



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**  
**CORPS OF ENGINEERS, NORTHWESTERN DIVISION**  
**PO BOX 2870**  
**PORTLAND OR 97208-2870**

CENWD-PDD

16 June 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Portland District (CENWP-PM-FP/Hicks)

SUBJECT: Review Plan (RP) Approval for the Columbia River Navigation Improvements Report, Section 107 Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Project

1. Reference EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2010.
2. The enclosed RP for the Columbia River Navigation Improvements Section 107 project has been prepared in accordance with the referenced guidance.
3. The RP was not coordinated with the appropriate Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) as it is a Section 107 project under the CAP and CAP projects do not require endorsement by the PCX.
4. The RP has been revised to address NWD review comments. All comments have been back-checked and closed out.
5. I hereby approve this RP, which is subject to change as study circumstances require, consistent with study development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this RP or its execution will require review by CENWD-PDD and approval by this office.
6. The RP should be posted to the internet and made available for public comment.
7. Please contact Valerie Ringold at (503) 808-3984, if you have further questions regarding this matter.

Encl

8 DAVID J. PONGANIS  
Chief, Planning, Environmental Resources,  
Fish Policy and Support Division

**REVIEW PLAN**  
**USING THE NWD MODEL REVIEW PLAN**  
for  
**Continuing Authorities Program**  
**Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208, 1135 and projects directed by guidance to**  
**use CAP procedures**

**Columbia River Navigation Improvements, Lower Columbia River**

**Section 107 Project**

**Portland District**

**MSC Approval Date: Pending**  
**Last Revision Date: 15 June 2011**



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers ®**

**REVIEW PLAN  
USING THE NWD MODEL REVIEW PLAN**

**Columbia River Navigation Improvements, Lower Columbia River  
Section 107 Project**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. PROJECT INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC).....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>6. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7. COST ENGINEERING Directory of Expertise (DX) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>8. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>9. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>10. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>11. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>12. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT 2: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS.....</b>	<b>9</b>

## 1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

- a. **Purpose.** This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Columbia River Navigation Improvements, Lower Columbia River, Section 107 project.

Section 107 of River and Harbor Act of 1960, as amended, authorizes the Corps to study, adopt, construct and maintain navigation projects. This is a Continuing Authorities Program 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 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 NWD Model Review Plan for Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208, 1135 and authorities directed by guidance to follow CAP procedures, which is applicable to projects that do not require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), as defined in EC 1165-2-209 Civil Works Review Policy.

### c. References

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
- (2) EC 1105-2-412, Model Certification, 31 May 2005
- (3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
- (4) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007
- (5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007
- (6) Continuing Authority Program Planning Process Improvements, Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1, 19 Jan 2011

## 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 107 projects is the home MSC. The MSC will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the Agency Technical Review (ATR). The Portland District will post the approved review plan on its public website and provide the appropriate NWD District Support Planner with the link. A copy of the approved review plan (and any updates) will be provided to the SBH-PSCX to keep the PCX apprised of requirements and review schedules.

## 3. PROJECT INFORMATION

- a. **Decision Document.** The Columbia River Navigation Improvements, Lower Columbia River decision document will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F. The approval level of the decision document (if policy compliant) is the home MSC. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document.

- b. Study/Project Description.** The Columbia River Navigation Improvements Project focuses on the area of the channel between the mouth of the river and the Portland/Vancouver area. This study is cost shared with the non-Federal sponsors: The Port of Portland, OR and the Ports of Kalama, Longview, and Vancouver, WA. The purpose of the proposed action is to relieve congestion, improve safety, and reduce cost for ships utilizing the channel's anchorage areas. Types of measures being evaluated are buoys, free swinging anchorages, and mooring dolphins. Ideal quantities and locations will be evaluated once the type of improvement is determined. The federal limit for projects under this authority is \$7 million. Initially evaluated alternatives have project costs approximately ranging from \$1 to \$2.5 million.

The Federal Interest Determination was approved by OASA(CW) on 1 June 2011.

- c. 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 currently no anticipated work in kind products.

#### **4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)**

All decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC prior to ATR. The Portland District shall manage DQC.

#### **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 is managed within USACE by the designated RMO and is conducted by a qualified team from outside the Portland 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 within the home MSC.

**a. 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 107 decision documents and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. The ATR lead will also serve as a reviewer for any of the below disciplines. The ATR Lead MUST be from outside the Portland District.
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in Section 107 projects.
Economics	The Economics reviewer should be a senior professional with experience in complex economic studies, preferably those related to commercial navigation.
Environmental Resources	The Environmental Resources Reviewer should be an experienced environmental professional with a background in NEPA implementation, CWA compliance, and endangered species compliance requirements, among others.
Navigation Expert / Engineer	This reviewer should have navigation expertise in looking at what is practical from the standpoint of dredging, maintenance, and minimizing interference with navigation.
Cost Engineering	Cost DX Staff or Cost DX Pre-Certified Professional with experience preparing cost estimates for commercial navigation projects.

**b. Charge Document.** The district will prepare the charge document which clearly identifies the review requirements. This document must be completed prior to requesting an ATR team.

**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. If an ATR concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the ATR team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the vertical team for further resolution in accordance with the policy issue resolution process described in either ER 1110-2-12 or ER 1105-2-100, Appendix H, as appropriate. Unresolved concerns can be closed in DrChecks with a notation that the concern has been elevated to the vertical team for resolution.

**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 home MSC 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. 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.

- a. **EC 1105-2-412.** This EC 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 and ATR.
- b. **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
Excel Spreadsheet	An Excel spreadsheet was prepared, for this specific study only, for the purpose of evaluating potential benefits of anchor buoys (other alternatives had been screened out at the point of development).

## 9. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

### ATR Schedule and Cost.

- a. **Schedule:** ATR is currently anticipated to begin in July 2011 and, to meet a very tight schedule, is anticipated to last 3 days. The ATR lead and team members must be committed to a quick turnaround on any comments to the report.

**b. Cost:**

Reviewer Type	Hours	Labor Rate	Total
ATR Team Reviewers (5)	12	\$120/hr	\$7,200
ATR Team Lead additional responsibilities	32	\$120/hr	\$3,840
Total			\$11,040

**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. Agencies with regulatory review responsibilities will be contacted for coordination as required by applicable laws and procedures. The ATR team will be provided copies of public and agency comments.

The public will be invited to participate during the review period for the environmental documentation once the report has been developed. It is anticipated that this may occur concurrent with ATR. Partner agencies will participate in review and comment throughout the entire project as members of the PDT and formally during the DQC process.

**11. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES**

The NWD Planning Chief has been delegated responsibility for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the NWD 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 Portland District is responsible for keeping the review plan up to date. Minor changes to the review plan since the last NWD Planning Chief 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 re-approved by the NWD Planning Chief following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in the NWD Planning Chief determining that use of the NWD Model Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-209. The latest version of the review plan, along with the Chief’s approval memorandum, will be posted on the Portland 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:

- Mark Dasso, Project Manager (503) 808-4728
- Valerie Ringold, District Support Team Member (503) 808-3984

**ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS**  
**Project Delivery Team**

<b><u>NAME</u></b>	<b><u>DISCIPLINE</u></b>	<b><u>Phone</u></b>	<b><u>E-mail</u></b>
Mark Dasso	Project Manager	(503) 808-4728	Joseph.m.dasso@usace.army.mil
Steve Helm	Environmental/Biology	(503) 808-4778	Steve.R.Helm@usace.army.mil
Tom Hackett	Economist	(503) 808-4769	Thomas.W.Hackett@usace.army.mil
Jon Gornick	Operations Representative	(503) 808-4341	Jon.M.Gornick@usace.army.mil
Eric Burnette	Port Representative	*	*
Steve Cohen	U.S. Navy Point of Contact	*	*

\*Contact information regarding review available upon request

**ATTACHMENT 2: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS**

<b>Revision Date</b>	<b>Description of Change</b>	<b>Page / Paragraph Number</b>