

REVIEW PLAN

Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt: Fort Dodge, IA
Webster County, IA
Engineering Documentation Report

Rock Island District

12 January 2010



US Army Corps
of Engineers ®

REVIEW PLAN

***Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt: Fort Dodge, Webster County, IA
Engineering Documentation Report***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS 1

2. STUDY INFORMATION..... 2

3. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) 5

4. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)..... 6

5. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL..... 7

6. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS 7

7. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION 8

8. PCX COORDINATION 8

9. MSC APPROVAL 8

10. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT 9

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS 10

ATTACHMENT 2: ATR CERTIFICATION TEMPLATE 11

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. **Purpose.** This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt: Fort Dodge, IA, Engineering Documentation Report.

b. References

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1105-2-410, Review of Decision Documents, 22 Aug 2008
- (2) EC 1105-2-407, Planning Models Improvement Program: Model Certification, 31 May 2005
- (3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-2-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
- (4) Des Moines River Recreational Greenbelt: Fort Dodge, IA PMP, March 2004
- (5) Rock Island District Quality Management Plan

c. **Requirements.** This review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1105-2-410, which establishes the procedures for ensuring the quality and credibility of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) decision documents through independent review. The EC outlines three levels of review: District Quality Control, Agency Technical Review, and Independent External Peer Review. In addition to these three levels of review, decision documents are subject to policy and legal compliance review and, if applicable, safety assurance review and model certification/approval.

- (1) District Quality Control (DQC). DQC is the review of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the Project Management Plan (PMP). It is managed in the home district and may be conducted by staff in the home district as long as they are not doing the work involved in the study, including contracted work that is being reviewed. Basic quality control tools include a Quality Management Plan providing for seamless review, quality checks and reviews, supervisory reviews, Project Delivery Team (PDT) reviews, etc. Additionally, the PDT is responsible for a complete reading of the report to assure the overall integrity of the report, technical appendices and the recommendations before approval by the District Commander. The Major Subordinate Command (MSC)/District quality management plans address the conduct and documentation of this fundamental level of review; DQC is not addressed further in this review plan.
- (2) Agency Technical Review (ATR). ATR is an in-depth review, managed within USACE, and conducted by a qualified team outside of the home district that is not involved in the day-to-day production of the project/product. The purpose of this review is to ensure the proper application of clearly established criteria, regulations, laws, codes, principles and professional practices. The ATR team reviews the various work products and assure that all the parts fit together in a coherent whole. ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel (Regional Technical Specialists (RTS), etc.), and may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate. To assure independence, the leader of the ATR team shall be from outside the home MSC.
- (3) Independent External Peer Review (IEPR). 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. IEPR is generally for feasibility and reevaluation studies and modification reports with Environmental Impact Statements (EISs). IEPR is managed by an outside eligible organization (OEO) that is described in Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c) (3), is exempt from Federal tax under section 501(a), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; is independent; is free from conflicts of interest; does not carry out or advocate for or against Federal water

resources projects; and has experience in establishing and administering IEPR panels. The scope of review will address all the underlying planning, engineering, including safety assurance, economics, and environmental analyses performed, not just one aspect of the project.

- (4) Policy and Legal Compliance Review. Decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. These reviews culminate in Washington-level determinations that the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy, and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority by the Chief of Engineers. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed further in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook. When policy and/or legal concerns arise during DQC or ATR that are not readily and mutually resolved by the PDT and the reviewers, the District will seek issue resolution support from the MSC and HQUSACE in accordance with the procedures outlined in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. IEPR teams are not expected to be knowledgeable of Army and administration policies, nor are they expected to address such concerns. The home district Office of Counsel is responsible for the legal review of each decision document and signing a certification of legal sufficiency.
- (5) Safety Assurance Review (SAR). In accordance with Section 2035 of Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007, EC 1105-2-410 requires that all projects addressing flooding or storm damage reduction undergo a safety assurance review of the design and construction activities prior to initiation of physical construction and periodically thereafter until construction activities are completed on a regular schedule sufficient to inform the Chief of Engineers on the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities for the purpose of assuring public health, safety, and welfare. A future circular will provide a more comprehensive Civil Works Review Policy that will address the review process for the entire life cycle of a Civil Works project. That document will address the requirements for a safety assurance review for the Pre-Construction Engineering Phase, the Construction Phase, and the Operations Phase. The decision document phase is the initial design phase; therefore, ER 1105-2-410 requires that safety assurance factors be considered in all reviews for decision document phase studies. This project will not require a SAR as it does not include FDR or CSDR.
- (6) Model Certification/Approval. EC 1105-2-407 requires certification (for Corps models) or approval (for non-Corps models) of planning models used for all planning activities. The EC defines planning models 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 EC does not cover engineering models used in planning. Engineering software is being addressed under the Engineering and Construction (E&C) Science and Engineering Technology (SET) initiative. Until an appropriate process that documents the quality of commonly used engineering software is developed through the SET initiative, engineering activities in support of planning studies shall proceed as in the past. 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.

2. STUDY INFORMATION

a. Decision Document. Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt: Fort Dodge, IA, Engineering Documentation Report (EDR). The EDR is a detailed, site-specific document describing the project including a cost estimate, engineering considerations, economic analysis, environmental documentation and coordination, items of local cooperation and Federal/non-Federal cost allocation. The approval level for this decision document is HQUSACE. The project has been authorized by Public Law 99-88 as approved on August 15, 1985, the 1985 Supplemental Appropriations Act. Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), an Environmental Assessment (EA) is being prepared concurrently with the EDR.

b. Study Description.

The Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt, hereafter referred to as “Greenbelt,” was funded and authorized by Public Law 99-88 as approved on August 15, 1985, the 1985 Supplemental Appropriations Act, which reads:

“The Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers is authorized and directed to proceed with planning, design, engineering, and construction of the following projects substantially in accordance with the individual report describing such project as reflected in the Joint Explanatory Statement in the Committee of Conference accompanying the Conference Report for H.R. 2577: ... Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt ...”

The Conference Report on H.R. 2577, dated July 29, 1985, provides a description of the Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt:

“Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt, IA. – The project will provide central Iowa and the City of Des Moines with environmental protection of scarce river bottom timberlands and greatly enhance opportunities for recreation. The project is for the development, operation and maintenance of a recreation and greenbelt area on, and along the Des Moines River, Iowa, between the point at which the Des Moines River is intersected by United States Highway 20 to the point downstream at which relocated United States Highway 92 intersects the Des Moines River. The project shall include, but not be limited to: (1) the construction, operation and maintenance of recreational facilities and streambank stabilization structures; (2) the operation and maintenance of all structures constructed before the date of authorization of this project (other than any such structure operated and maintained by any person under a permit or agreement with the Secretary) within the area described in the Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt Map and on file with the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives; (3) such tree plantings, trails, vegetation, and wildlife protection and development and other activities as will enhance the natural environment for recreational purposes; and (4) the prohibition or limitation by the Secretary of the killing, wounding, or capturing at any time of any wild bird or animal in such areas as may be directed by the Secretary.”

A cost-sharing Design Agreement (DA) (75% Federal and 25% non-Federal) was executed in April of 2004 for preparation of this EDR, including completing any required Environmental Assessments (EA), and for the preparation of any plans and specifications (P&S) prior to the execution of the Project Partnership Agreement (PPA). This EDR establishes the designs and cost estimates for the recommended project and establishes a schedule for project implementation.

The (EDR) and Environmental Assessment (EA), prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Rock Island District, recommends the construction of the Fort Dodge Riverfront and Trail Project (Trails Project) in downtown Fort Dodge, Iowa as part of the Greenbelt Project. The

recommended Trails Project would consist of four multipurpose trail segments, approximately 3.2 miles long consisting of three main trail components, Central Riverfront Loop, Sunkissed Meadows Loop and Low Dam Trail. The Central Riverfront Loop is set to be a little over 0.5 mile, starting at the most southern end of Soldier Creek Nature Trail and extends downstream to loop around the Karl King viaduct embankment. The Sunkissed Meadow Loop begins at the southwest portion of the Central Riverfront Loop and extends downstream to circle around the Sunkissed Meadows golf course and end at the southeast portion of Central Riverfront Loop. An 800 foot connection to the Kenyon Road Bridge is planned at the southern area of the Sunkissed Meadow Loop to create connectivity between the east and west side of the river. The Sunkissed Meadow Loop is roughly 1.25 miles long. The Low Dam trail begins at the southwest corner of the Sunkissed Meadow Loop and extends downstream for 1.25 miles following the Des Moines River. The projects' features include a minor culvert for access across a drainage way, trailheads, a fishing pier, parking lots and river access areas. Construction of a bridge across the Des Moines River to connect trails was not feasible due to costs. The recommended project is a cooperative effort between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the City of Fort Dodge (City). In general, the USACE is responsible for the design and construction of the trail project features and the City will be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the project.

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review.

- This project is primarily a recreation project, and therefore is not anticipated to represent a challenge with regard to scope and level of review;
- Project risks include, but may not be limited to:
 - Possibility of minor design changes or a small adjustment to the location of the fishing pier if detailed Geotechnical data dictates.
 - The design team will have to be on guard against potential “scope-creep” caused by sponsor requests to add nice-to-have features that have not already been included in the project;
 - This project has a rather short schedule as desired by the sponsor, so there is some risk of Congressional involvement if the review takes unreasonably long.
- The project report is not likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment. It is a routine analysis of very typical issues and assumptions;
- The project is unlikely to have significant economic, environmental, and/or social effects to the Nation. Although public trail systems are highly visible and highly sought-after in this part of the country at this time, the presence or absence of a trail system is not likely to make or break the economy or environment;
- The project is likely to have minimal interagency interest. NEPA coordinating agencies are aware of the project;
- The project is not likely to involve a significant threat to human life/safety. Recreation trails and associated appurtenances are common in this area and there are no peculiarities about the proposed project that would make the project unsafe.;
- The project is not anticipated to be controversial;
- The information in the decision document will be based on conventional methods and will not present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices.

d. In-Kind Contributions. A Design Agreement (DA) between the City of Fort Dodge and the District was executed on April 12, 2004. The DA allows the City credit for Work-in-Kind (WIK) that is completed in accordance with Government standards and procedures, is integral to the project, and is suitable for inclusion in the design of the project. The authority to allow this credit is included in Section 122 of Public Law 108-7. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for a 25 percent share of design credit as defined by the DA. Work-in-Kind credits must amount to at least 25 percent of the

design credits or the sponsor may need to provide cash in order to meet the required contribution. There are no technical work products to be provided by the sponsor. If this changes, then technical work products prepared as in-kind contributions will be subject to DQC and ATR.

3. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

a. **General.** ATR for decision documents covered by EC 1105-2-410 are managed by the appropriate Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) with appropriate consultation with the allied Communities of Practice such as engineering and real estate. The ATR shall ensure that the product is consistent 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 the results in a reasonably clear manner for the public and decision makers. Members of the ATR team will be from outside the home district. The ATR lead will be from outside the home MSC. The leader of the ATR team will participate in milestone conferences and the Civil Works Review Board (CWRB) to address review concerns.

b. **Products for Review.**

Engineering Documentation Report
Environmental Assessment

c. **Required ATR Team Expertise.** The Water Management and Reallocation Studies (WMRS) PCX will identify the ATR team. MVR is not proposing candidates for the team. The expertise/disciplines represented on the ATR team should reflect the significant disciplines involved in the planning effort.

- Hydrology & Hydraulics: Team member will be an expert in the field of hydrology & hydraulics and have a thorough understanding of floodplain development impacts on flood heights and durations as well as computer modeling techniques.
- Planning: Team member will be experienced in recreation planning and have a working knowledge of the cost-sharing requirements, and policy and procedures for DA's and PPA's as they apply to non-Federal sponsor participation in cost-shared projects.
- Economic: Team member will be experienced in calculating interest, escalating costs and benefits, and performing cost-benefit analyses.
- Civil Design: Team member will be an expert in the field of Civil Engineering design and have a thorough understanding of civil engineering principles to include preparing designs for recreation features. It is recommended that the review be a registered/licensed professional engineer.
- Geotechnical: Team member will be familiar with standard geotechnical analysis to support the design and construction of project features including but not limited to paved surfaces, retaining walls, and structure foundations. It is recommended that the review be a registered/licensed professional engineer.
- Landscape Architect: Team member will have experience in design of recreation features in both urban and rural settings.
- Cost Engineering: Team member will be familiar with Mii, will have a familiarity with current cost estimating procedures and will have responsibility for identifying any significant errors in the District's cost estimating approach. Coordination with Mr. Chuck VanLaarhoven, the District's cost engineer is authorized and encouraged. He can provide source files for review as necessary.
- Real Estate: Team member will be familiar with all aspects of the Civil Works policy concerning Real Estate Plans and LERRD crediting.
- Environmental: Team member will be an expert in the field of Environmental Planning and have a thorough understanding of the National Environmental Policy Act.

d. 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 or 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 coordination, and lastly the agreed upon resolution. The ATR team will prepare a Review Report which includes a summary of each unresolved issue; each unresolved issue will be raised to the vertical team for resolution. Review Reports will be considered an integral part of the ATR documentation and shall:

- 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; 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 HQUSACE for resolution and the ATR documentation is complete. Certification of ATR should be completed, based on work reviewed to date, for the draft report and final report. A sample certification is included in ER 1110-2-12.

4. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

a. General. IEPR is conducted for decision documents if there is a vertical team decision (involving the district, MSC, PCX, and HQUSACE members) that the covered subject matter meets certain criteria (described in EC 1105-2-410) where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside the USACE is warranted. IEPR is coordinated by the appropriate PCX and managed by an Outside Eligible Organization (OEO) external to the USACE. IEPR panels shall evaluate whether the interpretations of analysis and conclusions based on analysis are reasonable. To provide effective review, in terms of both usefulness of results and credibility, the review panels should be given the flexibility to bring important issues to the attention of decision makers; however, review panels should be instructed to not make a recommendation on whether a

particular alternative should be implemented, as the Chief of Engineers is ultimately responsible for the final decision on a planning or reoperations study. IEPR panels will accomplish a concurrent review that covers the entire decision document and will address all the underlying engineering, economics, and environmental work, not just one aspect of the study. Whenever feasible and appropriate, the office producing the document shall make the draft decision document available to the public for comment at the same time it is submitted for review (or during the review process) and sponsor a public meeting where oral presentations on scientific issues can be made to the reviewers by interested members of the public. An IEPR panel or OEO representative will participate in the CWRB.

- b. Decision on IEPR.** Engineering Circular (EC) 1105-2-410 requires Independent External Peer Reviews (IEPR) for projects where there are public safety concerns, a high level of complexity, novel or precedent-setting approaches; where the project is controversial, has significant interagency interest, has a total project cost greater than \$45 million or has significant economic, environmental and social effects to the nation. The Ft. Dodge Greenbelt project proposes construction of recreation features that are low cost, low risk, do not pose a life/safety risks and will have no significant impact upon natural resources. It is recommended that IEPR be waived for this study.
- c. Products for Review. NA**
- d. Required IEPR Panel Expertise. NA.**
- e. Documentation of IEPR. NA**

5. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

- a. General.** The use of certified or approved models for all planning activities is required by EC 1105-2-407. This policy is applicable to all planning models currently in use, models under development and new models. The appropriate PCX will be responsible for model certification/approval. The goal of certification/approval is to establish that planning products are theoretically sound, compliant with USACE policy, computationally accurate, and based on reasonable assumptions. The use of a certified or approved model does not constitute technical review of the planning product. Independent review of the selection and application of the model and the input data and results is still required through conduct of DQC, ATR, and, if appropriate, IEPR. Independent review is applicable to all models, not just planning models. Both the planning models (including the certification/approval status of each model) and engineering models used in the development of the decision document are described below:
 - b. Planning Models.** The following planning models are anticipated to be used:
 - No planning models are being used for the decision document.
 - c. Engineering Models.** The following engineering models are anticipated to be used:
 - Mii was used to develop total cost project estimates.
 - HEC-RAS was used to develop flood profiles.

6. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. ATR Schedule and Cost.

Below is the tentative schedule for the ATR including review of the preliminary draft report and final report.

Major Milestone Events	Start Date	End Date
Sign Design Agreement	Completed	
Prepare Engineering Documentation Report	January 2005	January 2010
Agency Technical Review	January 2010	February 2010
MSC Approval of EDR	February 2010	March 2010
Public Review	April 2010	May 2010
HQUSACE Approval of EDR	May 2010	June 2010
Sign Project Partnership Agreement	June 2010	August 2010
Prepare Contract Documents (Plans & Specs)	January 2010	July 2010
Contract Solicitation & Award	September 2010	November 2010

Agency Technical Review will be completed prior to submission of documentation to the vertical team for a decision. ATR costs for the Draft Document are estimated at \$25,000.

b. IEPR Schedule and Cost. NA.

c. Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost. NA.

7. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In the spring of 2010 the EDR and EA will be available for public review. This will include a public meeting in Ft. Dodge. Two previous public meetings were held in Ft. Dodge in 2005 and 2006 to scope the initial design efforts and solicit input on the project.

8. PCX COORDINATION

Review plans for decision documents and supporting analyses outlined in EC 1105-2-410 are coordinated with the appropriate Planning Center(s) of Expertise (PCXs) based on the primary purpose of the basic decision document to be reviewed. The lead PCX for this study is the Water Management and Reallocation Studies (WMRS) PCX. The Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) will conduct the ATR of cost estimates, construction schedules and contingencies.

9. MSC APPROVAL

The MSC that oversees the home district is responsible for approving the review plan. Approval is provided the MSC Commander. The commander's approval should reflect vertical team input (involving district, MSC, PCX, and HQUSACE members) as to the appropriate scope and level of review for the decision document. Like the PMP, the RP is a living document and may change as the study progresses. Changes to the RP should be approved by following the process used for initially approving the RP. In all cases the MSCs will review the decision on the level of review and any changes made in updates to the project.

10. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

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

- Mr. Tom Heinold, Greenbelt Program Manager; 309-794-5203
- Mr. Marshall Plumley, Study Manager; 309-794-5447
- Ms. Elizabeth Ivy, Mississippi Valley Division; 601-634-5310
- Mr. Brad Hudgens, Planning Center of Expertise for Water Management and Reallocation Studies; 469-487-7033.

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS

Organizational Breakdown Structure	
Project Delivery Team Member	Organizational Code, & Roles and Responsibilities
Rock Island District	
Tom Heinold	CEMVR-PM-M Program & Project Management
Marshall Plumley	CEMVR-PD-F EDR Study Management, Planning
Rachel Fellman	CEMVR-EC-DN Project Engineer, Engineering Appendix, Plans & Specifications
Randy Kraciun	CEMVR-PM-A Environmental Studies
Eric Hackbarth	CEMVR-EC-G Geotechnical Engineering Appendix for the EDR & CCD
Doris Sullivan	CEMVP-EC-D Engineering Appendix, Plan Formulation and Evaluation Report, and Plans & Specifications
Chuck VanLaarhoven	CEMVR-EC-DE Cost Engineering for the EDR & CCD
John Lacina	CEMVR-ED-HH HH Analysis for EDR & CCD
Jim Ross	CEMVR-PM-A Cultural Resources Report
Rick Eberts	CEMVR-PM-A Economics Report
Ron Silver	CEMVR-RE Real Estate Plan, LERRD Acquisition

ATTACHMENT 2: ATR CERTIFICATION TEMPLATE

STATEMENT OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

COMPLETION OF INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW

The District has completed the *(type of product)* of *(project name and location)*. Notice is hereby given that an independent technical review, that is appropriate to the level of risk and complexity inherent in the project, has been conducted as defined in the Quality Control Plan. During the independent technical review, compliance with established policy principles and procedures, utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses; alternatives evaluated; the appropriateness of data used and level obtained; and reasonableness of the result, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing Corps policy. The independent technical review was accomplished by *(an independent team)*. All comments resulting from ITR have been resolved.

(Signature)
Technical Review Team Leader

(Date)

(Signature)
Project Manager

(Date)

CERTIFICATION OF INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW

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

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

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

(Signature)
Chief, Engineering Division

(Date)