

## **Appendix C QUALITY MANAGEMENT OF PLANNING PRODUCTS**

### **1. Purpose**

This appendix establishes the process to assure the production of high quality Civil Works planning documents, and expands the guidance provided in the main body of the South Pacific Division (CESPD) Quality Management Plan. This guidance establishes a framework of general policies and principles to achieve planning services and documents that meet or exceed customer requirements, and are consistent with Corps policies and regulations. The guidance includes:

Main Body of Appendix C	Quality Management of Planning Products
Enclosure 1	South Pacific Division Feasibility Phase Milestone System
Enclosure 2	South Pacific Division Milestone Conference Requirements
Enclosure 3	Decision Document Checklist

### **2. Applicability**

2.1. This appendix applies to all activities of the CESPD Planning and Policy Division, other functional organizations of CESPD, and CESPD districts that are involved in the preparation, review or approval of planning documents.

2.2. The quality management process that is established in this appendix applies to all decision and implementation documents that are developed as a part of the CESPD planning program, including the following:

2.2.1. Reconnaissance Reports, including Section 905(b) Analyses.

2.2.2. Feasibility Reports.

2.2.3. Post-Authorization Decision Documents, including General and Limited Reevaluation Reports.

2.2.4. Major Rehabilitation Reports involving either authorization or new investment decisions.

2.2.5. Dredged Material Management Plans.

2.2.6. Documents developed in support of the Continuing Authorities Programs (except Plans and Specifications).

2.2.7. Documents developed in support of the Planning Assistance to States and Flood Plain Management Services Programs.

2.2.8. Master Plans.

2.2.9. Financial Capability Analyses.

2.2.10. Economic Updates, Reassessments and Economic Reevaluations.

2.2.11. Environmental Impact Statements that stand alone without a decision document.

2.2.12. Project Management Plans for the Feasibility Phase (referred to as the Project Study Plan – PSP or Initial Project Management Plan – IPMP, in previous guidance).

2.2.13. Initial Appraisal Reports (Section 216)

2.2.14. Special Regional Studies

2.2.15. Planning Work For Others and Support for Others

2.3. The quality management process established in this appendix applies to all NEPA documents, including Environmental Impact Statements, Environmental Assessments and other related environmental documents, regardless of the program for which the documents are prepared. The quality control plans for all decision and implementation documents that are managed by other functional organizations and that are supported by environmental documentation shall include an independent technical review to ensure consistency between the environmental documentation and the decision and implementation documents.

2.4. Planning organizations have significant input to other products, even though other functional organizations have the primary responsibility for the technical quality. The technical review processes for these products are described in the other appendices to the CESPD Quality Management Plan.

2.5. Reports, memorandums, legal opinions and other documents that are required to support the planning program, that are not an integral part of the Civil Works planning documents, and that are the responsibility of either Real Estate or Counsel, shall be reviewed and approved in accordance with the procedures and guidance provided by the Directorate of Real Estate, HQUSACE and the HQUSACE Chief Counsel.

### **3. References**

3.1. ER 5-1-11, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Business Process, dated 17 August 2001.

3.2. ER 1105-2-100 - Policy and Planning, Planning Guidance, dated 22 April 2000.

3.3. Environmental Operating Principles, announced by Lt. General Robert Flowers on March 26, 2002.

3.4. CESPD-ET-P Memorandum, dated 5 June 2000, subject: Expedited Reconnaissance Phase Studies.

- 3.5. CESPД-ET-P Memorandum, dated 31 July 2000, subject: Guidance for Post-Authorization Decision Documents.
- 3.6. CESPД-ET-P Memorandum, dated 31 July 2000, subject: Processing of Planning Reports in the South Pacific Division.
- 3.7. CESPД Regional Project Management Business Process, dated February 2000.
- 3.8. CESPД-DE Memorandum, dated 24 March 2000, subject: Establishment of District Support Teams.
- 3.9. Planning for Civil Works Programs, Engineer Inspector General Report, dated July 2000.
- 3.10. Principles and Guidelines for District Support Teams, January 2001.
- 3.11. CESPД-CM-P Memorandum, dated 19 June 2001, subject: Interdistrict Review of Decision Documents.
- 3.12. CECW-PM Memorandum, dated 4 September 2001, subject: Implementation of Section 222 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (WRDA 00) – Enhanced Public Participation.
- 3.13. CESPД-CM-P Memorandum, dated 1 May 2002, subject: Study Initiation in the Civil Works Program.
- 3.14. CESPД-CM-P Memorandum, dated 7 May 2002, subject: Guidance for the Review of Projects Not Yet Under Construction.
- 3.15. CECW-PD Memorandum, dated 5 April 2001, subject: Planning Roles and Responsibilities.

#### **4. Definitions**

The definitions of terms used in this appendix are generally consistent with the definitions provided in the basic CESPД Quality Management Plan. Within the text of this appendix, certain definitions are expanded upon to place them in a context that is appropriate to the planning program. All definitions are consistent with ER 1105-2-100, Reference 3.2, which provides overall guidance for the planning program.

#### **5. Relationship of the Division and Districts**

5.1. The CESPД Planning and Policy Division is responsible for quality assurance for planning documents prepared by the districts. The Planning and Policy Division, through its members on the district support teams that are described below in Paragraph 6.3 shall review and approve the planning portion of each district's quality management plan and shall provide oversight of the quality control processes. These representatives of the Planning and Policy Division shall

also lead the policy compliance review for planning products that are approved at CESPD. This memorandum does not address the Planning and Policy Division's roles and responsibilities for the other CESPD functions of command and control, program management, and regional interface.

5.2. Districts are responsible for controlling quality for all work that they accomplish, which includes both technical quality and policy compliance. To assist in the achievement of high quality, the districts shall develop, carry out and keep up to date their own quality management plans. The quality management plans shall establish district roles, responsibilities and processes consistent with this appendix. Districts shall also be responsible for the development and implementation of quality control plans for decision and implementation documents covered by this appendix.

## **6. Division Quality Assurance Responsibilities**

6.1. Chief, Planning and Policy Division. At CESPD, the Chief, Planning and Policy Division is responsible for the following quality assurance activities:

6.1.1. Providing technical oversight of the district's planning activities.

6.1.2. Developing procedures and guidelines for accomplishing interdisciplinary planning studies.

6.1.3. Assuring quality of district technical review and policy compliance programs for all planning studies, reports and activities.

6.1.4. Providing oversight of the district planning chief's approval of quality control plans for planning products.

6.1.5. Providing technical and planning management support to the districts, as requested. Providing assistance to districts in resolving major technical issues.

6.1.6. Assuring current policies are implemented in district planning products. Facilitating resolution of policy issues with HQUSACE and others.

6.1.7. Chairing issue resolution conferences for complex or controversial actions.

6.1.8. Monitoring customer satisfaction with district planning products.

6.1.9. Leading the planning portion of the command inspection program.

6.2. Planning Program Manager. Planning program managers are members of the CESPD Planning and Policy Division staff who are responsible for the various parts of the planning program. At CESPD, the planning program managers often serve three roles related to quality management. The first role includes the responsibility for managing quality assurance activities for planning studies or programs, most often as the planning representative on a district support

team. The second role includes the responsibility for quality assurance oversight in one or more specific technical areas for all districts, often as an ad hoc member to a district support team. And, the third role is in the development of guidance and training activities that may be applicable to all districts. These quality assurance roles are summarized in the list that follows:

- 6.2.1. Providing informal consultation regarding technical and policy issues.
- 6.2.2. Managing the CESPD quality assurance activities for assigned studies and seeking quality assurance support as required from members of the District Support Teams and other technical specialists.
- 6.2.3. Approving the planning portion of the district's quality management plan.
- 6.2.4. Participating in selected technical review strategy sessions at the start of major studies.
- 6.2.5. Participating in selected CESPD mandated milestone conferences and other significant meetings, and providing feedback to the district's planning function chiefs.
- 6.2.6. Facilitating the resolution of policy issues and major technical issues with HQUSACE and others.
- 6.2.7. Facilitating issue resolution conferences (IRC) with the districts and HQUSACE, which include Reconnaissance Review Conferences (RRC), Feasibility Scoping Meetings (FSM), Feasibility Review Conferences (FRC) and Alternative Formulation Briefings (AFB). Chair these conferences in the absence of the Chief, Planning and Policy Division.
- 6.2.8. Managing and performing policy compliance review for activities that have been delegated to CESPD.
- 6.2.9. Certifying district final decision documents for public distribution, forwarding final decision documents to HQUSACE for policy review and processing, and providing oversight of the Washington-level review.
- 6.2.10. Approving planning products on behalf of the Division Commander and District Support Team for planning products that can be delegated to the District Support Team. Recommending approval of planning products that cannot be delegated.
- 6.2.11. Assisting in non-Federal sponsor education.
- 6.2.12. Provide training, coaching, guidance for review of documents and related "mentoring" activities with district staff.
- 6.2.13. Managing the audit of selected planning products and the associated review documentation to assess the adequacy of the district's quality control program.

6.2.14. Managing and participating in workshops to address systemic issues and new procedures. Managing process action teams to improve the planning process and the production of planning products.

6.2.15. Providing input to the command inspection program.

6.3. District Support Teams. District Support Teams were chartered by Reference 3.8 to support the districts in the execution of their programs. They are tasked to provide maximum support to the districts in delivering quality projects to their customers. In the context of quality management, this would include providing oversight and quality assurance of the district's overall quality management program, assisting the districts on project specific issues, performing policy reviews for delegated actions and processing district products through CESPD, HQUSACE and ASA (CW). The district support team concept is developed further in Reference 3.10, Principles and Guidelines for District Support Teams. The coordination among the members of the District Support Teams is described in Reference 3.6, for planning products.

## **7. District Quality Control Participants**

7.1. Roles and Responsibilities. Planning function chiefs, other function chiefs, the project manager, the project delivery team, the review team and the review team leader all have significant roles and responsibilities in achieving quality planning products. The roles and responsibilities of all the participating individuals shall be described in the district's quality management plan and shall include the responsibilities that are outlined in the independent technical review process which is described below in Paragraph 8.

7.2. Function Chiefs. The Chief, Planning Division in the Sacramento and Los Angeles Districts, the Chief, Planning Branch in the San Francisco District and the Chief, Civil Planning Section in the Albuquerque District are the planning function chiefs. In cases where only an environmental product is developed, the Chief, Environmental Resources Branch in the Albuquerque District is also considered a planning function chief. These planning function chiefs shall have the overall responsibility for the technical quality of planning products. Specific responsibilities of the planning function chiefs include the approval of quality control plans for planning products and the quality certification of planning products. Responsibilities of the planning function chiefs, as well as the planning organizations are set forth in Reference 3.15. The district chiefs of the Construction/ Operations, Engineering and Real Estate Divisions, and the Deputy for Programs and Project Management, are also referred to as function chiefs. At the discretion of the planning function chief, chiefs of functional organizations such as economics, environmental resources and plan formulation may also be considered function chiefs for the processes set forth in this appendix. In accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Business Process, the function chiefs are responsible for developing and maintaining a professional, technically competent workforce; establishing and maintaining the necessary systems, technical processes and environment to produce quality products; and providing the technical oversight to assure production of quality products. They are also responsible and accountable for the quality of the organization's technical products, assigning qualified members to project teams, keeping commitments made in management plans, and ensuring that their technical processes produce the desired results.

7.3. Project Manager. The project manager is the leader of the project delivery team. For the quality control of planning products, the project manager's role is to provide adequate time and resources to the independent technical review team for the review of planning products and adequate time and resources to the project delivery team to respond to and resolve quality issues. Reference 3.7 describes the standard operating procedures for team establishment and the team processes. In accordance with these procedures, the project manager shall negotiate the cost and schedule for members of both the project delivery team and the independent technical review team with the appropriate section chiefs. To preserve the independence of the technical review, the project manager will not, however, be a member of the independent technical review team. To ensure that quality expectations are met in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Business Process, the project manager shall ensure that certification requirements are met prior to approval by the District Commander or transmittal of a product to CESPD.

7.4. Project Delivery Team Members. The study team, or project delivery team as used in this regulation, is responsible for delivering a quality project. Each member of the project delivery team is responsible for the quality of their own work, for keeping the commitments for completion of their portion of the study as documented in the Quality Control Plan and the Project Management Plan. The teams shall be assigned representatives that have expertise in plan formulation, economics, environmental, hydrology and hydraulics or coastal engineering, civil design, geotech, real estate and other disciplines, as required.

7.5. Review Team Members. Review teams shall be assigned representatives that are senior experienced staff that mirror the expertise of the project delivery teams. A goal will be the establishment of an informed, objective review team with full accountability to maintain objectivity. To ensure this objectivity, the members of the review teams must be independent from those who perform the work. Supervisors of project delivery team members or, as indicated above, the project managers are not to be included on the review team. In addition, technical managers of contracts that provide assumptions, clarify guidance or otherwise participate in the preparation of the products are not to be review team members. Review team members shall serve in a part time capacity and any one individual's review responsibilities shall not exceed 50% of their time. If sufficient staff is not available in a district, or if specialized review expertise is required, function chiefs shall supplement the review team with personnel from other districts, divisions, HQUSACE, centers of expertise, laboratories, the non-Federal sponsor's organization or by contract. Interdistrict review of major decision documents is required and discussed below in Paragraph 9. Project or study funds shall be used to pay for the cost of conducting technical reviews. A district in need of review assistance shall find the expertise needed and negotiate the schedule and cost for the required services. Members of the District Support Team may provide assistance in this effort. The formation of the review team should consider regional interests, resources, special expertise requirements and unusual complexity.

7.6. Review Team Leaders. Review Team leaders will normally be selected from the pool of regional technical specialists that represent the planning function and that are described below. Since careful coordination between the disciplines is required, the review team leaders must be senior staff with broad expertise.

7.7. Regional Technical Specialists. The Engineer and Scientist Career Program Planning Board, in May 1997, directed that a strong career ladder for technical disciplines is essential to maintaining CESPД core competencies. With districts being fully responsible for the technical adequacy of products, the establishment of enhanced non-supervisory technical specialist positions at the districts (GS-13 level) is imperative and a division-wide advisory panel was established. Technical specialist positions are regional in nature, including workload of the home district as well as the workload of the entire Division. A minimum of 25% of a regional technical specialist position is as a CESPД regional expert, which would include but not be limited to: leading independent technical review teams or serving as an independent technical reviewer for other districts, trouble shooting or consulting on unresolved technical issues for other districts, performing audits, providing specialized training, participation on panels at the annual CESPД planning conference, or representing the entire Division at meetings and conferences. The other 75% of the position would be directed specifically at the home district's technical requirements.

7.8. Centers of Specialized Planning Expertise. In response to a request from the Director of Civil Works, CESPД evaluated opportunities to concentrate specialized planning expertise. The evaluation resulted in: 1) the identification of the economics workgroup in the San Francisco District as a regional center for deep-draft navigation economics, 2) the identification of the economics workgroup in the Los Angeles District as a regional center for coastal storm damage economics, and 3) the identification of virtual center in the Los Angeles District including members of the environmental resources branch and the economics workgroup as a regional center for recreation analysis for significant recreational development (defined as visitation greater than 500,000 per year). These centers of expertise shall either perform the specialized planning analyses or review such analyses, for all studies in the South Pacific Division. These centers would also coordinate with HQUSACE, the Institute for Water Resources (IWR) and similar centers in other regions to form communities of specialized planning expertise. These communities will facilitate the sharing of resources, share evaluation tools, verify economic models and share lessons learned.

7.9. Review Team Members for Water Control Management. Due to its special requirements, Water Control Management has been classified as a unique function of the Corps, as described in Appendix D, Engineering Subplan. Therefore, for planning products that either include modifications to water control management or otherwise may affect the operation of existing reservoir projects, the district shall consult with the CESPД Water Control Center staff to determine an appropriate water control review team member. The consultation will result in a water control review team member being selected from either: the CESPД Water Control Center staff, the local district producing the product, or another district. If a CESPД team member participates in the technical review of the product, that CESPД team member may not be involved in the quality assurance of that product.

## **8. District Independent Technical Review**

8.1. Independent Technical Review Process. Quality control is the appropriate evaluation of technical products and processes to ensure that they meet customer requirements and are in compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and sound technical practices of the disciplines

involved. This is to be accomplished through a process of independent technical review, which also includes policy compliance review. Quality assurance includes the oversight of the independent technical review process. The independent technical review process begins with a technical review strategy session, continues with seamless in-progress reviews and finishes with a comprehensive review of the final product.

8.2. Technical Review Strategy Session. The technical review strategy session shall form the basis for a quality control plan for all major studies. For feasibility studies and general reevaluation reports, this session shall be held during the preparation of the project management plan for the feasibility phase. For other types of major products, this session shall be held early in the product development phase. The planning function chief shall chair the technical review strategy session. Also attending would be the project manager, other function chiefs and representatives of the non-Federal cost-sharing sponsor. CESPD's planning program managers may also attend selected sessions, in a quality assurance role. In addition to establishing the independent review team, the participants shall establish the level of review, identify documents to be reviewed and identify policy or major technical issues that need to be brought to the attention of CESPD for resolution early in the study. This session should be combined with other initial formulation/scoping meetings. For products of an uncomplicated or routine nature, the technical review strategy session may be waived by the planning function chief.

8.3. Quality Control Plans. Quality control plans shall be prepared using information developed at the technical review strategy session. Specific quality control plans shall be prepared for complex planning products. A generic quality control plan shall be prepared for small or low risk products, such as reconnaissance studies and most products prepared for the Continuing Authorities Program (CAP). In developing the quality control plan, the districts are encouraged to rely heavily on their approved quality management plans, through reference, and highlight only exceptions. For major studies entering the feasibility phase, and for the initiation of post-authorization reevaluation studies, the quality control plan shall be fully integrated into the project management plan and shall be certified by the planning function chief. All other quality control plans for planning products shall be approved by the planning function chief. A quality control plan, or a project management plan for the feasibility phase, shall, as a minimum, include the following:

8.3.1. A statement of quality control objectives.

8.3.2. A statement of the guidelines that will be followed for the technical review.

8.3.3. A roster of the proposed project delivery team or, in the case of a generic plan, a list from which the roster would be selected.

8.3.4. A roster of the proposed technical review team with the number of years and bullet description of relevant experience for each member. Similarly, in the case of a generic plan, a list from which the roster would be selected.

8.3.5. A list of documents to be reviewed by the technical review team.

8.3.6. A list of quality objectives.

8.3.7. A milestone list and schedule for review activities that integrate the mandated division milestones.

8.3.8. A discussion of proposed deviations from the approved quality management plan.

8.3.9. The cost estimate for conducting the independent technical review.

8.4. Seamless Single Discipline Review. To maintain a seamless review concept, products of individual project delivery team members shall, consistent with the scope and complexity of the products, receive technical review from review team members before they are released to other members of the project delivery team or integrated into the overall study. A memorandum of record shall be the basis for establishing accountability for the quality of the product and the review. The review team member shall prepare the memorandum that shall become part of the review team's records. Specific issues raised in the review shall be documented in a comment, response, discussion, action required, action taken and, if appropriate, lessons learned format. Unresolved differences between the project delivery team and review team members shall be documented, along with the basis for the function chief's decision on the issue. The software system DrChecks may be used, at the option of the district. These reviews should be completed prior to major decision points in the planning process so that the technical results can be relied upon in setting the course for further study activities.

8.5. Product Review. The quality control plan shall identify products to be reviewed by the technical review team. The products would include: documentation for the major milestone conferences, documentation for mandatory issue resolution conferences, draft documents for public release and final documents. These products shall be essentially complete before review is undertaken and the branch and section chiefs shall be responsible for accuracy of the computations through design checks, supervisory review and other internal procedures, prior to the independent technical review.

8.5.1. Scope. The documents shall be reviewed using an interdisciplinary team approach. The document shall be reviewed for scope, adequate level of detail, compliance with guidelines and policy, consistency, accuracy, and comprehensiveness. The independent technical reviews will specifically address several areas of emphasis that are particularly important to planning products. The review shall ensure that the document tells a story that is a coherent whole, the steps of the analyses are consistent and follow logically, the assumptions are convincing and consistent, especially those related to the probable/most likely with and without project futures, and outstanding action items from the issue resolution conferences (RRC, FSM, AFB and FRC), milestone conferences and other reviews are adequately addressed.

8.5.2. Integration of Prior Reviews. At the beginning of a document review, team members shall review their counterpart's presentations in the document. The review shall determine whether prior seamless review activities have produced the technical product envisioned during the seamless review. Material reviewed in the seamless review phase shall not be subjected to additional detailed review, except when the presentation in the documents is significantly

different from the work previously reviewed or it is the judgment of the review team that the technical material may be causing the plan formulation process to produce unreasonable or inconsistent results.

8.5.3. Interdisciplinary Review. All members of the review team shall be expected to raise concerns in other functional areas. These concerns shall be addressed to the review team as a whole. The review team shall then work through the appropriate review team counterparts to resolve technical issues. Review team meetings shall be open to representatives of CESPD for quality assurance purposes. It is the responsibility of the review team leader to seek resolution of disagreements among review team members before referring issues to the project delivery team.

8.5.4. Content of Review Comments. Review comments should follow the suggested structure that has been established by HQUSACE for their development of comments when they perform policy compliance review. Each comment should include: 1) a clear statement of the concern (information deficiency or incorrect application of policy or procedures), 2) the basis of the concern (law, policy, guidance), 3) significance of the concern, and 4) specific actions needed to resolve the concern.

8.5.5. Responses to and Resolution of Review Comments. The review team shall coordinate with the project delivery team to resolve the issues that have been raised. Face to face communication is encouraged between the review team and project delivery team members. While E-mail is adequate for providing information, telephonic communication is preferred for communication. Along with a description of the scope of the review, all review comments shall be documented in a comment, response, discussion, action required, action taken format and, when appropriate, lessons learned. In those cases where a function chief decides unresolved disputes between the project delivery team and the review team, the review documentation shall provide the basis for the function chief's decision. As indicated above, the DrChecks software system may be used at the option of the district.

8.5.6. Final Documentation. Proper documentation is a key component of an effective independent technical review process. Significant decisions must be recorded and the entire process must leave a clear audit trail. The documentation of the independent technical review shall be included with the submission to CESPD. As an example, the review documentation for a final feasibility report will include memorandums from seamless single discipline review, memorandums from the milestone conferences and memorandums from the draft and final product reviews. The purpose of the review documentation is to show the full scope of the independent technical review and a summary of the review need not be prepared if action items are appropriately tracked.

8.5.7. District Certification. Documentation of the independent technical review shall be accompanied by a certification, indicating that the independent technical review process has been completed and that all technical issues have been resolved. This requirement is discussed further in Paragraph 17.

8.5.8. Certification of the Without-Project Hydrology. Because of the critical need to establish the without-project hydrology early in a flood control planning study, the chief of the district element that is responsible for the hydrological analysis shall certify the hydrology prior to the first milestone conference in the feasibility phase. This certification shall be included in the review documentation.

8.6. Dispute Resolution. The review team leader shall review the documentation to identify any outstanding disagreements between members of the project delivery team and the review team. Any disagreements shall be brought to the attention of the appropriate function chief to facilitate resolution of technical disagreements between study and review team counterparts. If a dispute is between representatives from different functional organizations, then the issue shall be forwarded to the planning function chief, who shall facilitate resolution. The appropriate function chief shall make the final decision. The function chief may consult with CESPD staff or regional technical experts that can serve as an unbiased sounding board, or major technical issues may be formally submitted to CESPD for resolution.

8.7. Policy Issue Resolution. Issues involving policy interpretation shall be brought to the attention of the planning function chief for resolution or referral to CESPD. In some cases, the planning function chief, may request CESPD to hold an issue resolution conference to resolve major policy issues. CESPD may also arrange for HQUSACE input or participation in the issue resolution conference.

8.8. Use of Checklists. Checklists may be used to guide the technical review and ensure that critical items are not overlooked. Checklists may be used to simplify the documentation of the review. Checklists may also be used to track outstanding action items for a particular study. The use of checklists shall not, however, eliminate the requirement to document specific comments. A checklist of items to consider during a review is included as Enclosure 3.

8.9. Lessons Learned. The development of a CESPD-wide lessons learned program is being led by the CESPD Technical Engineering and Construction Division. In the interim, each district should take maximum advantage of lessons learned and share these lessons at appropriate workshops and conferences. The result of audits that have been conducted by CESPD to date, have identified a need to give special emphasis to the following items:

8.9.1. With and without project assumptions

8.9.2. Consistency with the process, terminology and other requirements of the Principles and Guidelines.

8.9.3. Cost Apportionment (who pays), especially when a locally preferred plan is proposed.

8.9.4. Commitments and unresolved issues in prior conference memorandums.

8.9.5. Consistency between the decision document and the EIS.

8.10. Products Developed by Contractors: The development and execution of a quality control plan for products developed by a contractor shall be the responsibility of the contractor. The contractor's quality control plan shall be reviewed and approved by the responsible function chief at the district. In order to maintain contractor responsibility, the contractor shall be responsible for quality control of its own work. An overall quality control plan shall be developed by the district that outlines quality control activities by the district for any portion of a product developed by in-house forces and quality assurance activities by the District for overseeing the contractor's quality control activities. These quality assurance activities shall include actions to define the work for the contractor and ensure that the contractor meets the requirements of the contract, and they shall also include an independent quality assurance review. The responsible function chief at the district shall approve the overall quality control plan for the total product.

## **9. Interdistrict Review of Decision Documents**

9.1. Interdistrict Reviews. Reference 3.9, the July 2000 Engineer Inspector General Report, "Planning for Civil Works Programs", presented a set of recommendations for commanders to improve and retain the Corps' planning capability. One of the report's recommendations was "that division commanders, in accordance with the Regional Business Center concept, actively encourage more use of other districts for independent technical reviews." Interdistrict reviews will ensure the independence of reviews, thus maintaining the credibility and integrity necessary for quality products. Interdistrict reviews will also provide outstanding learning opportunities to understand the way other professionals tackle problems and to learn lessons from the experiences of others.

9.2. South Pacific Division Policy. Reference 3.11 established the policy of the South Pacific Division that all decision documents that are to be sent to Congress for authorization shall undergo independent technical review by another district. These decision documents include both feasibility reports and post-authorization decision documents requiring Congressional authorization with an Alternative Formulation Briefing scheduled after 1 January 2002. Other documents may be also reviewed by another district at the request of the district producing the documents.

9.3. Review Management. All independent technical review work shall be included in the project management plan. As with other reviews, interdistrict review shall be planned in advance and conducted as a continuous and seamless activity with formal documentation prepared for each of the South Pacific Division milestones. The producing district shall ensure that the review team shall be given the full funding and time allotted in the project management plan to ensure a prompt and quality independent technical review. The reviewing district shall be accountable to meet reasonably established target dates to complete the independent technical review.

9.3.1. Review Team Alternatives. The composition of the independent technical review team may include team members from multiple districts (including districts outside the South Pacific Division), centers of specialized planning expertise, and from other qualified sources such as non-Federal sponsors and other Federal and State agencies. Alternatives available for interdistrict review include: establishment of an independent review team in another district,

establishment of a review team composed of regional technical experts from multiple districts or establishment of a multi-organization team that could include contractors, sponsors, different districts, and laboratories. In all cases, the leader of the independent review team would be a regional technical specialist from another district.

9.3.2. Interdistrict Review of Contractor Products. Paragraph 8.10, above, establishes that the quality control responsibilities of a product that is produced by a contractor are the responsibility of the contractor. The district is then responsible for quality assurance review. When products developed by a contractor are subject to interdistrict review, then the independent quality assurance review portion of quality assurance shall be provided by another district. This does not relieve the responsible district from appropriately managing and providing input to the contractor, and certifying the product.

## **10. Division Quality Assurance Process**

10.1. In addition to the oversight of the technical review process as indicated above, quality assurance by CESPD shall include the following:

10.2. Informal Consultation. The cornerstone of CESPD's role in quality assurance is to provide informal consultation regarding technical and policy issues with district and customer counterparts.

10.3. Approval of Quality Management Plans. CESPD shall review and approve each district's quality management plan. CESPD shall also review and approve quality control plans for selected, high profile, planning products.

10.4. Milestone Conferences. Milestone conferences shall serve as checkpoints to ensure that quality control has taken place and that appropriate progress is being made in the studies. The results of the independent technical review and the resolution of issues shall be presented by the review team leader. The purpose of the presentation shall be to confirm that the district is following the quality control plan and evaluate any required changes. Selected CESPD participation in these conferences shall be a significant element of CESPD's quality assurance program. This opportunity shall be used to ensure, for example, that the districts are making appropriate site visits, public participation has been adequate and that the non-Federal sponsor is satisfied with the progress of the study. A further discussion of milestone conferences is in Paragraph 12.

10.5. Issue Resolution Conferences. Three types of issue resolution conferences may be held. The first would be at the request of a district to obtain technical and policy assistance on major issues, usually on a particular project. The second would be held at the request of CESPD, to address major issues raised as a result of quality assurance activities. And, the third would be those mandatory issue resolution conferences that include the RRC, FSM and FRC, and upon the recommendation of CESPD, the AFB, all of which are attended by HQUSACE. The CESPD Planning and Policy Division shall chair all issue resolution conferences. A draft memorandum for each conference shall be developed during the conference and signed within fifteen working days. For a mandatory conference with HQUSACE participation, the Chief of Planning at

HQUSACE shall sign the memorandum. The CESPDP Chief, Planning and Policy Division shall sign the memorandum for other issue resolution conferences. Guidance for holding issue resolution conferences is included as Exhibit G-3 to Reference 3.2.

10.6. Audits of Sample Products. CESPDP shall conduct detailed quality assurance reviews of selected planning documents and the independent technical review documentation when CESPDP determines a need or at the request of the districts. The districts are encouraged to take advantage of these opportunities for assessing and improving their quality management processes. These reviews are for the purpose of identifying system problems, trends and possible improvements to the process, and assure compliance with current HQUSACE policy. Audits are available to the districts on a first come-first-served basis, with the exception that during each fiscal year, each district is to request at least one audit of either a feasibility report or a significant post-authorization decision document with an engineering appendix. The selection of studies that a district proposes for detailed review should be based on a number of criteria, including: the expressed needs and concerns of the district, new processes or techniques, or studies that have poor performance histories.

10.7. Annual Report to the District Commander. The command inspection program shall normally be used to ensure that all requirements in this appendix and the requirements reflected in each district's quality management plan are discussed with district personnel, and an assessment is presented to the district commander. When the focus of a particular command inspection is concentrated on other items, the assessment of the district's quality management program shall be conducted as a separate, but similar initiative. As a specific inspection item, the roles and responsibilities established in Reference 3.15 will be reviewed to ensure that they are appropriately being accomplished by both the planning organization and the planning function chief.

10.8. Training. The CESPDP Planning and Policy Division has developed a catalog of presentations for planning training that is published as a CD, and will continue to add to this catalog. Members of the CESPDP Planning and Policy Division staff are available to make presentations to the districts upon request. In addition, selected presentations are including on the Planning and Policy Division homepage. CESPDP Planning and Policy Division staff and the regional technical specialists will also participate and support both Prospect courses and courses in the Corps-wide core planning curriculum.

10.9. Technical Workshops and Conferences. Because of the press of ongoing work, training, technology transfer, and the promotion of innovation often do not get the required attention. These activities will normally be accomplished through technical workshops and conferences. The most important of these is the South Pacific Division's annual planning conference. Members of the planning community and those who work with the planning community, attend this conference, including representatives from the districts, CESPDP, HQUSACE and often representatives from other divisions. The conference provides an outstanding opportunity to present and address current planning issues and the conference is an important part of the training program for all planners. In addition, quarterly planning workshops are held in conjunction with meetings of the CESPDP planning chiefs. These workshops provide additional training opportunities and/or address current planning issues. Every opportunity to attend these

conferences and workshops must be provided to members of the planning community. The results of the workshops and conferences, and other current activities, are posted on the Planning and Policy Division web site.

10.10. Monitoring Technical Competency. Assuring that the team members who perform the work have the knowledge, skills and experience is an essential element of quality control and quality assurance. Quality assurance includes an evaluation of the district's development and maintenance of the technical competency, and assistance to enhance technical competency. Sharing technical capability between districts will be necessary to ensure that proper experts are available for technical review and CESPD may assist in facilitating these efforts. Distribution of division-wide resource allocations is a CESPD responsibility and the CESPD Planning and Policy Division shall be an active proponent for the district planning organizations. A listing of the technical specialist positions is included on the CESPD web site, and an E-Mail address book of regional technical specialists in the planning function will be maintained on the Planning and Policy Division web site.

10.11. Guidance. The CESPD Planning and Policy Division staff continues to develop regional guidance for the implementation of the planning program. Along with this guidance, model document formats are developed to assist the districts in the preparation of planning products. The guidance, formats and selected documents from other sources are available both on CD and on the Planning and Policy Division web site.

10.12. Recognition Programs. The CESPD Planning and Policy Division shall manage those programs that recognize and promote outstanding achievement in the production of quality planning products and planning services. These programs include the annual Planning Excellence Award, Outstanding Planning Achievement Awards and Web Page of the Year.

## **11. Expedited Reconnaissance Phase Studies**

11.1. Generic Quality Control/Study Plan. Guidance for expedited reconnaissance phase studies is provided in Reference 3.4. As directed in this guidance, each district shall prepare a generic quality control/study plan for the preparation of all expedited reconnaissance phase study products. The plan shall include a sample schedule and sample distribution of costs that would be adapted for each specific reconnaissance study. Within the first month after the initiation of an expedited reconnaissance study, the project delivery team shall be formed from potential candidates that are listed in the generic quality control/study plan and the plan shall be adapted for the implementation of the specific study.

11.2. Team Members. The further reliance on informed judgment emphasizes the need for even more experienced project delivery team members. Periodic peer consultation, rather than review will be included, especially after initial field investigations, to broaden and test the conclusions reached from the limited data available. Individuals participating in peer consultation will be selected from the same approved list as the project delivery team. These individuals shall be the most experienced in the planning process, with the ability to draw conclusions from limited data.

11.3. Independent Technical Review. The products developed during the expedited reconnaissance phase include the project management plan for the feasibility phase and a Section 905(b) Analysis. These products shall be subject to supervisory review. Independent technical review of these products shall be limited to a single recognized expert in planning procedures and the planning process. This individual shall be selected from a list that would, also, be included in the generic quality control/study plan. The independent technical review shall ensure that the documents reflect a coherent logic and that the assumptions and conclusions are convincing and consistent.

11.4. Mandatory Milestone Conference. As indicated in Reference 3.4, a CESPDP mandated milestone conference shall be held to preview the reconnaissance findings and shall be used to establish a corporate district-sponsor position relative to the direction for the feasibility phase. A description of this conference is included in Enclosure 2. The conference will normally involve all members of the project delivery team who will participate in the identification of the process for completing outstanding items and resolving outstanding issues. CESPDP's planning program manager and representatives of the proposed non-Federal cost-sharing sponsor shall also be given the opportunity to attend. The independent document review shall occur between this interim milestone conference and the completion of the Section 905(b) Analysis. In accordance with Appendix H of Reference 3.2, the Section 905(b) Analysis shall be submitted to HQUSACE via e-mail and no formal transmittal letter is necessary.

11.5. Certification Requirement. The results of the independent technical review shall be included in a memorandum that shall be included with the planning function chief's certification, which shall be placed in the project files and be subject to audit. In addition to indicating that the independent technical review process has been completed and that all issues have been addressed, the planning chief's certification of the project management plan for the feasibility phase shall indicate that proposed streamlining initiatives will result in a technically adequate product and that quality control plan requirements have adequately been incorporated into the project management plan for the feasibility phase. The certification shall be bound with the plan. Certification requirements are also discussed in Paragraph 17.

## **12. Feasibility Milestone Conferences**

12.1. Milestone Conferences. The quality control plans shall include milestone schedules that shall be employed as a performance measurement system for project delivery teams and review teams working on planning products. For feasibility studies, this milestone schedule shall be developed to include all CESPDP milestones that are included in Enclosure 1. Within a study schedule, CESPDP mandated milestone conferences shall be scheduled to occur at significant decision points in the study process. The requirements for the CESPDP mandated milestone conferences are included in Enclosure 2. One of the functions of the milestone conferences shall be to recognize that key steps have been accomplished. Performance at each milestone shall be documented with a memorandum to be signed by the planning function chief. While the milestone requirements that follow are specific to feasibility reports, the districts shall establish appropriate internal milestones for other products in the quality control plans. At the initiation of the planning function chief, additional milestone conferences may also be held.

12.2. Enhanced Public Participation. Reference 3.12 establishes procedures to enhance public participation in the development of feasibility studies. In addition to requiring an early public meeting, which CESPD had previously required as the F2 milestone, the procedures allow for the establishment of stakeholder advisory groups. Such groups shall be given the opportunity to participate in the mandated CESPD milestone conferences.

12.3. Level of CESPD Participation. When HQUSACE takes advantage of the opportunity to participate in a CESPD mandated milestone conference, the conference shall follow the guidance for other issue resolution conferences as indicated above in Paragraph 10.5. In those cases where the district requires a formal CESPD or higher headquarters position regarding study issues and a meeting is the best vehicle for developing this position, a CESPD issue resolution conference may, also, be requested. Other milestone conferences will be chaired by the district planning function chief, CESPD participation would be limited to informal consultation and oversight for quality assurance, and the conference memorandum shall be signed by the district planning function chief.

12.4. Technical Review Requirements. Technical review shall be broken down into manageable parts that correspond to the CESPD mandated milestone conferences. Therefore, documentation that is developed in support of conference discussions shall be reviewed by the technical review team and, to the degree practicable, issues should be resolved in advance of the conference. Since this quality control will have occurred prior to each milestone conference, the conference is free to address critical outstanding issues and set direction for the next step of the study, since a firm technical basis for making decisions will have already been established.

12.5. Submittal of Pre-conference Documentation. Unless alternative arrangements are made, the district shall submit to CESPD five copies of the same pre-conference documentation that is furnished to the independent review team, or provide this same pre-conference documentation electronically. Before the conference is held, the review documentation from the review team shall also be provided to all conference participants. A major goal of the process is to prepare the conference participants to make decisions regarding the future course of the study, which can be compromised if there are many outstanding technical issues. Towards this end, it is desirable for the technical review team and the project delivery team to have resolved as many issues as possible prior to the conference. Because of time constraints, this activity may not be complete by the date of the conference. The review documentation that is provided to the conference participants should, to the degree possible, be annotated to indicate major issues that require discussion.

12.6. Areas of Special Emphasis. Each CESPD milestone conference that is held during the feasibility phase shall include a review of the status of the project management plan for the feasibility phase to clarify any potential changes in cost and schedule. Any requirements established in the approval of the reconnaissance phase shall be reviewed at each conference to ensure that specific study requirements established in the reconnaissance phase are addressed, and consistency with the Environmental Operating Principles established in Reference 3.3 will be reviewed. Also, the transmittal letter for the documentation in support of an AFB shall clearly outline all issues that should be addressed at the AFB.

12.7. Feasibility Scoping Meeting. Milestone conference requirements for studies undertaken through the expedited reconnaissance phase process are set forth in Reference 3.4. The first milestone conference in the feasibility phase has been expanded to incorporate the rescoping of the feasibility phase and HQUSACE participation is outlined in Appendix G of Reference 3.2. Preconference documentation must be provided to HQUSACE at least 35 days in advance of the conference. This documentation must clearly describe the assumptions and conclusions regarding the without project condition and provided a clear discussion of the formulation and screening of preliminary alternatives.

12.8. Start-Up Team Meeting. In order to review the findings of the previous studies, to review the Project Management Plan, and to set the direction for addressing future milestone requirements, a start-up team meeting/study area field visit will be held within a month after the study initiation (CESPD Milestone F1 for feasibility studies), in accordance with Reference 3.13. The project delivery team and the independent technical review team shall attend this meeting. Representatives of the CESPD district support team and the local sponsor will also be provided the opportunity to attend. This team meeting shall be held within 45 days of CESPD Milestone F1 and it may be combined with other initial formulation/ scoping meetings and related field trips in the study area.

### **13. Post-Authorization Decision Documents**

13.1 General Guidance. The development of post-authorization decision documents shall follow the same process and milestone system as used for feasibility phase studies. If adequate information exists where one or more of the milestone conferences can be eliminated, then this shall be clearly indicated an equivalent document to a Section 905(b) Analysis for the post-authorization review and coordinated with the CESPD planning member of the district support team. The ultimate processing requirements for the post-authorization decision document will depend on the approval authority of the proposed changes to the authorized plan. These authorities are specified in Reference 3.5. Generally, for changes that are not significant, both technical and policy review will be accomplished at the district. Policy compliance review shall be accomplished at the Division for a decision document recommending significant changes to a project if the Federal cost of the project is less than \$15,000,000. For a decision document recommending significant changes to a project where the Federal cost of the project is greater than \$15,000,000, CESPD shall forward the documentation to HQUSACE for policy compliance review. The purpose of the CESPD and HQUSACE policy compliance reviews will be to ensure that the study objectives have been achieved at the appropriate level of detail of analysis and policy issues regarding eligibility and consistency have been resolved.

13.2 Economic Updates, Reassessments and Economic Reevaluations. Guidance for updating project economics and the definitions of the specific products are outlined in Reference 3.14. A generic quality control plan may be used for economic updates and reassessments, adapted to a particular project. The independent technical review may be accomplished by a single recognized expert in the process, selected from a list included in the generic quality control plan. A generic quality control plan may also be used for those limited reevaluation reports that are limited to economic reevaluations. More complex post-authorization decision documents

will require separate quality control plans, which may be integrated into the project management plan prepared for the study. For those decision documents approved at the district, the review documentation and certification shall be placed in the project file. For those documents that require approval at a higher level, the certification and review documentation shall be submitted with the post-authorization decision document in accordance with Reference 3.5.

#### **14. Engineering Appendices to Decision Documents and MCACES Cost Estimates**

14.1. Engineering Appendices. An engineering appendix is an essential part of a feasibility report or post-authorization decision document for a Civil Works project. Similar to other portions of the decision document, the technical review of the engineering appendix is a district responsibility. For decision documents that are approved by the district, the policy compliance review shall also be a district responsibility. And, for any decision document that is not approved at the district, the ultimate policy compliance review of the engineering appendix has been delegated to CESPD. Either a printed copy or an electronic copy of the engineering appendix shall be transmitted to CESPD with the draft decision document for policy compliance review. A printed copy of the engineering appendix shall be included with the submission of the final report since the appendix will be published with the final decision document that supports authorization and/or the signing of a PCA.

14.2. MCACES Cost Estimates. A cover memorandum to the MCACES cost estimate that is submitted with a final decision document will include a certification statement by the engineering function chief that the estimate has been prepared in accordance with current guidance, that the estimate has undergone an independent technical review and that all issues that may have been identified in the independent technical review have been resolved.

#### **15. Continuing Authorities**

15.1. Quality Control. The quality control activities for the Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) shall follow the concepts established above. However, the districts are encouraged to be innovative within this guidance to exercise efficient use of limited funds. Except for complex projects (multi-faceted characteristics, subject to numerous policy determinations, unique technical problems or potentials for numerous requirements for deviations to the model Local Cost Sharing Agreement), the plan for technical review may be established in a generic quality control plan developed for the specific continuing authorities programs.

15.1.1. Standing operating procedures for Preliminary Restoration Plans and Initial Appraisals shall be developed by each district that will include supervisory review and oversight review by the designated district CAP or Section 1135 Coordinators, prior to transmission to CESPD.

15.1.2. A generic quality control plan may either establish a standing team for the review of documents covered by the generic quality control plan, or present a roster of reviewers from which an individual review team would be selected. The generic quality control plan will also identify products to be reviewed, durations required for review and required meetings and

conferences. The generic quality control plan shall address all products that are prepared for the specific continuing authorities program.

15.1.3. The generic quality control plan will be adapted for a particular study, or a separate quality control plan will be prepared for approval by the planning function chief, no later than 30 days after the initial work allowance for the decision document is received. Intermediate milestone conferences are encouraged and would be held at the option of the district. Review team members shall be included in discussions with the project delivery team as the proposed project is framed and products are identified.

15.1.4. Documentation, as described above in Paragraph 8.5.5, and certification of the district's independent technical review shall be submitted with the draft and final decision documents, which will also allow CESPD to perform a quality assurance check of the independent technical review process. The District Commander shall certify the final decision for all projects recommended by the District Commander.

15.2. Quality Assurance and Policy Compliance. Approval authority and policy compliance review for the CAP programs has been delegated to CESPD. For these studies and projects, CESPD has both the quality assurance responsibilities for technical quality, as well as the quality control responsibility for policy. CESPD must, therefore, conduct a policy compliance review of studies and projects submitted by districts for CESPD approval. The district support team shall be responsible for the quality assurance and policy compliance review. The review will be led by the planning program manager that is a member of the district support team.

15.2.1. Issues that arise over appropriate level of detail should be elevated to CESPD through the members of the district support team for early resolution.

15.2.2. Policy compliance issues associated with continuing authority studies may relate to factors such as formulation, Federal interest, cost-sharing, environmental compliance, etc. Prior to the release of a draft feasibility-type report (detailed project reports, etc.) for public review, the report will undergo a full policy compliance review. For low risk studies, the district shall conduct this review, but high-risk studies shall be submitted to CESPD for review before public release of the draft report. For purposes of definition, "low risk" studies in the Continuing Authorities Program are those that do not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and where the tentatively recommended plan would have a Federal cost less than \$4 million. Studies that require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement or where the tentatively recommended plan would have a Federal cost greater than \$4 million are considered "high risk". [Note: \$4M is a 57-80 percent threshold of the limit of Federal investment for flood control and ecosystem restoration authorities respectively.]

15.2.3. In those cases where a district tentatively selects a project that would have a Federal cost less than \$4 million and where a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) is prepared, the District will include policy compliance review as an integral part of the independent technical review process to determine if any significant policy issue exists. The district shall resolve all policy issues prior to the release of the draft report for public review. If the district is unable to

resolve a policy issue, the report shall be considered a high-risk study and submitted to CESPD for policy compliance review.

15.2.4. In all cases where an Environmental Impact Statement is required for a continuing authority project irrespective of the Federal cost, in all cases where the Federal cost is greater than \$4 million and in all cases where the district is unable to resolve a policy issue, the district shall submit the report to CESPD for an initial policy compliance review. This review shall be initiated at least two weeks prior to the proposed release of a draft feasibility-type report for public review. Unless alternative arrangements are made, the district shall submit to CESPD five copies of the draft decision document and supporting documentation. The supporting documentation shall include a copy of the latest fact sheet, documentation of independent technical review and quality certification.

15.2.5. The Division review will use the checklist that HQUSACE has developed for policy compliance review of other decision documents, which is reproduced as Enclosure 3. Within ten working days, the District will be notified that they may release the report for public review, or that there are significant policy issues that may materially effect the conclusions and recommendations in the report, which would cause the report not to be released. CESPD will continue its review, concurrent with the public review of the report, concluding this effort within 30 days from the receipt of the documents.

## **16. Planning Assistance to States and Flood Plain Management Services Products**

16.1. District studies in support of the Planning Assistance to States Program and in support of the Flood Plain Management Services Program are subject to the same quality control requirements as other products. Quality control for smaller, low risk efforts may be managed through the use of a generic quality control plan that is developed for the program. Study efforts that exceed a \$100,000 threshold shall have a specifically developed quality control plan.

16.2. Certification of products developed from the Planning Assistance to States Program or the Flood Plain Management Services Program shall be certified by the district planning chief. This certification, along with the technical review documentation shall be included in the district files and may be subject to audit.

## **17. Certification of Quality Control**

17.1. Documentation of the independent technical review shall be accompanied by a certification, indicating that the independent technical review process has been completed and that all issues have been resolved. This requirement applies to all implementation and decision documents that will be approved by the district commander, approved by the district project review board, documents that will be forwarded to CESPD for approval and all documentation that will be forwarded by the division to HQUSACE for review or approval.

17.2. For the feasibility study process, the certification requirements apply to all Section 905(b) Analyses, project management plans for the feasibility phase, pre-conference documentation for

issue resolution conferences and alternative formulation briefings and draft and final feasibility report submittals.

17.3. For decision documents that include a signed recommendation of the District Commander to the Division Commander, such as a final feasibility report, post authorization decision document (GRR) or final report under a CAP, the certification shall follow the example that is included as Appendix H to the CESPD Quality Management Plan. This certification is to be signed by both the planning function chief and the district commander and shall include the review documentation as an enclosure. The planning function chief shall certify other submittals and the certification may be included within the transmittal letter for the product and review documentation.

17.4. These certification responsibilities shall be specified in the District's quality management plan and cannot be delegated. Any certification requirements for significant modifications to a decision document that result from policy review shall be specified in the CESPD guidance that requires the modifications.

#### **18. Process Deficiency Corrections**

Significant deficiencies may be revealed in a planning product, after it has been certified at the district. If, on the off chance a planning product is produced that includes significant deficiencies, then the district shall develop and implement a plan of corrective action to ensure that such deficiencies are not repeated. Progress on implementing the plan of action shall be actively reported and monitored through the CESPD Executive Project Review Board process. This reporting requirement does not apply to any product that has been subject to an audit, as described in Paragraph 10.6.

**ENCLOSURE 1**  
**SOUTH PACIFIC DIVISION FEASIBILITY PHASE MILESTONE SYSTEM**

MIL (1)	MILESTONE NAME	DESCRIPTION
100	Initiate Feasibility Phase	SPD Milestone F1 (2) - This is the date the district receives Federal feasibility phase study funds. A public notice will be issued by the district in accordance with guidance implementing Section 222 of WRDA 2000
101	Feas Study Pub Wkshp (F2)	SPD Milestone F2 – This is a Public Meeting/Workshop to inform the public and obtain input, public opinions and fulfill scoping requirements for NEPA purposes.
102	Feas Study Conf #1 (F3)	SPD Milestone F3 – The Feasibility Scoping Meeting is with HQUSACE to address potential changes in the PMP. It will establish without project conditions and screen preliminary plans.
103	Feas Study Conf #2 (F4)	SPD Milestone F4 – The Alternative Review Conference will evaluate the final plans, reach a consensus that the evaluations are adequate to select a plan and prepare AFB issues.
124	Date of AFB	SPD Milestone F4A - Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) is for policy compliance review of the proposed plan with HQUSACE to identify actions required to prepare and release the draft report.
145	Public Review of Draft Report	SPD Milestone F5 - Initiation of field level coordination of the draft report with concurrent submittal to HQUSACE through SPD for policy compliance review.
162	Final Public Meeting	SPD Milestone F6 - Date of the final public meeting.

1 MIL – Milestone number used in the PROMIS database.

2 F1 through F9 are the historical designations for the SPD Milestones.

<u>MIL(1)</u>	MILESTONE NAME	DESCRIPTION
130	Feasibility Review Conference	SPD Milestone F7 - Policy compliance review of the draft report with HQUSACE to identify actions that are required to complete the final report.
165	Feasibility Report w\NEPA	SPD Milestone F8 - Date of submittal of final report package to CESPD-ET-P, including technical and legal certifications, compliance memorandum and other required documentation.
170	MSC Commander's Public Notice	SPD Milestone F9 - Date of issue of the Division Commander's Public Notice. Congressional notification would occur two days prior. The report and supporting documentation would be forwarded to HQUSACE. This milestone is used as the completion of the feasibility report in the CMR.

1 MIL – Milestone number used in the PROMIS database.

The following table provides the order and a typical example of durations for a 3-year feasibility study.

Milestone	Description	Duration (mo)	Cumulative (mo)
Milestone F1	Initiate Study	0	0
Milestone F2	Public Workshop/Scoping	2	2
Milestone F3	Feasibility Scoping Meeting	11	13
Milestone F4	Alternative Review Conference	9	22
Milestone F4A	Alternative Formulation Briefing	5	27
Milestone F5	Draft Feasibility Report	3	30
Milestone F6	Final Public Meeting	1	31
Milestone F7	Feasibility Review Conference	1	32
Milestone F8	Final Report to SPD	3	35
Milestone F9	DE's Public Notice	1	36
-	Chief's Report	4	40
-	Project Authoriztion	4	44

**ENCLOSURE 2**  
**SOUTH PACIFIC DIVISION MILESTONE CONFERENCE REQUIREMENTS**

**1. RECONNAISSANCE PHASE**

A CESPD mandated milestone conference shall be held to preview the reconnaissance findings and will be used to establish a corporate district-sponsor position relative to the direction for the feasibility phase. This conference shall be held prior to the submittal of the Section 905(b) Analysis to HQUSACE. The conference will normally involve all members of the project delivery team who will participate in the identification of the process for completing outstanding items and resolving outstanding issues. CESPD's planning program manager and representatives of the proposed non-Federal cost-sharing sponsor shall also be given the opportunity to attend. The memorandum summarizing the conference shall be signed by the planning function chief within 10 days of the conference and distributed to all participants.

**2. FEASIBILITY PHASE**

**2.1. F3 Milestone Conference:**

The district project delivery team shall present the refinement of existing conditions, any new assumptions for the without project condition, results of additional public involvement, problems and opportunities, the identification of specific planning objectives and planning constraints, and the evaluation of the preliminary plans considered in the feasibility phase.

The technical review team leader shall summarize the results of the technical review and the resolution of issues. These issues would normally involve the refinement of the without project conditions and the formulation, design and evaluation of with-project conditions for the preliminary plans.

The study cost-sharing sponsor shall summarize the views of the agency and identify any plans that the agency wishes to include in the final array of alternatives.

The project management plan for the feasibility phase shall be reviewed and the conference shall serve as the HQUSACE Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM) to address potential changes in the project management plan for the feasibility phase. Instructions for the Feasibility Scoping Meeting are included as Exhibit G-3 of Reference 3.2.

Any policy questions shall also be raised at the milestone conference and if these cannot be resolved, the CESPD planning program manager shall raise them to the CESPD Chief, Planning and Policy Division or HQUSACE for resolution. Federal interest shall be reviewed.

This milestone conference shall mark the completion of an iteration of planning steps with the screening of preliminary plans and shall conclude with a consensus on the plans that will be considered in the final array of alternatives.

**2.2. F4 Milestone Conference:**

This conference shall mark the completion of the evaluations of the final array of plans and prepare for the alternative formulation briefing that will be held with HQUSACE.

The project delivery team shall present the evaluation of the final array of alternatives that will be presented in the feasibility study.

Again, the technical review team leader shall summarize the results of the technical review and the resolution of issues. These issues would normally involve the formulation, design and detailed evaluation of the with-project conditions for the final array of plans.

The study cost-sharing sponsor shall summarize the views of the agency and identify any issues that must be resolved prior to the selection of a locally preferred plan.

Federal interest shall be reviewed.

This conference shall reach a consensus that the evaluations are adequate to select a locally preferred plan and the NED Plan. The conference shall also identify policy issues that will be of concern at the alternative formulation briefing (AFB) and develop a listing of the issues that shall be presented at the AFB. There will be no surprises at the AFB and CESPd shall actively support the district.

### **ENCLOSURE 3 DECISION DOCUMENT CHECKLIST**

This checklist is originally from the historic reference – EC 1165-2-203, Appendix B, Policy Compliance Review Considerations, an obsolete but often still useful circular.

All decision documents will receive a policy compliance review. Policy compliance review involves consideration of the development and application of decision factors and assumptions that are used to determine the extent and nature of Federal interest, project cost sharing and cooperation requirements, and related issues. Policy compliance review ensures that there is uniform application of clearly established policy and procedures nationwide and identifies policy issues that must be resolved in the absence of clearly established criteria, guidance, regulations, laws, codes, principles and procedures or where judgment plays a substantial role. Policy compliance also ensures that the proposed action is consistent with the overall goals and objectives of the Civil Works program. Items that will be considered during this review include, but are not limited to, the following:

#### **1. Formulation.**

(a) Will alternatives function safely, reliably, and efficiently, and are they sound from an engineering perspective?

(b) What is the without-project condition and what are the assumptions upon which it is based?

(c) Are the key assumptions underlying the predicted with-project conditions documented and justified as the most likely parameters?

(d) What alternatives, including different performance levels, have been considered?

(e) What is the rationale for screening out the alternatives that were not selected for implementation?

(f) What beneficial and adverse effects have been evaluated for the alternative plans that are studied in detail?

(g) Does risk and/or uncertainty inherent in the data or in the various assumptions of future economic, demographic, social, and environmental trends, have a significant effect on plan formulation?

(h) What are the assumptions regarding future conditions associated with the alternatives?

(i) What coordination has occurred with State, local, and Federal agencies, and how have their views been considered in formulating the recommended plan?

(j) For the flood damage reduction purpose, does the final array of alternatives include a primary non-structural alternative plan; or, a comprehensive flood management plan which includes both structural and non-structural measures to reduce flood damages pursuant to the statutory requirements of WRDA 86 and 96, as amended? (Added)

## **2. Plan Selection.**

(a) Is the selected plan the NED (or most cost effective) plan?

(b) If a departure from the NED (or most cost effective) plan is being recommended, what is the rationale to support the recommended departure?

(c) How do the benefits and costs of the NED (or most cost effective) plan compare to other candidate plans?

(d) Are there any international implications of the project, and if so, how have they been addressed?

(e) Are there any legal or institutional obstacles to project implementation, and if so, how have they been addressed?

(f) Does the Federal Power Agency indicate the marketability of the power produced based on the selected plan?

## **3. Economic Feasibility.**

(a) What discount rate, price level, and amortization period were used to determine annual benefits and costs?

(b) What procedures were used to evaluate NED benefits?

(c) What are the bases for the economic projections?

(d) What separable features have been incrementally economically evaluated, and what are the separable B/C ratios?

(e) Have all anticipated project outputs, monetary and non-monetary, positive and negative, been included in the economic evaluation? If not, what outputs were omitted and why?

(f) What is the B/C ratio of the project and separable elements based on existing benefits?

(g) What contingency allowances were used for major cost items and what is the basis for them?

(h) What engineering and design, and supervision and administration charges were included in the estimate, and what is the basis for them?

(i) What items are included in annual OMRR&R costs, and how were they developed?

(j) Was interest during construction documented?

4. **Environmental Evaluation.**

(a) What studies and coordination were conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and other applicable environmental laws?

(b) What studies were conducted to determine if there are potential or actual contaminated lands (hazardous and toxic wastes, pollutants, etc.) included in the land requirements?

(c) What preservation, conservation, historical, and scientific agencies and interests were consulted, what were their views, and how were their views considered during plan formulation?

(d) What incremental analysis was performed to determine the scope of the fish and wildlife mitigation plan?

5. **Environmental Design Considerations.**

(a) Is the project designed to be in concert with the environment and the sponsor and public views concerning the environment?

(b) Overall, is this project environmentally sound? To what degree does this project add or detract from the environment?

6. **Engineering Appendix.**

(a) Is there an engineering appendix to the feasibility report or similar section in other decision documents in accordance with ER 1110-2-1150?

(b) Does the report document that the cost estimate will remain relatively stable based on the engineering effort contained in the engineering appendix?

(c) Does the report document the design with clear references and assumptions?

(d) Has design criteria for the project been established and does it include functional requirements, non-Federal sponsor requirements, technical design, and environmental engineering considerations?

(e) If appropriate, has the U.S. Coast Guard been contacted to determine requirements for permits for any structures to be constructed or relocated over a navigable waterway?

(f) If no DM is to be prepared, does the engineering appendix provide a comprehensive discussion and complete documentation of the completed design?

7. **Hydrology and Hydraulics.**

(a) Is the analysis based on current hydraulic, hydrologic, and climatic data?

(b) Does the report provide the hydraulic and hydrologic studies necessary to establish channel capacities, structure configurations, interior flood control requirements, residual or induced flooding, etc.?

(c) Have required physical and numerical modeling, including ship-simulation investigations, been performed in accordance with current guidance? If numeric modeling or other studies required by regulation are not to be performed, is the rationale for omitting these efforts documented and has the appropriate approval been obtained?

8. **Surveying and Mapping.**

(a) Does the report provide topographic maps to support the level of detail required to eliminate possibility of large quantity errors?

(b) Has suitable site-specific mapping been accomplished during PED?

(c) Has the report met the requirements listed in the table of required actions in ER 1110-1-8156 (Policies, Guidance, and Requirements for Geospatial Data and Systems)?

9. **Geotechnical.**

(a) Does the report document that a site investigation, subsurface explorations, testing and analysis been accomplished and present geotechnical information to support the type of project, foundation design, structural components and availability of construction materials?

(b) Does the report address any special construction features or procedures (dewatering, stage construction, etc.) and are they included in the estimate?

(c) Does the report provide the level of design necessary to document the cost estimate?

10. **Structural Design.**

(a) Does the report clearly present the results of alternatives needed to support the selected project site, configuration, and features, including main structures and major appurtenances?

(b) Does the report document the comparison of alternatives in sufficient detail to establish a realistic comparison of costs?

(c) Have appropriate additional studies or tests planned for later phases of the design been identified?

11. **Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste.**

(a) Have HTRW areas been identified and the project designed to avoid HTRW?

(b) If HTRW cannot be avoided, have investigations been conducted by an approved HTRW design district to establish the type and extent of HTRW contamination and the impact and cost of needed response action?

12. **Construction Materials and Procedures.**

(a) Have potential sources and suitability of construction material for concrete, earth and rock borrow, stone slope protection; and for disposal sites been identified?

(b) Have preliminary construction procedures, construction sequence and duration, and a water control plan for each step of the proposed plan, been developed?

(c) Have construction equipment and production rates been determined for major items, in support of the work schedule and cost estimate?

13. **Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation (OMRR&R).**

(a) Has an OMRR&R plan been developed for the project, and does it include detailed estimates of the Federal and non-Federal costs?

(b) Are budgets and schedules for the preparation of the necessary OMRR&R manuals included?

(c) Does the report include a discussion of primary and emergency power supplies based on local availability and reliable sources?

14. **Cost Estimate and Schedule.**

(a) Has the current working estimate supporting the NED plan been prepared using MCACES software and is it in Civil Works Breakdown Structure?

(b) Is the baseline estimate the fully funded project cost estimate and is it developed for the recommended scope and schedule established in the report?

(c) Does the estimate include all Federal and non-Federal costs for lands and damages, all construction features, planning, engineering and design and supervision and administration along with the appropriate contingencies and inflation associated with each of these activities through project completion?

(d) Do the contingencies reflect the risks related to the uncertainties or unanticipated conditions identified by the data and design detail available at the time the estimate was prepared?

(e) Is the final product a reliable, accurate cost estimate that defines the non-Federal sponsors obligations and supports project authorization within the established laws and regulations?

15. **Value Engineering (VE).**

(a) For projects with estimated cost of \$2,000,000 or greater, has a Value Engineering Study been completed or is there a cost estimate and schedule for the study?

(b) If the district determines a VE study is not cost effective, has a formal waiver request been approved by the division commander, and has a copy of the approved waiver been forwarded to CEMP-EV?

16. **Real Estate.**

(a) Does the decision document contain a comprehensive Real Estate Plan (REP) that describes the real estate requirements needed to support all project purposes?

(b) Does the report provide a complete real estate cost estimate?

(c) Does the report document the thorough investigation of facility/utility relocations?

(d) Does the report provide the "Assessment of Non-Federal Sponsor's Real Estate Acquisition Capability" checklist of the Non-Federal Sponsor's legal and professional capability to acquire and provide all project lands, easements and rights-of-way in a timely fashion?

(e) Does the report provide a suitable acquisition and related real estate schedule?

17. **Cost Sharing and Local Cooperation Requirements.**

(a) What project purposes are addressed by the selected plan and how have costs been allocated to them?

(b) If recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement are included in multiple-purpose projects, has the appropriate letter of intent from the non-Federal sponsor been obtained in accordance with Public Law 89-72?

(c) What documentation is available to assure that local interests fully understand and are willing and capable of furnishing the local cooperation specified?

(d) How was the apportionment of cost to local interests calculated?

(e) Who are the beneficiaries of the project and are there special circumstances associated with the project that warrant consideration of increased non-Federal cost sharing?

(f) If the non-Federal sponsor is relying on non-guaranteed debt (e.g. a particular revenue source or limited tax, or bonds backed by such a source) to obtain remaining funds, what information is available to demonstrate the financial capability of the non-Federal sponsor and that the projected revenues or proceeds are reasonably certain and are sufficient to cover the sponsor's stream of costs through time?

(g) If the non-Federal sponsor is relying on third party contributions, is data available from the third party to insure financial capability and its legal commitment to the sponsor?

(h) Does the decision document contain a complete list of relevant Items of Local Cooperation?

18. **Project Authorization**. If the document is pre-authorization, have all elements necessary for congressional authorization been included in the report? If the decision document is post-authorization, is it in keeping with the project authorization? If not, is further authorization to be requested of Congress?

19. **Technical and Legal Review**.

(a) Has documentation of significant issues and possible impact; and their resolution been provided?

(b) Has certification of technical / legal review been provided?

20. **Budget and Appropriation Decision**. Is the document consistent with previous Washington-level decisions on the budget and on Congressional adds, including decisions on project or study scope, non-Federal participation, and cost sharing?