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

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

CEMVD-DE

11 APR '17

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Memphis District

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

1. References:

a. Memorandum, CEMVM-PM-P, 10 February 2017, subject: MVD Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Model Review Plan and Model Review Plan Checklist, Piney Creek, TN Section 206 Project, Memphis District (encl 1).

b. Memorandum, CEMVD-RB-T, 21 March 2017, subject: MVD Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Model Review Plan and Model Review Plan Checklist, Piney Creek, TN Section 206 Project, Memphis District (encl 2).

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

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

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

4. The MVD point of contact for this action is Sarah Palmer, CEMVD-PD-L, (601) 634-5910.

3 Encls

MICHAEL C. WEHR
Major General, USA
Commanding

REVIEW PLAN

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

Piney Creek, TN
Hardeman County
Section 206 Project

Memphis District

MSC Approval Date: 11 April 2017
Last Revision Date: *none*

US Army Corps
of Engineers ®

Review Plan
Using the MVD Model Review Plan

Piney Creek, TN
Section 206 Project

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	**Purpose and Requirements**	1
2.	**Review Management Organization (RMO) Coordination**	2
3.	**Project Information**	2
4.	**District Quality Control (DQC)**	3
5.	**Agency Technical Review (ATR)**	3
6.	**Policy and Legal Compliance Review**	5
7.	**Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) Review and Certification**	5
8.	**Model Certification and Approval**	5
9.	**Review Schedules and Costs**	6
10.	**Public Participation**	6
11.	**Review Plan Approval and Updates**	6
12.	**Review Plan Points of Contact**	8
Attachment 1: Team Rosters		1
Attachment 2: Review Plan Revisions		2

REVIEW PLAN
Piney Creek, TN Section 206

1. Purpose and Requirements.

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Piney Creek Section 206 Feasibility Report, Plans and Specifications package and Design Documentation Report with all attendant appendices.

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

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

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

c. References:

(1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review Policy, 15 December 2012.
(2) Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, CECW-P, dated 19 January 2011.
(3) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 March 2010.
(4) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 September 2006.
(5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 January 2007.
(6) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 November 2007.
(7) Piney Creek, TN Project Management Plan

2. Review Management Organization (RMO) Coordination.

The RMO is responsible for managing the overall peer review effort described in this review plan. The RMO for Section 206 is MVD. MVD will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the Agency Technical Review (ATR). The home District will post the approved review plan on its public website.

3. Project Information.

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

b. Study/Project Description. Piney Creek is a tributary of the Hatchie River in Hardeman County, TN east of Bolivar, TN. The last site visit was 9 June 2016.

Many of the Hatchie River's 36 tributaries have been channelized or altered. The habitat quality in these tributaries is poor and they are delivering heavy sediment loads into the Hatchie. The increased sediment from the tributaries threatens to create valley plugs in the Hatchie. Approximately 50 years ago, several miles of the downstream end of Piney Creek were bypassed and replaced with a ditch to alleviate agricultural flooding. The ditch filled with sediment and has been replaced with new ditches several times. The current ditch is a sediment source to the Hatchie River and conditions in the Hatchie downstream from the ditch are degraded. The ditch has little value for habitat. The historic meanders of Piney Creek are cut off and do not provide habitat for fish or other aquatic species. Stagnant water around the old meanders is killing bottomland hardwoods and reducing the quality of the forested swamp habitat for a variety of native species.

The action alternative presented in the approved FID is: Restore the historic meanders of Piney Creek, block the existing ditch, replant bottomland hardwoods and other tree species that listed bats prefer, take necessary actions to stabilize all of Piney Creek. The initial plan anticipates up to four weirs may be necessary on Piney Creek, however future studies may find that fewer are required.

A project has the potential to restore over 12 miles of river habitat and reconnect it to the Hatchie River. It could restore 50 -100 acres of healthy bottomland forest habitat and habitat for the species mentioned above and many other native species. It would reduce sedimentation to the Hatchie River.

The total project cost to reopen the historic Piney Creek channel, install grade-control weirs upstream (if necessary), and replant BLH is approximately $8 - $10 million.

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and level of Review. The model review plan is appropriate for this project. The estimated cost of the project is within the CAP limit, no innovative techniques are anticipated, there are no life safety issues, and no controversy is expected. The project area is rural and local landowners and river users are generally supportive of restoration. The project will address a common problem in the region and other projects have been constructed to restore similar habitats. The techniques most likely to be used are not technically complex and have been used in the region. Other similar projects have been monitored to assess both the engineering outcomes and ecological responses. The standard risks to study cost and schedule will be tracked, but they are not likely to be significant.

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. The sponsor is expected to provide surveys, habitat analyses, and some engineering design.

4. District Quality Control (DQC).

All decision and implementation documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC prior to ATR. DQC is an internal review process of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the Project Management Plan (PMP). The home district shall manage DQC in accordance with MVD and district Quality Management Plan. Any discrepancies between a reviewer and a Project Delivery Team (PDT) member will be resolved face-to-face. If a concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the DQC team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the section supervisor for further resolution.

DrChecks will be used to document the DQC review for both the decision and implementation documents. The reviews will require a journey-level hydrologist, geotechnical engineer, planner w/ NEPA experience, environmental specialist, cost engineer, civil engineer, real estate specialist, and economist. The DQC review and comment, response, and backcheck should take no more than two weeks.

a. Feasibility Phase. Technical supervisors will assure that experienced personnel will check PDT member's technical work for completeness, accuracy, and clarity.

    1. A draft of the report will be sent to each reviewer and analyst for review and comments.
    2. The reviewer will record any technical comments in DrChecks.
    3. The PDT member and reviewer will resolve all comments and work with the Planner to ensure any changes are captured in the report.
    4. A revised report will be available for final review before ATR.
    5. All comments will be closed and the DrChecks record will be provided to the ATR Team.

b. Plans and Specifications Phase.
    1. DQC will be done for the 60-65% design and recorded in DrChecks.
    2. Biddability, Constructability, Operability, Environmental, Sustainability (BCOES) Review and ATR will be done concurrently on the 95% design.

5. Agency Technical Review (ATR).

One ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.), however additional ATRs may be performed if deemed warranted. ATR shall be certified prior to the MSC Decision Milestone (MDM) milestone. ATR is managed within USACE by the designated RMO and is conducted by a qualified team from outside the home district that

is not involved in the day-to-day production of the project/product. ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel. The ATR team lead will be from outside the home MSC.

a. Products to Undergo ATR. ATR will be performed throughout the project in accordance with the District and MVD Quality Management Plans. Products to undergo ATR include: Feasibility Report, Design Documentation Report (DDR) and Plans and Specifications (P&S).

The first review will include the Feasibility Report, Environmental Assessment (EA), and all attendant appendices.

If funded and the Project Partnership Agreement (PPA) is signed with the non-Federal sponsor, the second review shall consist of plans and specifications for construction of the project along with all supporting design documentation.

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 206 documents and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. Typically, the ATR lead will also serve as a reviewer for a specific discipline (such as planning, economics, environmental resources, etc.). The ATR Lead MUST be from outside MVD.
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in Section 206 and general planning policy. This reviewer will only review the planning document and not the P&S unless the reviewer also provides the environmental review. For this effort, the planning review shall also have experience in NEPA and the preparation of Environmental Assessments.
Biologist	The Environmental reviewer will be a senior biologist with experience in stream habitat restoration and ecological modeling. The reviewer will also have experience in ESA coordination. This reviewer will have reachback capability to a cultural resources expert, unless significant Cultural sites are found in which case a cultural resource reviewer will be added to the team.
Economics	An economics reviewer will only be required if neither the ATR lead, Planning or Environmental Reviewer are not qualified to review the CE/ICA
H&H Engineering	The hydraulic engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of hydraulics and have a thorough understanding of stream erosion and bank stabilization techniques and HEC-RAS. The reviewer will be necessary for both phases.
Geotechnical Engineering	The geotechnical engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of geotech and have a thorough understanding of stream erosion and sedimentation processes. The reviewer will be necessary for both phases.

Civil Engineering	The engineering design reviewer will be an expert in the field of design and have a thorough understanding of stream stabilization techniques. The reviewer will only be necessary for the study phase if weirs are determined to be necessary. The reviewer will be required for the D&I phase.
Cost Engineering	Cost DX Staff or Cost DX Pre-Certified Professional with experience preparing cost estimates for small bank stabilization projects.
Real Estate	The Real Estate Reviewer will be an expert in the field of real estate as it pertains to ecosystem restoration projects. The reviewer will be necessary for both phases.
Construction/Operations	The Construction reviewer will only participate in the P&S ATR.

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

6. Policy And Legal Compliance Review.

All decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. These reviews culminate in determinations that the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy, and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority by the MVD Commander. DQC and ATR augment and complement the policy review processes by addressing compliance with pertinent published Army policies, particularly policies on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents.

Policy review will follow the MVD QMS process 03501.

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

For CAP projects, ATR of the costs may be conducted by pre-certified district cost personnel within the region or by the Walla Walla Cost DX. The pre-certified list of cost personnel has been established and is maintained by the Cost DX at 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.

8. Model Certification And Approval.

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

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

identified as preferred or acceptable for use on Corps studies and these models should be used whenever appropriate. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

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

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study
HEC-RAS & HEC-1	These are standard engineering models used to calculate peak flows and flowlines. There is no significant risk associated with using this model.
IBI – Index of Biotic Integrity	This index is designed to measure the condition of the biotic community in a given area. It includes measures of richness, diversity, composition, abundance and condition. This index will provide a picture of the aquatic community health and can be compared to other stream in the area.
Slough Darter: Habitat Suitability Index Model	The model is designed to examine habitat changes in the channel including: %pools, gradient, substrate and velocity. The anticipated alternatives could have impacts on all of these. The model also examines water quality parameters which would not likely change as a result of the project.
Bullfrog Habitat Suitability Index Model	This model is designed to examine habitat in slow-moving water and along the shoreline.
Mink Model – Modification of the Riverine Cover Type Component	This model is sensitive to the differences in habitat quality between channelized stream segments and natural stream segments. This model will be used only on the selected TSP to insure the plan provides benefits to a wide range of species. It will not be used incrementally to size the alternatives or to compare the alternatives.
IWR Planning Suite - CE/ICA	Used for cost-effectiveness and incremental cost analyses of projects/plans involving non-monetary units of benefit.

9. Review Schedules And Costs.

ATR Schedule and Cost. There are limited funds in the Section 206 program currently**.**

ATR of Decision Document & Cost Estimate — Start: TBD; Duration 2 weeks
Estimated Cost — $17,500

ATR of Plans and Specifications — Start: TBD; Duration 3 weeks
Estimated Cost — $20,000

10. Public Participation.

State and Federal resource agencies may be invited to participate in the study covered by this review plan as partner agencies or as technical members of the PDT, as appropriate.

The decision document will be released for 30 day public comment period after the MDM milestone.

11. Review Plan Approval And Updates.

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

12. Review Plan Points Of Contact.

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

- Marsha Raus, Planner, 901-544-3455
- Shawn Phillips, Project Manager, 901-544-3321
- Sarah Palmer, CAP Program Manager, 601-634-5910

Attachment 2: Review Plan Revisions

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page/Paragraph Number

Attachment 3: Sample Statement of Technical Review for Decision Documents

Completion of Agency Technical Review

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the *<type of product>* for *<project name and location>*. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project's Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-214. During the ATR, compliance with established policy principles and procedures utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses, alternatives evaluated, the appropriateness of data used and level obtained, and reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing US Army Corps of Engineers policy. The ATR also assessed the District Quality Control (DQC) documentation and made the determination that the DQC activities employed appear to be appropriate and effective. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved and the comments have been closed in DrChecks[sm].

SIGNATURE _____ _____
Name Date
ATR Team Leader
Office Symbol/Company

SIGNATURE _____ _____
Name Date
Project Manager (home district)
Office Symbol

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

SIGNATURE _____ _____
Name Date
Review Management Office Representative
Deputy Chief, MVD Planning
Office Symbol

Certification of Agency Technical Review

Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows: *Describe the major technical concerns and their resolution.*

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

SIGNATURE _____ _____
Name Date
Chief, Engineering Division (home district)
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ _____
Name Date
Chief, Planning Division (home district)
Office Symbol

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

Attachment 4: Sample Statement of Technical Review for Implementation Documents

Completion of Agency Technical Review

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the *<type of product>* for *<project name and location>*. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project's Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-214. During the ATR, compliance with established policy principles and procedures utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses, alternatives evaluated, the appropriateness of data used and level obtained, and reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing US Army Corps of Engineers policy. The ATR also assessed the District Quality Control (DQC) documentation and made the determination that the DQC activities employed appear to be appropriate and effective. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved and the comments have been closed in DrChecks[sm].

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
ATR Team Leader
Office Symbol/Company

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Project Manager (home district)
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ _____

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

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Review Management Office Representative
Deputy Chief, MVD Engineering and Construction
Office Symbol

Certification of Agency Technical Review

Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows: *Describe the major technical concerns and their resolution.*

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

SIGNATURE _____ _____

Name Date
Chief, Engineering Division (home district)
Office Symbol

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

MVD CAP Review Plan Checklist

Date:	**2 February 2017**
Originating District:	Memphis
Project/Study Title:	Piney Creek, TN Section 206
P2# and AMSCO#:	145833
District POC:	Marsha Raus
MSC Reviewer:	
CAP Authority:	206

Section I - Decision Documents

REQUIREMENT	EVALUATION
1. Is the Review Plan (RP) for a Continuing Authorities Project? Or Other Program Directed to follow CAP Processes?	Yes ☒ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒
a. Does it include a cover page identifying it as following the Model RP and listing the project/study title, originating district or office, and date of the plan? b. Does it include a table of contents? c. Is the purpose of the RP clearly stated? d. Does it reference the Project Management Plan (PMP) of which the RP is a component? e. Does it succinctly describe the levels of review: District Quality Control (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), and Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) if applicable for Sec 103 or Sec 205? f. Does it include a paragraph stating the title, subject, and purpose of the decision document to be reviewed? g. Does it list the names and disciplines of the Project Delivery Team (PDT)?* **Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.* **Comments:** Per EC 1165-2-214, Appendix B, Paragraph 6.a, reviewer names should not be listed in the posted approved review plan, and will be removed following approval.	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☒ No ☐ c. Yes ☒ No ☐ d. Yes ☒ No ☐ e. Yes ☒ No ☐ f. Yes ☒ No ☐ g. Yes ☒ No ☐
2. Is the RP detailed enough to assess the necessary level and focus of the reviews?	Yes ☒ No ☐

3. Does the RP define the appropriate level of review for the project/study?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it state that DQC will be managed by the home district in accordance with the MVD and district Quality Management Plans? b. Does it state that ATR will be managed by MVD? c. Does it state whether IEPR will be performed? For Sec 103 and Sec 205, see additional questions in 5. below. **Comments: IEPR - NA**	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☒ No ☐ c. Yes ☒ No ☐
4. Does the RP explain how ATR will be accomplished?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it identify the anticipated number of reviewers? b. Does it provide a succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed for the review (not simply a list of disciplines)? c. Does it indicate that ATR team members will be from outside the home district? d. Does it indicate where the ATR team leader will be from? e. If the reviewers are listed by name, does the RP describe the qualifications and years of relevant experience of the ATR team members?* **Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.* **Comments:** Per EC 1165-2-214, Appendix B, Paragraph 6.a, reviewer names should not be listed in the posted approved review plan. Additionally, the RMO determines the list of ATR reviewers per Appendix B, paragraph 4. K. (1). Therefore the District would not have that list in this initial submittal. Suggested reviewers can be provided by the District if needed.	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☒ No ☐ c. Yes ☒ No ☐ d. Yes ☒ No ☐ e. Yes ☐ No ☒
5. For Sec 103 and Sec 205 projects, does the RP explain how IEPR will be accomplished?	Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒
a. Is an exclusion being requested, requiring CG approval? b. Does it provide a defensible rationale for the decision on IEPR? c. If IEPR is required, does it state that IEPR will be managed by an Outside Eligible Organization, external to the Corps of Engineers? d. If IEPR is required, does the RP indicate which PCX will manage the IEPR and whether any coordination with the PCX has occurred? **Comments:**	a. Yes ☐ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐ c. Yes ☐ No ☐ d. Yes ☐ No ☐
6. Does the RP address review of sponsor in-kind contributions?	Yes ☒ No ☐

7. Does the RP address how the review will be documented?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR and IEPR comments using Dr Checks? b. Does the RP explain how the IEPR will be documented in a Review Report? c. Does the RP document how written responses to the IEPR Review Report will be prepared? d. Does the RP detail how the district will disseminate the final IEPR Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the IEPR on the internet and include them in the applicable decision document? **Comments:**	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒ c. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒ d. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒
8. Does the RP address Policy Compliance and Legal Review?	Yes ☒ No ☐
9. Does the RP present the tasks, timing and sequence (including deferrals), and costs of reviews?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it provide a schedule for ATR including review of the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) materials and final report? b. Does it present the timing and sequencing for IEPR? c. Does it include cost estimates for the reviews?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒ c. Yes ☒ No ☐
10. Does the RP indicate the study will address Safety Assurance factors? Factors to be considered include: ● Where failure leads to significant threat to human life ● Novel methods\complexity\ precedent-setting models\policy changing conclusions ● Innovative materials or techniques ● Design lacks redundancy, resiliency of robustness ● Unique construction sequence or acquisition plans ● Reduced\overlapping design construction schedule	Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☒ **Comments:**
11. Does the RP address opportunities for public participation?	Yes ☒ No ☐
12. Does the RP indicate ATR of cost estimates will be conducted by pre-certified district cost personnel who will coordinate with the Walla Walla Cost DX?	Yes ☒ No ☐
13. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?	Yes ☒ No ☐

Section II - Implementation Documents

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

REQUIREMENT	EVALUATION
1. Are the implementation documents/products described in the review or subsequent amendments?	Yes ☒ No ☐
2. Does the RP contain documentation of risk-informed decisions on which levels of review are appropriate?	Yes ☒ No ☐
3. Does the RP present the tasks, timing, and sequence of the reviews (including deferrals)?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it provide an overall review schedule that shows timing and sequence of all reviews?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does the review plan establish a milestone schedule aligned with the critical features of the project design and construction? - Milestones will not be set for implementation until D&I funds are allocated.	b. Yes ☐ No ☒
4. Does the RP address engineering model review requirements?	Yes ☒ No ☐
a. Does it list the models and data anticipated to be used in developing recommendations?	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does the RP identify any areas of risk and uncertainty associated with the use of the proposed models?	b. Yes ☒ No ☐
c. Does it indicate the certification/approval status of those models and if review of any model(s) will be needed?	c. Yes ☒ No ☐
d. If needed, does the RP propose the appropriate level of review for the model(s) and how it will be accomplished?	d. Yes ☒ No ☐
5. Does the RP explain how and when there will be opportunities for the public to comment on the study or project to be reviewed?	Yes ☒ No ☐
6. Does the RP address expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor?	Yes ☒ No ☐
If expected in-kind contributions are to be provided by the sponsor, does the RP list the expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor?	Yes ☒ No ☐

7. Does the RP explain how the reviews will be documented?	Yes ☒ No ☐

a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR comments using Dr Checks and Type II IEPR published comments and responses pertaining to the design and construction activities summarized in a report reviewed and approved by the MSC and posted on the home district website? IEPR-NA	a. Yes ☒ No ☐
b. Does the RP explain how the Type II IEPR will be documented in a Review Report? NA	b. Yes ☐ No ☐
c. Does the RP document how written responses to the Type II IEPR Review Report will be prepared? NA	c. Yes ☐ No ☐
d. Does the RP detail how the district/MVD will disseminate the final Type II IEPR Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the Type II IEPR on the internet? NA	d. Yes ☐ No ☐
8. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?	Yes ☒ No ☐