DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
PACIFIC OCEAN DIVISION, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
FORT SHAFTER, HAWAII 96858-5440

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CEPOD-PDC

15 JUN 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDER ALASKA ENGINEER DISTRICT (CEPOA-PM-C/DAVID WILLIAMS), P.O. BOX 898, ELMENDORF AFB, AK 99506-0898

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for the Savoonga Small Boat Harbor, Savoonga, Alaska, Section 107 Decision Document

1. The enclosed Review Plan for the Savoonga Small Boat Harbor, Savoonga, Alaska, Section 107 Decision Document has been prepared in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, dated 31 January 2010. The Pacific Ocean Division is the lead office to execute this Review Plan, which does not include Type I Independent External Peer Review.

2. I approve this Review Plan. It is subject to change as circumstances require, consistent with project development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this Review Plan or its execution will require new written approval from this office.

3. The point of contact for this memorandum is Mr. Russell Iwamura, Senior Economist, Civil Works Integration Division, at 808-438-8859 or email Russell.K.Iwamura@usace.army.mil.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

EUGENE M. BAN, P.E.
Director of Programs

Encl
as

REVIEW PLAN
FOR CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM (CAP)
SECTION 107 PROJECTS

Savoonga Small Boat Harbor, Savoonga, Alaska
Section 107 Decision Document

Alaska District

MSC Approval Date: *15 June 2011*
Last Revision Date: None, Original Review Plan

US Army Corps
of Engineers ®

REVIEW PLAN
FOR CAP SECTION 107 PROJECTS

Savoonga Small Boat Harbor, Savoonga, Alaska
Section 107 Decision Document

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Savoonga Small Boat Harbor, Savoonga, Alaska, Section 107 project decision document.

Section 107 of River and Harbor Act of 1960, as amended, authorizes the Corps to study, adopt, construct and maintain navigation projects. This is a Continuing Authorities Program which focuses on water resource related projects of relatively smaller scope, cost and complexity. Unlike the traditional Corps' civil works projects that are of wider scope and complexity, the Continuing Authorities Program is 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. It should be noted that under the current Administration policy, Section 107 is an "unsupported" CAP Authority.

b. Applicability. The Pacific Ocean Division (POD) model review plan used as a template for this Review Plan is applicable to those Section 107 project decision documents that do not require an Independent External Peer Review (IEPR).

c. References

(1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
(2) Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, Continuing Authority Program Planning Process Improvements, 19 Jan 2011
(3) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 Mar 2011
(4) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
(5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007
(6) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007
(7) St. Lawrence Island Small Boat Harbor Study Savoonga, Alaska, Project Management Plan (PMP) and Detailed Study Scope, February 2011
(8) Alaska District Quality Management Plan CEPOA-QMP-001, January 2010

d. Requirements. This POD Model Review Plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum#1, which establishes an accountable, comprehensive, life-cycle review strategy for Civil Works Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) products by providing a seamless process for review of all Civil Works projects during the Feasibility Phase. 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, CAP decision documents are subject to cost engineering review and certification (per EC 1165-2-209) and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum#1.

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 this Section 107 decision document is POD. POD will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the Agency Technical Review (ATR).

Upon approval by the RMO 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 SBH-PSCX to keep the PCX apprised of requirements and review schedules.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

a. Decision Document. The Savoonga Small Boat Harbor, Savoonga, Alaska, Section 107 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 POD. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document.

b. Study/Project Description. This study is to identify the National Economic Development plan, and the Locally Preferred plan if needed, for navigation improvements at Savoonga, Alaska. The Native Village of Savoonga is the non-Federal sponsor.

Savoonga is a community on the north coast of St. Lawrence Island in the Bering Sea. Savoonga is located about 80 miles from Cape Chaplin, Russia, 160 miles from Nome, Alaska, and 680 miles from Anchorage, Alaska. Savoonga residents engage in commercial fishing for halibut, transfer goods and fuel to St. Lawrence Island using barges, and hunt marine mammals, fish, gather eggs and transport themselves around the island using small craft. There are no navigation improvements at Savoonga.

The small boats used for commercial halibut and subsistence fishing must launch and land several times per day, often in three to five-foot surf. Breaking waves of 6 to 10 feet height are common. Safe moorage areas are defined as having waves of no more than 1-foot height. These hazardous conditions cause damages to boats, motors, equipment and cargo, as well as endangering lives. There is no protected beach within three miles of the village. In stormy weather, boats cannot be launched. Because of shallow boulders scattered about the approach to the village barge landing area, barges carrying supplies to the island now must land three miles from the village or must lighter goods ashore. Fuel must be pumped ashore via a floating pipeline.

Alternatives to be considered will likely include a protected boat launch facility, a protected barge landing facility, and a protected small boat harbor with moorage space. Breakwaters to be considered include both connected and non-connected. Dredging and/or blasting of safe entrance and maneuvering channels will also be considered. If a local rock source is identified on St. Lawrence Island then it is likely that a project can be implemented within the $7,000,000 Federal funding limit.

A Tab E Continuing Authorities Fact Sheet from January 2003 identified a 225 foot-long breakwater built atop the Savoonga Point shoal as a potential recommended plan. The breakwater would hook to the east at its offshore end to provide a protected area on which to beach and launch boats (Figure 2). At that time the estimated construction cost of the breakwater was $2,930,000 which equates to $3,760,000 in 2011 based upon the Civil Works Construction Cost Index for breakwaters & seawalls. No annual maintenance dredging is anticipated to be part of this project and predicted repairs would be negligible.

As indicated below, the use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan to determine the appropriate scope and level of review for the study is warranted for this study.

The remote location and environmental conditions prevalent at Savoonga will complicate construction of a project there. Seasonal sea ice, high winds, rough seas, and the long sailing distance from any major port will make mobilization of any needed equipment and material a major effort.

Any project constructed in the marine or intertidal environment at Savoonga will have to accommodate the forces of the seasonal sea ice pack in the winter and large waves in the summer. While challenging, this is not a novel project. Harbor and port facilities have been constructed at Nome and Delong Mountain Terminal, both of which are subjected to seasonal sea ice, as well as at St. Paul Island which is subjected to large waves. At this time it is not known if suitably sized rock is available from local material sources on the island. If not, imported rock would be required. This would be a major additional cost and could make the project infeasible. The project design is not anticipated to require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness.

There are multiple sea bird colonies that utilize habitat in the vicinity of the village that will have to be considered. In addition there are listed species that include polar bears, whales, and seals. If blasting is required for construction, potential noise impacts to whales will require evaluation. Due to the annual scouring action of sea ice, the intertidal zone here is not as valuable of habitat as in other, ice-free environments. Frequent consultation with resource agencies, local sponsor, and community will be required throughout the study to ensure the location, scale, and actual construction of the project, are all acceptable.

Construction will have to be timed around potential constraints related to seasonal sea ice, subsistence practices, and species specific construction windows. Dredging could be difficult and drilling and blasting may be required.

There are potential archeological resources throughout the project vicinity. Archeological assessments will be required at any projects sites and material sources.

The information in the decision document is not anticipated to be based on novel methods, involve the use of innovative materials or techniques, present complex challenges for interpretation, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices. A new model, currently under development, to economically evaluate the benefits of subsistence harvests is planned to be utilized.

If a harbor is constructed, it will not involve a significant threat to human safety, rather, it would improve boater safety.

There is no request by the Governor of Alaska for a peer review by independent experts.

The challenges posed by this potential project are within the normal realm of those dealt with by the Alaska District, and hence, use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan to determine the appropriate scope and level of review for the study is warranted for this study.

c. **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. As an in-kind service, the Native Village of Savoonga will execute a contract to collect needed bathymetric and upland topographic surveys. They will also assist in identifying potential local material sources for armor rock and core material and participate in periodic meetings.

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)

All decision 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. Documentation of DQC activities is required and should be in accordance with the Quality Manual of the District and POD.

Review comments and evaluations from the DQC review will be available in Dr. Checks. An Adobe PDF document including the comments and evaluations will be available to the ATR team.

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

ATR is mandatory for all decision 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 USACE guidance, and that the document explains the analyses and results in a reasonably clear manner for the public and decision makers. The RMO for ATR for CAP projects may be the home MSC in lieu of a National Planning Center of Expertise (PCX). The ATR team lead will be from outside the home MSC unless the review plan justifies an exception and is explicitly approved by the MSC Commander.

a. **Products to Undergo ATR.** ATR will be performed throughout the study in accordance with the District and POD Quality Management Plans. The ATR shall be documented and discussed at the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) milestone. Certification of the ATR will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. Products to undergo ATR include draft and final Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment for the Section 107 Savoonga Small Boat Harbor Project.

b. Required ATR Team Expertise.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional preferably with experience in preparing Section 107 decision documents and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. The ATR Lead MUST be from outside POD unless the Review Plan justifies an exception and is explicitly approved by the MSC Commander.
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in development of small boat harbors.
Economics	In addition to typical USACE National Economic Development analyses, the economics reviewer should have some familiarity with subsistence benefits and methods to quantifiably valuate non-monetary project benefits.
Environmental Resources	The Environmental Resources reviewer should be familiar with marine/estuarine habitat, concerns related to developmental of coastal areas, in-water dredging impacts and appropriate mitigation measures. They should have a working knowledge of the National Environmental Policy Act and Endangered Species Act, in particular, concerns related to endangered marine mammals.
Cultural Resources	The Cultural Resources reviewer should be familiar with the rules and regulations to protect cultural resources as well as familiarity with mitigation measures to eliminate, reduce, and/or compensate any potential impacts to them.
Coastal Engineering	The Coastal Engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of coastal engineering and have a thorough understanding of coastal dynamics, wave and wind analysis, breakwater design, and small boat harbor design and operation in arctic environments.
Geotechnical/Structural Engineering	The Geotechnical/Structural Engineer should have specific experience in the design and construction of rubblemound breakwaters. This experience shall include optimization of breakwater design based upon geotechnical investigations.
Real Estate	The Real Estate reviewer should be familiar with a wide range of real estate matters, to include formulating initial assessments, real estate plans, acquisitions, outgrants, and working with the non-Federal sponsors in their acquisition of necessary Lands, Easements, Rights-of-Way, Relocations and Disposal areas (LERRDs).
Cost Engineering	The Cost Engineering reviewer (from Walla Walla District) should be familiar with conducting construction projects in remote regions such as Alaska.

c. Documentation of ATR. DrChecks review software will be used to document all ATR comments, responses and associated resolutions accomplished throughout the review

process. Comments should be limited to those that are required to ensure adequacy of the product. The four key parts of a quality review comment will normally include:

(1) The review concern – identify the product's information deficiency or incorrect application of policy, guidance, or procedures;
(2) The basis for the concern – cite the appropriate law, policy, guidance, or procedure that has not been 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, based on work reviewed to date, for the AFB, draft report, and final report. A sample Statement of Technical Review is included in Attachment 2.

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

IEPR may be required for decision 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 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.

- 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.

A Type I and Type II IEPR will not be required for this Section 107 decision document (Feasibility Phase) based on the following factors and criteria stated in EC 1165-2-209.

- The project is not anticipated to require an EIS.
- The life safety consequences and risks for this project will be no greater than those expected conditions experienced under the "Without Project Conditions". Therefore, based on existing historical records for this project failure of the project would not pose a significant threat to human life/safety.
- The project is not controversial.
- The project has no more than negligible adverse impacts on scarce or unique cultural or historic resources.
- The project has no significant adverse impacts on fish and wildlife species and their habitat.
- The project is not expected to have more than a negligible adverse impact on species listed as endangered or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or the critical habitat of such species designated under such Act.

- The project is for an activity for which there is ample experience within USACE and industry
- The Federal action is not justified by life safety.
- The project does not involve the use of innovative materials or techniques where the engineering is based on novel methods, does not present complex challenges for interpretations, does not contain precedent-setting methods or models, or does not present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices;
- The project design does not require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness
- The project does not have unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule.
- The risks associated with this project is the construction cost. Fluctuations in the construction cost index are factored into the determination of the project cost contingency. Other factors such as potential weather delays are also included.
- This study will contain no influential scientific information and will be conducted using standard and routine analyses typically associated with flood control projects.
- There has been no request by the Governor for a peer review by independent experts

7. 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 POD 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.

8. 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: https://kme.usace.army.mil/EC/cost/CostAtr/default.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.

9. VALUE ENGINEERING

All requirements of ER 11-1-321 Change 1, dated 01 Jan 2011, will be planned for and complied with early on in the design process.

10. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

The approval of planning models under EC 1105-2-412 is not required for CAP projects. The

POD Commander is responsible for assuring models for all planning activities are technically and theoretically sound, compliant with USACE policy, computationally accurate, and based on reasonable assumptions. Therefore, the use of a certified/approved planning model is highly recommended and should be used whenever appropriate. Planning models 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 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).

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).

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
Subsistence Economic Evaluation Model	This model, currently under development, will estimate the full monetary value of subsistence resources harvested in many Alaska Native communities.	Model under development

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
WAM	Wave Model (WAM): is a USACE preferred discrete spectral wave model solving the action (energy/radial frequency) balance equation for time and spatial variation of a 2-D wave spectrum from wind forcing.
STWAVE	STWAVE (STeady State spectral WAVE) is a USACE preferred, easy-to-apply, flexible, robust, half-plane model for nearshore wind-wave growth and propagation. STWAVE simulates depth-induced wave refraction and shoaling, current-induced refraction and shoaling, depth- and steepness-induced wave breaking, diffraction, parametric wave growth because of wind input, and wave-wave interaction and white capping that redistribute and dissipate energy in a growing wave field. STWAVE will be used to transport the waves generated from the hindcast onto shore.

11. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. **ATR Schedule and Cost.** The ATR reviews are anticipated to take from 4 – 6 weeks to complete and cost between $35,000 and $40,000. At this time, the ATR of the draft report and Environmental Assessment will occur during the spring of 2013. The review of the final Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment will not be determined until the ATR of the draft documents are completed

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

12. 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.

The public will have two opportunities to comment on the findings of the report. A public scoping meeting will be conducted in Savoonga to share the latest findings and proposed alternatives with the community. This will occur after additional geotechnical data collection, breakwater design optimization, and cost estimate development, currently estimated in July 2011. The second opportunity for public comment will be during the 30-day comment period for the Final Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment for the revised project. This will occur after the majority of the ATR comments have been resolved and after the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB), likely spring – summer 2013. The AFB occurs after alternative plans have been formulated and a recommended plan has been identified that will likely proceed into the design and implementation (DI) phase.

13. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The POD Director of Programs is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the POD 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 POD 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 POD following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in POD

determining that use of the POD Model Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-209 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1. The latest version of the review plan, along with POD's approval memorandum, will be posted on the home district's webpage.

14. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

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

- Project Formulator, Alaska District 907-753-2622
- Project Manager, Alaska District 907-753-5621
- Review Management Organization, Pacific Ocean Division, 808-438-8859

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS

Project Delivery Team

Name	Specialty	Affiliation
George Kalli	Plan Formulation	Alaska District
Guy McConnell	Environmental Resources	Alaska District
Lorraine Cordova	Economics	Alaska District
Dee Ginter	Hydraulics/Hydrology/Coastal Engineering	Alaska District
Kenneth McInally	Soils and Geology	Alaska District
Al Arruda	Cost Engineering	Alaska District
Carmen Osmond	Real Estate	Alaska District
Anne Burman	Office of Counsel	Alaska District
David Williams	Project Management	Alaska District
Don Tybus	Value Engineer	Alaska DIstrict

Agency Technical Review Team

Name	Specialty	Affiliation	Years Experience
Jon Brown	ATR Lead	Buffalo District	30
alternate Mike Greer	Jon Brown has 30 years experience and has been the Lead Economist in the Planning Branch of the Buffalo District since 1990. As a regional team member, he assists in the evaluation and formulation of regional studies in LRD and other MSC's. Mr. Brown served as U.S. technical work group leader for the recreational navigation component of International Joint Commission's St. Lawrence River-Lake Ontario Criterion study. Mr. Brown developed the recreational boating and tourism methodology portion for this is a five-year $20M bi-national plan of study. Other recent work include: developing the methodology and designing contingent valuation mail survey questionnaire for measuring economic impacts of proposed Valdez, AK small boat harbor expansion.		
Phil Berkeley	Planning	Buffalo District	30+
alternate Mike Greer	Philip E. Berkeley is a Biologist in the Planning Branch at the USACE, Buffalo District. He received a B.S. in Biology from Springfield College in Springfield, Massachusetts and M.S. in Biology from the State University of New York at Buffalo. He has over 30 years Federal government experience in Corps of Engineers Planning and Project Evaluation, for navigation, flood risk management and ecosystem restoration.		
Roger Haberly	Economics	Buffalo District	29
alternate Jon Brown	Have performed and been a team member on a number of Section 107 economic evaluations. Was a major team player in the following Section 107 evaluations: Cooley Canal Section 107-1995, Buffalo Inner Harbor, 2005. Was the team leader on the following section 107s; Rochester Harbor section 107-2003; Olcott Harbor Reevaluation-Section 107, 2006, Two Harbors, Minnesota, 2007. Currently involved in an Ogdensburg Harbor, New York section 107. Analyses have involved developing surveys for dock owners, and charter fishing operators to generate willingness to pay values and charter fishing operating budgets. Analyses have developed the full range of Associated Costs needed to make the project fully operational (from parking lots, to floating docks, gasoline docks, winter storage facilities, roadways, signage, etc.).		
Jay Miller	Environmental Resources	Buffalo District	11
alternate Bill Butler	Responsible for coordinating and conducting investigations, planning, and preparing environmental reports such as Environmental Impact Statements, Environmental Assessments, Coastal Zone Management (CZM) consistency determinations, Water Quality Certification applications, Section 404 Evaluations, and other associated National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents for District Operations and Maintenance (O&M), Continuing Authorities Program (CAP),		

	Construction General (CG), General Investigation (GI), and other projects. Coordinates District projects with Federal, state, and local government representatives and officials, as well as special interest groups and the general public. Assures environmental compliance of District projects by applying knowledge of applicable Federal, State and local environmental regulations and executive orders. Undertakes coordination, development and technical evaluation of biological assessments for required consultation under the Endangered Species Act.		
Mike Mohr	Coastal Engineering	RTS (A/E firm)	
alternate Shanon Chader	Mr. Mohr's expertise includes the hydraulic design and evaluation of all features of a Coastal Engineering project from inception to completion. Functional areas include commercial deep draft navigation harbors and channels (structure layout and design, channel sizing and evaluation), wave propagation, littoral transport, small boat harbors and complex beach (nourishment, offshore breakwaters, artificial headland breakwaters), and shoreline erosion control (nourishment, revetments, emergency shore protection) projects. Mr. Mohr has ATR'ed several POA studies		
Jon Kolber	Geotechnical/Structural Engineering	Buffalo District	30
alternate: Frank Lewandowski	Mr. Kolber possesses thirty years experience with experience in stability analysis, earthwork construction, subsurface explorations, foundation design, and berm raising design and construction. Has deployed on numerous emergency missions and has served on special teams addressing dam safety.		
Bill Butler	Cultural Resources	Buffalo District	31
	Environmental and cultural resources compliance manager. District Tribal Liaison. District Pest Management Program POC. Technical authority on environmental compliance with regulations and laws for planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance of water resource development projects and programs. Manage environmental and cultural resources program including preparation of environmental assessments, environmental impact statements, consultation for endangered species, and memoranda of agreement. Perform Independent Technical Review and quality control of environmental documents. Promote sound environmental stewardship. Prepare and review plans and assessments for maintenance of navigation including navigation structure repair and rehabilitation, and dredging and disposal activities. Develop and review mitigation plans. Review facility management actions for environmental compliance. Prepare decision documents.		
Jennifer Janik	Real Estate	Detroit District	8
	Employed as a Realty Specialist by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers since 2003. Serve as the Real Estate Specialist at the Buffalo District field office under the management the Detroit District. Manage a wide range of real estate matters, to include formulating initial assessments,		

	real estate plans, acquisitions, outgrants, and working with the non-Federal sponsors in their acquisition of necessary Lands, Easements, Rights-of-Way, Relocations and Disposal areas (LERRDs). Have negotiated and processed several right-of-entry agreements with public and private property owners for projects under the Formally Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP). Serve as a Project Delivery Team member for all Buffalo District projects. Serves as an Agency Technical Review Team member for the real estate discipline for numerous authorities.		
Anne Fore	Cost Engineering	Alaska District	See below
	Anne Fore has served as a Civil Engineer in three USACE Districts: Wilmington (1980-1994), Jacksonville (1994-2003), and Alaska (2003-present). She has over 30 years of experience in Civil Works and Military construction, design, contract administration, inspection, and cost engineering. Her experience includes four years in Coastal Engineering designing beach protection and erosion control projects, five years in Construction-Operations preparing dredging estimates, writing plans and specifications, administering contracts, and inspecting dredging operations, five years as a Senior Cost Engineer preparing estimates for a wide variety of dredging and other Civil Works and Military projects, fifteen years as a Cost Engineering Branch Chief, and three years as a Cost Engineering Subject Matter Expert (SME). Ms. Fore has a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering and a Master of Engineering in Coastal and Oceanographic Engineering from the University of Florida. She is a licensed professional engineer and a Tri-Service certified cost engineer, has participated in ATR reviews of cost estimates for several large Civil Works dredging projects, served on committees for revision of several Cost Engineering Regulations, and was chosen to participate in partnership meetings with the Dredging Contractors of America (DCA) to discuss cost estimating processes. In addition, Ms. Fore is an Instructor of the PROSPECT Course "Dredge Estimating" (1990-present), a founding member and former Co-Chair of the East Coast Dredge Team, and currently an active member of the West Coast Dredge Team.		

Vertical Team

Name	Specialty	Affiliation
David Williams	Project Management	Alaska District
George Kalli	Technical Lead	Alaska District
Bruce Sexauer	Chief, Project Formulation	Alaska District
Carl Borash	Chief, Civil Works	Alaska District
Tim Young	CAP Manager	Pacific Division
Russell Iwamura	Senior Economist	Pacific Division

ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECSION DOCUMENTS

COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the Section 107 Fact Sheet for Savoonga, Alaska. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project's Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-209 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1. During the ATR, compliance with established policy principles and procedures, utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses, alternatives evaluated, the appropriateness of data used and level obtained, and reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing US Army Corps of Engineers policy. The ATR also assessed the District Quality Control (DQC) documentation and made the determination that the DQC activities employed appear to be appropriate and effective. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved and the comments have been closed in DrChecks[sm].

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Jon Brown — Date
ATR Team Leader
Buffalo District

SIGNATURE _____ _____

David Williams — Date
Project Manager
Alaska District

SIGNATURE _____ _____

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

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Russell Iwamura — Date
Review Management Office Representative
Pacific Ocean Division

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

CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (CONT'D)

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 _____ _____

Dave Frenier
Chief, Engineering Division
Alaska District

Date

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Stephen Boardman
Chief, Civil Project Management Branch
Alaska District

Date

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Term	Definition	Term	Definition
AFB	Alternative Formulation Briefing	NED	National Economic Development
ASA(CW)	Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works	NER	National Ecosystem Restoration
ATR	Agency Technical Review	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
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
Home District/MSC	The District or MSC responsible for the preparation of the CAP decision document.	RMO	Review Management Organization
HQUSACE	Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	RTS	Regional Technical Specialist
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review	SAR	Safety Assurance Review
ITR	Independent Technical Review	USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
LRR	Limited Reevaluation Report	WRDA	Water Resources Development Act
MSC	Major Subordinate Command		