize comment responses to highlight any areas of disagreement.

(5) A revised electronic version of the report and appendices with comments incorporated shall be posted at <ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/> for use during back checking of the comments. A secure ftp site will be utilized where practicable.

(6) Team members shall contact ATR members or leader as appropriate to seek clarification of a comment's intent or provide clarification of information in the report. Discussions shall occur outside of DrChecks, but a summary of discussions may be provided in the system.

(7) Reviewers will be encouraged to contact PDT members directly via email or phone to clarify any confusion. DrChecks shall not be used to post questions needed for clarification.

(8) The ATRT, PDT, and vertical team shall conduct an after action review (AAR) no later than 2 weeks after the policy guidance memo is received from HQUSACE for the AFB and draft reports.

D. Funding.

(1) The PDT District shall provide labor funding by cross charge labor codes. Funding for travel, if needed, will be provided through government order. The Project Planner will work with the ATR Team Leader to ensure that adequate funding is available and is commensurate with the level of review needed. The current cost estimate for this review is \$65,000. Any funding shortages will be negotiated on a case-by-case basis and in advance of a negative charge occurring.

(2) The team leader shall provide organization codes for each team member and a responsible financial point of contact (CEFMS responsible employee) for creation of labor codes.

(3) Reviewers shall monitor individual labor code balances and alert the ATRT Project Planner to any possible funding shortages.

E. Timing and Schedule.

(1) Throughout the development of this document, the team will conduct seamless review to ensure planning quality.

(2) ATR will be conducted on the Feasibility Scoping Meeting documentation and assumptions; Alternatives Review Conference; Alternative Formulation Briefing documentation; the draft Limited Reevaluation Report; and if changes are made to the draft report, those changes will be reviewed in the Final Limited Reevaluation Report.

(3) The PDT will hold a “page-turn” session to review the draft report to ensure consistency across the disciplines and resolve any issues prior to the start of ATR. Writer/editor services will be performed on the draft prior to ATR as well.

(4) The ATR process for this document will follow the timeline on page 11. Actual dates will be scheduled once the period draws closer. All products produced for these milestones will be reviewed, including those produced as in-kind services by the non-Federal sponsors and products developed by contractors.

ATR Timeline Task	Date
ATR Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSC) Document	01-May-09
ATR FSM Comments	15-May-09
PDT FSM Responses	29-May-09
Back check	19-Jun-09
SPD Policy Compliance Review of FSM	23-Jun-09
SPD FSM Comments	21-Aug-09
PDT FSM Responses	14-Sep-09
SPD Back Check	Oct-09
PDT Supplemental FSM Responses	02-Nov-09
SPD Back Check	13-Nov-09
PDT Supplemental FSM Responses	03-Dec-09
FSM Briefing/IRC	14-Dec-10
SPD/SPN PDT Environmental Break-Out Discussion	14-Jan-10
SPD Back Check	19-Jan-10
SPD/SPN PDT Economics Break-Out Discussion	04-Feb-10
SPD Back Check	04-Mar-10
SPD/SPN IRC	13-Apr-10
FSM Close-Out MFR	30-Apr-10
ATR Alternative Review Conference (ARC) / Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB)	08-Jul-10
ATR ARC/AFB Comments	22-Jul-10
PDT ARC/AFB Responses	05-Aug-10
Back Check	19-Aug-10
ATR AFB Certification	30-Aug-10
SPD Certification of AFB for HQUSACE Policy Compliance Review	05-Oct-10
HQUSACE Policy Compliance Review of AFB	Oct-10
HQUSACE Comments	15-Nov-10
PDT FSM Responses	09-Dec-10
HQUSACE Back check	In-Progress
ATR Draft SEIS	Dec-10
ATR Draft SEIS Comments	Dec-10
PDT Draft SEIS Comments	Dec-10
Back Check	Dec-10
HQUSACE IRC	11-Jan-11
Public Review of Draft Report ¹	25-Feb-11
ATR Draft LRR	14-December-11
ATR Draft LRR Comments	21-December-11
PDT Draft LRR Responses	28-December-11
Back Check	04-January-12
ATR Certification Draft LRR ²	10-January-12
HQUSACE Policy Compliance Review of Draft LRR	11-January-12
HQUSACE Comments	25-January-12
PDT Responses	08-February-12
HQUSACE Back check	15-February-12
Feasibility Review Conference (FRC)	12-March-12
2 nd Public Review of Draft SEIS	12-March-12

ATR Final LRR and Final SEIS	07-June-12
ATR Final LRR/SEIS Comments	14-June-12
PDT Final LRR/SEIS Responses	21-June-12
Back Check	28-June-12
ATR Certification Final LRR/SEIS	04-July-12
Final LRR and Final SEIS	16-July-12

¹Note: SPN obtained policy waiver on 7-Feb-11 to release the Draft SEIS for public and agency review prior to completing policy compliance review on the Draft LRR; correspondingly the purpose of an AFB is now overtaken by above waiver and is no longer necessary to be held; a FRC and any IRC's as appropriate will be scheduled.

²Incorporate comments from IEPR sessions into Draft LRR and Draft SEIS

F. Review.

(1) ATRT responsibilities are as follows:

(a) Reviewers shall review conference material and the draft report to confirm that work was done in accordance with established professional principles, practices, codes, and criteria and for compliance with laws and policy. Comments on the report shall be submitted into DrChecks.

(b) Reviewers shall pay particular attention to one's discipline but may also comment on other aspects as appropriate. Reviewers that do not have any significant comments pertaining to their assigned discipline shall provide a comment stating this.

(c) Grammatical and editorial comments shall not be submitted into DrChecks. Comments should be submitted to the ATR Team Leader via electronic mail using the tracked changes feature in the Word document or as a hard copy mark-up. The ATR Team Leader shall provide these comments to the Project Planner.

(d) Review comments shall contain these principal elements:

1. A clear statement of the concern
2. The basis for the concern, such as law, policy, or guidance
3. Significance for the concern
4. Specific actions needed to resolve the comment

(e) The "Critical" comment flag in DrChecks shall not be used unless the comment is discussed with the ATR Team Leader and/or the Project Planner first.

(2) PDT Team responsibilities are as follows:

(a) The team shall review comments provided by the ATRT in DrChecks and provide responses to each comment using "*Concur*", "*Non-Concur*", or "*For Information Only*". *Concur* responses shall state what action was taken and provide revised text from the report if applicable. *Non-Concur* responses shall state the basis for the disagreement or clarification of the concern and suggest actions to negotiate the closure of the comment.

(b) Team members shall contact the PDT and ATRT managers to discuss any "Non-Concur" responses prior to submission.

G. Resolution.

(1) Reviewers shall back check PDT responses to the review comments and either close the comment or attempt to resolve any disagreements. Conference calls shall be used to resolve any conflicting comments and responses.

(2) Reviewers may "agree to disagree" with any comment response and close the comment with a detailed explanation. If reviewer and responder cannot resolve a comment, it should be brought to the attention of the ATR Team Leader, and, if not resolved by the ATR Team Leader, it should be brought to the attention of the planning chief who will need to sign the certification. ATRT members shall keep the ATR Team Leader informed of problematic

comments. The vertical team will be informed of any policy variations or other issues that may cause concern during HQ review.

H. Certification. To fully document the ATR process, a statement of technical review will be prepared. Certification by the ATR Team Leader and the Project Planner will occur once issues raised by the reviewers have been addressed to the review team's satisfaction, and the final report is ready for submission for HQ review. Indication of this concurrence will be documented by the signing of a certification statement (Appendix A). A summary report of all comments and responses will follow the statement and accompany the report throughout the report approval process. An interim certification will be provided by the ATR team lead to indicate concurrence with the report to date until the final certification is performed when the report is considered final.

I. Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB). The AFB for this project has been overtaken by events and is no longer necessary. SPN obtained a policy waiver in February of 2011 to release the Draft SEIS for public and agency review prior to completing policy compliance review on the Draft LRR; correspondingly, the purpose of an AFB is now overtaken by the waiver and is no longer necessary to be held. A FRC and any IRC's as appropriate will be scheduled.

4. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW PLAN

The Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel Limited Reevaluation Study is being undertaken to recommend DDN improvements for federal funding and to evaluate the action of resuming construction of the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel. EC 1105-2-408 set forth and EC 1105-2-410 reaffirmed thresholds that trigger IEPR. EC 1165-2-209 distinguished between two types of IEPR. Type I IEPR is required for decision documents in cases where any of the following are true: there are public safety concerns; a high level of complexity; novel or precedent-setting approaches; where the project is controversial; where the project has significant interagency interest; where the project has a total project cost greater than \$45 million; is preparing an EIS; or has significant economic, environmental, and social effects to the nation. Type II IEPR includes safety assurance review (SAR) and should be conducted on design and construction activities for hurricane and storm risk management and flood risk management projects, as well as projects where potential hazards pose a significant threat to human life. Based on a risk informed decision process, work products may be determined to require Type I IEPR only, Type II IEPR only, both Type I and Type II IEPR, or no IEPR.

The project is not anticipated to have significant economic and social effects to the nation. Due to the location of the project within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, the potential for salinity intrusion will need to be addressed in the study. This could result in a project with a high level of complexity requiring novel or precedent setting approaches. The project may, therefore, draw interagency interest and heightened public awareness. The project cost is estimated to be \$169 million; however, this estimate may be revised. A joint SEIS/SEIR is being prepared for this project. For these reasons, Type I IEPR is required for this study.

Type I IEPR is a project cost but is not cost shared. The IEPR panel review will be federally funded. In-house costs associated with developing and procuring the IEPR panel contract as well as PDT response to IEPR comments will be cost-shared expenses. The cost for IEPR will be developed with an IEPR coordinator once a coordinator is identified by the DDN-PCX. IEPR will be conducted by a minimum of 4 IEPR team members. Disciplines that are anticipated to undergo IEPR are hydrology, hydraulic and geotechnical engineering, feasibility-

level design, environmental compliance, and economics. This includes products that are produced by the non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services and products produced by contractors.

In accordance with EC 1165-2-209, the San Francisco District's Chief of Engineering has assessed the potential for the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel Deepening Project to pose a significant threat to human life. Based on preliminary analyses, the District's Chief of Engineering has determined that the project does not incur life safety concerns or pose a significant threat to human life. Therefore Type II IEPR/ SAR are not required. The San Francisco District PDT will continue with its engineering assessment of channel deepening as part of the Detailed Design Report (DDR) to address safety considerations and confirm above determination.

A. Project Magnitude. The magnitude of the project is considered high. The remaining 35 miles of the Federal channel will be dredged, requiring removal of approximately 6.5 million cubic yards of sediment at an estimated total project cost of \$169 million; however, this estimate may be revised.

B. Project Risk. There are three areas of concern with large uncertainty that represent significant risks to the project. These risks include: (1) Getting the utility company to move its gas pipeline(s) in time for the dredging, (2) Securing and constructing some placement sites in time for the dredging, and (3) Securing and ensuring resource agency agreements to dredge outside the environmental windows. In addition, there is public and agency concern about salinity effects from the deepening. This project is considered to have high overall risk.

The potential for failure is high because of the complex nature of the study area. It will be important to make sound planning assumptions in application of all the modeling, and to do so, will require application of multiple levels of review. Public and agency input will be sought in order to minimize the potential for controversy. Uncertainty of success of the project ultimately will be low to moderate if the proposed review processes are implemented.

C. Vertical Team Consensus. This Review Plan will serve as the coordination document to obtain vertical team consensus. Subsequent to PCX approval, the plan will be provided to the vertical team for approval. MSC approval of the plan will indicate vertical team consensus.

D. Products for Review. The full IEPR panel will receive the Draft LRR (AFB Report), Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DSEIS/R) and all technical appendices concurrent with public and agency review. The IEPR panel will begin their review of the Draft LRR and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Report and all technical appendices in August of 2011. If required, a subsequent round of IEPR, limited in scope, may begin concurrent with the second public release of the DSEIS/R. If it is determined that a subsequent round of IEPR is required, the review will focus only on aspects of the draft reports that changed substantively from the first draft review. In an effort to meet the project goals in accordance with the project schedule, the District has requested the cooperation of the IEPR panel in submitting their final report no later than two weeks after public and agency comments on the draft reports are received. As the public and agency review is 45 days, a concurrent 60 day IEPR provides approximately two weeks within the review timeline to consider any comments received as they relate to the final IEPR report. A representative of the IEPR panel is expected to attend any public meeting(s) held during public and agency review of the draft report. The San Francisco District will draft a response to the IEPR final report and process it through the vertical team. HQUSACE will issue the final response to the IEPR panel and notify the public.

The San Francisco District is coordinating with the South Pacific Division and HQUSACE to determine if the existing project authorization is sufficient to implement the LRR's proposed plan to complete construction of the remaining reaches of the authorized project without the need to seek additional or new Congressional authorization. A project authority-scope analysis (April 2011) and a legal opinion (April 2011) were prepared by the San Francisco District. Both conclude that the existing authorization is sufficient to implement the LRR's proposed plan within the Chief of Engineer's discretionary authority without the need for additional Congressional authorization. The legal opinion states,

This analysis found that the existing authorization is sufficient to implement the LRR's proposed plan and is within the discretionary approval authority of the Chief of Engineers without the need to obtain new or additional Congressional authority.¹ This analysis also demonstrates that HQUSACE RIT may reasonably determine that approval to implement the LRR's proposed plan to resume and complete construction of the project is within the SPD Commander's delegated approval authority.²... This analysis has determined that the existing project authorization is sufficient to implement the LRR's proposed plan to complete construction of the remaining reaches of the authorized project without the need to seek additional or new Congressional authorization. As such a Civil Works Review Board briefing is not required.

The LRR's proposed plan meets all of the standards of ER-1105-2-100 (PGN) for approval by the SPD Commander and is consistent with legislation subsequent to the original authorization. Although the vertical team previously decided that HQUSACE approval under the Chief of Engineers discretionary authority was appropriate for the project, the HQUSACE RIT may determine, in the future, that project approval be delegated to the SPD Commander. (Reference ER 1105-2-100 Appendices G and H; a Civil Works Review Board is not required as new or additional Congressional authorization is not being sought). A final decision regarding the scope of the existing authorization and the necessity of a Civil Works Review Board will be made in coordination with the South Pacific Division and the HQUSACE RIT.

E. Communication and Documentation. The communication plan for the IEPR is as follows: (1) The panel will use DrChecks to document the IEPR process. The Project Planner will facilitate the creation of a project portfolio in the system to allow access by all PDT members and a qualified Outside Eligible Organization (OEO). An electronic version of the document, appendices, and any significant and relevant public comments shall be posted in Word format at: <ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/> at least one business day prior to the start of the comment period. A secure ftp site will be utilized where practicable.

The OEO will compile the comments of the IEPR panelists, enter them into DrChecks, and forward the comments to the District. The District will consult the PDT and outside sources as necessary to develop a proposed response to each panel comment. The District will enter the proposed response in DrChecks, and then return the proposed response to the panel. The panel will reply to the proposed response through the OEO, again using DrChecks. This final panel reply may or may not concur with the District's proposed response, and the panels final response will indicate concurrence or briefly explain what issue is blocking concurrence. There will be no final closeout iteration. The District will consult the vertical team and outside resources to

¹ Reference ER 1105-2-100 Appendices G and H; a Civil Works Review Board is not required as new or additional Congressional authorization is not being sought

² Reference ER 1105-2-100 Appendix G

prepare an agency response to each comment. The initial panel comments, the District’s proposed response, the panel’s reply to the District’s proposed response, and the final agency response will all be tracked and archived in DrChecks for the administrative record. However, only the initial panel comments and the final agency responses will be posted. This process will continue to be refined as experience shows a need for changes. This is in accordance with the EC 1105-2-410, Frequently Asked Questions, dated 3 November 2008.

(2) The PDT shall send each IEPR panel member one hard copy (with color pages as applicable) of the document and appendices such that the copies are received at least one business day prior to the start of the comment period.

(3) The Project Planner shall inform the IEPR panel when all responses have been entered into DrChecks and conduct a briefing to summarize comment responses to highlight any areas of disagreement.

(4) A revised electronic version of the report and appendices with comments incorporated shall be posted at <ftp://ftp.usace.army.mil/pub/> for use during back checking of the comments. A secure ftp site will be utilized where practicable.

(5) PDT members shall contact IEPR panel members as appropriate to seek clarification of a comment’s intent or provide clarification of information in the report. Discussions shall occur outside of DrChecks, but a summary of discussions may be provided in the system.

(6) The IEPR panel shall produce a final Review Report no later than 15 days after the District provides public and agency comments on the draft report to the IEPR panel. This report shall be scoped as part of the effort to engage the IEPR panel. The San Francisco District will draft a response report to the IEPR final report and process it through the vertical team for discussion. Upon satisfactorily resolving any relevant follow-on actions, the Corps will finalize its response to the IEPR Review Report and will post both the Review Report and the Corps’ final responses to the public website.

IEPR TIMELINE	
ROUND ONE: START	11-August-11
ROUND ONE: FINISH	11-October-11
ROUND TWO: START	TBD
ROUND TWO: FINISH	TBD

F. Funding. The DDN-PCX will identify someone independent from the PDT to scope the IEPR and develop an Independent Government Estimate. The San Francisco District will provide funding to the IEPR panel.

5. PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW

The public and agencies will have multiple opportunities to participate in this study. The earliest opportunity for public participation was the NEPA public scoping process held in June of 2008.

The first public review of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) began in February of 2011. A second public release of the DSEIS will be scheduled at a date to be determined. The period will last a minimum of 45 days as required for a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. One or more public workshops will be held during this public and agency review period. Comments received during the first public comment period will be provided to the IEPR team prior to completion of the final Review Report and to the ATRT before review of the final Decision Document.

SPN obtained a policy waiver in February of 2011 to release the DSEIS for public and agency review prior to completing policy compliance review on the Draft LRR; correspondingly the purpose of an AFB is now overtaken by the waiver and is no longer necessary to be held. A FRC and any IRC's as appropriate may be scheduled.

Public review of necessary state or Federal permits will also take place during this period. A formal state and agency review will occur concurrently with the public review. However, it is anticipated that intensive coordination with these agencies will have occurred concurrent with the planning process.

Upon completion of the review period, comments will be consolidated in a matrix and addressed, if needed. A comment resolution meeting will take place if needed to decide upon the best resolution of comments. A summary of the comments and resolutions will be included in the document.

6. PLANNING CENTERS OF EXPERTISE COORDINATION

The appropriate PCX for this document is the National Deep Draft Navigation Center of Expertise located at the Corps' South Atlantic Division in Atlanta, Georgia. The PCX will be asked to manage the IEPR review. For ATR, the PCX is requested to nominate the ATR team as discussed in paragraph 3.b. The approved Review Plan will be posted to the San Francisco District public website. Any public comments on the Review Plan will be collected by the Office of Water Project Review (OWPR) and provided to the San Francisco District for resolution and incorporation, if needed.

7. APPROVALS

The PDT will carry out the Review Plan as described. The Project Planner will submit the plan to the PDT District Planning Chief for endorsement of MSC approval. Formal coordination with PCX for DDN will occur through the PDT District Planning Chief.

8. POINTS OF CONTACT

Questions about this Review Plan may be directed to Neil Hedgecock, San Francisco District Project Delivery Team contact, at (415) 503-6728, Neil.C.Hedgecock@usace.army.mil.

**REVIEW PLAN
SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL LIMITED REEVALUATION
STUDY
SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT**

**APPENDIX A
STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW
COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW
SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL
DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION LIMITED REEVALUATION STUDY**

The San Francisco District has completed the Limited Reevaluation Study, Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR). Notice is hereby given that an agency technical review appropriate to the level of risk and complexity inherent in the project has been conducted as defined in the Review Plan. During the agency technical review, 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 result, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing Corps policy. The ATR was accomplished by an agency team composed of staff from multiple districts. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved.

Sacramento River
Deep Water Ship Channel
Limited Reevaluation Study
Agency Technical Review Team

Date

CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

A summary of all comments and responses is attached. Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows:

(Describe the major technical concerns, possible impact and resolution)

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

Chief, Planning Division
San Francisco District

Date

**REVIEW PLAN
SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL
LIMITED REEVALUATION STUDY
SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT**

**APPENDIX B
REVIEW PLAN TEAMS**

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM

Name	Discipline	Phone	Email
David Patterson	Project Management	(415) 503-6723	David.R.Patterson@usace.army.mil
Neil Hedgecock	Project Management	(415) 503-6728	Neil.C.Hedgecock@usace.army.mil
	Plan Formulation		
	Plan Formulation		
	Environmental		
	Environmental		
	Environmental/Sediments		
	Chemistry/Sediments		
	Chemistry/Sediments		
	Cultural Resources		
	Economics		
	Economics		
	Economics		
	Hydrology, Hydraulics, & Coastal		
	Civil Design		
	Geotech/Geology/GIS		
	Cost Engineering		
	Real Estate		
	Office of Counsel		
	Public Affairs Office		
	Sponsor PM		

AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM

Name	Discipline	Phone	Email
	ATR Team Leader/Plan Formulation		.army.mil
TBD	Civil Design		
TBD	Environmental Resources		
TBD	Hydrology/Reservoir Operations		
TBD	Hydraulics		
TBD	Economics		
TBD	Cost Engineering 1		
TBD	Real Estate/Lands		
TBD	Cultural Resources		
TBD	Geotechnical Engineering		

¹The cost engineering team member nomination will be coordinated with the NWW Cost Estimating Center of Expertise as required. That PCX will determine if the cost estimate will need to be reviewed by PCX staff.

INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW PANEL

Name	Discipline	Phone	Email
TBD	Hydrology		
TBD	Hydraulic Design		
TBD	Geotechnical Engineering		
TBD	Economics		

VERTICAL TEAM

Name	Discipline	Phone	Email
	District Support Team Lead		
	Regional Integration Team		

PLANNING CENTER OF EXPERTISE

Name	Discipline	Phone	Email
	PCX for Deep Draft Navigation (DDN)		

Review Plan Checklist For Decision Documents

Date: April 7, 2009 Updated 8 August 2011

Originating District: SPN

Project/Study Title: Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel Deepening Feasibility Study

PWI #:

District POC:

PCX Reviewer:

Please fill out this checklist and submit with the draft Review Plan when coordinating with the appropriate PCX. Any evaluation boxes checked 'No' indicate the RP may not comply with ER 1105-2-410 (22 Aug 2008) and should be explained. Additional coordination and issue resolution may be required prior to MSC approval of the Review Plan.

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	EVALUATION
1. Is the Review Plan (RP) a stand alone document?	EC 1105-2-410, Para 8a	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. Does it include a cover page identifying it as a RP and listing the project/study title, originating district or office, and date of the plan?</p> <p>b. Does it include a table of contents?</p> <p>c. Is the purpose of the RP clearly stated and EC 1105-2-410 referenced?</p> <p>d. Does it reference the Project Management Plan (PMP) of which the RP is a component?</p> <p>e. Does it succinctly describe the three levels of peer review: District Quality Control (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), and Independent Technical Peer Review (IEPR)?</p> <p>f. Does it include a paragraph stating the title, subject, and purpose of the decision document to be reviewed?</p> <p>g. Does it list the names and disciplines of the Project Delivery Team (PDT)?*</p> <p><i>*Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.</i></p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4a</p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>e. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>f. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>g. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>

<p>2. Is the RP detailed enough to assess the necessary level and focus of peer review?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 3a</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a. Does it indicate which parts of the study will likely be challenging?</p> <p>b. Does it provide a preliminary assessment of where the project risks are likely to occur and what the magnitude of those risks might be?</p> <p>c. Does it indicate if the project/study will include an environmental impact statement (EIS)?</p> <p><i>Is an EIS included? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></i> <i>If yes, IEPR is required.</i></p> <p>d. Does it address if the project report is likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment?</p> <p><i>Is it likely? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></i> <i>If yes, IEPR is required.</i></p> <p>e. Does it address if the project is likely to have significant economic, environmental, and social affects to the nation, such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more than negligible adverse impacts on scarce or unique cultural, historic, or tribal resources? • substantial adverse impacts on fish and wildlife species or their habitat, prior to implementation of mitigation? • more than negligible adverse impact on species listed as endangered or threatened, or to the designated critical habitat of such species, under the Endangered Species Act, prior to implementation of mitigation? <p><i>Is it likely? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></i> <i>If yes, IEPR is required.</i></p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 3a</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 3a</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410 Para 7c & 8f</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4b</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Para 6c</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410 Para 8f</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410 Para 8f</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410 Para 8f</p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>e. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>

<p>f. Does it address if the project/study is likely to have significant interagency interest?</p> <p><i>Is it likely? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></i> <i>If yes, IEPR is required.</i></p> <p>g. Does it address if the project/study likely involves significant threat to human life (safety assurance)?</p> <p><i>Is it likely? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></i> <i>If yes, IEPR is required.</i></p> <p>h. Does it provide an estimated total project cost?</p> <p><i>What is the estimated cost: <u>57 M</u></i> <i>(best current estimate; may be a range)</i></p> <p><i>Is it > \$45 million? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></i> <i>If yes, IEPR is required.</i></p> <p>i. Does it address if the project/study will likely be highly controversial, such as if there will be a 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?</p> <p><i>Is it likely? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></i> <i>If yes, IEPR is required.</i></p> <p>j. Does it address if the information in the decision document will likely be based on novel methods, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices?</p> <p><i>Is it likely? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></i> <i>If yes, IEPR is required.</i></p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Para 6c</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 1b</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 1b</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 1b</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 1b</p>	<p>f. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>g. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>h. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>i. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>j. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>3. Does the RP define the appropriate level of peer review for the project/study?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Para 8a</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a. Does it state that DQC will be managed by the home district in accordance with the Major Subordinate Command (MSC) and district Quality Management Plans?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Para 7a</p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>

<p>b. Does it state that ATR will be conducted or managed by the lead PCX?</p> <p>c. Does it state whether IEPR will be performed?</p> <p><i>Will IEPR be performed? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></i></p> <p>d. Does it provide a defensible rationale for the decision on IEPR?</p> <p>e. Does it state that IEPR will be managed by an Outside Eligible Organization, external to the Corps of Engineers?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 3a</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4b</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Para 7c</p>	<p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>e. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>4. Does the RP explain how ATR will be accomplished?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4l</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a. Does it identify the anticipated number of reviewers?</p> <p>b. Does it provide a succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed for the review (not simply a list of disciplines)?</p> <p>c. Does it indicate that ATR team members will be from outside the home district?</p> <p>d. Does it indicate that the ATR team leader will be from outside the home MSC?</p> <p>e. Does the RP state that the lead PCX is responsible for identifying the ATR team members and indicate if candidates will be nominated by the home district/MS?</p> <p>f. If the reviewers are listed by name, does the RP describe the qualifications and years of relevant experience of the ATR team members?*</p> <p><i>*Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.</i></p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4f</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4g</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Para 7b</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Para 7b</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4k(1)</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4k(1)</p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>e. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>f. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>

5. Does the RP explain how IEPR will be accomplished?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4k & Appendix D	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. Does it identify the anticipated number of reviewers?</p> <p>b. Does it provide a succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed for the review (not simply a list of disciplines)?</p> <p>c. Does it indicate that the IEPR reviewers will be selected by an Outside Eligible Organization and if candidates will be nominated by the Corps of Engineers?</p> <p>d. Does it indicate the IEPR will address all the underlying planning, safety assurance, engineering, economic, and environmental analyses, not just one aspect of the project?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4f</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4g</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4k(1) & Appendix D, Para 2a</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Para 7c</p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
6. Does the RP address peer review of sponsor in-kind contributions?		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. Does the RP list the expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor?</p> <p>b. Does it explain how peer review will be accomplished for those in-kind contributions?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4j</p>	<p>a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
7. Does the RP address how the peer review will be documented?		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR and IEPR comments using DrChecks?</p> <p>b. Does the RP explain how the IEPR will be documented in a Review Report?</p> <p>c. Does the RP document how written responses to the IEPR Review Report will be prepared?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Para 8g(1)</p> <p>EC1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4k(13)(b)</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4l</p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/></p>

<p>d. Does the RP detail how the district/PCX will disseminate the final IEPR Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the IEPR on the internet and include them in the applicable decision document?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Para 8g(2) & Appendix B, Para 4l</p>	<p>d. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>8. Does the RP address Policy Compliance and Legal Review?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Para 7d</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>9. Does the RP present the tasks, timing and sequence (including deferrals), and costs of reviews?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4c & Appendix C, Para 3d</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a. Does it provide a schedule for ATR including review of the Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM) materials, Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) materials, draft report, and final report?</p> <p>b. Does it include interim ATR reviews for key technical products?</p> <p>c. Does it present the timing and sequencing for IEPR?</p> <p>d. Does it include cost estimates for the peer reviews?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix C, Para 3g</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix C, Para 3g</p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>10. Does the RP indicate the study will address Safety Assurance factors?</p> <p>Factors to be considered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where failure leads to significant threat to human life • Novel methods\complexity\ precedent-setting models\policy changing conclusions • Innovative materials or techniques • Design lacks redundancy, resiliency of robustness • Unique construction sequence or acquisition plans • Reduced\overlapping design construction schedule 	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Para 2 & Appendix D, Para 1c</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments: Safety Assurance Factors are addressed in Section 1 (B) (7) and Section 4 of the RP. This study does not address a hurricane and storm risk management project, or flood risk management project, nor does failure of the project pose a significant threat to human life. Therefore, the project is not required to undergo a safety assurance review.</p>

11. Does the RP address model certification requirements?	EC 1105-2-407	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. Does it list the models and data anticipated to be used in developing recommendations (including mitigation models)?</p> <p>b. Does it indicate the certification/approval status of those models and if certification or approval of any model(s) will be needed?</p> <p>c. If needed, does the RP propose the appropriate level of certification/approval for the model(s) and how it will be accomplished?</p>	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4i	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
12. Does the RP address opportunities for public participation?		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. Does it indicate how and when there will be opportunities for public comment on the decision document?</p> <p>b. Does it indicate when significant and relevant public comments will be provided to reviewers before they conduct their review?</p> <p>c. Does it address whether the public, including scientific or professional societies, will be asked to nominate potential external peer reviewers?</p> <p>d. Does the RP list points of contact at the home district and the lead PCX for inquiries about the RP?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4d</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4e</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4h</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4a</p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
13. Does the RP address coordination with the appropriate Planning Centers of Expertise?	EC 1105-2-410, Para 8a	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. Does it state if the project is single or multi-purpose? Single <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multi <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>List purposes: DDN</p> <p>b. Does it identify the lead PCX for peer review? Lead PCX: DD</p> <p>c. If multi-purpose, has the lead PCX coordinated the review of the RP with the other PCXs as appropriate?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 3c</p>	<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>

<p>14. Does the RP address coordination with the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) in Walla Walla District for ATR of cost estimates, construction schedules and contingencies for all documents requiring Congressional authorization?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 3</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a. Does it state if the decision document will require Congressional authorization?</p> <p>b. If Congressional authorization is required, does the state that coordination will occur with the Cost Engineering DX?</p>		<p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>15. Other Considerations: This checklist highlights the minimum requirements for an RP based on EC 1105-2-410. Additional factors to consider in preparation of the RP include, but may not be limited to:</p> <p>a. Is a request from a State Governor or the head of a Federal or state agency to conduct IEPR likely?</p> <p>b. Is the home district expecting to submit a waiver to exclude the project study from IEPR?</p> <p>c. Are there additional Peer Review requirements specific to the home MSC or district (as described in the Quality Management Plan for the MSC or district)?</p> <p>d. Are there additional Peer Review needs unique to the project study?</p>	<p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 1b</p> <p>EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 1d</p>	<p>Comments:</p>
<p>Detailed Comments and Backcheck:</p>		

CESPD Supplemental Review Plan Checklist

Review Plan: Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel

Date of review: First Review: March 2011. Second Review August 2011

Reviewed by:

References: CESPD R 1110-1-8, Appendix C, Planning; EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy

Note: Any "No" answer requires explanation in the comment field.

	Item	Yes	No	Comment
1	Is there a Technical Review Strategy Session identified early in the study process? (See Appendix C paragraph 8.2,)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: TRSS is not addressed in the RP. TRSS is not applicable because the scope of a Limited Reevaluation Study does not permit it.
2	Are potential Continuing Authority Program (CAP) "spinoffs" identified, along with the appropriate QCP identified for them?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: No potential CAP projects have been identified to date.
3	Are the review costs/schedules identified?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: ATR cost is identified in section 3.D (1) of the RP. The cost of technical review as part of IEPR will be added to section 4 of the RP when it becomes available. The cost of DQC will be added to the RP once the cost is established. The cost of SAR will be added to the RP once the cost is established.
	For District Quality Control (DQC)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The cost of DQC will be added to the RP once the cost is established.
	ATR?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ATR cost is identified in section 3.D (1) of the RP.
	Independent External Peer Review (IEPR)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The cost of technical review as part of IEPR will be added to section 4 of the RP when it becomes available. SAR is not required (SAR Text box below does not work). Safety Assurance Factors are addressed in Section 1 (B) (7) and Section 4 of the RP. This study does not address a hurricane and storm risk management project, or flood risk management project, nor does failure of the project pose a significant threat to human life. Therefore, the project is not required to undergo a safety assurance review.
	Safety Assurance Review (SAR)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
4	Does the RP identify seamless DQC technical review (8.4), including supervisory oversight of the technical products? (See Appendix C paragraph 8.5)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: Yes, the RP identifies seamless technical review and addresses supervisory oversight of the technical products. Seamless review is addressed in sections 1.B (1), and 3.E (1).
5	Does the RP identify the recommended review comment content and structure? (See Appendix C paragraph 8.5.4)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: Yes. This is addressed in sections 3 and 4.

CESPD Supplemental Review Plan Checklist

	Item	Yes	No	Comment
6	Does the RP encourage face-to-face resolution of issues between the PDT and reviewers? (See Appendix C paragraph 8.5.5)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: This is addressed in section 3 of the RP. This will be done where possible. If the reviewers are at many locations, different methods including email, VTC, and conference calls will be used by team members to resolve issues between the PDT and reviewers.
7	If issues remain, does the RP identify an appropriate dispute resolution process? (See Appendix C paragraph 8.6)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. And if issues remain, does the RP identify an appropriate dispute resolution process? (8.6)
8	Does the RP require documentation of all significant decisions, and leave a clear audit trail? (See Appendix C paragraph 8.5.6)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: The RP identifies a clear method of documentation of all the significant decisions related to the review and describes the development of a clear audit trail. See sections 1, 3 and 4.
9	Does the RP identify all requirements for technical certifications? (See Appendix C paragraph 8.5.7)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: Yes, this is addressed in section 3.H.
10	Does the RP identify the requirement that without-project hydrology will be certified by the Feasibility Scoping Meeting (or equivalent depending upon project development phase)? (See Appendix C paragraph 8.5.8)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: Yes, this is addressed in section 3 in the ATR timeline table.
11	Does the RP fully address products developed by contractors? (See Appendix C paragraph 8.10)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: Yes, this is addressed in sections 1.B (1), 3.E (4), and section 4.
12	Is the need for a VE study identified, and incorporated into the review process, after the feasibility scoping meeting? (See Appendix C paragraph 8.11)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: VE is addressed in section 1.B (8).
13	Does the RP include a Feasibility Alternative Review Milestone to obtain CESPD approval of the tentatively recommended plan? (See Appendix C paragraph 12.1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: Yes, this is included in the ATR timeline table in section 3 of the RP.
14	Does the RP identify the final public meeting milestone? (See Appendix C, Enclosure 1, SPD Milestones)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: The final public meeting milestone is accounted for in the ATR timeline in section 3 of the RP and is discussed in section 5 of the RP.
15	Does the RP identify the report approval process, and if there is a delegated approval authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: Review Plan approval is addressed in section 1.B (4) and (6), section 4.C, and section 7 of the RP.
16	Does the RP reference CESPD milestones, along with USACE required (PGN) milestones?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPN Response: This is included in section 3 of the RP.
17	Have regional Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts been surveyed for potential AE support in the Review Plan process?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not at this time.
18	Did you confirm that the PED agreement is consistent with the engineering scopes of work for the Design Documentation Reports (DDR's) and Engineering Documentation Reports (EDR's) if applicable?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	