



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

03 MAR 2015

CESAD-RBT

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDER, JACKSONVILLE DISTRICT

SUBJECT: Approval of the Review Plan for the San Juan Harbor Mitigation Project,
San Juan, Puerto Rico

1. References:

a. Memorandum, CESAJ-EN-Q, 11 February 2015, subject: Approval of Review
Plan for San Juan Harbor Mitigation Project, San Juan Puerto Rico (Encl 1).

b. EC 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review, 15 December 2012.

2. The enclosed subject Review Plan (RP) submitted by the Jacksonville District via
reference 1.a has been reviewed by this office and is hereby approved in accordance
with reference 1.b above.

3. We concur with the conclusion of the District Chief of Engineering that a
Type II IEPR is not required for the plans, specifications and design documentation
associated with this effort. The primary basis for this concurrence is that failure or loss
of this feature would not pose a significant threat to human life.

4. The District should post the approved RP to its web site and provide a link to
CESAD-RBT. Before posting the RP to the web site, the names of Corps/Army
employees should be removed. Subsequent significant changes, such as scope or
level of review changes, to this RP, should they become necessary, will require new
written approval from this office.

5. The SAD point of contact is [REDACTED]

Encl

C. DAVID TURNER
Brigadier General
Commanding

CF:
[REDACTED]



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

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

CESAJ-EN-Q

11 February 2015

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

SUBJECT: Approval of Review Plan for San Juan Harbor Mitigation Project, San Juan Puerto Rico

1. References.

- a. EC 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review, 15 December 2012
- b. WRDA 1986; PL 99-662 dated 17 November 1986 (Project Authorization)

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:

Encl



PROJECT REVIEW PLAN

For

Preconstruction, Engineering and Design Phase

Implementation Documents

For

**San Juan Harbor Mitigation
San Juan, Puerto Rico**

Project P2 Number: 114386

Jacksonville District

February 2015

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.



**US Army Corps
of Engineers ®**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS 2**
 - a. Purpose 2
 - b. References 2
 - c. Requirements..... 2
 - d. Review Plan Approval and Updates 2
 - e. Review Management Organization 2
- 2. PROJECT INFORMATION..... 2**
 - a. Project Location and Name 2
 - b. Project Authorization 2
 - c. Current Project Description 2
 - d. Public Participation 2
 - e. In-Kind-Contributions by Project Sponsor..... 3
 - f. Civil Works Cost Engineering Mandatory Center of Expertise (MCX) Review and Certification 3
- 3. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL 3**
- 4. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW..... 3**
 - a. Risk Informed Decision on Appropriate Level of Review 3
 - b. Agency Technical Review Scope. 3
 - c. ATR Disciplines..... 3
- 5. BIDDABILITY, CONSTRUCTABILITY, OPERABILITY, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND SUSTAINABILITY REVIEW 4**
- 6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW 4**
 - a. General..... 4
 - b. Type I Independent External Peer Review Determination. 4
 - c. Type II Independent External Peer Review Determination (Section 2035). 5
- 7. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE..... 5**
- 8. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL..... 5**
- 9. PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM DISCIPLINES 6**
- 10. BUDGET AND SCHEDULE 6**
 - a. Project Milestones..... 6
 - b. ATR Cost. 6

ATTACHMENT A - Approved Review Plan Revisions

ATTACHMENT B - Partial List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ATTACHMENT C - ATR Report Outline and Completion of Agency Technical Review Form

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. Purpose

This Review Plan defines the scope and level of review activities for the San Juan Harbor Mitigation Project, Puerto Rico. 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 design 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 for this project as an appendix to the Quality Management Plan.

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
- (3). EC 1165-2-214, "Civil Works Review", 15 December 2012
- (4). ER 415-1-11, "Biddability, Constructability, Operability, Environmental, and Sustainability (BCOES) Review", 1 January 2013
- (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
- (7). Enterprise Standard (ES) 08025, "Government Construction Quality Assurance Plan and Project/Contract Supplements"
- (8). Enterprise Standard (ES) 08026, "Three Phase Quality Control System"

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) should 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 is designated as the Review Management Organization (RMO). The RMO, in cooperation of the vertical team, will determine/select/approve the ATR team members. Jacksonville District may assist SAD with management of the ATR and development of the "charge to reviewers."

2. PROJECT INFORMATION

a. Project Location and Name

San Juan Harbor is located on the northeast coast of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and serves as the primary deep-draft harbor for the commonwealth and a transshipment center to many neighboring islands of the Antilles.

b. Project Authorization

Authorization for the San Juan Harbor project was provided in Section 202 (a) of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986. The project was originally authorized at a total cost of \$72,300,000 with an estimated first Federal cost of \$52,700,000 and an estimated first Non-Federal cost of \$19,600,000.

c. Current Project Description

The project work consists of dredging approximately 50,000 cubic yards of shoal material from the La Esperanza peninsula in the western portion of San Juan Bay and transporting and placing that material into former dredge holes in the Condado Lagoon located approximately 3 miles east from the dredging location. The material will be placed in open water and used to create 1.2 acres of habitat for submerged aquatic vegetation above elevation -15' Puerto Rico Vertical Datum (PRVD).

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. In-Kind-Contributions by Project Sponsor

There are no in-kind sponsor contributions related to the P&S and DDR that will affect this review plan or related reviews.

f. Civil Works Cost Engineering Mandatory Center of Expertise (MCX) Review and 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

The project is construction of 1.2 acres of substrate for purposes of colonization by Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV). PED phase implementation documents will be prepared and an ATR of the P&S and DDR documents will be required.

b. Agency Technical Review Scope.

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 are documented in the DrCheckssm model review documentation database. DrCheckssm is a module in the ProjNetsm 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 provided in Attachment C. The report will include at a minimum the Charge to Reviewers, ATR Certification Form from EC 1165-2-214, and the DrCheckssm 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 will be from outside SAD and should have a minimum of 10 years of experience and have performed ATR Team Leader duties. ATR Team Leader can also serve as a co-duty to one of the review disciplines.

Civil Engineering/Dredging Operations. The team member should have at least 7 years of civil/site work project experience that includes dredging and disposal operations, embankments, groins, channels, revetments and shore protection project features.

Geotechnical Engineering and Engineering Geology. The team member should have a minimum of 10 years experience in geologic and geotechnical analyses used to support the development of Plans and Specifications for dredging and environmental/ecosystem restoration projects. Experience with in-water material placement is required.

NEPA Compliance. The NEPA compliance reviewer should be a senior environmental resources specialist with 7 years of experience in NEPA compliance activities associated with dredging and open water disposal projects. NEPA and other environmental documents will be submitted to the ATR team with the DDR and Plans and Specifications to aid in performing ATR.

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 SAN 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 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 (Section 2035).

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 plans applicability statements follow.

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

This project consists of dredging and openwater disposal. Failure of the underwater berm will not pose a significant 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 concept of redundancy does not apply to such dredging projects.

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

This project's construction sequence and schedule have been used successfully by the Corps of Engineers on other similar works. Construction schedules do not have unique sequencing and activities are not reduced or overlapped.

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

No engineering models are being used to prepare the documents covered by this review plan.

9. PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM DISCIPLINES

Discipline/Expertise
Geomatics & Survey
Civil Site Design
Geotechnical Engineering
Environmental Engineering
Geology

10. BUDGET AND SCHEDULE

a. Project Milestones.

Milestone	Task	Start Date	End Date
CW310	Draft P&S complete	10-Dec-2014	02-Feb-2015
	DQCR	20-Jan-2015	23-Jan-2015
	PQCR/DQC*	26-Jan-2015	12-Feb-2015
	ATR Review	20-Feb-2015	09-Mar-2015
	Evaluate ATR Comments	10-Mar-2015	12-Mar-2015
	ATR Review Certification	31-Mar-2015	31-Mar-2015
	BCOES	01-Apr-2015	05-May-2015
CW320	BCOES Certification	18-May-2015	16-Jun-2015

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

b. ATR Cost.

Funds will be budgeted to execute ATR and schedule as outlined above. It is envisioned that each reviewer will be afforded 20 hours review plus 8 hours for coordination. The estimated cost range is \$12,000 - \$15,000.

ATTACHMENT A: APPROVED REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number

ATTACHMENT B: PARTIAL LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<u>Acronyms</u>	<u>Defined</u>
AFB	Alternatives Formulation Briefing
ATR	Agency Technical Review
BCOES	Biddability, Constructability, Operability, Environmental, and Sustainability Review
CAP	Continuing Authorities Program
CERCAP	Corps of Engineers Reviewer Certification and Access Program
CY	Cubic Yards
DDR	Design Documentation Report
DQC	District Quality Control
DQCR	Discipline Quality Control Review
EC	Engineering Circular
EA	Environmental Assessment
ER	Engineering Regulation
EA	Environmental Assessment
ERDC-CERL	Engineer Research and Development Center – Construction Engineering Research Laboratory
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ETL	Engineering Technical Lead
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
FONSI	Findings of No Significant Impacts
FSCA	Feasibility and Cost Sharing Agreement
FY	Fiscal Year
GRR	General Reevaluation Report
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review
LPP	Locally Preferred Plan
MCX	Mandatory Center of Expertise
MLLW	Mean Low Low Water
MSC	Major Subordinate Command
NAS	National Academy of Sciences
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
ODMDS	Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OMRR&R	Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation
P&S	Plans and Specifications
PED	Preconstruction Engineering and Design
PDT	Project Delivery Team
PM	Project Manager

<u>Acronyms</u>	<u>Defined</u>
PMP	Project Management Plan
PPA	Project Partnering Agreement
PQCR	Product Quality Control Review
QA	Quality Assurance
QCP	Quality Control Plan
QMP	Quality Management Plan
QMS	Quality Management System
RMC	Risk Management Center
RMO	Review Management Organization
RP	Review Plan
RTS	Regional Technical Specialist
SAJ	South Atlantic Jacksonville District Office
SAD	South Atlantic Division Office
SAR	Safety Assurance Review (also referred as Type II IEPR)
SME	Subject Matter Expert
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
WRDA	Water Resources and Development Act

Attachment C

ATR Report Outline and COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

San Juan Harbor Mitigation

San Juan, Puerto Rico

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:

Geotechnical Engineering and Engineering Geology.

Civil Engineering/Dredging Operations.

NEPA Compliance.

ATR Team Leader.

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

COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the San Juan Harbor Mitigation Project, San Juan, Puerto Rico, 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.

NAME
ATR Team Leader

Date

NAME
Project Manager

Date

NAME
Review Management Office Representative

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.

NAME
Chief, Engineering Division
SAJ-EN

Date