



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20314-1000

CECW-MVD

MAY 16 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mississippi Valley Division (ATTN: CEMVD-PD-SP)

SUBJECT: Request for Approval of a Model Peer Review Plan for the Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program

1. HQUSACE has reviewed the draft model peer review plan for the Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program. The model peer review plan is consistent with programmatic review plans developed and in use for the Continuing Authorities Program. The model Peer Review Plan is to be used for all projects within the program except those that include an Environmental Impact Statement or that meet the mandatory triggers for Type I IEPR as stated in EC 1165-2-209.
2. Questions or concerns should be directed to Mr. Joseph Redican, Deputy Chief, Mississippi Valley Division Regional Integration Team, at 202-761-4523.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Theodore A. Brown".

THEODORE A. BROWN, P.E.
Chief, Planning and Policy Division
Directorate of Civil Works

MODEL REVIEW PLAN
Using the MVD Model Review Plan
for the
Environmental Management Program (EMP)
and
Referencing the EMP Programmatic Riview Plan

Project Name and Location

Home District

MSC Approval Date: *(enter date of approval, or state “Pending” if not yet approved)*

Last Revision Date: *(enter date of last revision or “none” if no changes since last approved by MSC)*

NOTE: This MVD Model Review Plan may be used for projects consistent with *the criteria presented in Paragraph 1.b. of the plan and accompanying Checklist. If these criteria are not met, a project specific review plan must be prepared in accordance with EC 1165-2-209.* Required model review plan text is provided in normal black font and should not be changed. Areas in the RP where project specific information must be added is shown in *underlined blue italic font.* Supplemental information is shown in red text in a text box (like this note) and should be **deleted** in the final review plan. You may need to adjust page breaks, update page numbers in Table of Contents, and adjust header and footer information in your final RP.

DELETE THIS TEXT BOX BEFORE FINALIZING THE REVIEW PLAN.



**US Army Corps
of Engineers** ®

**Review Plan
Using the MVD Model Review Plan**

Project Name and Location

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Purpose and Requirements	1
2. Review Management Organization (RMO) Coordination	1
4. District Quality Control (DQC)	2
5. Agency Technical Review (ATR	2
6. Policy And Legal Compliance Review	2
7. Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) Review And Certification	2
9. Review Schedules And Costs	2
10. Public Participation.	2
11. Review Plan Approval And Updates.	2
Attachment 1: Team Rosters	4
Attachment 2: Review Plan Revisions	5
Revision Date	5
Description of Change	5
Page/Paragraph Number	5
Attachment 3: EMP Review Plan Checklist	6
Attachment 4: ATR Certification	11

REVIEW PLAN
Project Name and Location

1. Purpose and Requirements

a. Purpose

This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the <ENTER project name and location products. <INCLUDE the Products included for review, e.g. Project Factsheet; an environmental and cultural assessment; cost estimate; economic analysis; hydraulic and hydrologic analysis; geotechnical analysis; real estate plan; and drawings and specifications. This Review Plan can be used for decision documents and/or implementation documents.>

The Environmental Management Program (EMP) study and construction authority is contained in the EMP Programmatic Review Plan (EMP PRP), Section IV.

b. Applicability

This review plan is based on the MVD Model Review Plan, 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 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy.

The applicability regarding the EMP is contained in the EMP PRP, Section II.

c. References

Reference materials are shown in the EMP PRP.

2. Review Management Organization (RMO) Coordination

RMO coordination will be in accordance with the MP PRP, Sections I, III, VI, and VIII.

3. Project Information

a. Decision and/or Implementation document

<INCLUDE "and implementation document" if RP covers both>. The <ENTER project name and location> 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. <INCLUDE, if necessary - An implementation document (Plans and Specifications, or P&S), will also be prepared for implementation of the project and will undergo ATR review.>

b. Study/Project Description

<DESCRIBE the basic background information on the study/project to provide an overview for the PDT, RMO, review teams, and public. At a minimum, briefly describe the study area, the types of measures/alternatives to be considered in the study, the estimated cost (or range of cost) for a potentially recommended plan, and the non-Federal sponsor(s). Also identify the status of any existing or anticipated policy waiver requests (pursued per paragraph F-10.f.(4) of ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F, Amendment #2).>

REVIEW PLAN
Project Name and Location

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and level of Review

The factors affecting the scope and level of review are discussed in the EMP PRP, Section V.

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. *<DESCRIBE the expected in-kind products/analyses to be provided by the sponsor, or indicate that no in-kind products are anticipated.>*

4. District Quality Control (DQC)

District Quality Control (DQC) will be conducted in accordance with the EMP PRP, Section III.A.

5. Agency Technical Review (ATR)

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) will be conducted in accordance with the EMP PRP, Section III.B and VI.C.

6. Policy And Legal Compliance Review

The Policy and Legal Compliance Reviews will be conducted in accordance with the EMP PRP, Section III.D.

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

Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) Review and Certification will be conducted in accordance with the EMP PRP, Section VIII.D.

8. Model Certification And Approval

Approval of planning and engineering models used in EMP projects will be in accordance with the EMP PRP, Section III.E, and Section VII. *<LIST the specific planning an engineering models to be used, and briefly describe each model and how it will be applied ON THIS PROJECT.>*

9. Review Schedules And Costs

<IDENTIFY the estimated schedule for ATR and provide an estimated cost for the ATR effort. Coordination with MVD may be needed to complete this section. The ATR schedule and budget should include participation of the ATR Lead in the AFB milestone conference to address the ATR process and any significant and/or unresolved ATR concerns.>

10. Public Participation

Public review will be in accordance with the EMP PRP, Section VI.F

11. Review Plan Approval And Updates

The Review Plan approval process will be in accordance with the EMP PRP, Section VIII.B.

REVIEW PLAN
Project Name and Location

12. Review Plan Points Of Contact

NOTE: It is critical that the Review Plan is kept up to date and the latest version (complete with the team rosters) be provided to MVD. In particular, the schedule for ATR must be kept updated. The PDT should contact MVD about 8 weeks in advance of any scheduled peer review or model review effort to coordinate the effort.

DELETE THIS TEXT BOX BEFORE FINALIZING THE REVIEW PLAN.

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

- *Add title and phone number for the point of contact(s) at the home District*
- *Add title and phone number for the point of contact(s) at the home MSC*

REVIEW PLAN
Project Name and Location

Attachment 1: Team Rosters

NOTE: Attachment 1 should include rosters and contact information for the PDT, ATR team, and MVD. The credentials and years of experience for the ATR team should also be included when available.
DELETE THIS TEXT BOX BEFORE FINALIZING THE REVIEW PLAN.

REVIEW PLAN
Project Name and Location

Attachment 2: Review Plan Revisions

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page/Paragraph Number

NOTE: Revisions to the Review Plan since it was last approved by MVD should be documented. Significant changes (such as a change in the level or scope of review) require reapproval by MVD following the process used for initially approving the plan.
DELETE THIS TEXT BOX BEFORE FINALIZING THE REVIEW PLAN.

REVIEW PLAN
Project Name and Location

ATTACHMENT 3: EMP Review Plan Checklist

MVD EMP Review Plan Checklist

Date:	
Originating District:	
Project/Study Title:	
P2# and AMSCO#:	
District POC:	
PCX Reviewer:	

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 an EMP Project?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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?</p> <p>b. Does it include a table of contents?</p> <p>c. Is the purpose of the RP clearly stated?</p> <p>d. Does it reference the Project Management Plan (PMP) of which the RP is a component?</p> <p>e. Does it succinctly describe the levels of review: District Quality Control (DQC), and Agency Technical Review (ATR)?</p> <p>f. Does it include a paragraph stating the title, subject, and purpose of the decision document to be reviewed?</p> <p>g. Does it list the names and disciplines of the Project Delivery Team (PDT)?*</p> <p><i>*Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.</i></p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>e. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>f. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>g. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>

REVIEW PLAN
Project Name and Location

<p>2. Is the RP detailed enough to assess the necessary level and focus of the reviews?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>3. Does the RP define the appropriate level of review for the project/study?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a. Does it state that DQC will be managed by the home district in accordance with the MVD and district Quality Management Plans?</p> <p>b. Does it state that ATR will be managed by MVD?</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>4. Does the RP explain how ATR will be accomplished?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>a. Does it identify the anticipated number of reviewers?</p> <p>b. Does it provide a succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed for the review (not simply a list of disciplines)?</p> <p>c. Does it indicate that ATR team members will be from outside the home district?</p> <p>d. Does it indicate where the ATR team leader will be from?</p> <p>e. If the reviewers are listed by name, does the RP describe the qualifications and years of relevant experience of the ATR team members?*</p> <p><i>*Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.</i></p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>e. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>5. Does the RP address review of sponsor in-kind contributions?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>

REVIEW PLAN
Project Name and Location

6. Does the RP address how the review will be documented?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR comments using Dr Checks?</p> <p>Comments:</p>	a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
7. Does the RP address Policy Compliance and Legal Review?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
8. Does the RP present the tasks, timing and sequence (including deferrals), and costs of reviews?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. Does it provide a schedule for ATR including review of the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) materials and final report?</p> <p>b. Does it include cost estimates for the reviews?</p>	<p>a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>9. Does the RP indicate the study will address Safety Assurance factors? Factors to be considered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Where failure leads to significant threat to human life ● Novel methods\complexity\ precedent-setting models\policy changing conclusions ● Innovative materials or techniques ● Design lacks redundancy, resiliency of robustness ● Unique construction sequence or acquisition plans ● Reduced\overlapping design construction schedule 	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
10. Does the RP address opportunities for public participation?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
11. 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 <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
12. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

REVIEW PLAN
Project Name and Location

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 <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
2. Does the RP contain documentation of risk-informed decisions on which levels of review are appropriate?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
3. Does the RP present the tasks, timing, and sequence of the reviews (including deferrals)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. Does it provide an overall review schedule that shows timing and sequence of all reviews?</p> <p>b. Does the review plan establish a milestone schedule aligned with the critical features of the project design and construction?</p>	<p>a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
4. Does the RP address engineering model review requirements?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. Does it list the models and data anticipated to be used in developing recommendations?</p> <p>b. Does the RP identify any areas of risk and uncertainty associated with the use of the proposed models?</p> <p>c. Does it indicate the certification/approval status of those models and if review of any model(s) will be needed?</p> <p>d. If needed, does the RP propose the appropriate level of review for the model(s) and how it will be accomplished?</p>	<p>a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
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 <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
6. Does the RP address expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
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 <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

REVIEW PLAN
Project Name and Location

7. Does the RP explain how the reviews will be documented?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR comments using Dr Checks 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 <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
8. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

REVIEW PLAN
Project Name and Location

ATTACHMENT 4: STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION & IMPEMENTAITON DOCUMENTS

COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the *Project Fact-Sheet, Environmental Assessment, Preliminary Design Documents, and Cost Estimate* for *NAME OF PROJECT* 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 DrCheckssm.

ATR Team Lead (TBD)
ATR Team Leader
CEXXX

Date

NAME
Project Manager
CEXXX

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.

NAME
Chief, Engineering Division
CEXXX

Date

NAME
Chief, Planning Division
CEXXX

Date