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

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

CEMVD-PD-SP

04 OCT 2016

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, St. Paul District

SUBJECT: MVD Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Section 206 Model Review Plan and MVD CAP Model Review Plan Checklist, Painter Creek - Review Plan Approval

1. References:

a. Memorandum, CEMVP-PM-B, 19 August 2016, subject: MVD Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Model Review Plan and MVD CAP Model Review Plan Checklist, Painter Creek-Section 206 (encl 1).

b. Memorandum, CEMVD-RB-T, 13 September 2016, subject: MVD Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Model Review Plan and MVD CAP Model Review Plan Checklist, Painter Creek-Section 206 (encl 2).

c. EC 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review Policy, 15 December 2012.

2. The enclosed Review Plan (RP) (encl 3) is a combined decision document and implementation document review plan. It includes the MVD Review Plan Checklist for the CAP and has been prepared in accordance with EC 1165-2-214. The RP has been coordinated with the Upper District Support Team and the Business Technical Division who concurred with the plan in reference 1.b.

3. I hereby approve this RP, which is subject to change as circumstances require, consistent with study development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this RP or its execution will require new written approval from this office. Non-substantive changes to this RP do not require further approval. The district should post the approved RP to its web site.

4. The MVD point of contact for this action is Mr. Ben Robinson, CEMVD-PD-SP, (601) 634-5310.

3 Encls

FOR MICHAEL C. WEHR
Major General, USA
Commanding

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ST. PAUL DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
180 FIFTH STREET EAST, SUITE 700
ST. PAUL MN 55101-1678

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

AUG 19 2016

CEMVP-PM-B

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Mississippi Valley Division (CEMVD-PD-SP/Mr. Mark Moore), P.O. Box 80, Vicksburg, MS 39181-0080

SUBJECT: MVD Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Model Review Plan and MVD CAP Model Review Plan Checklist, Painter Creek – Section 206

1. The Subject Model Review Plan and Model Review Plan Checklist for the Painter Creek Section 206 Feasibility Study is submitted for your review and approval. Electronic copies of the Subject Model Review Plan and Model Review Plan Checklist have been sent to Mr. Ben Robinson, CEMVD-PD-SP.

2. The St. Paul District point of contact is Robert K. Edstrom, Project Manager, (651) 290-5026, or e-mail: robert.k.edstrom@usace.army.mil.

SAMUEL L. CALKINS
COL, EN
Commanding

2 Encls
1. Review Plan
2. Review Plan Checklist

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

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

CEMVD-RB-T 13 Sep 2016

MEMORANDUM FOR CEMVD-PD-SP (Don Balch)

SUBJECT: MVD Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Model Review Plan and MVD CAP Model Review Plan Checklist, Painter Creek - Section 206

1. Reference memorandum, CEMVP-PM-B, 19 Aug 2016, subject as above.

2. RB-T has reviewed the subject Project under the Continuing Authorities Programs request and all of our comments have been satisfactorily addressed by the St. Paul District. This office concurs with the recommendation for approval.

3. RB-T POC is Scott Stewart, 601-634-5883.

MICHAEL A.TURNER
Chief, Business Technical
Division

REVIEW PLAN

Using the MVD Model Review Plan
for
Continuing Authorities Program
Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208, or 1135 Projects,
or Projects directed by Guidance
to use CAP processes

Painter Creek Ecosystem Restoration Project
Section *206* Project

St. Paul District

MSC Approval Date: *October 4, 2016*
Last Revision Date: *September 12, 2016*

US Army Corps
of Engineers ®

Review Plan
Using the MVD Model Review Plan

Painter Creek Ecosystem Restoration Project
Section *206* Project

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REVIEW PLAN
Painter Creek Ecosystem Restoration Project

1. Purpose and Requirements.

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the *Painter Creek Ecosystem Restoration Project*, Section *206 Project* products. *Products included for review consist of the following: Project Factsheet (Federal Interest Determination); Feasibility Report with Integrated Environmental Assessment (MSC Decision Milestone and Definitive Project Report (DPR)); cost estimate; economic analysis; hydraulic and hydrologic analysis; geotechnical analysis; real estate plan; plans and specifications (P&S); and Design Documentation Report (DDR).*

Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, Public Law 104-305, authorizes the Secretary of the Army to carry out a program of aquatic ecosystem restoration with the objective of restoring degraded ecosystem structure, function, and dynamic processes to a less degraded, more natural condition considering the ecosystem's natural integrity, productivity, stability and biological diversity. This authority is primarily used for manipulation of the hydrology in and along bodies of water, including wetlands and riparian areas. This authority also allows for dam removal. It is a Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) which focuses on water resource related projects of relatively smaller scope, cost and complexity. Traditional USACE civil works projects are of wider scope and complexity and are specifically authorized by Congress. The Continuing Authorities Program is a delegated authority to plan, design, and construct certain types of water resource and environmental restoration projects without specific Congressional authorization.

Additional Information on this program can be found in Engineering Regulation 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Amendment #2.

b. Applicability. This review plan is based on the MVD Model Review Plan for Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208, or 1135 Projects or Programs directed by guidance to follow CAP processes, which is applicable to projects that do not require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), as defined by the mandatory Type I IEPR triggers contained in EC 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review Policy.

c. References:

(1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review Policy, 15 December 2012.

(2) Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, CECW-P, dated 19 January 2011.

(3) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 March 2010.

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

(5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 January 2007.

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

(7) MVD Program Management Plan (PgMP) for the Continuing Authorities Program (CAP), June 2012.

(8) ER 1110-1-8159, Engineering and Design – DrChecks, 1 January 2015.

(9) ER 415-1-11 Engineering and Construction – Biddability, Constructability, Operability, Environmental and Sustainability (BCOES) Reviews, 1 January 2013.

(10) Project Management Plan (PMP), Painter Creek Ecosystem Restoration Project, CAP Section 206, February 27, 2007.

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 Section *206 Projects* is MVD. MVD will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the Agency Technical Review (ATR). The home District will post the approved review plan on its public website.

3. Project Information.

a. Decision *and Implementation* Document. The *Painter Creek Ecosystem Restoration Project* decision document will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F, Amendment #2. The approval level of the decision document (if policy compliant) is MVD. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document. *Plans and Specifications (P&S) and a Design Documentation Report (DDR) will also be prepared for implementation of the project and will undergo DQC and ATR review.*

b. Study/Project Description.

The Painter Creek basin is located in the western suburbs of the Minneapolis, MN metropolitan area in the headwaters of Minnehaha Creek. Minnehaha Creek begins at Lake Minnetonka and drains into the Mississippi River near Lock and Dam No. 1. Painter Creek was straightened, and many of the adjacent wetlands were drained for agricultural uses, in the early 1900s. The ecosystem restoration project is intended to preserve, enhance and restore the connective ecosystems corridors leading to Lake Minnetonka; preserve, protect, and restore the natural habitat, appearance, and function of riparian/shoreline/ wetland ecosystems throughout the basin; improve the chemical and physical quality of surface water in the creek and subsequently in Jennings Bay (Lake Minnetonka). Measures identified to achieve these objectives include construction of a series of weirs within the wetlands to restore the natural hydro-period and scrapes of wetland soils to restore native plant communities.

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and level of Review.

An ATR review was previously completed in 2009 which addressed each of the technical components of the project. Comments were provided, responses were issued and a significant number of changes were made to the report. Certification of the ATR is attached. Following ATR, an MSC Decision Milestone was conducted with MVD with an additional iteration of comments, responses and amendments. The Feasibility Report has since been updated and will be submitted to MVD for final review upon approval of the Review Plan.

Through the ATR, MSC Decision Milestone and Public Review process, it has been determined that:
- *The project is not likely to have significant economic, environmental, and/or social effects to the Nation;*
- *The project does not likely involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance;*
- *The project/study is not likely to have significant interagency interest;*
- *The project/study will not be highly controversial;*
- *The project report is not likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment;*
- *The information in the decision document or proposed project design will not likely 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;*

CAP Section 206 projects are excluded from Type I IEPR. Type II IEPRs may not be required for CAP Section 206 projects as there is usually no potential hazards that pose a significant threat to human life associated with the implementation of these types of projects, however the PDT will evaluate and conclude the decision on whether or not to conduct Type II IEPR during the Implementation Phase.

d. In-Kind Contributions. Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to District Quality Control (DQC) and ATR, similar to any products developed by USACE.

No in-kind service products have been submitted by the non-Federal sponsor for this project.

4. District Quality Control (DQC).

All decision *and implementation* documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC prior to ATR. 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 in accordance with MVD and district Quality Management Plan. Any discrepancies between a reviewer and a Project Delivery Team (PDT) member will be resolved face-to-face. If a concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the DQC team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the section supervisor for further resolution. *All work products including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc., shall undergo District Quality Control (DQC).*

a. Feasibility Phase. *At a minimum Federal Interest Determination, the MSC Decision Milestone, and the feasibility study DPR will undergo a District Quality Control Review (DQCR). The DQCR will be conducted prior to ATR. Technical supervisors will assure that experienced personnel, who have been involved with similar work, check team members' technical work for completeness, accuracy and clarity. The DQC of the feasibility portion of the project will be documented by a completed (signed) memorandum for record of technical review.*

b. Plans and Specifications Phase. *DQC in the Plans and Specifications Phase will consist of at least one technical check; a DQCR; a Plans and Specifications (P&S) review, Design Documentation Report (DDR) review, and a Biddability, Constructability, Operability, Environmental and Sustainability (BCOES) review. DQCR will be conducted at the 95 percent design level prior to ATR. Review comments and resolutions will be entered into DrChecks, in accordance with ER 1110-1-8159. The review will be documented by a completed (signed) Statement of Technical Review and Certification, to which all review comments and resolutions will be attached.*

BCOES occurs in the plans and specifications phase of the project. In accordance with ER 415-1-11, the Project Engineer will conduct a BCOES review at the final design level, after all ATR comments have been resolved and incorporated. The review documents will include a complete drawing set, complete specifications (with special clauses), and Engineering Considerations. The review will commence at least 30 days prior to advertisement. Review comments and resolutions will be entered into DrChecks. The BCOES review will be documented by a completed (signed) BCOES certification, to which all review comments and resolutions will be attached.

5. Agency Technical Review (ATR).

One ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.), however additional ATRs may be performed if deemed warranted. ATR shall be documented and discussed at the MSC Decision Milestone. Certification of the ATR will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. ATR is managed within USACE by the designated RMO and is conducted by a qualified team from outside the home district that is not involved in the day-to-day production of the project/product. ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel. The ATR team lead will be from outside the home MSC.

a. Products to Undergo ATR. ATR will be performed throughout the project in accordance with the District and MVD Quality Management Plans. Products to undergo ATR include *Project Factsheet (Federal Interest Determination); Feasibility Report with Integrated Environmental Assessment (MSC Decision Milestone and DPR); cost estimate; economic analysis; hydraulic and hydrologic analysis; geotechnical analysis; real estate plan; plans and specifications (P&S); Design Documentation Report (DDR).*

b. Required ATR Team Expertise. *Expertise in Plan Formulation, Environmental compliance, Hydraulics and Hydrology, Geotechnical Engineering, Civil Engineering and Cost Estimating will be represented on the ATR Team. The ATR Team Leader role can be assigned to any of the ATR team members. An ATR Team member may serve more than one role if the scope of the study and the level of effort warrant. The ATR Team Leader will follow the requirements as outlined in the "ATR Lead Checklist" developed by the National Planning Centers of Expertise.*

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	***Expertise Required***
ATR Lead	*The ATR lead should be a senior professional preferably with experience in preparing Section 206 projects 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). The ATR Lead MUST be from outside the Mississippi Valley Division.*
Planning	*The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in Section 206 Project development and review. The Planning reviewer will participate in the feasibility ATR.*
Environmental/Cultural Resources	*The Environmental reviewer should be a senior biologist with experience in Section 206 Project development and review. The Environmental reviewer will participate in the feasibility ATR.*
Hydrology/Hydraulic Engineering	*The Hydrology/Hydraulics reviewer should be a senior engineer with experience in Section 206 Project development, review, and familiar with HEC-RAS modeling. The Hydrology/Hydraulics reviewer will participate in the feasibility ATR and the Implementation ATR.*
Geotechnical Engineering	*The Geotechnical reviewer should be a senior geotechnical engineer with experience in Section 206 Project development and review. The Geotechnical reviewer will participate in the feasibility ATR and the Implementation ATR.*

Civil Engineering	*The Civil Engineering reviewer should be a senior engineer with experience in Section 206 Project development and review. The Civil Engineering reviewer will participate in the feasibility ATR and the Implementation ATR.*
Cost Engineering	*The Cost DX Staff or Cost DX Pre-Certified Professional should be a senior cost engineer with experience in Section 206 Project development and review. The Cost DX Staff or Cost DX Pre-Certified Professional will participate in the feasibility ATR.*
Real Estate	*The Real Estate reviewer should be a senior real estate professional with experience in Section 206 Project development and review. The Real Estate reviewer will participate in the feasibility and implementation ATR.*

c. Documentation of ATR. DrChecks review software will be used to document all ATR comments, responses and associated resolutions accomplished throughout the review process. Comments should be limited to those that are required to ensure adequacy of the product. Any editorial comments should be provided informally by email to the PDT.

6. Policy And Legal Compliance Review.

All decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. These reviews culminate in determinations that the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy, and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority by the MVD 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.

7. Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) Review And Certification.

For CAP projects, ATR of the costs may be conducted by pre-certified district cost personnel within the region or by the Walla Walla Cost DX. The pre-certified list of cost personnel has been established and is maintained by the Cost DX at http://www.nww.usace.army.mil/missions/costengineering.aspx.
The cost ATR member will coordinate with the Cost DX for execution of cost ATR and cost certification. The Cost DX will be responsible for final cost certification and may be delegated at the discretion of the Cost DX.

8. Model Certification And Approval.

Approval of planning models under EC 1105-2-412 is not required for CAP projects. MSC commanders remain responsible for assuring the quality of the analyses used in these projects. ATR will be used to ensure that models and analyses are compliant with Corps policy, theoretically sound, computationally accurate, transparent, described to address any limitations of the model or its use, and documented in study reports.

EC 1105-2-412 does not cover engineering models used in planning. The responsible use of well-known and proven USACE developed and commercial engineering software will continue and the professional practice of documenting the application of the software and modeling results will be followed. As part of the USACE Scientific and Engineering Technology (SET) Initiative, many engineering models have been identified as preferred or acceptable for use on Corps studies and these models should be used whenever

appropriate. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

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

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

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Certification / Approval Status
Wetland Evaluation Method (WEM)	The Wetland Evaluation Method (WEM) utilizes analysis of existing and future with-project wetland conditions to project a Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) for each wetland within the project area to quantify benefits in Average Annual Habitat Units (AAHU).	Certified

b. **Engineering Models.** The following engineering models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document:

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study
XP-SWMM (1D-2D)	1-dimensional hydrologic and hydraulic modeling was completed for the existing conditions a 2-dimensional model was used to visualize the spatial changes of the wetland water depths from raising the weirs, creating channel meanders and using scrapes. The modeling was used to predict the normal and maximum water levels along the creek and in the wetlands for optimization as well as real estate acquisition purposes.

9. Review Schedules And Costs.

ATR Schedule and Cost.

a. ***Feasibility*** *- ATR and MSC Decision Milestone for this project have been completed. If significant changes to the document are made, a second ATR may be conducted or the original ATR lead may be notified of the changes for concurrence.*

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

c. ***Implementation Documents, P&S and DDR*** *- ATR review should consist of geotechnical review (4 hours), hydraulics and hydrology review (20 hours), civil engineering review (20 hours), and ATR team lead (20 hours). The total cost of this review should not exceed $16,000. It is anticipated that this review should not exceed 4 weeks.*

ATR Estimated Schedule (Implementation Documents, P&S and DDR)
TBD - Submit review material to ATR team for review, ATR Team submits comments
TBD - PDT begins evaluation of comments
TBD - ATR team begins back check and comment close out

TBD – ATR sign-off complete

10. 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. *The Public Participation period was completed early in August of 2010. State and Federal resource agencies were 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 were contacted for coordination as required by applicable laws and procedures. Due to the length of time since the public participation period was conducted, if a change warrants additional public review, then a 30-day public review period will be conducted.*

11. Review Plan Approval And Updates.

The *MVD Commander* is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the MVD Model 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 MVD approval are documented in Attachment 2. Significant changes to the review plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) should be reapproved by MVD following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in MVD determining that use of the MVD Model Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-214. The latest version of the review plan, along with the MVD approval memorandum, will be posted on the home district's webpage.

12. Review Plan Points Of Contact.

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

- *Katie Opsahl, St. Paul District (MVP), Plan Formulation; (651) 290-5259*
- *Bob Edstrom, St. Paul District (MVP), Project Management; (651) 290-5026*
- *Nathan Wallerstedt, St. Paul District (MVP), CAP Program Manager; (651) 290-5477*
- *Ben Robinson, Mississippi Valley Division (MVD), District Support Team; (601) 634-5310*
- *Sarah Palmer, Mississippi Valley Division (MVD), CAP Program Manager; (601) 634-5910*

Attachment 1: Team Rosters

Discipline/Title	Name	Phone	Email
Project Development Team			
Project Manager	Robert Edstrom	651-290-5026	Robert.k.edstrom@usace.army.mil
CAP Manager	Nathan Wallerstedt	651-290-5477	Nathan.h.wallerstedt@usace.army.mil
Hydraulics & Hydrology	Mike Lesher	651-290-5972	Mike.d.lesher@usace.army.mil
Plan Formulation	Katie Opsahl	651-290-5259	Katie.m.opsahl@usace.army.mil
Geotechnical	Jason Foss	651-290-5192	Jason.foss@usace.army.mil
Cost/Spec/EC-D Lead	Jim Sentz	651-290-5639	James.r.ulrick@usace.army.mil
Civil/Layout/Specs	Paul Morken	651-290-5243	Paul.j.morken@usace.army.mil
Environmental	Steve Clark	651-290-5278	Steven.j.clark@usace.army.mil
Economics	Diane Karnish	309-794-5006	Diane.e.karnish@usace.army.mil
Cultural Resources	Brad Perkl	651-290-5370	Bradley.e.perkl@usace.army.mil
Construction	Tom Johnson	651-290-5862	Thomas.r.johnson@usace.army.mil
Real Estate	Stephanie Dupey	651-290-5369	Stephanie.t.dupey@usace.army.mil
GIS	Keith LeClaire	561-290-5266	Jack.f.westman@usace.army.mil
Contracting	Kevin Henricks	651-290-5414	Kevin.p.henricks@usace.army.mil
Small Business	Gwendolyn Davis	651-290-5723	Gwendolyn.k.davis@usace.army.mil
Public Affairs	Shannon Bauer	651-290-5108	Shannon.l.bauer@usace.army.mil
Local Sponsor Contacts			
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	James Wisker	952-641-4509	jwisker@minnehahacreek.org
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	Tiffany Schaufler	952-641-4513	tschaufler@minnehahacreek.org
District Quality Control Review Team			
Plan Formulation			
Hydraulics & Hydrology			
Geotechnical			
Cost/Spec/EC-D Lead			
Civil/Layout/Specs			
Environmental			
Economics			
Cultural Resources			
Construction			
Real Estate			
Agency Technical Review			
Lead			
Plan Formulation			
Environmental			
Hydrology/Hydraulics			
Geotechnical Engineering			
Civil Engineering			
Cost Estimation			
Real Estate			

ATTACHMENT 2: STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION & IMPLEMENTATION DOCUMENTS

Completion of Agency Technical Review

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the *Project Factsheet (Federal Interest Determination); Feasibility Report with Integrated Environmental Assessment including MSC Decision Milestone and feasibility DPR; cost estimate; economic analysis; hydraulic and hydrologic analysis; geotechnical analysis; real estate plan; and a DDR* for *Colfax Wastewater treatment Lagoons, Village of Colfax, Wisconsin*. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project's Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-214. During the ATR, compliance with established policy principles and procedures utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses, alternatives evaluated, the appropriateness of data used and level obtained, and reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing US Army Corps of Engineers policy. The ATR also assessed the District Quality Control (DQC) documentation and made the determination that the DQC activities employed appear to be appropriate and effective. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved and the comments have been closed in DrChecks[sm].

_____ _____

ATR Team Leader (TBD) Date
ATR Team Leader
CEXXX

_____ _____

Nathan Campbell Date
Project Manager
CEMVP

_____ _____

Name Date
Architect Engineer Project Manager[1]
Company, location

_____ _____

Fay Lachney Date
Review Management Office Representative
CEMVD-PD-L

Certification of Agency Technical Review

Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows: *TBD*

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

_____ _____

Michael J. Bart P.E. Date
Chief, Engineering & Construction Division
CEMVP

_____ _____

Thomas L. Crump P.E. Date
Chief, RPED

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

Attachment 3: Review Plan Revisions

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page/Paragraph Number

MVD CAP Review Plan Checklist

Date:	
Originating District:	MVP – St. Paul District
Project/Study Title:	Painter Creek Ecosystem Restoration Project
P2# and AMSCO#:	
District POC:	Bob Edstrom
MSC Reviewer:	Ben Robinson
CAP Authority:	206

Other Program Directed to follow CAP Processes: n/a

Please fill out this checklist and submit with the draft Review Plan when coordinating with the MSC. Any evaluation boxes checked "No" may indicate the project may not be able to use the MVD Model Review Plan. Further explanation may be needed or a project specific review plan may be required. Additional coordination and issue resolution may be required prior to MSC approval of the Review Plan. Checklist may be limited to Section I or Section II or Both, depending on content of review plan (or subsequent amendments).

Section I - Decision Documents

REQUIREMENT	EVALUATION
1. Is the Review Plan (RP) for a Continuing Authorities Project?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Or Other Program Directed to follow CAP Processes?	Yes ☐ No ☒
a. Does it include a cover page identifying it as following the Model RP and listing the project/study title, originating district or office, and date of the plan?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does it include a table of contents?	b. Yes ☒ No ☐
c. Is the purpose of the RP clearly stated?	c. Yes ☒ No ☐
d. Does it reference the Project Management Plan (PMP) of which the RP is a component?	d. Yes ☒ No ☐
e. Does it succinctly describe the levels of review: District Quality Control (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), and Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) if applicable for Sec 103 or Sec 205?	e. Yes ☒ No ☐
f. Does it include a paragraph stating the title, subject, and purpose of the decision document to be reviewed?	f. Yes ☒ No ☐
g. Does it list the names and disciplines of the Project Delivery Team (PDT)?*	g. Yes ☒ No ☐
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.* **Comments:	

2. Is the RP detailed enough to assess the necessary level and focus of the reviews?	Yes ☒ No ☐
3. Does the RP define the appropriate level of review for the project/study?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it state that DQC will be managed by the home district in accordance with the MVD and district Quality Management Plans? b. Does it state that ATR will be managed by MVD? c. Does it state whether IEPR will be performed? For Sec 103 and Sec 205, see additional questions in 5. below. **Comments:** *CAP Section 206 projects are excluded from Type I IEPR. Type II IEPRs may not be required for CAP Section 206 projects as there is usually no potential hazards that pose a significant threat to human life associated with the implementation of these types of projects, however the PDT will evaluate and conclude the decision on whether or not to conduct Type II IEPR during the Implementation Phase.*	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☒ No ☐ c. Yes ☒ No ☐
4. Does the RP explain how ATR will be accomplished?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it identify the anticipated number of reviewers? b. Does it provide a succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed for the review (not simply a list of disciplines)? c. Does it indicate that ATR team members will be from outside the home district? d. Does it indicate where the ATR team leader will be from? e. If the reviewers are listed by name, does the RP describe the qualifications and years of relevant experience of the ATR team members?* **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.* **Comments:** *The RP describes the needed qualifications and expertise of the ATR reviewers however reviewers have not been listed by name. Once the RMO assigns ATR reviewers to the project MVP will update the RP to include ATR names.*	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☒ No ☐ c. Yes ☒ No ☐ d. Yes ☐ No ☒ e. Yes ☐ No ☒
5. For Sec 103 and Sec 205 projects, does the RP explain how IEPR will be accomplished?	Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒
a. Is an exclusion being requested, requiring CG approval? b. Does it provide a defensible rationale for the decision on IEPR? c. If IEPR is required, does it state that IEPR will be managed by an Outside Eligible Organization, external to the Corps of Engineers?	a. Yes ☐ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐ c. Yes ☐ No ☐

d. If IEPR is required, does the RP indicate which PCX will manage the IEPR and whether any coordination with the PCX has occurred? **Comments:**	d. Yes ☐ No ☐
6. Does the RP address review of sponsor in-kind contributions?	Yes ☒ No ☐
7. Does the RP address how the review will be documented?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR and IEPR comments using Dr Checks?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does the RP explain how the IEPR will be documented in a Review Report?	b. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒
c. Does the RP document how written responses to the IEPR Review Report will be prepared?	c. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒
c. Does the RP detail how the district 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? **Comments:** *CAP Section 206 projects are excluded from Type I IEPR. Type II IEPRs may not be required for CAP Section 206 projects as there is usually no potential hazards that pose a significant threat to human life associated with the implementation of these types of projects, however the PDT will evaluate and conclude the decision on whether or not to conduct Type II IEPR during the Implementation Phase.*	d. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒
8. Does the RP address Policy Compliance and Legal Review?	Yes ☒ No ☐
9. Does the RP present the tasks, timing and sequence (including deferrals), and costs of reviews?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it provide a schedule for ATR including review of the MSC Decision Milestone materials and final report?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does it present the timing and sequencing for IEPR?	b. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒
c. Does it include cost estimates for the reviews?	c. Yes ☒ No ☐
10. Does the RP indicate the study will address Safety Assurance factors? Factors to be considered include: • 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	Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒ **Comments:**

11. Does the RP address opportunities for public participation?	Yes ☒ No ☐
12. Does the RP indicate ATR of cost estimates will be conducted by pre-certified district cost personnel who will coordinate with the Walla Walla Cost DX?	Yes ☒ No ☐
13. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?	Yes ☒ No ☐

Section II - Implementation Documents

Please fill out this checklist and submit with the draft Review Plan or subsequent Review Plan amendments when coordinating with the MSC. For DQC, the District is the RMO; for ATR and Type II IEPR, MVD is the RMO. Any evaluation boxes checked "No" indicate the RP possibly may not comply with MVD Model Review Plan and should be explained. Additional coordination and issue resolution may be required prior to MVD approval of the Review Plan.

REQUIREMENT	EVALUATION
1. Are the implementation documents/products described in the review or subsequent amendments?	Yes ☒ No ☐
2. Does the RP contain documentation of risk-informed decisions on which levels of review are appropriate?	Yes ☒ No ☐
3. Does the RP present the tasks, timing, and sequence of the reviews (including deferrals)?	Yes ☐ No ☒
a. Does it provide an overall review schedule that shows timing and sequence of all reviews? b. Does the review plan establish a milestone schedule aligned with the critical features of the project design and construction? **Comments:** *Details for the reviews during the Implementation phase of the project will be developed and incorporated into a revised Review Plan at a later date.*	a. Yes ☐ No ☒ b. Yes ☐ No ☒
4. Does the RP address engineering model review requirements?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it list the models and data anticipated to be used in developing recommendations? b. Does the RP identify any areas of risk and uncertainty associated with the use of the proposed models? c. Does it indicate the certification/approval status of those models and if review of any model(s) will be needed? d. If needed, does the RP propose the appropriate level of review for the model(s) and how it will be accomplished? **Comments:**	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☒ No ☐ c. Yes ☒ No ☐ d. Yes ☒ No ☐
5. Does the RP explain how and when there will be opportunities for the public to comment on the study or project to be reviewed?	Yes ☒ No ☐
6. Does the RP address expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor? If expected in-kind contributions are to be provided by the sponsor, does the RP list the expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor?	Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments: *No in-kind contributions are expected from the sponsor*	
7. Does the RP explain how the reviews will be documented?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR comments using Dr Checks and Type II IEPR published comments and responses pertaining to the design and construction activities summarized in a report reviewed and approved by the MSC and posted on the home district website?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does the RP explain how the Type II IEPR will be documented in a Review Report?	b. Yes ☐ No ☒
c. Does the RP document how written responses to the Type II IEPR Review Report will be prepared?	c. Yes ☐ No ☒
d. Does the RP detail how the district/MVD will disseminate the final Type II IEPR Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the Type II IEPR on the internet? **Comments:** *CAP Section 206 projects are excluded from Type I IEPR. Type II IEPRs may not be required for CAP Section 206 projects as there is usually no potential hazards that pose a significant threat to human life associated with the implementation of these types of projects, however the PDT will evaluate and conclude the decision on whether or not to conduct Type II IEPR during the Implementation Phase.*	d. Yes ☐ No ☒
8. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?	Yes ☒ No ☐