



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

CESAD-RBT

29 September 2016

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDER, JACKSONVILLE DISTRICT

SUBJECT: Approval of Review Plan for Preconstruction, Engineering and Design Phase Implementation Documents for Jacksonville Harbor Channel Deepening, Contract B, Duval County, Florida

1. References:

a. Memorandum, CESAJ-EN-Q, 12 September 2016, subject: Approval of Review Plan for Preconstruction, Engineering and Design Phase Implementation Documents for Jacksonville Harbor Channel Deepening (47') Contract B, Duval County, Florida (Encl).

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 determination of the District Chief of Engineering and conclusion in the RP that a Type II Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) is not required on the Design Documentation Report and Plans and Specifications for this channel dredging effort. The primary basis for our concurrence is that the failure or loss of these channel features will not pose a significant threat to human life.

4. The District should take steps to post the RP 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 RP, such as scope or level of review changes, should they become necessary, will require new written approval from this office.

CESAD-RBT

SUBJECT: Approval of Review Plan for Preconstruction, Engineering and Design Phase Implementation Documents for Jacksonville Harbor Channel Deepening, Contract B, Duval County, Florida

5. The SAD point of contact is [REDACTED]

Encl

[REDACTED]  
Lieutenant General, USA  
Commanding

CF:

[REDACTED]



# **PROJECT REVIEW PLAN**

**For**

## **Preconstruction, Engineering and Design Phase Implementation Documents**

**For**

### **Jacksonville Harbor Channel Deepening (47') Contract B**

**Duval County, Florida**

**Project P2 number: 443862**

**Jacksonville District**

**September 2016**



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers** ®

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.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

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 Jacksonville Harbor Deepening Project (Contract B), Duval 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 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). Final General Reevaluation Report II and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Jacksonville Harbor Deepening Study, Duval County, Florida, 18 April 2014
- (6). Chief of Engineers Report, Jacksonville Harbor Deepening Study, Duval County, Florida, 30 April 2014
- (7). Project Management Plan dated November 2013, Jacksonville Harbor, General Reevaluation Report for Proposed 50-foot Project Depth, P2 # 113131
- (8). 02611-SAJ, Quality Control of In-House Products: Civil Works PED, 21 November 2011
- (9). 08550-SAJ, BCOES Reviews, 21 September 2011

### **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) shall 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 Overview**

The Jacksonville Harbor Federal navigation project encompasses approximately 20 river miles from the mouth of the St. Johns River at Mayport to the Talleyrand terminal near downtown Jacksonville. The current authorized channel depth is 40 feet for the main channel and 38 feet for the West Blount Island Channel. Channel improvements will allow existing fleet and new deeper draft vessels to utilize the channel more efficiently and safely, thereby reducing transportation cost.

The Recommended Plan (preferred alternative) is the locally preferred plan (LPP) of 47-foot MLLW as identified in the 16 April 2014 Chiefs Report. This plan includes deepening from the existing 40-foot channel to 47 feet from the entrance channel to approximately River Mile 13. The following areas of widening are included as part of the new channel footprint for the LPP:

- Mile Point: Widen to the north by 200 feet from Cuts 8 to 13 (~River Miles 3 to 5)
- Training Wall Reach: Widen to the south 100 feet from Cuts 14 to 16 (~River Miles 5 to 6) transitioning to 250 feet for Cut 17 (~River Mile 6) and back to 100 feet from Cuts 18 to 19 (~River Mile 6)
- St. Johns Bluff Reach: Widen both sides of the channel varying amounts up to 300 feet from Cuts 40 to 41 (~River Miles 7 to 8)

The following turning basin areas are included in the Recommended Plan.

- Blount Island: ~2,700 feet long by 1,500 feet wide located in Cut 42 (~River Mile 10)
- Brills Cut: ~2,500 feet long by 1,500 feet wide located in Cut 45 (~River Mile 13)

Construction of the recommended plan involves dredging of approximately 18 million cubic yards of material. All material dredged for construction is expected to go to the Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site (ODMDS).

The mitigation plan consists of conservation land purchase of approximately 638 acres of freshwater wetlands, uplands, river shoreline, and salt marsh wetlands. It has been determined by USACE that this plan would be sufficient to offset any minor effects that may occur as a result of the proposed project. A long-term Corrective Action Plan, which includes field data collection, has been prepared by USACE to provide assurances that actual effects will be assessed and corrective actions coordinated.

**b. Project Authorization**

The original deepening study was authorized through a resolution from the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, U.S. House of Representatives, dated February 5, 1992 resulting in a feasibility study that recommended modifications from the entrance channel to River Mile 14.7, including deepening 38 feet to 40 feet. Deepening of that segment was authorized in 1999 Water Resources Development Act, and construction was completed in 2003. A General Reevaluation Report (GRR) recommended deepening the harbor from River Mile 14.7 to River Mile 20 from 38 feet to 40 feet; deepening of that segment was authorized in the FY2006 Appropriations Act and construction was completed in 2010. To follow through with the intent of the original 1992 study authorization, it was determined by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) that further study was needed. The Feasibility and Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) for this study was signed July 1, 2005 and amended June 15, 2006. President Barack Obama issued an Executive Order (“We Can’t Wait”) expediting completion of the Jacksonville Harbor deepening study and reducing the study schedule by 14 months.

**c. Current Project Description**

The Jacksonville Harbor Deepening Project is currently scheduled to be awarded in four separate construction contracts as shown in Figure 1 below. This review plan covers the work for Contract B, which includes dredging Station 10+00 Cut-7 through Station 33+80 Cut-42.



Figure 1: Jacksonville Harbor Deepening Project Construction Contracts

**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 that will affect this review plan or related reviews.

**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 new construction widening and deepening from 40 feet to 47 feet. PED phase implementation documents are being prepared and in accordance with EC 1165-2-214 an ATR of the P&S and DDR documents will be required.

**b. Agency Technical Review Scope.**

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. Per EC 1165-2-214, ATR is mandatory for all implementation documents. The ATR of the P&S 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 DrChecks<sup>sm</sup> model review documentation database. DrChecks<sup>sm</sup> is a module in the ProjNet<sup>sm</sup> suite of tools developed and operated at ERDC-CERL ([www.projnet.org](http://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<sup>sm</sup> 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. Experience with navigation projects that involve blasting and blast plans is desired but not required for ATR members unless stated otherwise.

ATR Team Leader. The ATR Team Leader shall be from outside SAD and shall have a minimum of 15 years of experience with navigation improvement projects and have previously performed ATR Team Leader duties. ATR Team Leader can also serve as a co-duty to one of the review disciplines.

Civil Engineering/Dredging. The team member shall be a registered professional and have at least 7 years of civil/site experience with navigation improvement projects that include dredging and disposal operations and associated features.

Construction Management. The team member shall be a registered professional and have 7 years of construction management experience with navigation improvement projects that include dredging and disposal operations, and associated features. Specialized experience with underwater rock blasting is required.

Geotechnical Engineering/Engineering Geology. The team member shall be a registered professional and have a minimum of 7 years of experience with navigation improvement projects. Specialized experience with underwater rock blasting is required.

NEPA Compliance. The NEPA compliance reviewer shall be a senior environmental resources specialist with 5 years of experience in NEPA compliance activities associated with navigation and marine ecology projects. For reference, NEPA and other environmental documents will be submitted to the ATR team with the DDR and Plans and Specifications to aid in performing ATR.

**d. 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. 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 addressing incomplete or unclear information, ATR team members 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 draft report, and final report. A sample Statement of Agency Technical Review is included in Attachment C.

## **5. BIDDABILITY, CONSTRUCTABILITY, OPERABILITY, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND SUSTAINABILITY (BCOES) 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 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 (IEPR) 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 (IEPR) 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 channel dredging and failure of the navigation channel 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 channel 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.

**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**

Organization
Civil Engineering / Dredging
Geotechnical Engineering
Hydrogeology and Geology
Environmental

## 10. BUDGET AND SCHEDULE

### a. Schedule.

Milestone	Task	Start Date	End Date
CW310	Draft P&S complete	24 Aug 2016	24 Aug 2016
	DQCR	25 Aug 2016	13 Sep 2016
	PQCR/DQC*	19 Sep 2016	13 Oct 2016
	ATR Review	17 Oct 2016	4 Nov 2016
	ATR Comment Evaluation	7 Nov 2016	18 Nov 2016
	ATR Backcheck/Close Comments	21 Nov 2016	28 Nov 2016
	ATR Certification	2 Dec 2016	7 Dec 2016
	BCOES	8 Dec 2016	6 Jan 2017
CW320	BCOES Certification	7 Feb 2017	7 Feb 2017
CW400	Advertisement	21 Feb 2017	21 Feb 2017

\* 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 32 hours review plus 8 hours for coordination. The estimated cost range is \$30,000 - \$35,000.

**ATTACHMENT A: APPROVED REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS**

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

**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
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
PMP	Project Management Plan

<u>Acronyms</u>	<u>Defined</u>
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**

#### **Jacksonville Harbor Deepening Project (Contract B) Duval County, Florida**

#### **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 Engineering/Dredging
  - Geotechnical Engineering/Engineering Geology
  - Construction Management
  - NEPA Compliance
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 Jacksonville Harbor Deepening Project (Contract B), Duval County, Florida, including the design documents, plans and specifications and DDR. 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