

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

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

Boardman River Dams  
Grand Traverse County and  
City of Traverse City, Michigan

**[Detroit District](#)**

**MSC Approval Date:**  
October 31, 2012

**Last Revision Date:** 24 October 2012



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers®**

**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**

**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>7</b>
<b>6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR).....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>7. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>8. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>10. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>11. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>15</b>

## 1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

- a. **Purpose.** This Regional Review Plan model defines the scope and level of peer review for the *Boardman River Dams, Traverse City, Michigan* Great Lakes Fisheries and Ecosystem Restoration (GLFER) Program which was authorized by Section 506, Water Resources Development Act of 2000, as amended by Section 5011 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

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 documents, which is applicable to projects that do not require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), as defined in ER 1165-2-209 Civil Works Review Policy. A GLFER project generally does not require IEPR if it is determined during the course of the study that 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 is not likely to have significant economic, environmental, and/or social effects to the Nation;

- The project/study is not likely to have significant interagency interest;
- The project/study is not likely highly controversial;
- The decision document is not likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific;
- The information in the decision document or proposed project design is not likely to be based on novel methods, involve the use of innovative materials or techniques, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices; and
- The project has not been deemed by the USACE Director of Civil Works or Chief of Engineers to be controversial nature.

If any of the above criteria are not met, the model GLFER Regional Review Plan model 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 Major Subordinate Command (MSC) in accordance with EC 1165-2-209.

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. In addition, the home district and MSC should assess at the Alternatives Formulation Briefing (AFB) whether the initial decision on the use of the model plan is still valid or if a project specific review plan should be developed based on new information. If a project specific review plan is required, it must be approved prior to execution of the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) for the study.

This regional review plan may be used to cover implementation products. The 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) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 March 2010.
- (3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
- (4) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007
- (5) 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 1165-2-209, which establishes an accountable, comprehensive, life-cycle review strategy for Civil Works products by providing a seamless process for review of all Civil Works projects from initial planning through design, construction, and operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and rehabilitation (OMRR&R). The EC outlines four general levels of review: District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), and Policy and Legal Compliance Review. In addition to these levels of review, decision documents are subject to

cost engineering review and certification (per EC 1165-2-209) and planning model certification/approval (per EC 1105-2-412).

- (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 1165-2-209, is made as to whether IEPR is appropriate. IEPR panels will consist of independent, recognized experts from outside of the USACE in the appropriate disciplines, representing a balance of areas of expertise suitable for the review being conducted. There are two types of IEPR: Type I is generally for decision documents and Type II is generally for implementation products.
  - (a) Type I IEPR. Type I IEPR reviews are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on project studies. Type I IEPR panels assess the adequacy and acceptability of the economic and environmental assumptions and projections, project evaluation data, economic analysis, environmental analyses, engineering analyses, formulation of alternative plans, methods for integrating risk and uncertainty, models used in the evaluation of environmental impacts of proposed projects, and biological opinions of the project study. Type I IEPR will cover the entire decision document or action and will address all underlying engineering, economics, and environmental work, not just one aspect of the study. For decision documents where a Type II IEPR (Safety Assurance Review) is anticipated during project implementation, safety assurance shall also be addressed during the Type I IEPR per EC 1165-2-209.

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

- (b) 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 [Boardman River Dams, Traverse City, Michigan](#) decision document will be prepared in accordance with the Great Lakes Fisheries Support Plan April 2006. The approval level of decision documents (if policy compliant) is the home MSC. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document.

**Study/Project Description.** Located in the northwestern portion of Michigan's Lower Peninsula, the Boardman River originates in central Kalkaska County and flows southwest into Grand Traverse County where it turns north and flows into West Grand Traverse Bay/ Lake Michigan at Traverse City, Michigan. The Boardman River Watershed is comprised of 291 square miles of surface area and includes 179 lineal stream miles and 12 natural lakes. The Boardman River is a designated Natural River and considered among the "top ten" trout streams in Michigan, containing nearly 36 lineal miles of Blue Ribbon Trout Stream. The project area is a 8-mile plus section of the River's main stem, includes three dams (Union Street, Sabin, Boardman), and spans from Keystone Pond to the mouth of the river at Grand Traverse Bay.

### Alternative Considered:

- No Action – This alternative provides no restoration benefits, and maintains the fragmented warm-water riverine ecosystem.
- Modify Union Street Dam – This alternative provides some habitat improvements for sturgeon by opening up the lower river and Boardman Lake.
- Modify Union Street Dam and Remove Sabin dam – This option is expected to provide the migrating fish access to spawning and rearing habitat from Boardman Lake to the Boardman dam.
- Modify Union Street Dam and Remove Boardman Dam – This alternative provides some habitat improvements for all three species. It opens up new habitat to the sturgeon and removes negative impacts from Boardman Dam and the Cass road bridge would be replaced.

- Modify Union Street Dam and Remove Sabin, and Boardman Dams – This alternative maximizes restoration benefit for indigenous species, and provides connectivity for migrating species.
- Remove Sabin – This alternative provides limited habitat improvements.
- Remove Boardman Dam – This alternative provides limited habitat improvements.
- Remove Sabin and Boardman Dams - This alternative maximizes restoration benefit for indigenous species, but would not provide any connectivity from Lake Michigan to the Boardman River spawning and rearing habitat for migrating species.

The objective of the project is to reconnect/restore tributary habitat by allowing woody debris and sediment materials to flow throughout the Boardman River, negate the thermal disruption, restore the natural balance between coldwater and cool-water species and limit the zebra mussel infestation to Boardman Lake. These ends would be accomplished without transporting pollutants into Grand Traverse Bay and Lake Michigan or allowing upstream migration of undesirable and exotic fish species.

The cumulative expected result of the tributary restoration improvements would be the rebounding of Great Lakes fish populations by increasing the diversity of species moving between the Lakes and Boardman River. Restoration of tributary habitat was indicated in the Great Lakes Fisheries and Ecosystem Restoration support plan as a high basin-wide priority. The preliminary total project cost is estimated to be between \$4.4 and \$9.5 million dollars.

- b. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review.** Dam modification or removal projects carry inherent risks to life and safety. Those risk increase when the project is located in a highly populated area or in areas where there is significant infrastructure. The use of the GLFER Programmatic Review Plan is applicable because the Boardman dam removal project is located in a rural setting thus the risk to life and safety is expected to be relatively low. The risk of environmental damage is low because of the data that has been collected on sediment transport, and the implementation of construction precautions such as silt screens and sediment traps. Additional risk will be mitigated through meticulous coordination with State and local authorities.

Ecosystem restoration projects are not completely without controversy. It is near impossible to plan and implement a project that would satisfy everyone in a given community. The Boardman dam removal project is not without those dissenting voices in favor of maintaining the status quo. However, most residents in the Boardman River watershed recognize the value and opportunity in restoring a rare coldwater riverine environment. The Boardman River Dams project is expected to have a routine level of coordination with Federal, State and local officials. The dam removal project will not provide access to spawning habitat for invasive species nor will it provide a pathway for asian carp to migrate into the Great Lakes.

The Boardman River Dams DPR will not contain any highly influential scientific or be an influential assessment of the watershed. The restoration project relies on a vast amount of detailed data about the existing condition within the Boardman River basin and established engineering practices such as sediment management, and the gradual drawdown of the impoundments behind the dams.



- 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 products are anticipated during the feasibility phase.

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

District Quality Control (DQC). DQC is the review of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the Project Management Plan (PMP). It is managed in the home district and may be conducted by staff in the home district as long as they are not doing the work involved in the study, including contracted work that is being reviewed. Basic quality control tools include a Quality Management Plan 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 approval by the District Commander. The Major Subordinate Command (MSC)/District quality management plans address the conduct and documentation of this fundamental level of review; DQC is not addressed further in this review plan.

**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 the Detailed Project Report (DPR) including appendices and the Environmental Assessment (EA).
- b. **Required ATR Team Expertise.** The proposed ATR team members are presented in Table 1. The following expertise is needed: Plan Formulation, Water Quality, Limnology, Incremental Cost Analysis, Civil or Structural Design, Hydrology and Hydraulics. The Review Team leader has expertise in aquatic ecosystem quality parameters, ecology, water quality, and restoration of degraded reservoirs. The Plan Formulation/Economics team member is a senior planner and economist. The remaining team members will be selected by the team leader based on expertise and availability.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional with experience in preparing Section 206 or GLFER decision documents and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. Typically, the ATR lead will also serve as a reviewer for a specific discipline (such as planning, economics, environmental resources, etc).
Planning	The team member shall have extensive knowledge of Planning processes, with special emphasis on Ecosystem Restoration studies.
Economics	The Economics Team member should have extensive

	experience with calculating Cost Effective (CE) and conducting an Incremental Cost Analysis (ICA) for restoration projects.
Environmental Scientist	The team member should have extensive knowledge of the integration of environmental evaluation and compliance requirements, pursuant to national environmental statutes (NEPA), applicable executive orders and other Federal planning requirements, into the planning of Civil Works comprehensive plans and implementation projects.
Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineer	Hydrology & Hydraulics: Team member will be an expert in the field of hydrology & hydraulics and have a thorough understanding of open channel dynamics, stream geomorphology, flood routing, and watershed hydrology and a working knowledge of HEC-RAS.
Civil Engineering	Team member will be knowledgeable in the art and science ecosystem restoration projects such as design of channels, detention ponds. Should also be a licensed professional engineer.
Cost Engineering	Cost Engineer shall be familiar with estimates for civil works (water retention, flood control, etc.), structural work (bridges, overpass, etc.) and environmental clean-up. The Cost Engineer will be required to perform some quantity checks. Be familiar with the USACE estimating software MII in reviewing cost estimate.
Real Estate	The Real Estate Specialist should have extensive experience standard real estate agreements, easement determination, and determination of LERRDs .

**b. 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 1110-2-12 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 prior to the District Commander signing the 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 paragraph 3(c) 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, the model National 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 Major Subordinate Command (MSC) in accordance with EC 1165-2-209.
- 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**

- a. **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 – PLAN	The model will be used to identify the Cost Effective (CE) plan and to conduct an Incremental Cost Analysis (ICA)	Certified
USFWS HEP HSI	This model will be used to identify the habitat benefits associated with each of the restoration alternatives	Single use

- b. **Engineering Models.** The following engineering 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>
HEC-RAS 4.0 (River Analysis System)	The Hydrologic Engineering Center’s River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) program provides the capability to perform one-dimensional steady and unsteady flow river hydraulics calculations. The program will be used for steady flow analysis to evaluate the future without- and with-project conditions.

**8. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS**

- a. **ATR Schedule and Cost.**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Scheduled Start Date</b>	<b>Scheduled Completion Date</b>	<b>Cost</b>
DPR/EA package ATR	Dec 2012	Feb 2013	\$23,610
AFB Milestone		April 2013	-

- b. **Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost.** Not applicable.
- c. **Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost.** 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.

**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.

- A public meeting will be held in Traverse City, MI (Project Site) for residents of the watershed
- The DPR and EA will be sent out to the public for a 30 day review

**10. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES**

The home MSC Commander is responsible for approving this and ensuring that use of the GLFER model Regional 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 Regional Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-209. The latest version of the review plan, along with the MSC 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 points of contact:

POC	Title	Office Phone Number
	ATR Lead	215 656-6562
	Project Manager	616 842-5521 x25521
	Planner	313 226- 6815
	Division Liaison	513 684- 6212

**ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS.** Include contact information for the PDT, ATR team, and MSC. The credential and years of experience for the ATR team should be included when it is available.

**Table 1. Study Project Delivery Team**

Discipline	Name	Office/Agency
Project Manager		CELRE-PM
Lead Planner		CELRE-PL-P
Environmental Analysis		CELRE-PL-E
Environmental Analysis, Archeologist		CELRE-PL-E
Environmental Analysis HTRW		CELRE-PL-E
Economic Analysis		CELRE-PL-P
Real Estate		CELRE-RE
Civil Design Analysis		CERLE-ED-G
Geotechnical Analysis		CERLE-ED-G
Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering		CELRE-HH-E
Cost Engineering		CELRE-ED-C
Contracting Admin Branch		CELRE-ET-CAB
Contracting		CELRE-CT-C
Public Affairs Officer		CELRE-PA
Office of Counsel		CELRE-OC

**Table 2. Agency Technical Review Team**

Discipline	Name	Office/Agency
Environmental Analysis (RTS)		NAP (ATR lead)
Plan Formulation		LRB
Civil Design Analysis		NAP
Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering		NAP
Cost Engineering		LRB
Cost Engineering		NWW (Cost DX)
Real Estate		LRP

**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 Detail [Project Report and Environmental Assessment](#) for [Boardman Dam Removal, Traverse City, Michigan](#). The ATR was conducted as defined in the project’s Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-209. During the ATR, compliance with established policy principles and procedures, utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses, alternatives evaluated, the appropriateness of data used and level obtained, and reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets the customer’s needs consistent with law and existing US Army Corps of Engineers policy. The ATR also assessed the District Quality Control (DQC) documentation and made the determination that the DQC activities employed appear to be appropriate and effective. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved and the comments have been closed in DrChecks<sup>sm</sup>.

SIGNATURE  
\_\_\_\_\_  
[Name](#)  
ATR Team Leader  
[CENAP-PL-E](#)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SIGNATURE  
\_\_\_\_\_  
[Name](#)  
Project Manager  
[CELRE-PM-C](#)

\_\_\_\_\_  
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  
[Office Symbol](#)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

SIGNATURE  
\_\_\_\_\_  
[Name](#)  
Chief, Planning Division  
[Office Symbol](#)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

<sup>1</sup> Only needed if some portion of the ATR was contracted

**ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS**

<b>Revision Date</b>	<b>Description of Change</b>	<b>Page / Paragraph Number</b>



#### ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>	<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>
AFB	Alternative Formulation Briefing	NED	National Economic Development
ASA(CW)	Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works	NER	National Ecosystem Restoration
ATR	Agency Technical Review	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
CAP	Continuing Authorities Program	O&M	Operation and maintenance
CSDR	Coastal Storm Damage Reduction	OMB	Office and Management and Budget
DPR	Detailed Project Report	OMRR&R	Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation
DQC	District Quality Control/Quality Assurance	OEO	Outside Eligible Organization
DX	Directory of Expertise	OSE	Other Social Effects
EA	Environmental Assessment	PCX	Planning Center of Expertise
EC	Engineer Circular	PDT	Project Delivery Team
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	PAC	Post Authorization Change
EO	Executive Order	PMP	Project Management Plan
ER	Ecosystem Restoration	PL	Public Law
FDR	Flood Damage Reduction	QMP	Quality Management Plan
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	QA	Quality Assurance
FRM	Flood Risk Management	QC	Quality Control
FSM	Feasibility Scoping Meeting	RED	Regional Economic Development
GRR	General Reevaluation Report	RMC	Risk Management Center
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