



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION  
60 FORSYTH STREET SW, ROOM 10M15  
ATLANTA, GA 30303-8801

20 NOV 2012

CESAD-PDP

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Jacksonville District (CESAJ-PD/Eric Bush)

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for Jacksonville Harbor, FL Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) 2010-2031 Update

1. References:

- a. Memorandum, CESAJ-PD, 27 March 2012
- b. Memorandum, CESAM-PD-D, 29 March 2012
- c. EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2010

2. The attached Review Plan for the Jacksonville Harbor, FL Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) 2010-2031 Update has been prepared in accordance with Engineer Circular (EC) 1165-2-209 (enclosure).

3. The Review Plan has been coordinated with the National Deep Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise (DDNPCX) of the South Atlantic Division (SAD), which is the lead office to execute this plan. For further information, please contact the DDNPCX at (251) 694-3884. The Review Plan does not include independent external peer review. Per EC 1165-2-209, I conclude this DMMP can be classified as an "other work product" and that independent external peer review is not applicable. As this DMMP confirms existing disposal areas, and practices will allow for disposal of operations and maintenance (O&M) dredged material for a period of 20 years, it is not considered a decision or implementation document for the purposes of independent external peer review.

4. I hereby approve this Review Plan, which is subject to change as circumstances require, consistent with study development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this Review Plan or its execution will require new written approval from this office.

5. The District should take steps to post the approved Review Plan and a copy of this approval memorandum to the SAJ District public internet website and provide a link to the DDNPCX for their use. Before posting to the website, the names of Corps/Army employees must be removed.

CESAD-PDP

SUBJECT: Review Plan Approval for Jacksonville Harbor, FL Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) 2010-2031 Update

6. The point of contact for this action is Ms. Karen Dove-Jackson at (404) 562-5225.

Encl

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Jackson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

DONALD E. JACKSON  
COL, EN  
Commanding



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
JACKSONVILLE DISTRICT CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
P.O. BOX 4970  
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA 32232-0019

REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

CESAJ-PD

MAR 27 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR Chief, Planning and Policy (CESAD-PDS)

SUBJECT: Request for MSC Approval – Review Plan of Jacksonville Harbor, FL Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) 2010-2031 Update

1. Reference: EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2010.
2. SAJ hereby requests two actions, as follows:
  - a. Approval of the enclosed subject Review Plan, consistent with the intent of Reference 1, and
  - b. Support for an exclusion from Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), consistent with the intent of Reference 1.
3. The Deep Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise (DDNPCX) has reviewed the Review Plan (RP) and concurs that the RP satisfies peer review policy requirements outlined in Reference 1 and supports the IEPR Exclusion request.
4. The RP complies with all applicable policies and provides an adequate agency technical review of the plan formulation, engineering, environmental analyses, and other aspects of plan development. It is our understanding that non-substantive changes to this RP, should they become necessary, are authorized by CESAD. The RP is enclosed.
5. The IEPR Exclusion request is based upon the premise that the Jacksonville Harbor DMMP Update will not change the authorized 1965 recommended plan. The RP update will provide the factual basis for amending the 2006 Project Partnership Agreement (PPA). In that context, it is considered an "Other Work Product" rather than a decision document. It is limited in scope and impact and therefore would not significantly benefit from IEPR.
6. The District will post the MSC-approved Final RP to its web site and provide a link to SAJ and the PCX.

CESAJ-PD

SUBJECT: Request for MSC Approval -- Review Plan of Jacksonville Harbor, FL Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) 2010-2031 Update

7. The SAJ point of contact is either of: Stephanie Groleau, Planning Technical Lead, 904-232-1979, Samantha Borer, Assisting Lead, 904-232-1066, or Jim Baker, Review Coordinator, 904-232-2698.



Encls

STUART J. APPELBAUM  
Chief of Planning and Policy Division

## **REVIEW PLAN**

**Jacksonville Harbor, Florida, Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP)  
2012-2031 Update**

**Jacksonville District**

**MSC Approval Date: November 2012**  
**Last Revision Date: November 2012**



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers** \*

## REVIEW PLAN

### Jacksonville Harbor, Florida, Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) 2012-2031 Update

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS .....	1
2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION .....	3
3. STUDY INFORMATION .....	3
4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC) .....	9
5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) .....	9
6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR) .....	11
7. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL .....	13
8. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS .....	13
9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....	14
10. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES .....	14
11. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT .....	14
ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS .....	15
ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS .....	17
ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS .....	18
ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....	19

## 1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. **Purpose.** This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Jacksonville Harbor, FL Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) 2012-2031 Update ("DMMP Update"). This Review Plan is being developed concurrently with DMMP review.

### b. References

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
- (2) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 Mar 2011
- (3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 21 Jul 2006
- (4) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007
- (5) ER 1105-2-100 Appendix E – Instructions for Development of a DMMP

c. **Requirements.** This review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, which establishes an accountable, comprehensive, life-cycle review strategy for Civil Works products by providing a seamless process for review of all Civil Works projects from initial planning through design, construction, and operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and rehabilitation (OMRR&R). The EC outlines four general levels of review: District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), and Policy and Legal Compliance Review. The Jacksonville District has determined through a risked informed decision process that the DMMP updates the 2005 DMMP for efficient operational practices and methods for the operation and maintenance of Jacksonville Harbor. Per guidance provided in EC 1165-2-209 SAJ has concluded that this DMMP is not a decision document, as defined in EC 1165-2-209, as it does not change the recommendation for O&M practices, nor does it require any authorization for implementation. USACE guidance contained in the EC calls this type of document an "other work product" or "other report."

### d. Types of Review

- (1) District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC). All work products and reports, evaluations, and assessments shall undergo necessary and appropriate District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC). 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. Documentation of DQC activities is required and should be in accordance with the Quality Manual of the District and the home Major Subordinate Command (MSC).
- (2) Agency Technical Review (ATR). ATR is mandatory for all decision and implementation documents. For other work products, a case specific risk-informed decision, as described in EC 1165-2-209, shall be made as to whether ATR is appropriate. The objective of ATR is to ensure consistency with established criteria, guidance, procedures, and policy. The ATR will assess whether the analyses presented are technically correct and comply with published US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) guidance, and whether the document explains the analyses and results in a reasonably clear manner for the public and decision makers. ATR is managed within USACE by a designated Risk Management Organization (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. The RMO for this effort in the Deep Draft

Planning Center of Expertise, DDNPCX. ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel and may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate. To assure independence, the leader of the ATR team shall be from outside the home MSC.

- (3) Independent External Peer Review (IEPR). IEPR is the most independent level of review, and is applied in cases that meet certain criteria where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of USACE is warranted. Any work product, report, evaluation, or assessment that undergoes DQC and ATR also MAY be required to undergo IEPR under certain circumstances. A risk-informed decision, as described in EC 1.165-2-209, is made as to whether IEPR is appropriate. IEPR panels will consist of independent, recognized experts from outside of the USACE in the appropriate disciplines, representing a balance of areas of expertise suitable for the review being conducted. There are two types of IEPR: Type I is generally for decision documents and Type II is generally for implementation products.
  - (a) Type I IEPR. Type I IEPR reviews are managed outside USACE. Type I IEPR panels assess the adequacy and acceptability of the economic and environmental assumptions and projections, project evaluation data, economic analysis, environmental analyses, engineering analyses, formulation of alternative plans, methods for integrating risk and uncertainty, models used in the evaluation of environmental impacts of proposed projects, and an biological opinions of the project study. Type I IEPR will cover the entire decision document or action and will address all the underlying engineering, economics, and environmental work, not just one aspect of the study.
  - (b) Type II IEPR. Type II IEPR, or Safety Assurance Review (SAR), are managed outside the USACE and are considered for all projects in all Corps mission areas but are typically conducted on design and construction activities for hurricane, storm, and flood risk management projects or other projects where existing and potential hazards pose a significant threat to human life. Type II IEPR panels will conduct reviews of the design and construction activities prior to initiation of physical construction and, until construction activities are completed, periodically thereafter on a regular schedule. The reviews shall consider the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities in assuring public health safety and welfare.
- (4) Policy and Legal Compliance Review. All products 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 1.105-2-100. These reviews culminate in determinations by the MSC that that the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy. DQC and ATR augment and complement the policy and legal review processes by addressing compliance with pertinent published Army policies, particularly policies on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents.
- (5) Cost Engineering Review and Certification. The Cost Engineering Appendix will undergo ATR with the DMMP main report. A Cost engineer from outside the district is on the ATR Team, in addition to a Cost DX representative. The representative of the Cost DX (located in the Walla Walla District) will serve as an ATR team member and sign the ATR certification.

## 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 decision documents is typically either a Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) or the Risk Management Center (RMC), depending on the primary purpose of the decision document. The RMO for the peer review effort described in this Review Plan is the National Deep Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise (DDNPCX).

The RMO will coordinate with the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (Cost DX) to conduct ATR of cost estimates, construction schedules and contingencies and with any other Centers of Expertise as required.

## 3. STUDY INFORMATION

a. **Other Work Product.** The objective of the 2012-2031 DMMP Update is to update the Interim 2005 Jacksonville Harbor Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) to ensure that there are sufficient disposal areas and a plan for capacity to support a 20-year "planning horizon." An accompanying Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with NEPA to evaluate the impacts of nearshore placement of dredged material was also completed. The DMMP Update is consistent with the EA and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) that was signed on 6 June 2012. If the 2012-2031 DMMP Update does not recommend a Base Plan that changes the cost sharing outlined in the 2006 Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA), then the PCA will not need to be amended. The PCA describes the project and the responsibilities of the Government and sponsor in cost-sharing and execution of project work. In addition to detailing a 20 year plan for managing dredge material, the Jacksonville DMMP outlines the cost-sharing for Operation and Maintenance (O&M) during the 20 year planning horizon. SAJ has determined through a risk based decision process that the 2012-2031 DMMP Update stems from the 2005 DMMP for efficient operational practices and methods for the maintenance of Jacksonville Harbor. Per EC 1165-2-209 guidance, this DMMP is not a decision document as it does not change the recommendation for O&M practices, nor does it require any authorization for implementation. USACE guidance calls this type of document an "other work product" or "other report."

b. **Study/Project Description.**

The Interim 2005 Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) for Jacksonville Harbor Project, Florida was approved on 7 July 2005. The Jacksonville Harbor DMMP determined cost effective and environmentally acceptable ways to manage disposal material over a 20 year period for maintenance of the Jacksonville Harbor Federal Navigation Channel.

Based on changed conditions since the 2005 DMMP, the Jacksonville District determined an update was needed to the DMMP. The update will evaluate current and future operation and maintenance disposal needs of the Jacksonville Harbor Federal Navigation Channel as well as maintenance dredged material disposal needs of the Non-Federal Sponsor, the Jacksonville Port Authority and its tenants. This DMMP does **NOT** account for future quantities of dredged material as a result of any potential future deepening or widening which is currently being evaluated in the Jacksonville Harbor GRR2 feasibility study or the recent report detailing proposed improvement in the Mile Point. No additional Congressional authorization will be needed in order to implement the DMMP.

This study provides an updated account of the current disposal capacity and projects uses of all presently operational confined and ocean disposal areas designated to receive maintenance dredged material from Jacksonville Harbor for the next 20 years. Additionally, this study evaluates a full spectrum of alternatives to maintain and/or increase the capacity of dredged material disposal sites for Jacksonville Harbor.

The planning horizon for the DMMP update is from 2012 to 2031. A cost analysis will be performed to determine the most economically viable and environmentally acceptable plan by comparing existing upland disposal sites, ocean disposal, nearshore and beach placement, as well as potential development of additional upland disposal sites.

**Figure 1** shows the Jacksonville Harbor Federal Navigation Channel, as well as existing disposal sites: East and West Bartram Island, Buck Island, and an offshore dredged material disposal site (ODMDS) which is approximately 3.5 miles offshore.



**c. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review.**

This section discusses the factors affecting the risk informed decisions on the appropriate scope and level of review. The discussion is intended to be detailed enough to assess the level and focus of review and support the PDT, PCX, and vertical team decisions on the appropriate level of review and types of expertise represented on the various review teams. Factors affecting the risk informed decisions on the appropriate scope and level of review include the following:

- *If parts of the study will likely be challenging (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways – consider technical, institutional, and social challenges, etc.);*  
There are no technically, institutionally, or socially challenging aspects to this study. This is an update of an approved Dredged Material Management Plan, which has been in effect and been implemented since 2005. The update is mainly being performed to reflect new shoaling rates and disposal capacity, and to forecast the 20 year horizon beginning in 2012, rather than 2000. The recommended plan involves the standard dredging practices of nearshore placement, offloading by truck, stockpiling material suitable for reuse, and raising dikes.
- *A preliminary assessment of where the project risks are likely to occur and what the magnitude of those risks might be (e.g., what are the uncertainties and how might they affect the success of the project);*  
The project has been implemented successfully since 2005 and this update does not add risk. Section 13.3 of the DMMP outlines the minor risks involved with geotechnical borings, environmental testing for Section 103 compliance, catastrophic weather events, and funding. When these risks are combined, the cumulative risk to the project is still low. By providing a more current evaluation of disposal needs and capacity capabilities, the updated DMMP actually helps reduce risks associated with operations and maintenance of Jacksonville Harbor.
- *If the project is likely to have significant economic, environmental, and/or social effects to the Nation (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways);*  
The recommended plan will not have significant environmental or social effects to the Nation. If the recommended plan is not implemented, there would be significant negative economic effects to the Nation if Jacksonville Harbor channels could no longer be maintained for navigation.
- *If the project likely involves significant threat to human life/safety assurance (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways – consider at minimum the safety assurance factors described in EC 1165-2-209 including, but not necessarily limited to, the consequences of non-performance on project economics, the environmental and social well-being [public safety and social justice; residual risk; uncertainty due to climate variability, etc.];*  
No. The recommended plan outlines best practices for disposing of O&M dredged material and does not add significant threat to human life/safety assurance.
- *If the project/study is likely to have significant interagency interest (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways);*  
The recommended plan is not likely to have any significant interagency interest. The DMMP update is being coordinated with the appropriate agencies, and to date there have not been any objections from any agencies.
- *If the project/study will be highly controversial (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways);*

The recommended plan will not be controversial. All dredging practices discussed in the report are standard in USACE, the dredging industry, and closely match historical practices within the harbor.

- *If the project report is likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways);*  
The recommended plan does not contain influential scientific information and is not a highly influential scientific assessment.
- *If the information in the decision document or proposed project design will likely 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 prevailing practices (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways);*  
The information in DMMP update document is not based on novel methods, does not use innovative materials or techniques, does not present complex challenges, is not precedent setting, and is not likely to change prevailing practices
- *If the proposed project design will require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways – see EC 1165-2-209, Appendix E, Paragraph 2 for more information about redundancy, resiliency, and robustness); and*  
The recommended plan does not require any additional redundancy, resilience, or robustness.
- *If the proposed project has unique construction sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule (with some discussion as to why or why not and, if so, in what ways).*  
No, the recommended plan does not have unique construction sequencing or construction schedule. Schedules outline expected maintenance dredging needs over a 20 year planning horizon based on actual and historical shoaling rates.

**d. Risk Informed Decisions on Appropriate Reviews.** The following questions are explicitly considered, in accordance to EC 1165-2-209 paragraph 15b:

(1) *Does it include any design (structural, mechanical, hydraulic, etc)?*

No

(2) *Does it evaluate alternatives?*

Yes, to a lesser degree than a full Feasibility Study

(3) *Does it include a recommendation?*

Yes

(4) *Does it have a formal cost estimate?*

Yes; a cost reviewer outside the district is on the ATR team in addition to a representative of the Cost DX who signed the ATR certification.

(5) *Does it have or will it require a NEPA document?*

Yes, it has an accompanying EA for nearshore placement. The FONSI was signed 6 June 2012.

(6) *Does it impact a structure or feature of a structure whose performance involves potential life safety risks?*

No

(7) *What are the consequences of non-performance?*

If the recommended project is constructed and fails, no lives are at risk. If the recommended project is not constructed, there will be negative economic effects

(8) *Does it support a significant investment of public monies?*

Yes

(9) *Does it support a budget request?*

Yes

(10) *Does it change the operation of the project?*

No

(11) *Does it involve ground disturbances?*

If the recommended plan is approved, the only ground disturbances expected are those from the use of heavy equipment to raise the height of the dikes. This type of construction is routine for SAJ and has minimal risk.

(12) *Does it affect any special features, such as cultural resources, historic properties, survey markers, etc, that should be protected or avoided?*

No

(13) *Does it involve activities that trigger regulatory permitting such as Section 404 or stormwater/NPDES related actions?*

No

(14) *Does it involve activities that could potentially generate hazardous wastes and/or disposal of materials such as lead based paints or asbestos?*

No

(15) *Does it reference use of or reliance on manufacturers' engineers and specifications for items such as prefabricated buildings, playground equipment, etc?*

No

(16) *Does it reference reliance on local authorities for inspection/certification of utility systems like wastewater, stormwater, electrical, etc?*

No

(17) *Is there or is there expected to be any controversy surrounding the Federal action associated with the work product?*

No

- d. **In-Kind Contributions.** Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC and may be subject to ATR and IEPR. No in-kind products and analyses will be provided by the non-Federal sponsor

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

- a. **Documentation of DQC.** District Quality Control will be conducted by the SAJ Jacksonville DMMP PDT team, SAJ independent reviewers, as well as chiefs of relevant key disciplines, where each of the reviewers will review the documents for accuracy. All reviewers are listed in Attachment 1. All DQC comments and responses will be documented by the Planning Technical Lead. The comment and response package, along with the DQC signature sheet, is part of the report's transmittal package under the "Peer Review" section and will be provided to the ATR team for use in their review.
- b. **Products to Undergo DQC.** The DMMP Update and EA underwent DQC at the draft report stage in December 2011 and DQC was certified in January 2012.
- c. **Required DQC Expertise.** The SAJ Jacksonville DMMP PDT consists of key disciplines relevant to DMMP and EA material: Navigation Operations, Geotechnical, Environmental, Navigation Planning, DMMP specialist, Legal, Real Estate, and Cost and Economics. DQC reviewers consist of non-PDT experts and experts in the supervisory chain.

#### 5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

a. **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. Editorial comments or recommendations are welcome but are to be documented outside of DrChecks and provided to the PDT informally. The four key parts of a quality review comment will normally include:

- (1) The review concern – identify the product’s information deficiency or incorrect application of policy, guidance, or procedures;
- (2) The basis for the concern – cite the appropriate law, policy, guidance, or procedure that has not be properly followed;
- (3) The significance of the concern – indicate the importance of the concern with regard to its potential impact on the plan selection, recommended plan components, efficiency (cost), effectiveness (function/outputs), implementation responsibilities, safety, Federal interest, or public acceptability; and
- (4) The probable specific action needed to resolve the concern – identify the action(s) that the reporting officers must take to resolve the concern.

In some situations, especially where there appears to be incomplete or unclear information, comments may seek clarification in order to then assess whether further specific concerns may exist.

The ATR documentation in DrChecks will include the text of each ATR concern, the PDT response, a brief summary of the pertinent points in any discussion, including any vertical team coordination (the vertical team includes the district, RMO, MSC, and HQUSACE), and the agreed upon resolution. 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 1110-1-12 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.

At the conclusion of each ATR effort, the ATR team will prepare a Review Report summarizing the review. Review Reports will be considered an integral part of the ATR documentation and shall:

- Identify the document(s) reviewed and the purpose of the review;
- Disclose the names of the reviewers, their organizational affiliations, and include a short paragraph on both the credentials and relevant experiences of each reviewer;
- Include the charge to the reviewers;
- Describe the nature of their review and their findings and conclusions;
- Identify and summarize each unresolved issue (if any); and
- Include a verbatim copy of each reviewer's comments (either with or without specific attributions), or represent the views of the group as a whole, including any disparate and dissenting views.

ATR may be certified when all ATR concerns are either resolved or referred to the vertical team for resolution and the ATR documentation is complete. The ATR Lead will prepare a Statement of Technical Review certifying that the issues raised by the ATR team have been resolved (or elevated

to the vertical team). A Statement of Technical Review should be completed, based on work reviewed to date, for the AFB, draft report, and final report. A sample Statement of Technical Review is included in Attachment 2.

- b. Products to Undergo ATR.** The DMMP Update and EA underwent ATR at the draft report stage. The spreadsheet used to calculate O&M costs based on the discount rate was provided to the Economics reviewer. The Cost Appendix and all associated materials were provided to the Cost reviewer. All ATR reviewers are listed in Attachment 1. After comments and corrections were incorporated, ATR was certified in May 2012.
- c. Required ATR Team Expertise.** It is expected that the ATR Team would generally reflect the major technical disciplines of the Jacksonville Harbor DMMP PDT. As such, the ATR team consisted of the following disciplines: Plan Formulation, Navigation Operations, Geotechnical, Environmental, Cost, and Economics. No real estate acquisition by the Federal Government is associated with the recommended base plan, nor are there issues involving Navigation Servitude. Therefore, a Real Estate reviewer was not needed.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional with extensive experience in preparing Civil Works 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 the Plan Formulation reviewer. They should be a senior water resources planner with experience in navigation projects and associated planning reports and documents. The ATR Lead will be from a district outside the MSC.
Economics	Expertise in economics appropriate for a DMMP level to verify trends and commodities within the affected Ports indicate need for maintenance of channels.
Environmental Resources	Expertise in NEPA compliance.
Geotechnical Engineering	Expertise in geotechnical soils and construction to review upland disposal sites and materials assessment.
Cost Engineering	Expertise in cost engineering and Mill to review MCACES costs.
Navigation Construction/Operations	Expertise in shoaling and DMMPs.

## 6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

### a. Decision on IEPR.

Jacksonville District staff has determined that the 2012-2031 DMMP Update stems from the 2005 DMMP for efficient operational practices and methods for the maintenance of Jacksonville Harbor. This DMMP is not a decision document as envisioned in EC 1165-2-209 as it does not change the recommendation for O&M practices, nor does it require any authorization for implementation. Language in EC 1165-2-209 describes situations where this type of document can be determined to be an "other work product" or "other report." The DMMP Update is limited in scope and impact so

it would not significantly benefit from an independent external peer review. The PDT, based on its risk informed evaluation, determined that a Type I IEPR is not warranted on the Jacksonville Harbor DMMP 2012-2031 Update. Based on criteria contained in EC 1165-2-209, the District Chief of Engineering, as the Engineer-In-Responsible-Charge, has not recommended a Type II IEPR Safety Assurance Review (SAR). The Federal action is not justified by life safety, and project failure would not pose a significant threat to human life. Innovative materials or novel engineering methods will not be used. Redundancy, resiliency, or robustness is not required for design. Also, the project has no unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule. The risk informed decision for not performing a Type I IEPR or a Type II IEPR explicitly considered the following:

- *If the decision document meets the mandatory triggers for Type I IEPR described in Paragraph 11.d.(1) and Appendix D of EC 1165-2-209; and if it doesn't, then also:*
  - *the consequences of non-performance on project economics, the environmental and social well-being (public safety and social justice);*  
The Jacksonville Harbor DMMP is an “other work” document, not a decision document. The DMMP in place has performed well in the past and the environmental and social consequences of non-performance are likely to be insignificant. However, there are negative economic consequences if the project is not constructed.
  - *whether the product is likely to contain influential scientific information or be highly influential scientific assessment; and*  
The DMMP Update and EA do not contain influential scientific information nor are they highly influential scientific assessments.
  - *if and how the decision document meets any of the possible exclusions described in Paragraph 11.d.(3) and Appendix D of EC 1165-2-209.*  
The Jacksonville Harbor DMMP is an “other work” document, not a decision document. Appendix D of Engineering Circular 1165-2-209 dated 31 January 2010 lists the factors that trigger the requirement of Type I Independent External Peer Review (IEPR). The details provided below describe how the subject “other work” document and project address these factors.
    - (1) Significant threat to human life. No. The plan recommended in the DMMP 2012-2031 Update poses no threat to human life.
    - (2) Total Project cost greater than \$45 million. There are no CG costs for the recommended base plan. The DMMP Update illustrates the total project costs for the planning horizon, both CG construction, O&M, and non-Federal sponsor costs.
    - (3) Request by the State Governor. There has been no request for IEPR by the Governor of Florida.
    - (4) Request by the head of a Federal or state agency. There has been no request for IEPR by any Federal or State Agency.
    - (5) Significant public dispute as to the size, nature or effects of the project. There is no significant public dispute as to the size, nature or effects of the DMMP 2012-2031 Update.
    - (6) Significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project. There is no significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project. Environmental considerations are taken into account through NEPA (EA) and with beneficial use options.

- (7) Information is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretation, contains precedent-setting methods or models, or presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices. The proposed DMMP update is minor in scope and is not based on novel methods or models.
- (8) Any other circumstance where the Chief of Engineers determines Type I IEPR is warranted. The Chief of Engineers has not made a determination that Type I IEPR is warranted.

- *The status of any request to conduct IEPR from a head of a Federal or state agency charged with reviewing the project, if applicable; and*

There has been no request from a head of any Federal or State agency charged with reviewing the project.

- *If the proposed project meets the criteria for conducting Type II IEPR described in Paragraph 2 of Appendix D of EC 1165-2-209, including:*

- *if the Federal action is justified by life safety or failure of the project would pose a significant threat to human life;*

This project is not intended to benefit life safety, nor does it pose a significant threat to human life.

- *if the project involves the use of innovative materials or techniques where the engineering is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretations, contains precedent-setting methods or models, or presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices;*

The information in the other work product and proposed project design are not based on novel methods, do not use innovative materials or techniques, do not present complex challenges, are not precedent setting, and are not likely to change prevailing practices.

- *if the project design requires redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness; and/or*

The proposed project design does not require any redundancy, resilience, or robustness.

- *if the project has unique construction sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule.*

The construction sequencing for this project is not unique.

**b. Products to Undergo Type I IEPR.** Not-Applicable.

**c. Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise.** Not-Applicable.

**d. Documentation of Type I IEPR.** Not Applicable.

## **7. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL**

**a. Planning Models.** No planning models are being used in the DMMP Update.

**b. Engineering Models.** No engineering models are being used on the DMMP update.

## **8. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS**

**a. ATR Schedule and Cost.** ATR of the draft document was certified in May 2012, at a cost of approximately \$20,000.

b. **Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost.** Not Applicable.

c. **Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost.** Not Applicable

## **9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There will not be a public comment period for the DMMP. The public will be invited to comment on the Draft EA during the public review period in accordance with NEPA and the Coastal Zone Management Program. The public comment period for the Draft EA was from 19 October 2011 to 30 December 2011. These comments, along with ATR and MSC comments, were incorporated before finalizing the EA. The Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was signed on 6 June 2012.

## **10. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES**

The South Atlantic Division Commander is responsible for approving this Review Plan. The MSC Commander's approval reflects vertical team input (involving district, MSC, RMO, and HQUSACE members) as to the appropriate scope and level of review for the other work product. Like the PMP, 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 MSC Commander approval will be documented in Attachment 3. Significant changes to the Review Plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) must be re-approved by the MSC Commander following the process used for initially approving the plan. The latest version of the Review Plan, along with the MSC Commander's approval memorandum, should be posted on the Home District's webpage. The latest Review Plan should also be provided to the RMO and home MSC.

## **11. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT**

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

- Jacksonville District Project Manager, 904-232-1363
- South Atlantic Division Point of Contact, 404-562-5228
- Review Management Organization, DDNPCX, 251-694-3884

**ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS**

**PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM (PDT)**

<b>Discipline</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Team Member Name</b>
	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	
Economics	USACE-SAJ	Idris Dobbs
Quality Assurance	USACE -SAJ	Jim Baker
Navigation Operations (DMMP)	USACE-SAJ	John Bearce
Cost Estimating	USACE-SAJ	Randy Murray
Waterways Design	USACE-SAJ	Coraggio Maglio
Environmental (NEPA)	USACE-SAJ	Paul DeMarco
Cultural Resources	USACE-SAJ	Dan Hughes
Water Quality Permitting	USACE-SAJ	Mike Hollingsworth
Geotechnical	USACE-SAJ	Barbara Nist
(Environmental) Disposal Areas	USACE-SAJ	April Patterson/ Joelle Verhagen
Real Estate	USACE-SAJ	Lynn Zediak
Planning Coastal/Navigation	USACE-SAJ	Stephanie Groleau
Office of Counsel	USACE-SAJ	Matt Donaldson
Project Manager	USACE-SAJ	Steve Ross
GIS	USACE-SAJ	David Neumann

**INDEPENDENT REVIEWERS**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Name</b>
SAJ Planning Editor	USACE-SAJ	Cynthia Irvin
Planning Coastal/Navigation	USACE-SAJ	Matt Schrader
Chief, PD-PN	USACE-SAJ	Candida Bronson
Navigation Operations	USACE-SAJ	Jose Bilbao
Environmental	USACE-SAJ	Aubree Hershoin

**ATR TEAM (Draft Report)**

<b>Discipline/Expertise</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>District/Division</b>
DDNPCX ATR Manager	Bernard Moseby	Mobile/SAD
District ATR Coordinator	James Baker	Jacksonville/SAD
<b>Agency Technical Review Team</b>		
ATR Team Leader/Plan Formulation	Barbara Blumeris	New England/NAD
Cost DX	Jim Neubauer	Walla Walla/NWD
Cost Engineering	Richard Hurst	Memphis/MVD
Economics	Jeffery Morris	Savannah/SAD
Navigation Construction/Operation	James Hargove	Wilmington/SAD
Environmental	Jeff Richter	Wilmington/SAD
Geotech	Ben Lackey	Wilmington/SAD

**ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW**

**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 1165-2-209. 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>.

SIGNATURE

Name  
ATR Team Leader  
Office Symbol/Company

Date

SIGNATURE

Name  
Project Manager  
Office Symbol

Date

SIGNATURE

Name  
Architect Engineer Project Manager<sup>1</sup>  
Company, location

Date

SIGNATURE

Name  
Review Management Office Representative  
Office Symbol

Date

**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  
Chief, Engineering Division  
Office Symbol

Date

SIGNATURE

Name  
Chief, Planning Division  
Office Symbol

Date

<sup>1</sup> Only needed if some portion of the ATR was contracted

**ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS**

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

**ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
ATR	Agency Technical Review
DMMP	Dredged Material Management Plan
DQC	District Quality Control/Quality Assurance
DX	Directory of Expertise
EA	Environmental Assessment
EC	Engineer Circular
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
HQUSACE	Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review
MSC	Major Subordinate Command
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
ODMDS	Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site
OMRR&R	Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation
OEO	Outside Eligible Organization
PCX	Planning Center of Expertise
PDT	Project Delivery Team
QA	Quality Assurance
QC	Quality Control
RMC	Risk Management Center
RMO	Review Management Organization
SAR	Safety Assurance Review
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
WRDA	Water Resources Development Act