DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
ROOM 10M15, 60 FORSYTH ST, S.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-3490

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

21 OCT 2010

CESAD-PDS-P

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Jacksonville District (CESAJ-PD/Rebecca Griffith)

SUBJECT: Kissimmee River Restoration Limited Re-Evaluation Report Review Plan

1. References:

a. Memorandum, CESAJ-PD, 9 September 2010, subject as above (encl 1).

b. Engineering Regulation (ER) 110-2-12, Quality Management, 30 September 2006.

c. EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2010.

2. In accordance with EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2010, the Review Plan (RP) dated March 2010 for the Kissimmee River Restoration Limited Re-Evaluation Report has been reviewed and is approved subject to revisions noted on the attached redline/strikeout file. We concur with the conclusion that independent external peer review (IEPR) of this project is required.

3. The district should take steps to post the MSC-approved Final RP and a copy of this approval memorandum to the SAJ District public internet website and provide a link to the National Planning Center of Expertise for Ecosystem Restoration (ECO-PCX) for their use. Before posting to the web site the names of Corps/Army employees should be removed.

4. The district should also prepare a Review Plan for Implementation phase activities for review and approval by CESAD-BDT in accordance with requirements and guidance provided at reference 1.c.

5. The SAD point of contact for this action is Mike Magley, at (404) 562-5206.

Encl

WILBERT V. PAYNES
Chief, Planning and Policy Division

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

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CESAJ-PD

SEP 09 2010

SEP 09 2010

MEMORANDUM FOR CHIEF, PLANNING DIVISION, SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

SUBJECT: Kissimmee River Restoration Limited Re-Evaluation Report Review Plan

1. Reference: EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 2010.

2. I hereby request MSC approval of the subject Review Plan (RP) and concurrence with the conclusion that Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) of this project is necessary because the report concludes that total project cost would increase in excess of $45,000,000. The ECO-PCX endorsement and the subject RP are enclosed.

3. The SAJ point of contact is James M. Baker, CESAJ Review Coordinator, Planning Division, CESAJ-PD-PW, (904) 232-2698.

Rebecca S. Griffith

Encls

REBECCA S. GRIFFITH, Ph.D, PMP
Chief, Planning Division

REVIEW PLAN

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA PROJECT
KISSIMMEE RIVER RESTORATION
KISSIMMEE RIVER, FLORIDA

Post Authorization Change ***General*** Reevaluation Report
(KRR ***GRR***)

Jacksonville District

March 2010
Updated March 2011

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS REVIEW PLAN IS DISTRIBUTED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PREDISSEMINATION REVIEW UNDER APPLICABLE INFORMATION QUALITY GUIDELINES. IT HAS NOT BEEN FORMALLY DISSEMINATED BY THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, JACKSONVILLE DISTRICT. IT DOES NOT REPRESENT AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO REPRESENT ANY AGENCY DETERMINATION OR POLICY.

US Army Corps
of Engineers ®

REVIEW PLAN

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA PROJECT
KISSIMMEE RIVER RESTORATION KISSIMMEE RIVER, FLORIDA

Post Authorization Change ***General*** Reevaluation Report
(KRR ***GRR***)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the C&SF Project Kissimmee River Restoration, Kissimmee River, Florida Post Authorization Change ***General*** Reevaluation Report (KRR PAC ***GRR***).

This review plan was updated, in March 2011 to reflect a change in the report type, from a limited reevaluation report to a general reevaluation report. The change is not considered to be of sufficient substance to require additional approval. This revision will be posted on the Jacksonville District web site and appropriate organizations will be notified. Updates included the following:

- ***Update of report titling from LRR to GRR – The change to a GRR did not require significant substantive change; primarily, reorganization of material.***
- ***Documented completion of ATR and IEPR.***
- ***Additional cost certification review.***

b. References

(1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
(2) EC 1105-2-407, Planning Models Improvement Program: Model Certification, 31 May 2005 (expired 30 June 2007 but remains valid guidance)
(3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-2-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
(4) KRR ***GRR*** Project Management Plan (PMP)

c. Requirements. This review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, which establishes a 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 three levels of review: District Quality Control, Agency Technical Review, and Independent External Peer Review. In addition to these three levels of review, decision documents are subject to policy and legal compliance review and, if applicable, safety assurance review and model certification/approval.

(1) District Quality Control (DQC). DQC is the review of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the Project Management Plan (PMP). It is managed in the home district and may be conducted by staff in the home district as long as they are not doing the work involved in the study, including contracted work that is being reviewed. Basic quality control tools include a Quality Management Plan providing for seamless review, quality checks and reviews, supervisory reviews, Project Coordination Team (PCT) reviews, etc. Additionally, the PCT is responsible for a complete reading of the report to assure the overall integrity of the report, technical appendices and the recommendations before approval by the District Commander. The Major Subordinate Command (MSC)/District quality management plans address the conduct and documentation of this fundamental level of review; DQC is not addressed further in this review plan although one was performed for the Draft KRR PAC ***GRR***.

(2) Agency Technical Review (ATR). ATR is an in-depth review, managed within USACE, and conducted by a qualified team outside of the home district that is not involved in the day-to-day production of the project/product. The purpose of this review is to ensure the proper application of clearly established criteria, regulations, laws, codes, principles and professional practices. The ATR team reviews the various work products and assure that all the parts fit together in a coherent whole. ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel

(Regional Technical Specialists (RTS), etc.), 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. An ATR was performed by Walla Wall District, Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) for Civil Works and certified on February 17, 2010. The DX information will be incorporated into the Final KRR PAC ***GRR***.

(3) Type I 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. IEPR is generally for feasibility and reevaluation studies and modification reports with Environmental Impact Statements (EISs). IEPR is managed by an outside eligible organization (OEO) that is described in Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c) (3), is exempt from Federal tax under section 501(a), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; is independent; is free from conflicts of interest; does not carry out or advocate for or against Federal water resources projects; and has experience in establishing and administering IEPR panels. The scope of review will address all the underlying planning, engineering, including safety assurance, economics, and environmental analyses performed, not just one aspect of the project. South Atlantic Division and the project coordination team are recommending a Type I IEPR.

(4) Policy and Legal Compliance Review. Decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. These reviews culminate in Washington-level 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 Chief of Engineers. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed further in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook. When policy and/or legal concerns arise during DQC or ATR that are not readily and mutually resolved by the PCT and the reviewers, the District will seek issue resolution support from the MSC and HQUSACE in accordance with the procedures outlined in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. IEPR teams are not expected to be knowledgeable of Army and administration polices, nor are they expected to address such concerns. The home district Office of Counsel is responsible for the legal review of each decision document and signing a certification of legal sufficiency. Policy and Legal Compliance review of the Draft KRR PAC ***GRR*** will be performed concurrent with the IEPR. The Final KRR PAC ***GRR*** will also undergo Policy and Legal Compliance Review when scheduled.

(5) Safety Assurance Review or Type II IEPR. In accordance with Section 2035 of Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007, EC 1165-2-209 requires that all projects addressing flooding or storm damage reduction undergo a safety assurance review of the design and construction activities prior to initiation of physical construction and periodically thereafter until construction activities are completed on a regular schedule sufficient to inform the Chief of Engineers on the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities for the purpose of assuring public health, safety, and welfare. USACE policy extends this to all projects with life safety issues that safety assurance factors be considered in all reviews for decision document phase studies. Type II IEPR does not apply to the KRR PAC ***GRR***. The ***GRR*** requests Congress increase the authorized project cost and grant USACE the authority to credit the non-Federal sponsor for engineering solutions completed in lieu of real estate acquisition.

(6) Model Certification/Approval. EC 1105-2-407 requires certification (for Corps models) or approval (for non-Corps models) of planning models used for all planning activities. The EC

defines planning models as any models and analytical tools that planners use to define water resources management problems and opportunities, to formulate potential alternatives to address the problems and take advantage of the opportunities, to evaluate potential effects of alternatives and to support decision-making. The EC does not cover engineering models used in planning. Engineering software is being address under the Engineering and Construction (E&C) Science and Engineering Technology (SET) initiative. Until an appropriate process that documents the quality of commonly used engineering software is developed through the SET initiative, engineering activities in support of planning studies shall proceed as in the past. 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. Model Certification/Approval is not applicable to this project. The KRR PAC ***GRR*** requests Congress increase the authorized project cost and grant USACE the authority to credit the non-Federal sponsor for engineering solutions completed in lieu of real estate acquisition.

2. STUDY INFORMATION

a. Decision Document. The ***GRR*** will constitute the basis of a post authorization change request for exceeding maximum project cost limits, as set forth in Section the 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (WRDA 86), or 902 limit. The report will include a NEPA compliance protocol to update the public on this ongoing project. The current 902 limit is approximately $640,000,000. However, the actual cost of acquired real estate and increased construction cost are projected to result in exceeding the maximum project cost by approximately $350,000,000.

b. Study Description. Historically the Kissimmee River meandered approximately 103 miles from Lake Kissimmee to Lake Okeechobee through a one to two mile-wide floodplain. The river and its flanking floodplain consisted of a mosaic of wetland plant communities and supported a diverse group of waterfowl, wading birds, fish, and other wildlife. The historic Kissimmee River was hydrologically unique among North American river systems in that it had prolonged periods of extended floodplain inundation.

Between 1962 and 1971, the river was channelized and two-thirds of the historical floodplain was drained. Excavation of the canal and placement of the spoil material destroyed one-third of the river channel. Implementation of the Kissimmee Flood Control project led to drastic declines in wintering waterfowl, wading bird and game fish populations, and the loss of ecosystem functions.

The project area covers 3,000 square miles, stretching from the southern Orlando, Florida area south to Lake Okeechobee. Restoration is divided into the Upper Basin (referred to as the Kissimmee Headwaters Revitalization Project) and the Lower Basin (referred to as the Kissimmee Restoration Project). The river's upper basin includes the Upper Chain of Lakes and extends south through Lake Kissimmee to State Road 60. The lower basin includes the area from Lake Kissimmee to Lake Okeechobee.

In the upper basin, restoration efforts consist of improvements to two canals, changes in managing water levels in Lakes Kissimmee, Hatchineha, and Cypress, as well as the acquisition of land. In the river's lower basin, engineers will fill approximately 22 miles of the C-38 Canal,

excavate nearly nine miles of river channel, and remove S-65B and S-65C water control structures and locks.

These actions will provide a more natural fluctuation of water levels in both the upper and lower basins that will enhance marshes around the lakes and re-establish the river's hydrology. Fish and wildlife habitat in the river's one to two mile-wide floodplain will benefit substantially from this change.

The KRR, a single-purpose project, is intended to restore over 40 square miles of river and floodplain ecosystem, including 43 miles of meandering river channel and 27,000 acres of wetlands. Restoration efforts will re-establish an environment conducive to the fauna and flora that existed there prior to the channeling efforts in the 1960s. The following are the Corps's goals and objectives to restore the ecological integrity of the damaged ecosystem:

- re-establish historic hydrologic conditions
- recreate the historical river/floodplain connectivity
- recreate the historic mosaic of wetland plant communities
- restore the historic biological diversity and functionality

Accomplished to Date:

- Approximately 98% of lands needed to complete Kissimmee River Restoration have been acquired by the non-Federal sponsor—a total of 102,061 acres.
- Phase I construction was completed in 2001, and continuous water flow has been reestablished in the project area.
- Ten of twenty-two miles of canal backfilling has been completed.

c. Study Authority. The Kissimmee River Restoration project was authorized by the following Water Resource Development Act (WRDA) Sections:

- Section 1135 of the WRDA 1986 (Public Law 99-662)
- Section 46 of the WRDA 1988 (Public Law 100-676)
- Section 116 (h) of the WRDA 1990 (Public Law 101-640)
- Section 101 (8) of the WRDA 1992 (Public Law 102-580)

Section 101 (8) of the WRDA 1992 (Public Law 102-580)

"(8) KISSIMMEE RIVER RESTORATION, FLORIDA.--The project for the ecosystem restoration of the Kissimmee River, Florida: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated March 17, 1992, at a total cost of $426,885,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $139,943,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $286,942,000. The Secretary is further authorized to construct the Kissimmee River headwaters revitalization project in accordance with the report prepared under section 1135 of the Water Resources

Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4251-4252) for such headwaters project and any modifications as are recommended by the Secretary based on the benefits derived for the environmental restoration of the Kissimmee River basin, at a total cost of $92,210,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $46,105,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $46,105,000. The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to ensure that implementation of the project to restore the Kissimmee River will maintain the same level of flood protection as is provided by the current flood control project."

The general project authorizations are extensive and, for brevity, are not listed in this document. A comprehensive listing can be found in the C&SF Project for Flood Control and Other Purposes, Master Water Control Manual, Authorities and Responsibilities.

d. The Project Delivery Team is listed in Appendix A.

e. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review. In order to determine if independent external peer review is warranted for this particular project, an evaluation was conducted of the following triggering factors. Evaluations of individual decision criteria are provided below:

- Is the report likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment?

No. the intent of the report is to document higher than expected real estate and construction costs that would result in exceeding the maximum project cost limit as set forth in Section 902 of WRDA 86.

- Would a selected plan be likely to pose a significant threat to human life?

No. The post authorization change request is for an increase in authorized maximum project cost and proposes no new actions.

- Is total project cost estimated to exceed $45M?

Yes. The post authorization change request is projected to exceed $45M. The requested increase will be approximately $350 million in total cost.

- Requested by affected State Governor?

No.

- Request by head of a reviewing Federal Agency, if determined likely to have an adverse impact on environmental, cultural, or other resources under his/her jurisdiction (after implementation of proposed mitigation plans)?

No.

- Significant public dispute as to size, nature or effects?

No. This is simply a post authorization change request to account for unexpectedly high real estate and construction costs.

- Significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit?

No. This is simply a post authorization change request to account for unexpectedly high real estate and construction costs.

- Plan 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?

No. This is simply a post authorization change request to account for unexpectedly high real estate and construction costs. Risks associated with the requested action are limited to risks associated with accuracy of the cost estimate. The cost estimate has been reviewed and certified by the Cost DX.

- Any other circumstances where the Chief of Engineers determined IEPR is warranted?

No.

The Jacksonville District opinion is that this Post Authorization Change request would be considered large, approximately $350 million in additional total cost. The magnitude of the post authorization change would trigger the requirement for independent external peer review. However, there are no significant technical issues to review. The amount of the projected increase in cost triggered the requirement for an IEPR.

f. In-Kind Contributions. None

3. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

a. General. ATR for decision documents covered by EC 1165-2-209 are managed by the appropriate Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) with appropriate consultation with the allied Communities of Practice such as engineering and real estate. The ATR shall ensure that the product is consistent with established criteria, guidance, procedures, and policy. The ATR will assess whether the analyses presented are technically correct and comply with published USACE guidance, and that the document explains the analyses and the results in a reasonably clear manner for the public and decision makers. Members of the ATR team will be from outside the home district. The ATR lead will be from outside the home MSC. The leader of the ATR team will participate in milestone conferences and the Civil Works Review Board (CWRB) to address review concerns.

b. Products for Review. The vertical team decision was that only the cost engineering would be subjected to ATR. However, the ECO-PCX recommended that, at a minimum, an ATR team consisting of a Plan Formulation Reviewer and a Biology Reviewer conduct a review of the Post Authorization Change Report (PACR) to ensure consistency with current planning guidelines. Therefore, the PACR will be provided to the ATR team identified by the ECO-PCX for its review in addition to a Cost Engineering review. Cost engineering was reviewed by the Corps National Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (Cost-DX), Walla Walla District (NWW).

c. Required ATR Team Expertise. Qualified reviewers were selected by the ECO-PCX and the Cost DX.

d. Documentation of ATR. The Jacksonville District Cost Engineering Branch coordinated directly with the Cost DX. The review has been completed and cost certification provided. The ATR of the

PACR will be coordinated directly with the ECO-PCX, with the comments being documented in DrChecks and ultimately an ATR Certification memo being prepared for Jacksonville District. ***Necessary revisions, in the process of going from an LRR to a GRR, and reorganization of the report require additional review and certification by the Cost DX. A schedule for the additional review was added to below, Section 6.***

4. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

a. General. IEPR is conducted for decision documents if there is a vertical team decision (involving the district, MSC, PCX, and HQUSACE members) that the covered subject matter meets certain criteria (described in EC 1165-2-209) where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside the USACE is warranted. IEPR is coordinated by the appropriate PCX and managed by an Outside Eligible Organization (OEO) external to the USACE. IEPR panels shall evaluate whether the interpretations of analysis and conclusions are reasonable. To provide effective review, in terms of both usefulness of results and credibility, the review panels should be given the flexibility to bring important issues to the attention of decision makers; however, review panels should be instructed to not make a recommendation on whether a particular alternative should be implemented, as the Chief of Engineers is ultimately responsible for the final decision on a planning or reoperations study. IEPR panels will accomplish a concurrent review that covers the entire decision document and will address all the underlying engineering, economics, and environmental work, not just one aspect of the study. Whenever feasible and appropriate, the office producing the document shall make the draft decision document available to the public for comment at the same time it is submitted for review (or during the review process) and sponsor a public meeting where oral presentations on scientific issues can be made to the reviewers by interested members of the public. An IEPR panel or OEO representative will participate in the CWRB.

b. Decision on IEPR. This is a partially completed project for which the Corps of Engineers, by way of a Post Authorization Change request, will request additional appropriation. The partially completed project has realized ecosystem benefits consistent with, or exceeding, that predicted in the original report. However, the costs of the project have grown more than $75M, which indicates the need to conduct a Type I IEPR. So, the objective of this IEPR is to verify whether or not completed sections have realized predicted benefits, and whether or not providing additional appropriations to complete the project would be worth it. Accordingly, suggested reviewer charges include the following:

1. To what extent has it been shown that the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified?

2. Are the assumptions that underlie the economic, engineering, and environmental analyses sound?

3. Are the economic, engineering, and environmental methods, models, and analyses used adequate and acceptable?

4. In general terms, are the planning methods sound?

5. Are the interpretations of analysis and conclusions based on the analysis reasonable?

6. What sections of the report are well written and do not require further revision?

c. Products for Review. The draft ***General*** Reevaluation Report, including supporting documentation. The PCX was requested to contract an IEPR, via email of March 12, 2010.

d. Required IEPR Panel Expertise. Each panel member should be a professional from academia, a public agency, consulting firm, or similar vocation with a minimum of 10 years demonstrated experience in their area of expertise. Panel members should be familiar with large, complex civil works projects with high public and interagency interests. The final selection of panel members will be based on screening criteria that will be included in the work plan. The disciplines to be included are:

(1) Civil Works Planner - The Panel Member should have a degree in planning or a related field and should have experience in the plan formulation process. Panelist should be familiar with evaluation of alternative plans for ecosystem restoration projects. Familiarity with USACE standards and procedures is required.

(2) Ecology/ Biology – The Panel Member should have at minimum a Masters Degree in ecology or biology. Panelist should have particular knowledge of ecosystem restoration. Panel Member should have experience in wetland and riparian ecology, preferably in subtropical regions.

(3) Economist - The Panel Member should have a degree in economics or a related field and should be able to evaluate the appropriateness of cost effectiveness and incremental cost analysis (CE/ICA), as applied to dollar costs and ecosystem restoration benefits, and preferably familiar with the Corps of Engineers tool for CE/ICA called IWR-Planning Suite.

(4) Design and Construction Cost Engineering – The Panel Member should be have demonstrated experience in performing cost engineering/construction management, preferably with knowledge of riverine floodplain ecosystem restoration. Team member should be familiar with similar projects across US and related Cost Engineering. Experience in associated contracting procedures, total cost growth analysis and related cost risk analysis is desired. Panel member should be familiar with construction industry and practices used in Florida and/or the Southeastern United States.

e. Documentation of IEPR. DrChecks review software will be used to document IEPR comments and aid in the preparation of the Review Report. IEPR comments should generally include the same four key parts as described for ATR comments in Section 3. The OEO will be responsible for compiling and entering comments into DrChecks. The IEPR team will prepare a Review Report that will accompany the publication of the final report for the project and shall:

- 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; 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.
- Incorporate USACE responses to comments.

The report will be considered and documentation prepared on how issues were resolved or will be resolved by the District Commander before the district report is signed. The recommendations and responses will be presented to the CWRB by the District Commander with an IEPR panel or OEO representative participating, preferable in person. The final report, Corps response and associated materials will be posted on the District internet webpage.

5. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

Model certification/approval does not apply to the KRR PAC *GRR*. The ***GRR*** provides support for a request to Congress to increase the authorized project cost and to provide the authority to credit the non-Federal sponsor for engineering solutions completed in lieu of real estate acquisition.

6. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. ATR Schedule and Cost. Cost engineering review is complete. The DX information will be incorporated into the Final KRR PAC ***GRR***. ATR will begin on April 30, 2010, with comments provided by the ATR Team by May 14, 2010. Jacksonville District will provide responses to comments in DrChecks by May 21, 2010 and final backchecks and ATR Certification will be completed by May 28, 2010. The Cost for ATR will be $5,000. ***ATR of the Draft LRR was completed on June 3, 2010.***

b. IEPR Schedule and Cost. Preliminary cost estimate for IEPR is $120,000. Target start date for the IEPR is June 2010. ***The IEPR, completed on February 24, 2011, pending PCX final certification.***

c. Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost. Not applicable.

d. *Cost Certification. Additional cost certification is expected to occur in two parts, distinguishing between the upper and lower basins of the project. Cost certification for the upper basin is scheduled for March 2011 and the lower basin in May 2011.*

7. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document is not required for this ***GRR***. Therefore, no public coordination process is anticipated.

8. PCX COORDINATION

Review plans for decision documents and supporting analyses outlined in EC 1165-2-209 are coordinated with the appropriate Planning Center(s) of Expertise (PCXs) based on the primary purpose of the basic decision document to be reviewed. The lead PCX for this study is Ecosystem Restoration Planning Center of Expertise.

9. MSC APPROVAL

The MSC that oversees the home district is responsible for approving the review plan. Approval is provided by the MSC Commander. The commander's approval should reflect vertical team input (involving district, MSC, PCX, and HQUSACE members) as to the appropriate scope and level of review for the decision document. Like the PMP, the RP is a living document and may change as the study progresses. Changes to the RP should be approved by following the process used for initially approving

the RP. In all cases the MSCs will review the decision on the level of review and any changes made in updates to the project.

The March 2011 update will be posted on the Jacksonville District internet page and noticed.

10. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

Questions and/or comments on this review plan can be directed to the following points of contact (POC):

- Project Manager, 904-232-1548
- MSC POC, 404-562-5206
- ECO-PCX POC, 309-794-544