MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDER, JACKSONVILLE DISTRICT

SUBJECT: Approval of Review Plan for Preconstruction, Engineering and Design Phase Implementation Documents for Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Project, Miami Beach Hot Spots, Miami-Dade County, Florida

1. References:


2. The enclosed Review Plan for the Preconstruction, Engineering and Design Phase Implementation Documents for Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Project, submitted for approval by reference 1.a, has been reviewed by this office and is approved in accordance with reference 1.b above.

3. We concur with the conclusion in the Review Plan and the District Chief of Engineering that a Type II Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) is not required on this beach renourishment effort. The primary basis for our concurrence is that the failure or loss of the features associated with this beach renourishment project do not pose a significant threat to human life.

4. The District should take steps to post the Review Plan to its web site and provide a link to CESAD-RBT. Before posting to the web site, the names of Corps/Army employees should be removed. Subsequent significant changes to this Review Plan, should they become necessary, will require new written approval from this office.

5. The SAD point of contact is [Redacted].

   [Signature]
   DONALD L. WALKER
   Colonel, EN
   Acting Commander

Encl
MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, South Atlantic Division (CESAD-RBT)

SUBJECT: Approval of Review Plan for Preconstruction, Engineering and Design Phase Implementation Documents for Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Project, Miami Beach Hot Spots, Miami-Dade County, Florida

1. References.
   a. EC 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review, 15 Dec 12

2. I hereby request approval of the enclosed Review Plan and concurrence with the conclusion that a Type II Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) of the subject project is not required. The recommendation to exclude Type II IEPR is based on the EC 1165-2-214 Risk Informed Decision Process as presented in the Review Plan. Documents to be reviewed include plans, specifications, and design documentation. The Review Plan complies with applicable policy, provides Agency Technical Review and has been coordinated with the CESAD. It is my understanding that non-substantive changes to this Review Plan, should they become necessary, are authorized by CESAD.

3. The district will post the CESAD approved Review Plan to its website and provide a link to the CESAD for its use. Names of Corps/Army employees will be withheld from the posted version, in accordance with guidance.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

[Signature]

Encl
PROJECT REVIEW PLAN

For

Preconstruction, Engineering and Design Phase Implementation Documents

For

Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Project
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Jacksonville District
January 2016

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS REVIEW PLAN IS DISTRIBUTED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PREDISSEMINATION PEER 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.
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1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. Purpose

This Review Plan defines the scope and level of review activities for the Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection (BEC&HP) Project for the Miami Beach Hot Spots in Miami-Dade County, Florida. As discussed below, the review activities consist of a District Quality Control (DQC) effort, an Agency Technical Review (ATR), and a Biddability, Constructability, Operability, Environmental, and Sustainability (BCOES) Review. Also as discussed below, an Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) is not recommended. The project is in the Pre-Construction, Engineering and Design (PED) phase. The implementation documents to be reviewed are Plans and Specifications (P&S) and a Design Documentation Report (DDR). Upon approval, this Review Plan will be included into the Project Management Plan (PMP) for this project as an appendix to the Quality Management Plan (QMP).

b. References

(1). ER 1110-2-1150, “Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects”, 31 August 1999
(2). ER 1110-1-12, “Engineering and Design Quality Management”, 31 March 2011
(5). SAJ EN QMS 02611, “SAJ Quality Control of In-House Products: Civil Works PED”, 21 November 2011
(6). SAJ EN QMS 08550, “BCOES Reviews”, 21 September 2011
(8). Enterprise Standard (ES) 08026, “Three Phase Quality Control System”
(9). Project Management Plan, Beach and Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Project for Dade County, Florida, P2 Number 113082

c. Requirements

This Review Plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-214, 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 provides the procedures for ensuring the quality and credibility of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) decision, implementation, and operations and maintenance documents and other work products. The EC outlines five levels of review: District Quality Control (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), and an Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), Policy and Legal Review, and a Biddability, Constructability, Operability, Environmental, and Sustainability (BCOES) Review.

d. Review Plan Approval and Updates

The South Atlantic Division Commander is responsible for approving this Review Plan. The Commander’s approval reflects vertical team input (involving district, MSC, RMO, and
HQUSACE members) as to the appropriate scope and level of review. Like the PMP, the Review Plan is a living document and may change as the project progresses. The Jacksonville District is responsible for keeping the Review Plan up to date. Minor changes to the Review Plan since the last MSC Commander approval are documented in Attachment A. Significant changes to the Review Plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) will 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 Commanders’ approval memorandum, will be posted on the Jacksonville District’s webpage. The latest Review Plan will be provided to the RMO and home MSC.

e. Review Management Organization
The South Atlantic Division (SAD) is designated as the Review Management Organization (RMO). The RMO, in cooperation of the vertical team, will approve the ATR team members. CESAJ will assist SAD with management of the ATR and development of the charge to reviewers.

2. PROJECT INFORMATION
a. Project Background
Miami-Dade County, commonly referred to as “Dade County”, is located along the southeast coast of Florida, and contains the city of Miami. Dade County lies between Broward County (north of Dade) and Monroe County (south of Dade). The Dade County shoreline extends along two barrier island segments separated from the mainland by Biscayne Bay. The barrier islands vary in width from about 0.2 to 1.5 miles, with an average width of about 0.5 miles. Elevations along the entire coastal region (and much of the mainland) are low, as they are generally less than 10 feet; whereas elevations along the barrier islands are generally the highest along the Atlantic Ocean shorefront, and slope gradually downward toward the bay.

The authorized Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Project for Miami-Dade County contains two segments, the Sunny Isles Segment and the Main Segment, each with differing periods of Federal participation. See Figure 1 for map of BEC&HP Project.

1) The Sunny Isles Segment is comprised of the 2.5 miles of shore extending north from Haulover Beach Park. The segment was initially constructed in 1988, and covers the area between Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) Range monuments R-7 to R-19.3.

2) The Main Segment is 10.5 miles in length. This segment includes the stretch of beach from Government Cut to Bakers Haulover Inlet (9.3 miles) and Haulover Beach Park (1.2 miles). This segment stretches from FDEP monument R-19.3 to R-74. Initial construction of this segment began in 1975.

The primary purpose of the project between Government Cut and Bakers Haulover Inlet is to provide storm damage protection to upland development and to provide protection against storm surge. For the Haulover Park reach, the primary purpose is to provide protection to the park from beach erosion. For the Sunny Isles reach, the primary purpose of the project is to provide storm damage protection for upland development from a storm with a 10-year return interval.

Between Government Cut and Bakers Haulover Inlet, the project would provide a dune 20 feet wide at 11.5 feet above mean low water and a level berm 50 feet wide at elevation 9 feet mean low water (MLW) with natural slopes as shaped by wave action. At Haulover Beach Park, the
project would provide a level berm 50 feet wide at elevation 9 MLW and natural slopes. As authorized, the Main Segment did not have a recommended renourishment interval, but the project was intended to be nourished periodically as needed to compensate for erosion losses throughout the 50-year project life. The average annual nourishment requirements were estimated at 191,000 and 20,000 cubic yards of material for Government Cut to Bakers Haulover Inlet and Haulover Beach Park, respectively.

The authorized project for the Sunny Isles segment of the Dade County BEC&HP Project provides for the construction of a 20 foot berm seaward of the Erosion Control Line (ECL) at elevation 9 MLW with front slopes of 1 vertical to 10 horizontal from berm crest to mean low water (mlw), then 1 on 25 to the existing bottom. The authorized renourishment volume was 715,000 cubic yards every 10 years.

Figure 1: BEC&HP Project Map
b. Project Authorization

The original Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Report for Miami-Dade County, Florida was authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act on July 3, 1930. An extension of restudy to include all of the Miami-Dade County north of Government Cut was approved by the Chief of Engineers in January 1961 (USACE 1965).

The Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Project for Dade County, Florida was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1968. In addition, Section 69 of the 1974 Water Resources Development Act (Public Law 93-251) included the authorization for initial construction by non-Federal interests of the 0.85-mile segment along Bal Harbour Village, immediately south of Bakers Haulover Inlet. The authorized project, as described in House Document 335/90/2 (the 1968 Chief’s Report for the project), provided for the construction of a protective and recreational beach and a protective dune for 9.3 miles of shoreline between Government Cut and Bakers Haulover Inlet (encompassing Miami Beach, Surfside, and Bal Harbour) and for the construction of a protective and recreational beach along 1.2 miles of shoreline at Haulover Beach Park.

The Sunny Isles portion of the project was added in 1985. Specifically, the BEC&HP Project for Dade County, Florida, North of Haulover Beach Park was authorized by the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1985 and the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986 (Public Law 99-662). However, only the authority of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1985 has been implemented through the execution of a local cost sharing agreement. This authorization provides for modification of the authorized 1968 Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Project for Dade County, Florida, to provide for the following:

1. The construction of a protective beach along a reach of shore extending 2.5 miles through Sunny Isles, and for periodic nourishment of this area.

2. The extension of the period of Federal participation in the cost of nourishing the existing Dade County Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Project from 10 years to the life of the project.

The Chief of Engineers’ Report from December 1983 (“Dade County, North of Haulover Beach Park, Florida”) provides additional details on the Sunny Isles segment of the project.

Although the 1985 Supplemental Appropriations Act which authorized the Sunny Isles segment and extended the period of Federal participation of the existing Dade County (BEC & HP), the Project did not specify a time limit for Federal participation. Section 156 of WRDA 1976, as amended by Section 934 of WRDA 1986, limits the period of Federal participation to 50 years from the date of initiation of construction.

c. Current Project Description

The portion of the BEC&HP Project for Dade County, Florida, covered in this review plan will renourish critically eroded shoreline at the Miami Beach Hotspots located at approximately 55th Street and 46th Street in Miami Beach between Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) Range Monuments R-49.5 to R-50.5 and R-53.7 to R-55.5 respectively. The project beach has a maximum berm elevation of +6.6 feet, NAVD88, and a minimum berm elevation no less than +6.1 feet, NAVD88. The width of the restored beach is 230 feet measured perpendicular to the Erosion Control Line (ECL). The sand source for the project will
be an upland source, and material will be truck hauled to the project location. The upland source will be selected by the Contractor meeting specified criteria. Project work also includes environmental species, turbidity, and vibration monitoring.

d. Public Participation
The Jacksonville District Corporate Communications Office continually keeps the affected public informed on Jacksonville District projects and activities. There are no planned activities, public participation meetings or workshops that could generate issues needing provision to review teams. The approved Review Plan will be posted on the Jacksonville District Internet. Any comments or questions regarding the Review Plan will be addressed by the Jacksonville District.

e. Civil Works Cost Engineering Mandatory Center of Expertise Certification
The cost related documents associated with the P&S and DDR and the associated contract do not require external peer review or certification by the Cost Engineering Mandatory Center of Expertise (MCX).

3. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL
District Quality Control and Quality Assurance activities for DDRs and P&S are stipulated in ER 1110-1-12, Engineering & Design Quality Management and SAJ EN QMS 02611. The subject project DDR and P&S will be prepared by the Jacksonville District using ER 1110-1-12 procedures and will undergo District Quality Control. SAJ EN QMS 02611 defines DQC as the sum of two reviews, Discipline Quality Control Review (DQCR) and Product Quality Control Review (PQCR). Product Quality Control Review Certification is the DQC Certification and will precede ATR.

4. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW
a. Risk Informed Decision on Appropriate Level of Review
PED phase implementation documents are being prepared, and an ATR of the P&S and DDR documents is required.

Agency Technical Review (ATR) is undertaken to "ensure the quality and credibility of the government's scientific information" in accordance with EC 1165-2-214 and ER 1110-1-12. An ATR will be performed on the P&S and DDR pre-final submittals.

ATR will be conducted by individuals and organizations that are external to the Jacksonville District. The ATR Team Leader will be a Corps of Engineers employee outside the South Atlantic Division. The required disciplines and experience are described below.

ATR comments will be documented in the DrChecks™ model review documentation database. DrChecks™ is a module in the ProjNet™ suite of tools developed and operated at ERDC-CERL (www.projnet.org). At the conclusion of ATR, the ATR Team Leader will prepare an ATR Review Report that summarizes the review. An outline for an ATR Review Report is in Attachment C. The report will include at a minimum the Charge to Reviewers, ATR Certification Form from EC 1165-2-214, and the DrChecks™ printout of the comments.
c. ATR Disciplines.  
As stipulated ER 1110-1-12, ATR members will be sought from the following sources: regional technical specialists (RTS); subject matter experts (SME) certified in CERCAP; senior level experts from other districts; Center of Expertise staff; experts from other USACE commands; contractors; academic or other technical experts; or a combination of the above. The ATR Team will be comprised of the following disciplines; knowledge, skills and abilities; and experience levels.

ATR Team Leader. The ATR Team Leader should be a registered professional engineer and have 7 or more years’ experience with beach nourishment projects. The ATR Team Leader can also serve as one of the review disciplines.

Civil/Coastal Engineering. The team member should be a registered professional engineer and have 5 or more years’ experience with beach nourishment projects and/or civil/site work. Related project construction experience is desired.

Construction Management. The team member should have 5 or more years’ experience construction management experience with beach nourishment.

Coastal Geology. The team member shall be a registered professional and have 5 or more years’ experience in coastal geology. Experience shall include geotechnical evaluation of beach quality material for beach nourishment projects.

5. BIDDABILITY, CONSTRUCTABILITY, OPERABILITY, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND SUSTAINABILITY REVIEW
The value of a BCOES review is based on minimizing problems during the construction phase through effective checks performed by knowledgeable, experienced personnel prior to advertising for a contract. Biddability, constructability, operability, environmental, and sustainability requirements must be emphasized throughout the planning and design processes for all programs and projects, including during planning and design. This will help to ensure that the government’s contract requirements are clear, executable, and readily understandable by private sector bidders or proposers. It will also help ensure that the construction may be done efficiently and in an environmentally sound manner, and that the construction activities and projects are sufficiently sustainable. Effective BCOES reviews of design and contract documents will reduce risks of cost and time growth, unnecessary changes and claims, as well as support safe, efficient, sustainable operations and maintenance by the facility users and maintenance organization after construction is complete. A BCOES Review will be conducted for this project. Requirements and further details are stipulated in ER 1110-1-12, ER 415-1-11, and SAJ EN QMS 08550.

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW
a. General.
EC 1165-2-214 provides implementation guidance for both Sections 2034 and 2035 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007 (Public Law (P.L.) 110-114). The EC addresses review procedures for both the Planning and the Design and Construction Phases (also referred to in USACE guidance as the Feasibility and the Pre-construction, Engineering and Design and Construction Phases). The EC defines Section 2035 Safety Assurance Review (SAR), Type II Independent External Peer Review (IEPR). The EC also requires Type II IEPR be managed and conducted outside the Corps of Engineers.
b. Type I Independent External Peer Review Determination.
A Type I IEPR is primarily associated with decision documents. A Type I IEPR is not applicable to the implementation documents covered by this Review Plan.

c. Type II Independent External Peer Review Determination.
This project does not trigger WRDA 2007 Section 2035 factors for Safety Assurance Review (termed Type II IEPR in EC 1165-2-214), and therefore, a review under Section 2035 is not required. The factors in determining whether a review of design and construction activities of a project are necessary as stated under Section 2035 along with this Review Plan’s applicability statements follow.

(1) The failure of the project would pose a significant threat to human life.

*This project will renourish portions of Miami Beach. Failure of either feature will not pose a threat to human life.*

(2) The project involves the use of innovative materials or techniques.

*This project will utilize methods and procedures used by the Corps of Engineers on other similar works.*

(3) The project design lacks redundancy.

*The project features are not complex in nature and do not employ the concept of redundancy.*

(4) The project has unique construction sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule.

*This project’s construction does not have unique sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design. The construction sequence and schedule has been used successfully by the Corps of Engineers on other similar works.*

Based on the discussion above, the District Chief of Engineering, as the Engineer-In-Responsible-Charge, does not recommend a Type II IEPR Safety Assurance Review of the P&S and DDR.

7. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE
The Jacksonville District Office of Counsel reviews all contract actions for legal sufficiency in accordance with Engineer Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement 1.602-2 Responsibilities. The subject implementation documents and supporting environmental documents will be reviewed for legal sufficiency prior to advertisement.

8. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL
This project will not use any engineering models that have not been approved for use by USACE.
9. PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM DISCIPLINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDT Disciplines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATR Team Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil/Coastal Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Geology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. BUDGET AND SCHEDULE

a. Project Schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATR Certification</td>
<td>12-Feb-2016</td>
<td>12-Feb-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCOES</td>
<td>6-Jan-2016</td>
<td>27-Jan-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW320</td>
<td>BCOES Certification</td>
<td>25-Feb-2016</td>
<td>25-Feb-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW400</td>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>17-Mar-2016</td>
<td>14-Apr-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SAJ EN QMS 02611 defines DQC as the sum of DQCR and PQCR.

b. ATR Cost.

Funds will be budgeted for the ATR as outlined above. It is envisioned that each reviewer will be afforded 28 hours for the review plus 12 hours for coordination. The estimated cost range is $20,000 - $25,000.
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## ATTACHMENT B: PARTIAL LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFB</td>
<td>Alternatives Formulation Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR</td>
<td>Agency Technical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOES</td>
<td>Biddability, Constructability, Operability, Environmental, and Sustainability Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Continuing Authorities Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERCAP</td>
<td>Corps of Engineers Reviewer Certification and Access Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Cubic Yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>Design Documentation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQC</td>
<td>District Quality Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQCR</td>
<td>Discipline Quality Control Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Engineering Circular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Engineering Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDCCERL</td>
<td>Engineer Research and Development Center – Construction Engineering Research Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETL</td>
<td>Engineering Technical Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDEP</td>
<td>Florida Department of Environmental Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FONSI</td>
<td>Findings of No Significant Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCA</td>
<td>Feasibility and Cost Sharing Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRR</td>
<td>General Reevaluation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPR</td>
<td>Independent External Peer Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPP</td>
<td>Locally Preferred Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCX</td>
<td>Mandatory Center of Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLLW</td>
<td>Mean Low Low Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>Major Subordinate Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>National Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODMDS</td>
<td>Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>Office of Management and Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMRR&amp;R</td>
<td>Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;S</td>
<td>Plans and Specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PED</td>
<td>Preconstruction Engineering and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDT</td>
<td>Project Delivery Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronyms</td>
<td>Defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>Project Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>Project Partnering Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQCR</td>
<td>Product Quality Control Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCP</td>
<td>Quality Control Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMP</td>
<td>Quality Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMS</td>
<td>Quality Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMC</td>
<td>Risk Management Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMO</td>
<td>Review Management Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Review Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTS</td>
<td>Regional Technical Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAJ</td>
<td>South Atlantic Jacksonville District Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>South Atlantic Division Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>Safety Assurance Review (also referred as Type II IEPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Subject Matter Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRDA</td>
<td>Water Resources and Development Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT C

ATR Report Outline and COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Project
Miami-Dade County, Florida
Miami Beach Hotspots

Review of Plans and Specifications (P&S), Design Documentation Report (DDR)

ATR REPORT OUTLINE (Unneeded items, such as ATR Team Member Disciplines that are not identified as needed in the Review Plan, shall be deleted from the ATR Report.)

1. Introduction:
2. Project Description:
3. ATR Team Members:
   ATR Team Leader.
   Civil/Coastal Engineering.
   Construction Management.
   Coastal Geology.
4. ATR Objective:
5. Documents Reviewed:
6. Findings and Conclusions:
7. Unresolved Issues:

Enclosures:

1. ATR Statement of Technical Review
2. ATR Comments (DrChecks)
3. Project Review Plan
4. Charge to Reviewers
5. Certification of District Quality Control Review
The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection Project for the Miami Beach Hot Spots in Miami-Dade County, Florida, including the design documents, plans and specifications and DDR. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project’s Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-214 and ER 1110-1-12. 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.
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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.
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Chief, Engineering Division
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