



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

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

CEMVD-PD-SP

22 Jan '16

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, St. Louis District

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic
Ecosystem Restoration Project, Litchfield, Illinois

1. References:

a. Memorandum, CEMVS-PM-F, 12 November 2015, subject as
above (encl 1).

b. Memorandum, CEMVD-PD-KM, 5 April 2011, subject: MVD
Review Procedures for the Continuing Authority Program (CAP).

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

2. The enclosed Review Plan (RP) is a decision document review
plan (encl 2). It includes the MVD CAP Review Plan Checklist
and has been prepared in accordance with EC 1165-2-214.

3. MVD hereby approves the 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 website.

4. The MVD point of contact for this action is [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], CEMVD-PD-SP, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

2 Encls

Major General, USA
Commanding



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ST. LOUIS DISTRICT CORPS OF ENGINEERS
1222 SPRUCE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63103-2833

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

NOV 12 2015

CEMVS-PM-F

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, U.S. Army Engineer Division, Mississippi Valley
(CEMVD-PD-SP [REDACTED]), P.O. Box 80, 1400 Walnut Street, Vicksburg, MS 39181-0080

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project,
Litchfield, Illinois

1. References:

- a. Memorandum, CEMVD-PD-KM, dated 5 April 2011, subject: MVD Review Procedures for the Continuing Authority Program (CAP).
- b. EC 1165-2-214, 15 December 2012, Civil Works Review Policy.
- c. Memorandum, CEMVD-PD 11 October 2012, USACE Civil Works Review Process

2. The Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project Review Plan (Enclosure 1) is submitted for your approval. Also enclosed is the MVD CAP Review Plan Checklist (Enclosure 2) and the Draft MVD Approval Memorandum (Enclosure 3).

3. If you have any questions, please contact the Project Manager, [REDACTED], at [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

3 Encls

[REDACTED]
COL, EN
Commanding

Enc 11

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

Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Litchfield, Illinois
Section 206 Project

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers St. Louis District

MSC Approval Date: *Pending*
Last Revision Date: *None*



**US Army Corps
of Engineers®**

Encl 2

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

Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Litchfield, Illinois
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 | 7 |
| 11.REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES | 7 |
| 12.REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT | 7 |
| ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS | 8 |
| ATTACHMENT 2: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS | 9 |

REVIEW PLAN
Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Litchfield, Illinois

1. Purpose and Requirements.

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the *Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, Litchfield, Illinois, Section 206 Project Feasibility Report*.

Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, Public Law 104-303, 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 Mississippi Valley Division (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) MVS Quality Management Plan dated October 1999
- (8) QMS 22820 MVS Process for District Quality Control, approved 30 September 2011
- (9) *Project Management Plan for Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, Litchfield, Illinois, Section 206 Project, 30 April 2014*

REVIEW PLAN
Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Litchfield, Illinois

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 projects 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 Document. The *Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Litchfield, Illinois* 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.

b. Study/Project Description. *Lake Lou Yaeger (1,205 acres) is located just northeast of the town of Litchfield in Montgomery County, Illinois. The lake was created in 1966; however, over time sediment accumulation and shoreline erosion have occurred resulting in loss of lake depth and increased turbidity. These factors have led to the fisheries habitat within the lake to be degraded. In addition, wind and ice-induced bank erosion have degraded the shoreline, resulting in high vertical banks which reduce fish and wildlife habitat. The goal of this project is to restore aquatic habitat in Lake Lou Yaeger. Study objectives are to restore shallow aquatic habitat, increase habitat supporting migratory waterfowl and shorebirds, improve water quality for fish species, and increase wetland habitat supporting invertebrates.*

During the preliminary plan formulation performed for the Federal Interest Determination various sediment control and shoreline protection measures were developed by the Project Delivery Team (PDT) to address the issues facing Lake Lou Yaeger. The measures were grouped into four main categories: sediment control, shoreline protection, use of dredge spoil material, and in-lake structures. From these measures, several alternatives were developed and evaluated based on the extent to which they meet study goals and objectives, avoid possible constraints, consider the preferences of the non-Federal sponsor (City of Litchfield), program costs and benefits (habitat units), possible Lands, Easements, Rights-of-Way, Relocations, and Disposal Area (LERRDS), and the Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) requirements and capabilities of the non-Federal sponsor.

During the Federal Interest Determination, a preliminary restoration plan was developed through the PDT's assessments via site visits and meetings with the non-Federal sponsor. The preliminary plan included sediment control at the northern end of the lake and shoreline protection. The shoreline protection was planned to be rock placed approximately 15 feet from the shoreline to reduce further erosion and provide additional shelter and nursery habitat for fish, and rock structure for macroinvertebrates. Additionally, earthen fill material behind the placed rock could be used to create additional littoral wetland habitat with submersed aquatic vegetation and macrophytic plants (e.g., cattails, arrowheads, etc.) which will increase feeding and resting areas for migratory and resident waterfowl. Preliminary implementation costs for the FID plan were [REDACTED]

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and level of Review.

The project does not involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance. The project is considered very small-scale at a cost of approximately [REDACTED]. There is no request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts. The project is not anticipated to require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). There is not anticipated to be significant public dispute regarding the size, nature, and effects of the project. There is not anticipated to be significant public dispute regarding the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project. The information in the decision document or anticipated project design is not likely to be based on novel methods, involve the use of innovative materials or techniques, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change

REVIEW PLAN

Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Litchfield, Illinois

prevailing practices. The measures being considered are common to Corps studies, are proven methods and are not novel. The project design is not anticipated to require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule. Therefore, neither Type I nor Type II IEPR is required.

The project is considered low risk and low uncertainty overall. The sediment detention features are anticipated to have a low risk of failure and would not pose a risk to human life or safety should failure occur. The potential for project failure is low because the measures under consideration have numerous successful regional and national applications. As with any ecosystem restoration project, there will be uncertainty as to the exact magnitude of benefits that will be realized from the project. However, the habitat analysis methodology used will be based on proven techniques and is anticipated to adequately reflect project benefits. The risk of the benefits of project features being significantly under- or over-estimated is low. The potential for controversy regarding project implementation is low because the recommended plan will take into account the public's concerns. A socio-economic analysis will be prepared and at least one public meeting will be held.

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. *There are no in-kind products/analyses expected to be provided by the sponsor.*

4. District Quality Control (DQC).

All decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC prior to ATR. DQC is an internal review process of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the Project Management Plan (PMP). The home district shall manage DQC 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.

DQC includes such things as quality control and quality assurance plans, checking of computations, drawings, and documents, supervisory reviews, and PDT reviews. DQC efforts will include the necessary expertise to address compliance with published USACE policy. The DQC is managed in the District and may be conducted by in-house staff as long as the reviewers are not doing the work involved in the study, including contracted work that is being reviewed. The DQC of products and reports shall also cover any necessary National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other environmental compliance products.

Basic quality control tools include quality checks and reviews, supervisory reviews, Project Delivery Team (PDT) reviews, etc. During the DQC review, compliance with established policy principles and procedures, utilizing justified and valid assumptions, should be verified. This includes review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analysis, alternatives evaluated, the appropriateness of the result, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing Corps policy. In addition to technical reviews, products will be reviewed for legal sufficiency and policy compliance. DQC documentation (comments and responses) will be provided to the ATR team.

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 documented and discussed at the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) milestone. Certification of the ATR will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. 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

REVIEW PLAN

Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Litchfield, Illinois

day-to-day production of the project/product. ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel. The ATR team lead will be from within 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:

- (1) Draft Feasibility Report with Integrated Environmental Assessment prior to AFB*
- (2) Final Feasibility Report with Integrated Environmental Assessment prior to final approval, to review changes since the previous ATR.*

b. Required ATR Team Expertise. *The ATR team will be comprised of individuals who have not been involved in the development of the Feasibility Report and will be chosen based on expertise, experience, and skills. The selected members will roughly mirror the composition of the PDT. ATR team members will be from outside the Home District. Due to the overall low level of risk anticipated for this project and the straightforward design, the ATR team will consist of reviewers from the following areas of discipline:*

| ATR Team Members/Disciplines | Expertise Required |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| ATR Lead | <i>The ATR lead should be a senior professional preferably with experience in preparing Section 206 or similar CAP studies 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 the St. Louis District but will be from within MVD.</i> |
| Plan Formulation | <i>The Plan Formulation reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in the policies and procedures for the engineering and design of Civil Works aquatic ecosystem restoration projects, experience with CAP studies, alternative formulation and comparison, and general planning policy.</i> |
| Economics (CE/ICA) | <i>The Economics (Cost Effectiveness/Incremental Cost Analysis (CE/ICA)) reviewer should be a senior economist with demonstrated experience and understanding in CE/ICA and the Institute for Water Resources (IWR) Planning Suite. The reviewer should have experience generating and developing CE/ICA's for aquatic ecosystem restoration projects. The reviewer should be familiar with ecosystem output analyses and concepts.</i> |
| Environmental Resources | <i>The Environmental Resources reviewer must have National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance and implementation experience. The reviewer should also have an ecological/biological background and be familiar with habitat models used to assess environmental benefits.</i> |
| Hydraulic Engineering | <i>The Hydraulic Engineering reviewer should have experience in hydrology and hydraulic modeling, as well as sedimentation transport modeling. A certified professional engineer is desired.</i> |
| Civil Engineering | <i>The Civil Engineering reviewer should have experience in design of ecosystem restoration features. A certified professional engineer is desired.</i> |

REVIEW PLAN
Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Litchfield, Illinois

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Geotechnical Engineering | <i>The Geotechnical Engineering reviewer should have experience in designing sediment detention structures and shoreline erosion protection measures. A certified professional engineer is desired.</i> |
| Cost Engineering | <i>Cost DX Staff or Cost DX Pre-Certified Professional with experience preparing cost estimates for shoreline protection and dredging projects using M-CACES. The reviewer must coordinate with the Cost DX to conduct ATR of cost estimates, construction schedules, and contingencies.</i> |
| Real Estate | <i>The Real Estate reviewer must have experience in federal civil work real estate laws, policies, and guidance. The reviewer must have experience working with respective sponsor real estate issues.</i> |

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.

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).

REVIEW PLAN

Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Litchfield, Illinois

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

| Model Name and Version | Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study |
|--|--|
| <i>Wildlife Habitat Appraisal Guide (WHAG)</i> | <i>The Wildlife Habitat Appraisal Guide and Aquatic Habitat Appraisal Guide are habitat suitability index models based on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP). HEP models use existing and proposed habitat conditions to predict changes in the suitability of habitat for selected species. These models will be used to evaluate and compare the future without- and with-project conditions of Lake Lou Yaeger to aid in the selection of a recommended plan.</i> |
| <i>Aquatic Habitat Appraisal Guide (AHAG)</i> | |
| <i>IWR-Planning Suite with Annualizer (version 2.0.6.0)</i> | <i>IWR Planning Suite assists with plan comparison by conducting cost effectiveness and incremental cost analysis, identifying the plans that are the best financial investments based on costs and benefits.</i> |
| <i>Microcomputer Aided Cost Engineering System (M-CACES) MII Version 3.0</i> | <i>The Microcomputer Aided Cost Engineering System (M-CACES) MII Version 3.0 is a certified and approved for use on USACE projects cost estimating model. The program will be used to estimate costs for the Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project. These cost estimates will be used in conjunction with the results of the WHAG and AHAG to help select a recommended plan.</i> |

9. Review Schedules And Costs.

ATR Schedule and Cost.

(1) The PDT will hold a "page-turn" session to review the draft report to ensure consistency across the disciplines and resolve any issues prior to start of ATR. Writer/editor services will be performed on the draft prior to ATR as well.

(2) ATR will be conducted after DQC on the Draft Feasibility Report to review for policy and legal compliance prior to AFB. If following public review, significant comments are received which change the scope of the project, an additional ATR will be scheduled and conducted.

(3) The ATR of the Draft Feasibility Report prior to AFB is scheduled during the May 2016 and the Final Report ATR is scheduled for the October 2016.

ATR Timeline

| <i>Task</i> | <i>Date</i> |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Comment Period Begin</i> | <i>Week 1</i> |
| <i>Kick-off Meeting</i> | <i>Week 1</i> |
| <i>ATR Comments Due</i> | <i>Week 3</i> |
| <i>PDT Responses Due</i> | <i>Week 4</i> |
| <i>Responses Back-check</i> | <i>Week 5</i> |
| <i>Certification</i> | <i>Week 6</i> |

REVIEW PLAN

Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Litchfield, Illinois

(4) *The project manager will work with the ATR Lead to ensure that adequate funding is available and is commensurate with the level of review needed. The current cost estimate for each ATR review is \$40,000 (approximately \$5,000 per team member). However, this estimate will be revisited when the scope of the report is better defined. This cost estimate includes funds for the ATR Lead to participate in the AFB milestone conference to address the ATR process and any significant and/or unresolved ATR concerns. Any funding shortages will be negotiated on a case by case basis and in advance of a negative charge occurring. The ATR Lead shall provide organization codes for each reviewer and a responsible financial point of contact (CEFMS responsible employee) for creation of labor codes. Reviewers shall monitor individual labor code balances and alert the ATR Lead to any possible funding shortages.*

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 public will have opportunities to participate in this study as part of the NEPA process. Upon completion of AFB with MVD's approval, the Draft Feasibility Report with Integrated Environmental Assessment will be released for 30-day public review. It is anticipated that a public meeting will be held during this review period. Public review of necessary State or Federal permits will also take place.*

11. Review Plan Approval And Updates.

The *MVD 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:

- *Project Manager, St. Louis District 314-331-8286*
- *District Support Team Lead, Mississippi Valley Division 601-634-5293*

REVIEW PLAN
Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Litchfield, Illinois

Attachment 1: Team Rosters

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM

| Last | First | Role | Phone | Email |
|------|-------|------------------------|-------|-------|
| | | Project Manager | | |
| | | Plan Formulation | | |
| | | Environmental/NEPA | | |
| | | Hydraulics & Hydrology | | |
| | | Economics | | |
| | | Cultural Resources | | |
| | | Civil Engineer | | |
| | | Cost Estimating | | |
| | | Regulatory | | |
| | | Geotechnical Engineer | | |
| | | Real Estate | | |
| | | | | |

ATR TEAM - TBD

| Last | First | Credentials/Years of Experience | Role | Phone | Email |
|------|-------|---------------------------------|------|-------|-------|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

MVD VERTICAL TEAM

| Last | First | Discipline | Phone | Email |
|------|-------|----------------------------|-------|-------|
| | | District Support Team Lead | | |

REVIEW PLAN
Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project, Litchfield, Illinois

Attachment 2: Review Plan Revisions

| Revision Date | Description of Change | Page/Paragraph Number |
|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

MVD CAP Review Plan Checklist

Date: November 2015
Originating District: MVS
Project/Study Title: Lake Lou Yaeger Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project
P2# and AMSCO#: 115388; 169837
District POC: [REDACTED]
MSC Reviewer:
CAP Authority: 206
Other Program Directed to follow CAP Processes:

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 a Continuing Authorities Project? Or Other Program Directed to follow CAP Processes? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Does it include a table of contents? | b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Is the purpose of the RP clearly stated? | c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Does it reference the Project Management Plan (PMP) of which the RP is a component? | d. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | e. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Does it include a paragraph stating the title, subject, and purpose of the decision document to be reviewed? | f. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Does it list the names and disciplines of the Project Delivery Team (PDT)?* | g. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>*Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.</i></p> <p>Comments:</p> | |
| <p>2. Is the RP detailed enough to assess the necessary level and focus of the reviews?</p> | <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>3. Does the RP define the appropriate level of review for the project/study?</p> | <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>a. Does it state that DQC will be managed by the home district in accordance with the MVD and district Quality Management Plans?</p> <p>b. Does it state that ATR will be managed by MVD?</p> <p>c. Does it state whether IEPR will be performed? For Sec 103 and Sec 205, see additional questions in 5. below.</p> <p>Comments: The review plan is based on the MVD Model Review Plan for Section 206 Projects which is applicable to projects that not require IEPR, as defined by the mandatory Type I IEPR triggers contained in EC 1165-2-214</p> | <p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>4. Does the RP explain how ATR will be accomplished?</p> | <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>a. Does it identify the anticipated number of reviewers?</p> <p>b. Does it provide a succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed for the review (not simply a list of disciplines)?</p> <p>c. Does it indicate that ATR team members will be from outside the home district?</p> <p>d. Does it indicate where the ATR team leader will be from?</p> <p>e. If the reviewers are listed by name, does the RP describe the qualifications and years of relevant experience of the ATR team members?*</p> <p><i>*Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.</i></p> <p>Comments: ATR team member selection is still pending at this time.</p> | <p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>e. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>5. For Sec 103 and Sec 205 projects, does the RP explain how IEPR will be accomplished?</p> | <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>a. Is an exclusion being requested, requiring CG approval?</p> <p>b. Does it provide a defensible rationale for the decision on IEPR?</p> <p>c. If IEPR is required, does it state that IEPR will be managed by an Outside Eligible Organization, external to the Corps of Engineers?</p> <p>d. If IEPR is required, does the RP indicate which PCX will manage the IEPR and whether any coordination with the PCX has occurred?</p> | <p>a. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Comments: | | |
| 6. Does the RP address review of sponsor in-kind contributions? | | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Does the RP address how the review will be documented? | | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR and IEPR comments using Dr Checks?</p> <p>b. Does the RP explain how the IEPR will be documented in a Review Report?</p> <p>c. Does the RP document how written responses to the IEPR Review Report will be prepared?</p> <p>c. 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?</p> <p>Comments: Type I IEPR not required</p> | | <p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> |
| 8. Does the RP address Policy Compliance and Legal Review? | | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Does the RP present the tasks, timing and sequence (including deferrals), and costs of reviews? | | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>a. Does it provide a schedule for ATR including review of the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) materials and final report?</p> <p>b. Does it present the timing and sequencing for IEPR?</p> <p>c. Does it include cost estimates for the reviews?</p> | | <p>a. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>10. Does the RP indicate the study will address Safety Assurance factors? Factors to be considered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where failure leads to significant threat to human life • Novel methods\complexity\ precedent-setting models\policy changing conclusions • Innovative materials or techniques • Design lacks redundancy, resiliency of robustness • Unique construction sequence or acquisition plans • Reduced\overlapping design construction schedule | | <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments: Type II IEPR is not anticipated to be required</p> |
| 11. Does the RP address opportunities for public participation? | | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13. Has the approval memorandum been prepared and does it accompany the RP? | | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |