

### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

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

3 DEC 2014

ATTENTION

CEMVD-PD-SP

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, St. Louis District

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for Upper Mississippi River Restoration (formally known as the Environmental Management Program) Godar Glades Wetland Complex Habitat Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project

### 1. References:

- a. Memorandum, CEMVS-PM-F, 20 October 2014, subject: Request for Approval of the Upper Mississippi River Restoration (formerly known as the Environmental Management Program) Godar Glades Wetland Complex Habitat Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project Review Plan (encl 1).
- b. Memorandum, CEMVD-RB-T, 12 November 2014, subject: Review Plan (RP) Upper Mississippi River Restoration, Godar Glades Wetland Complex Habitat Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project (encl 2).
- c. Memorandum, CECW-MVD, 16 May 2012, subject: Request for Approval of a Model Peer Review Plan for the Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program (encl 3).
- d. EC 1165-2-214, 15 December 2012, subject: Civil Works Review Policy.
- 2. The enclosed Review Plan (encl 4) is a combined decision document and implementation document review plan. It includes the MVD Review Plan Checklist for EMP and has been prepared in accordance with EC 1165-2-214. The RP has been coordinated with the Upper District Support Team and the Business Technical Division, who concurred with the plan in reference 1.b.

CEMVD-PD-SP

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for Upper Mississippi River Restoration (formally known as the Environmental Management Program) Godar Glades Wetland Complex Habitat Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project

- 3. MVD hereby approves the RP for Godar Glades Wetland Complex Habitat Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project, which is subject to change as circumstances require, consistent with study development under the Project Management Business Process. Any 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 CEMVD-PD-SP, at

4 Encls

Director of Programs



# DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY ST. LOUIS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS 1222 SPRUCE STREET

1222 SPRUCE STREET ST. LOUIS MO 63103-2833

OCT 2 0 2014

CEMVS-PM-F

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Mississippi Valley Division, (CEMVD-PD-SP/, 1400 Walnut Street, Vicksburg, MS 39181-0080

SUBJECT: Request for Approval of the Upper Mississippi River Restoration (formerly known as the Environmental Management Program) Godar Glades Wetland Complex Habitat Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project Review Plan

1. The purpose of this memorandum is to request approval for the subject Model Review Plan with the MVD Upper Mississippi River Restoration (Environmental Management Program) Review Plan Checklist (Encl 1) for Godar Glades Wetland Complex Habitat Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project. The Model review Plan includes both the feasibility report (decision document) and Plans and Specification documentation (implementation product). An electronic coy of the subject Review Plan with MVD UMRR (EMP) Review Plan Checklist has been sent to Mr. Philip Hollis, CEMVD.

2. Questions regard Manager, at	ding this matter should be directed to or by email at	, Program
e e	E	16
	30	
Encl		
5 NG	COL, EN Commanding	

### MEMORANDUM FOR CEMVD-PD-SP

SUBJECT: Review Plan (RP) Upper Mississippi River Restoration, Godar Glades Wetland Complex Habitat Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project.

- 1. Reference documents, subject as above.
- 2. This office concurs with subject Review Plan.
- 3. RB-T point of contact is

Chief, Business Technical Division



### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

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

**CECW-MVD** 

MAY 1 6 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 Valley Division Regional Integration Team, at

Deputy Chief, Mississippi

FOR THE COMMANDER:

Chief, Planning and Policy Division Directorate of Civil Works Upper Mississippi River Restoration (UMRR)
[Formerly known as Environmental Management Program (EMP)]
and
Referencing the UMRR-EMP Programmatic Review Plan

Godar Glades Wetland Complex
Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Illinois—Illinois River
River Mile 12 - 31
St. Louis District

MSC Approval Date: <u>Pending</u>
Last Revision Date: <u>None</u>



### Review Plan Using the MVD Model Review Plan

### Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Purpose and Requirements		1
2. Review Management Organization (RMO) Coordination		2
3. Project Information		
4. District Quality Control (DQC)		2
5. Agency Technical Review (ATR)		3
6. Independnet External Peer Review (IEPR)		3
7. Policy And Legal Compliance Review		3
8. Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) Review And Certification		3
9. Model Certification and Approval	.e.	4
10. Review Schedules And Costs		4
11. Public Participation.		5
12. Review Plan Approval And Updates		6
13. Review Plan Points of Contact		6
Attachment 1: Team Rosters		7
Attachment 2: Review Plan Revisions		10
Attachment 3: UMRR (EMP) Review Plan Checklist	<u>.</u>	11
Attachment 4: ATR Certification	2	16

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

### 1. Purpose and Requirements

### a. Purpose

This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the <u>Upper Mississippi River Restoration</u> (formerly known as the Environmental Management Program) HREP Godar Glades Wetland Complex, <u>Calhoun and Jersey Counties</u>, <u>Illinois</u>, <u>Illinois River Miles 12-31</u>, <u>Public Law 99-662 of the 1986 WRDA</u>, <u>as amended</u>, <u>authorizes the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to study</u>, <u>design</u>, <u>and construct habitat rehabilitation and enhancement projects (HREP) on the Upper Mississippi River system without specific Congressional authorization</u>.

This Review Plan is for the Godar Glades Wetland Complex Feasibility Report with integrated environmental assessment as well as the Godar Glades Wetland Complex Plans and Specifications (P&S) implementation document. Products included for review consist of the following:

- Draft Feasibility Report: The purpose of the Feasibility Report with integrated Environmental Assessment (EA) is to document the planning process for ecosystem restoration of the Godar Glades Wetland Complex study area on the Illinois River, to provide the opportunity for participation in the planning process for river management partners and the public, to meet USACE planning guidance and to meet NEPA requirements. The Feasibility Report and EA will document existing and predict future habitat conditions and deficiencies; identify problems and opportunities; define measureable habitat goals and objectives to meet project goals and objectives; document the effects of the alternatives in accordance with NEPA and other environmental laws and regulations; and recommend a selected plan for habitat restoration and enhancement.
- Final Feasibility Report: A supplemental Agency Technical Review (ATR) would be completed if there are substantial changes to the project plan from the Draft Feasibility Report based on comments received during the public and agency review.
- Implementation Document (Plans and Specificiation): An ATR will be completed on 95% documents for Plans and Specifications.

The Upper Mississippi River Restoartion (UMRR), formerly known as Environmental Management Program (EMP), study and construction authority is contained in the UMRR (EMP) Programmatic Review Plan (UMRR-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 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review Policy. <u>HQ approval for a programmatic IEPR exclusion for the Upper Mississippi River Restoration program was granted on 22 February 2012. No other existing policy waiver request are anticipated.</u>

The applicability regarding the UMRR (EMP) is contained in the Programmatic UMRR (EMP) PRP, Section II.

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

### c. References

Reference materials are shown in the UMRR (EMP) PRP.

Godar Glades Wetland Complex HREP Project Management Plan, approved 11 September 2014

### 2. Review Management Organization (RMO) Coordination

RMO coordination will be in accordance with the MP PRP, Sections I, III, VI, and VIII. The RMO for the ATR will be MVD in lieu of ECO-PCX. The PCX will continue to serve in its advisory role.

### 3. Project Information

### a. Decision and/or Implementation document

The <u>Godar Glades Wetland Complex HREP</u> 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. An implementation document (Plans and Specifications) will also be prepared and will undergo DQC and ATR Review.

### b. Study/Project Description

Godar Glades Wetland Complex covers approximately 5,050 acres of backwaters, side channels, and island habitats. The proposed project area includes Glades Management Area, Twelve Mile Island, Helmbold Island, Mortland Island, Godar Management Area, Diamond Island, Hurricane Island, Crater Island, and Willow Island. These sites are General Plan (GP) lands owned by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and are managed by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources through a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Refuge.

The primary resource problems include: sedimentation, altered river hydrology, and lack of connectivity with the lower Illinois River. These problems have led to degraded aquatic and wetland ecosystem structures and functions. Potential project features to address these problems include: river training structures, in-stream habitat structure, excavation, water control structures, pump station, revetment, and reforestation.

### c. Factors Affecting the Scope and level of Review

The factors affecting the scope and level of review are discussed in the UMRR (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. No in-kind products are anticipated.

### 4. District Quality Control (DQC)

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

District Quality Control (DQC) will be conducted in accordance with the UMRR (EMP) PRP, Section III.A. DQC will be an ongoing process throughout the project. DQC will use Dr. Checks for tracking comments.

### 5. Agency Technical Review (ATR)

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) will be conducted in accordance with the UMRR (EMP) PRP, Section III.B and VI.C. An initial ATR will be conducted before the Alternative Formulation Briefing. A supplemental ATR will be completed if there are substantial changes to the project plan from the Draft Feasibility Report based on comments received during the public and agency review.

To assure independence, the leader of the ATR team shall be from outside the home MSC. ATR will use Dr. Checks for tracking comments.

### 6. Independent External Peer Review (IEPR)

A programmatic waiver for the Upper Mississippi River Restoration (formerly known as the Environmental Management Program) was approved 22 February 2012.

### 7. Policy And Legal Compliance Review

The Policy and Legal Compliance Reviews will be conducted in accordance with the UMRR (EMP) PRP, Section III.D. Policy and Legal Compliance Review will be completed prior to the Alternatives formulation Briefing of the Draft Report. An additional Policy and Legal Compliance Review will be done prior to Final Report submittal.

### 8. 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 UMRR (EMP) PRP, Section VIII.D. If the final feasibility report costs are greater than 1 year old (based on when the Mississippi Valley Division Commander will sign the final report), then the costs will be updated and reviewed by the Cost MCX.

### 9. Model Certification And Approval

Approval of planning and engineering models used in UMRR (EMP) projects will be in accordance with the UMRR (EMP) PRP, Section III.E, and Section VII. See Table 1.

Table 1. Planning and Engineering Models That May Be Used in the Development of the Godar Glades Wetland Complex HREP

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How it Will be Applied in the Study	Certification /Approval Status
IWR-Plan	The IWR-Plan was developed by the Institute of Water Resources as accounting software to compare habitat benefits among alternatives.	Certified

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

	10	This model will be used to determine best buy alternatives and incremental cost analysis of alternatives	
V	USFWS Habitat Suitability Index Models (HEP or Bluebooks).	The Habitat Evaluation Procedure (HEP) is a species-habitat approach to impact assessment using selected evaluation species documented with an index, the Habitat Suitability Index (HSI). This value is derived from an evaluation of the ability of key habitat components to compare existing habitat conditions and optimum habitat conditions for the species of interest. There are over 150 models for invertebrates, fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammals, and communities.  As the project progresses, a determination will be made as to which HEP models are most appropriate for use.	Approved for use, pending review of spreadsheets or other accounting software
308	Micro-Computer Aided Cost	MCACES is a cost estimation model.	Certified
	Engineering System (MCACES) MII Version 3.0	This model will be used to estimate costs for the Godar Glades Wetland Complex HREP.	-

### 10. Review Schedules And Costs

A. *District Quality Control (DQC) Schedule and Cost.* The DQC team will provide a review of the feasibility and P&S documents. DQC team roster is provided in Attachment 1. Dr. Checks will be used to document all DQC reviews.

1) DOC Estimated Schedule

Event	Kick-off	Reviewer Comments End	PDT Evaluation	Back Check	Complete
Feasibility	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
P&S	TBD	TBD	TBD .	TBD	TBD

2) DOC Estimated Cost

Reviewer	Feasibility	P&S	<b>Total Cost</b>
Real Estate			
Plan Formulation			
Geotechnical Engineer			
Regulatory			
Environmental			
Civil Engineer			
H&H Engineer			
Cultural Resources			
Structural Engineer			5
Mechanical Engineer			
Economics			
Cost Engineer			

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

### TOTAL

B. Agency Technical Review (ATR) Schedule and Cost. The ATR team will provide a review of the feasibility and P&S documents. ATR team roster is provided in Attachment 1. After DQC, the ATR team will provide a review of the Feasibility Report prior to Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB). Dr. Checks will be used to document ATR review. Following MSC concurrence of the AFB conference call, the ATR team will continue to review any changes that occur as feasibility documents are prepared. The ATR Lead will participate in the original AFB discussions with the MSC. The ATR team will provide ATR certification (Attachment 4). ATR shall be performed on the project plans and specification (P&S) and any supporting design documentation prior to BCOE sign-off. The ATR Lead will be from outside the MSC.

1) ATR Estimated Schedule

Event	Kick-off	Reviewer Comments End	PDT Evaluation	Back Check	Complete
Pre-AFB ATR	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
AFB	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Pre Final Feasibility Report ATR	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
P&S ATR	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

2) ATR Estimated Cost

Reviewer	ATR Pre AFB	ATR Pre	ATR P&S	COST
	**	Final		1
ATR Team Lead				
Civil Engineer				
Environmental				
Plan Formulation				
Model Reviewer				
Cultural				
Cost				
Economist				
Geotechnical				
Engineer				
H&H Engineer				
Real Estate				
Structural				
Engineer				
Mechanical				
Engineer				
TOTAL				

### 11. Public Participation

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

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

### 12. Review Plan Approval And Updates

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

### 13. Review Plan Points Of Contact

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

- St. Louis District UMRR-EMP Program Manager, 314-331-8455- MVS
- Environmental Planner/Ecologist, 314-331-8047 RPEDN
- St. Louis Program Manager, 601-634-5293- MVD

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

# Attachment 1: Team Rosters Major Subordinate Command Roster – 2014

Name	Title	Contact
	St. Louis Program Manager	
	Deputy Chief DST	

### Project Delivery Team Roster – 2014

Name	Discipline/Title	Contact Information
	Sponsor-	
	UMRR Regional Program Manager	
	UMRR District Program Manager	
	Project Manager	
	Civil Engineer	
	Environmental Planning	
TBD	Plan Formulator	TBD
TBD	Hydrology & Hydraulics Engineer	TBD
TBD	Mechanical Engineer	TBD
TBD	Electrical Engineer	TBD
TBD	Structural Engineer	TBD
TBD	Cultural Resources	TBD
TBD	Tribal Coordination	TBD
TBD	Economics	TBD
TBD	Geotechnical Engineer	TBD
TBD	Cost Estimate	TBD
TBD	Real Estate	TBD
TBD	HTRW	TBD
TBD	Survey	TBD

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

### District Quality Control Roster - YEAR

Name	Discipline/Title	Contact Information
TBD	Senior Real Estate Specialist	TBD
TBD	Senior Planner	TBD
TBD	Senior Geotechnical Engineer	TBD
TBD	Senior Regulatory Specialist	TBD
TBD	Senior Environmental Specialist	TBD
TBD	Senior Civil Engineer	TBD ·
TBD	Senior H&H Engineer	TBD
TBD	Senior Cultural Resources Specialist	TBD
TBD	Senior Cost Estimator	TBD

# REVIEW PLAN Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

# Agency Technical Review Roster - YEAR

Name	Discipline/Title	Contact Information	District	Education/	Years of
				Qualifications	Experience
TBD	ATR Team Lead	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TBD	Engineer	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TBD	Plan Formulation	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TBD	Model Review	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TBD	Environmental	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TBD	Cultural	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TBD	Cost	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TBD	Economist	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TBD	Geotechnical Engineer	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TBD	H&H Engineer	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TBD	Real Estate	TBD	ΠBD	TBD	TBD

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

### **Attachment 2: Review Plan Revisions**

<b>Revision Date</b>	Description of Change		Page/Paragraph Number
		8	
	21	*	
	S.		F)

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

### ATTACHMENT 3: UMRR (EMP) Review Plan Checklist

### MVD UMRR (EMP) Review Plan Checklist

Date:	November 2014
<b>Originating District:</b>	MVS
Project/Study Title:	Godar Glades HREP
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 ⊠ No □
a. Does it include a cover page identifying it as following the Model RP and listing the project/study title, originating district or office, and date of the plan?	a. Yes 🛛 No 🗌
b. Does it include a table of contents?	b. Yes 🛛 No 🗌
c. Is the purpose of the RP clearly stated?	c. Yes 🛛 No 🗌
d. Does it reference the Project Management Plan (PMP) of which the RP is a component?	d. Yes⊠ No□
e. Does it succinctly describe the levels of review: District Quality Control (DQC), and Agency Technical Review (ATR)?	e. Yes 🛛 No 🗌
f. Does it include a paragraph stating the title, subject, and purpose of the decision document to be reviewed?	f. Yes 🛭 No 🗌
g. Does it list the names and disciplines of the Project Delivery Team (PDT)?*	g. Yes 🛛 No 🗌
*Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.  Comments: Additional names will be added as the PDT team develops	

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

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?	a. Yes No
b. Does it state that ATR will be managed by MVD?	b. Yes⊠ No□
- ·	
Comments:	5
4. Does the RP explain how ATR will be accomplished?	Yes 🛛 No 🗌
a. Does it identify the anticipated number of reviewers?	a. Yes No 🗌
b. Does it provide a succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed for the review (not simply a list of disciplines)?	b. Yes 🛛 No 🗌
c. Does it indicate that ATR team members will be from outside the home district?	c. Yes 🛛 No 🗌
d. Does it indicate where the ATR team leader will be from?	d. Yes⊠ No□
e. If the reviewers are listed by name, does the RP describe the qualifications and years of relevant experience of the ATR team members?*	e. Yes 🗌 No 🖂
*Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.	ē
<b>Comments:</b> ATR team members, once identified, will be from outside the home district and the ATR lead, once identified, will be from outside MVD. Names and qualifications will be added once ATR team members have been identified.	± ±
5. Does the RP address review of sponsor in-kind contributions?	Yes ⊠ No □

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

6. Does the RP address how the review will be documented?	Yes ⊠ No □
a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR comments using Dr Checks?	a. Yes No
Comments:	
7. Does the RP address Policy Compliance and Legal Review?	Yes No 🗌
8. 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?	a. Yes 🛛 No 🗌
b. Does it include cost estimates for the reviews?	b. Yes 🛛 No 🗌
9. Does the RP indicate the study will address Safety Assurance factors?  Factors to be considered include:	Yes No n/a
<ul> <li>Where failure leads to significant threat to human life</li> <li>Novel methods\complexity\ precedent-setting models\policy changing conclusions</li> </ul>	Comments:
<ul> <li>Innovative materials or techniques</li> <li>Design lacks redundancy, resiliency of robustness</li> <li>Unique construction sequence or acquisition plans</li> <li>Reduced\overlapping design construction schedule</li> </ul>	3 A
10. Does the RP address opportunities for public participation?	Yes 🛛 No 🗌
11. Does the RP indicate ATR of cost estimates will be conducted by precertified district cost personnel who will coordinate with the Walla Walla Cost DX?	Yes 🛭 No 🗌
12. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?	Yes No No

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

### 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?	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 ☐ n/a ⊠

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

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 published comments and responses pertaining to the design and construction activities summarized in a report reviewed and approved by the MSC and posted on the home district website?	a. Yes No
e *	2
8. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP?	Yes 🗌 No 🗍

Godar Glades Wetland Complex, Calhoun and Jersey Counties, Ilinois – Illinois River River Miles 12-31

# ATTACHMENT 4: STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECSION & IMPLEMENTATION DOCUMENTS TEMPLATE

# STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

### **CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW**

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the *Definite Project Report with Integrated Environmental Assessment* for the *Godar Glades Wetland Complex National Wildlife Refuge HREP* 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<sup>sm</sup>.

\$		
TBD		Date
ATR Team Leader	想	
TBD		
TDD	_ #	Data
TBD		Date
Project Manager CEMVS		2 2
CENTVS	(4)	
		Date
Chief, Engineering and Construction Division	*	
CEMVS		
	F4	
		Data
Chief, Planning and Environment Division North		Date
CEMVP- RPEDN		
CLITIVI III EDII	365	
	_	Date
Review Management Office		
Representative, CEMVD-PD-SP	55	