DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
LOS ANGELES DISTRICT CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 532711
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90053-2325

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CESPL-ED-DC (1125) 22 April 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, South Pacific Division, Attn: CESPD-PDS, George Domurat

SUBJECT: Transmittal of Review Plans for Four Maintenance Dredging Projects

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

2. Enclosed are Review Plans for four Los Angeles District maintenance dredging projects which have scheduled FY2011 or FY2012 contract award dates. The maintenance dredging projects are Ventura Harbor, Marina del Rey Harbor, Newport Bay Harbor and San Diego Harbor. As described in the enclosed review plans, the Los Angeles District recommends that Agency Technical Review of the Plans and Specifications and the Environmental Assessment for these low risk and non-controversial routine maintenance dredging projects be satisfied through District Quality Control. A Type II Independent External Peer Review (Safety Assurance Review) is not required for these projects.

3. The Los Angeles District requests approval of these Review Plans as described in Appendix B of EC 1165-2-609.

Encls

RICHARD J. LEIFIELD, P.E.
Chief, Engineering Division

Shak, Arthur T SPL

From: Shak, Arthur T SPL
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2011 2:36 PM
To: Ryan, Joseph A SPL; Jung, Arthur Y SPL; Mesa, Chuck SPL
Cc: Grandon, Jane F SPL
Subject: FW: Maintenance Dredging Review Plans (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

George says the Santa Ana River Marsh Review Plan was approved!!!!!

-----Original Message-----
From: Domurat, George W SPD
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2011 1:39 PM
To: Shak, Arthur T SPL; Bigornia, Boniface SPD; Bowers, Paul W SPD
Cc: Jung, Arthur Y SPL
Subject: Re: Maintenance Dredging Review Plans (UNCLASSIFIED)

That one was also approved some time ago.....gd

Message sent via my BlackBerry Wireless Device

----- Original Message -----
From: Shak, Arthur T SPL
To: Bigornia, Boniface SPD; Bowers, Paul W SPD
Cc: Jung, Arthur Y SPL; Domurat, George W SPD
Sent: Fri Jun 03 13:17:18 2011
Subject: FW: Maintenance Dredging Review Plans (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Paul/Boni,
We are satisfied that we have an approved RP for this year's O&M dredging P&S from GWD (see below).
The re-dredging of the SARM Salt Marsh RP was also submitted, but I don't recall seeing a SPD approval on this one yet.
Art Shak

-----Original Message-----
From: Grandon, Jane F SPL
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2011 1:57 PM
To: Shak, Arthur T SPL; Clifford, Jodi L SPL; Ryan, Joseph A SPL; Chang, Mohammed N SPL
Subject: FW: Maintenance Dredging Review Plans (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Good news from George, and good comments.

We mention the VE in the response to questions, so we will need to put the VE in the proper place in the body of the document.

-----Original Message-----
From: Domurat, George W SPD
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2011 1:51 PM
To: Grandon, Jane F SPL
Subject: RE: Maintenance Dredging Review Plans (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Jane, the Maintenance Dredging Plans that you submitted are hereby approved....for future similar Plans please consider the following comments....Thanks....gd

1. In Section 2, add a figure showing the harbor, dredging areas, and disposal areas.

2. In Section 2, include a rough cost estimate for the project.

3. In Section 6, include a rough cost of the review effort.

4. Include in the RP, a reference to the programmatic VE study. You can check with Mo Chang on this one...

-----Original Message-----
From: Grandon, Jane F SPL
Sent: Friday, May 13, 2011 2:10 PM
To: Domurat, George W SPD
Subject: Maintenance Dredging Review Plans (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Hi George,
Did you receive the four maintenance dredging Review Plans? We sent them to you 25 April, and email on 28 April 2011.
Please let us know the status of their approval.
Thank you.
-Jane

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO

Review Plan

Ventura Harbor Maintenance Dredging
Ventura County, CA

Prepared by:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles District

21 April 2011

Ventura Harbor
Maintenance Dredging
Ventura County, CA

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION 1
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION 1
3. WORK PRODUCTS 2
4. SCOPE OF REVIEW 2
5. REVIEW TEAM 2
6. SCHEDULE/COSTS 3
7. DOCUMENTATION OF REVIEW 3
8. POINTS OF CONTACT 3
9. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL 3
10. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION TO SUPPORT RISK INFORMED DECISIONS ON APPROPRIATE REIVEIWS 4

REVIEW PLAN
Ventura Harbor Maintenance Dredging
Ventura County, CA

1. INTRODUCTION

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of quality management activities for the Plans and Specifications (P&S) and Environmental Assessment (EA) for Ventura Harbor maintenance dredging.

b. References.

(1) ER 1110-2-1150, Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects, 31 Aug 1999
(2) ER 1110-1-12, Engineering and Design Quality Management, 21 Jul 2006
(3) WRDA 2007 H. R. 1495 Public Law 110-114, 8 Nov 2007
(4) EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
(5) Army Regulation 15–1, Committee Management, 27 November 1992 (Federal Advisory Committee Act Requirements)
(6) National Academy of Sciences, Background Information and Confidential Conflict Of Interest Disclosure, BI/COI FORM 3, May 2003

c. Review Requirements. This review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, which establishes the procedures for ensuring the quality and credibility of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) decision and implementation documents through independent review. This Review Plan describes the scope of review for the current phase of work. All appropriate levels of review (DQC, ATR, IEPR and Policy and Legal Review) will be included in this Review Plan and any levels not included will require documentation in the Review Plan of the risk-informed decision not to undertake that level of review. The RP identifies the most important skill sets needed in the reviews and the objective of the review and the specific advice sought, thus setting the appropriate scale and scope of review for the individual project.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

a. Project Authority. The existing Federal project at Ventura was authorized by the 1968 River and Harbor Act, and is described in House Document No. 356, 90th Congress, second session, March 1968.

b. Location and Project Description. Ventura Harbor is a small craft harbor located in Ventura County, approximately 65 miles northwest of Los Angeles. Maintenance dredging of Ventura Harbor's federal navigation channels and sand trap is performed annually. Contract consists of a single year base bid, and options for two additional years. Typical annual dredge volumes range from 350,000 to 600,000 cubic yards. Material is typically placed on the downcoast adjacent beach.

3. WORK PRODUCTS

Plans and Specifications and the Environmental Assessment will be developed for Ventura Harbor Maintenance Dredging. Supporting products include a Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP), coordinated with resource agencies, for clearing dredge material and dredge material placement site(s). The SAP is external to the scope of this RP.

4. SCOPE OF REVIEW

The Scope of the review for maintenance dredging of Ventura Harbor is to ensure constructability, compliance with environmental commitments, and adherence to the authorized project limits. District Quality Control (DQC) activities will review the draft and final P&S, the draft and final EA, along with Bidability, Constructability, Operability and Environmental (BCOE) review. DQC activities are adequate for the review of this routine project.

Based on the de minimis risk to life safety and property loss, no separate ATR beyond DQC is required. Likewise, a SAR or IEPR is not warranted.

5. REVIEW TEAM

District Quality Control Activities. This is the list of the reviewers who will perform the DQC activities. DQC will be managed by the Los Angeles District, Engineering Division in accordance with South Pacific Division and SPL Quality Management Plans.

Review Review Plan Document

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
George Domurat	Chief, Program Support Division	Chief, Operations/Regulatory	SPD - PDS

DQC Review P&S and EA Documents

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
TBD	Construction Representative	Construction	SPL - So Cal Area Office
Ken Wong	C, Regional Planning	Environmental, Physical Scientist	SPL - Environmental Resources
Jeff Cole	Project Manager	Project Management	SPL - Project Management
Jane F. Grandon	Coastal Engineer	Coastal Engineering	SPL - Coastal Engineering Section
Ron Spencer	Surveyor	Surveys	SPL - Surveying Section

Approval of P&S

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
Arthur Jung, P.E.	Design Branch, Chief	Civil Engineer	SPL – Design Branch
Arthur Shak, P.E.	Assistant Chief, Engineering Div	Civil Engineer	SPL – Engineering Division
Richard Leifield, P.E.	Chief, Engineering Division	Civil Engineer	SPL – Engineering Division

FONSI

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
Colonel Mark R. Toy, P.E.	District Engineer	Civil Engineer	SPL-Commander

6. SCHEDULE/COSTS

The RP schedule is shown below. No extraordinary costs for reviews are anticipated.

Draft P&S	18-May-2011
DQC Review of Draft Completed	01-Jun-2011
Final P&S Package Completed	22-Jun-2011
Complete QA Back Check Review	30-Jun-2011
QC/QA Certification by SPL	30-Jun-2011
BCOE Certification Complete	30-Jun-2011
Approve Plans and Specifications	30-Jun-2011
EA/FONSI Approval	30-Jun-2011
Advertise Construction Contract	06-Jul-2011
Open Bids	09-Aug-2011
Construction Contract Award	08-Sep-2011

7. DOCUMENTATION OF REVIEW

The District Quality Control activities for Ventura Harbor maintenance dredging will be completed by the Los Angeles District. The Agency Technical Review external to the MSC is waived due to the minimal risk involved with the dredging activities. The Document Review and Checking System (DrChecks) will document the review process, including recording of comments, responses and back-checking. A copy of the DrChecks comments and their responses for this project will be maintained on file at Los Angeles District.

In addition, a Quality Control Certification and BCOE will be prepared once the process is completed and issues resolved. Indication of this concurrence will be documented by the signing of a quality assurance certification statement by the Los Angeles District Chief, Engineering Division.

8. POINTS OF CONTACT

Questions about this Review Plan may be directed to the Los Angeles District Project Delivery Team, Lead Engineer, Jeremy Jackson, 213-452-3662. The Chief, Engineering Division is Richard J. Leifield, 213-452-3629.

9. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL

The Los Angeles District requests that the South Pacific Division endorse the above recommendations and approve this Review Plan as described in Appendix B of EC 1165-2-209.

10. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION TO SUPPORT RISK INFORMED DECISIONS ON APPROPRIATE REIVEIWS

Paragraph 15 of EC 1165-2-209 Risk Informed Decisions on Appropriate Reviews is duplicated below, with the PDT's evaluation of questions to consider in arriving at the recommendation to not conduct an ATR for Ventura Harbor maintenance dredging.

a. Appropriate Reviews. All work products must undergo DQC. Beyond DQC, however, there is some level of judgment involved in determining whether ATR and/or IEPR levels of review are appropriate for any work product. Therefore, the RP for all work products shall include documentation of risk-informed decisions on those levels of review. Additional details on the various levels of review are provided below.

b. ATR. All decision and implementation documents are required to undergo ATR, regardless of the originating organization (Planning, Engineering, Construction, or Operations). In deciding whether to undertake ATR for other work products, answering a series of questions will aid the PDT to help identify work products as decision or implementation documents, even if they are not identified as such. Also, this process provides a basis for making a recommendation whether undertaking ATR is appropriate for products that are not either a decision or implementation document. A "yes" answer does not necessarily indicate ATR is required, rather it indicates an area where reasoned thought and judgment should be applied and documented in the recommendation. The following questions, and any appropriate additional questions, shall be explicitly considered:

(1) Does it include any design (structural, mechanical, hydraulic, etc)?

There are no new structural, mechanical, hydraulic or geotechnical designs for this maintenance dredging activity.

(2) Does it evaluate alternatives?

No, other than the "no-action".

(3) Does it include a recommendation?

No, the plans and specifications do not contain recommendations.

(4) Does it have a formal cost estimate?

There will be a feature budget estimate, and a fair and reasonable Government construction cost estimate to evaluate bids upon. But no formal cost estimate for an authorization decision.

(5) Does it have or will it require a NEPA document?

Dredging and the placement of dredge material on the beach or in nearshore waters for beneficial re-use will require an Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact. It is anticipated that all adverse impacts can be mitigated to insignificance through construction timing and environmental controls.

(6) Does it impact a structure or feature of a structure whose performance involves potential life safety risks?

No – Ventura Harbor maintenance dredging will not affect any structural features and will have no impact to potential life safety risks. Appropriate controls to separate the public from work areas will be implemented to minimize risks to the public during construction.

(7) What are the consequences of non-performance?

Sedimentation and shoaling in Ventura Harbor will continue, and navigational safety in the harbor will be adversely affected.

(8) Does it support a significant investment of public monies?

No – The awarded base bid in 2008 was $3.7 mil. It is expected that the 2011 contract award will be comparable.

(9) Does it support a budget request?

No.

(10) Does it change the operation of the project?

No.

(11) Does it involve ground disturbances?

No.

(12) Does it affect any special features, such as cultural resources, historic properties, survey markers, etc, that should be protected or avoided?

No.

(13) Does it involve activities that trigger regulatory permitting such as Section 404 or stormwater/NPDES related actions?

No.

(14) Does it involve activities that could potentially generate hazardous wastes and/or disposal of materials such as lead based paints or asbestos?

No.

(15) Does it reference use of or reliance on manufacturers' engineers and specifications for items such as prefabricated buildings, playground equipment, etc?

No.

(16) Does it reference reliance on local authorities for inspection/certification of utility systems like wastewater, stormwater, electrical, etc?

No.

(17) Is there or is there expected to be any controversy surrounding the Federal action associated with the work product?

No.

(18) Indicate if any models were (or are being) used. Confirm that ATR beyond DQC is deemed not warranted.

No models were or are being used. No ATR beyond DQC is warranted.

(19) Indicate if vertical datum is an issue or not. Confirm that ATR beyond DQC is deemed not warranted.

Vertical datum is not an issue. No ATR beyond DQC is warranted.

(20) Indicate if a VE study was performed (even programmatically).

This harbor was addressed in a value engineering study performed in 2007. Reference: Value Engineering Report on the South Pacific Division Operation and Maintenance Dredging, 2007.

Review Plan

Marina del Rey Harbor Maintenance Dredging
Los Angeles County, CA

Prepared by:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles District

21 April 2011

Marina del Rey Harbor Maintenance Dredging Los Angeles County, CA

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION 1
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION 1
3. WORK PRODUCTS 2
4. SCOPE OF REVIEW 2
5. REVIEW TEAM 2
6. SCHEDULE/COSTS 3
7. DOCUMENTATION OF REVIEW 3
8. POINTS OF CONTACT 3
9. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL 3
10. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION TO SUPPORT RISK INFORMED DECISIONS ON APPROPRIATE REIVEIWS 4

REVIEW PLAN
Marina del Rey Harbor Maintenance Dredging
Los Angeles County, CA

1. INTRODUCTION

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of quality management activities for the Plans and Specifications (P&S) and Environmental Assessment (EA) for Marina del Rey maintenance dredging.

b. References.

(1) ER 1110-2-1150, Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects, 31 Aug 1999
(2) ER 1110-1-12, Engineering and Design Quality Management, 21 Jul 2006
(3) WRDA 2007 H. R. 1495 Public Law 110-114, 8 Nov 2007
(4) EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
(5) Army Regulation 15–1, Committee Management, 27 November 1992 (Federal Advisory Committee Act Requirements)
(6) National Academy of Sciences, Background Information and Confidential Conflict Of Interest Disclosure, BI/COI FORM 3, May 2003

c. Review Requirements. This review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, which establishes the procedures for ensuring the quality and credibility of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) decision and implementation documents through independent review. This Review Plan describes the scope of review for the current phase of work. All appropriate levels of review (DQC, ATR, IEPR and Policy and Legal Review) will be included in this Review Plan and any levels not included will require documentation in the Review Plan of the risk-informed decision not to undertake that level of review. The RP identifies the most important skill sets needed in the reviews and the objective of the review and the specific advice sought, thus setting the appropriate scale and scope of review for the individual project.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

a. Project Authority. Marina del Rey Harbor was authorized by Act of Congress, Public Law 780, Eighty-third Congress, second session, approved 3 September 1954 in accordance with plan published in House Document 389, Eighty-third Congress, second session.

b. Location and Project Description. Marina del Rey Harbor is located in Santa Monica Bay within Los Angeles County. The harbor accomadates small and medium sized pleasure craft. Authorized channel depths are to -20 feet MLLW.

Maintenance dredging of Marina del Rey Harbor's Federal navigation channels is performed on an as-needed basis, approximately every 5 to 6 years. The entrance is protected by a detached breakwater, which splits the harbor entrance into a North Entrance and a South Entrance. The South Entrance passes in front of the Ballona Creek mouth. Sediments at the South Entrance are not suitable for beach or ocean disposal. Approximately 570,000 cubic yards of material is "unsuitable". "Unsuitable" material will be placed at the Port of Long Beach (POLB) middle harbor landfill, located approximately 20 miles to the

south of Marina del Rey Harbor. There is approximately 330,000 cubic yards of "clean" material, which will be placed either on adjoining Dockweiler Beach, or at Redondo Beach, 9 miles south of Marina del Rey. Total dredge volumes will be dependent upon final funding.
Marina del Rey Harbor was last dredged in 2007, when 325,000 cubic yards of "clean" material was dredged from the North Entrance and placed in the nearshore at Dockweiler Beach. The prior dredging event was in 1999 / 2000, when 282,000 cubic yards of "clean" material was placed at Redondo Beach, and 392,000 cubic yards of "unsuitable" material was placed at the POLB's Slip E.

3. WORK PRODUCTS

Plans & Specifications and the Environmental Assessment will be developed for Marina del Rey Harbor maintenance dredging. Supporting products include a Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP), coordinated with resource agencies, for clearing dredge material and dredge material placement site(s). The SAP is external to the scope of this Review Plan.

4. SCOPE OF REVIEW

The Scope of the review for maintenance dredging of Marina del Rey is to ensure constructability, compliance with environmental commitments, and adherence to the authorized project limits. District Quality Control (DQC) activities will review the draft and final P&S, the draft and final EA, along with Bidability, Constructability, Operability and Environmental (BCOE) review. DQC activities are adequate for the review of this routine project.

Based on the de minimis risk to life safety and property loss, no separate ATR beyond DQC is required. Likewise, a SAR or IEPR is not warranted.

5. REVIEW TEAM

District Quality Control Activities. This is the list of the reviewers who will perform the DQC activities. DQC will be managed by the Los Angeles District, Engineering Division in accordance with South Pacific Division and SPL Quality Management Plans.

Review Plan Document

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
George Domurat	Chief, Program Support Division	Chief, Operations/Regulatory	SPD - PDS

DQC Review P&S and EA Documents

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
TBD	Construction Representative	Construction	SPL - So Cal Area Office
Hayley Lovan	Biologist	Environmental	SPL - Environmental Resources
Jeff Cole	Project Manager	Project Management	SPL - Project Management
Jane F. Grandon	Coastal Engineer	Coastal Engineering	SPL - Coastal Engineering Section
Ron Spencer	Surveyor	Surveys	SPL - Surveying Section

Approval of P&S

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
Arthur Jung, P.E.	Design Branch, Chief	Civil Engineer	SPL – Design Branch
Arthur Shak, P.E.	Assistant Chief, Engineering Div	Civil Engineer	SPL – Engineering Division
Richard Leifield, P.E.	Chief, Engineering Division	Civil Engineer	SPL – Engineering Division

FONSI

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
Colonel Mark R. Toy, P.E.	District Engineer	Civil Engineer	SPL-Commander

6. SCHEDULE/COSTS

The RP schedule is shown below. No extraordinary costs for reviews are anticipated.

Draft P&S	24-June-2011
DQC Review of Draft Completed	15-July-2011
Final P&S Package Completed	22-July-2011
Complete QA Back Check Review	22-July-2011
QC/QA Certification by SPL	22-July-2011
BCOE Certification Complete	25-July-2011
Approve Plans and Specifications	22-July-2011
EA/FONSI Approval	08-July-2011
Advertise Construction Contract	25-July-2011
Open Bids	25-Aug-2011
Construction Contract Award	12-Sep-2011

7. DOCUMENTATION OF REVIEW

The District Quality Control activities for Marina del Rey maintenance dredging will be completed by the Los Angeles District. The Agency Technical Review external to the MSC is waived due to the minimal risk involved with the dredging activities. The Document Review and Checking System (DrChecks) will document the review process, including recording of comments, responses and back-checking. A copy of the DrChecks comments and their responses for this project will be maintained on file at Los Angeles District.

In addition, a Quality Control Certification and BCOE will be prepared once the process is completed and issues resolved. Indication of this concurrence will be documented by the signing of a quality assurance certification statement by the Los Angeles District Chief, Engineering Division.

8. POINTS OF CONTACT

Questions about this Review Plan may be directed to the Los Angeles District Project Delivery Team, Lead Engineer, Joe Ryan, 213-452-3679. The Chief, Engineering Division is Richard J. Leifield, 213-452-3629.

9. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL

The Los Angeles District requests that the South Pacific Division endorse the above recommendations and approve this Review Plan as described in Appendix B of EC 1165-2-209.

10. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION TO SUPPORT RISK INFORMED DECISIONS ON APPROPRIATE REIVEIWS

Paragraph 15 of EC 1165-2-209 Risk Informed Decisions on Appropriate Reviews is duplicated below, with the PDT's evaluation of questions to consider in arriving at the recommendation to not conduct an ATR for Marina del Rey Harbor maintenance dredging.

a. Appropriate Reviews. All work products must undergo DQC. Beyond DQC, however, there is some level of judgment involved in determining whether ATR and/or IEPR levels of review are appropriate for any work product. Therefore, the RP for all work products shall include documentation of risk-informed decisions on those levels of review. Additional details on the various levels of review are provided below.

b. ATR. All decision and implementation documents are required to undergo ATR, regardless of the originating organization (Planning, Engineering, Construction, or Operations). In deciding whether to undertake ATR for other work products, answering a series of questions will aid the PDT to help identify work products as decision or implementation documents, even if they are not identified as such. Also, this process provides a basis for making a recommendation whether undertaking ATR is appropriate for products that are not either a decision or implementation document. A "yes" answer does not necessarily indicate ATR is required, rather it indicates an area where reasoned thought and judgment should be applied and documented in the recommendation. The following questions, and any appropriate additional questions, shall be explicitly considered:

(1) Does it include any design (structural, mechanical, hydraulic, etc)?

There are no new structural, mechanical, hydraulic or geotechnical designs for this maintenance dredging activity.

(2) Does it evaluate alternatives?

No, other than the " no-action".

(3) Does it include a recommendation?

No, the plans and specifications do not contain recommendations.

(4) Does it have a formal cost estimate?

There will be a feature budget estimate, and a fair and reasonable Government construction cost estimate to evaluate bids upon. But no formal cost estimate for an authorization decision.

(5) Does it have or will it require a NEPA document?

Dredging and the placement of dredge material in nearshore waters for a beneficial re-use will require an Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact. It is anticipated that all adverse impacts can be mitigated to insignificance through construction timing and environmental controls.

(6) Does it impact a structure or feature of a structure whose performance involves potential life safety risks?

No, Marina del Rey Harbor maintenance dredging will not affect any structural features and will have no impact to potential life safety risks due to flooding. Appropriate controls to separate the public from work areas will be implemented to minimize risks to the public during construction.

(7) What are the consequences of non-performance?

Sedimentation and shoaling in Marina del Rey Harbor will continue, and navigational safety at the harbor entrance will be adversely affected.

(8) Does it support a significant investment of public monies?

No .

(9) Does it support a budget request?

No.

(10) Does it change the operation of the project?

No.

(11) Does it involve ground disturbances?

No.

(12) Does it affect any special features, such as cultural resources, historic properties, survey markers, etc, that should be protected or avoided?

No.

(13) Does it involve activities that trigger regulatory permitting such as Section 404 or stormwater/NPDES related actions?

No.

(14) Does it involve activities that could potentially generate hazardous wastes and/or disposal of materials such as lead based paints or asbestos?

No.

(15) Does it reference use of or reliance on manufacturers' engineers and specifications for items such as prefabricated buildings, playground equipment, etc?

No.

(16) Does it reference reliance on local authorities for inspection/certification of utility systems like wastewater, stormwater, electrical, etc?

No.

(17) Is there or is there expected to be any controversy surrounding the Federal action associated with the work product?

No.

(18) Indicate if any models were (or are being) used. Confirm that ATR beyond DQC is deemed not warranted.

No models were or are being used. No ATR beyond DQC is warranted.

(19) Indicate if vertical datum is an issue or not. Confirm that ATR beyond DQC is deemed not warranted.

Vertical datum is not an issue. No ATR beyond DQC is warranted.

(20) Indicate if VE study was performed (even programmatically).

Yes, Marina del Rey Harbor was addressed in a value engineering study performed in 2007. Reference: Value Engineering Report on the South Pacific Division Operation and Maintenance Dredging, 2007.

Review Plan

Newport Bay Harbor Maintenance Dredging
Orange County, CA

Prepared by:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles District

21 April 2011

Newport Bay Harbor Maintenance Dredging Orange County, CA

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION 1
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION 1
3. WORK PRODUCTS 2
4. SCOPE OF REVIEW 2
5. REVIEW TEAM 2
6. SCHEDULE/COSTS 3
7. DOCUMENTATION OF REVIEW 3
8. POINTS OF CONTACT 3
9. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL 3
10. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION TO SUPPORT RISK INFORMED DECISIONS ON APPROPRIATE REIVEIWS 4

REVIEW PLAN
Newport Bay Harbor Maintenance Dredging
Orange County, CA

1. INTRODUCTION

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of quality management activities for the Plans and Specifications (P&S) and Environmental Assessment (EA) for Newport Bay Harbor maintenance dredging.

b. References.

(1) ER 1110-2-1150, Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects, 31 Aug 1999
(2) ER 1110-1-12, Engineering and Design Quality Management, 21 Jul 2006
(3) WRDA 2007 H. R. 1495 Public Law 110-114, 8 Nov 2007
(4) EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
(5) Army Regulation 15–1, Committee Management, 27 November 1992 (Federal Advisory Committee Act Requirements)
(6) National Academy of Sciences, Background Information and Confidential Conflict Of Interest Disclosure, BI/COI FORM 3, May 2003

c. Review Requirements. This review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, which establishes the procedures for ensuring the quality and credibility of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) decision and implementation documents through independent review. This Review Plan describes the scope of review for the current phase of work. All appropriate levels of review (DQC, ATR, IEPR and Policy and Legal Review) will be included in this Review Plan and any levels not included will require documentation in the Review Plan of the risk-informed decision not to undertake that level of review. The RP identifies the most important skill sets needed in the reviews and the objective of the review and the specific advice sought, thus setting the appropriate scale and scope of review for the individual project.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

a. Project Authority. Authorized by 1937 (maintenance) and 1945 (S. Doc. 138, 78th Congress, 1st Session) River and Harbor Acts, modification authorized by the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662)

b. Location and Project Description. Newport Bay Harbor is a small craft recreational harbor located in Orange County, California. Authorized channel depths range from -10 ft to -20 ft MLLW.

Although the entrance channel has been maintained to the design depth of – 20 ft over the past 70 years, most of the rest of Newport Bay Harbor has not been maintained to authorized depths. Dredge volume for the entire harbor is approximately 1,300,000 cubic yards, with about 30% being “unsuitable” for ocean disposal. Limited funding will require a hybrid project in which the most critical areas of the harbor will be dredged. Sediments “unsuitable” for ocean disposal will be placed at the Port of Long Beach (POLB) middle harbor landfill, located approximately 20 miles north of Newport Beach. Sediments “suitable” for ocean disposal will be placed at the EPA approved ocean disposal site – LA3.

Newport Bay Harbor was last dredged in 2003, when 27,000 cubic yards of material was dredged and placed in a nearshore site near the Newport Beach groin field. In 1999, approximately 270,000 cubic yards of material was dredged and placed at the deep ocean disposal site LA3.

3. WORK PRODUCTS

Plans and Specifications and the Environmental Assessment will be developed for Newport Bay Harbor maintenance dredging. Supporting products include a Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP), coordinated with resource agencies, for clearing dredge material and dredge material placement site(s). The SAP is external to the scope of this RP.

4. SCOPE OF REVIEW

The Scope of the review for maintenance dredging of Newport Bay Harbor is to ensure constructability, compliance with environmental commitments, and adherence to the authorized project limits. District Quality Control (DQC) activities will review the draft and final P&S, the draft and final EA, along with Bidability, Constructability, Operability and Environmental (BCOE) review. DQC activities are adequate for the review of this routine project.

Based on the de minimis risk to life safety and property loss, no separate ATR beyond DQC is required. Likewise, a SAR or IEPR is not warranted.

5. REVIEW TEAM

District Quality Control Activities. This is the list of the reviewers who will perform the DQC activities. DQC will be managed by the Los Angeles District, Engineering Division in accordance with South Pacific Division and SPL Quality Management Plans.

Review Plan Document

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
George Domurat	Chief, Program Support Division	Chief, Operations/Regulatory	SPD - PDS

DQC Review P&S and EA Documents

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
TBD	Construction Representative	Construction	SPL - So Cal Area Office
Hayley Lovan	Biologist	Environmental	SPL - Environmental Resources
Scott John	Project Manager	Project Management	SPL - Project Management
Jane F. Grandon	Coastal Engineer	Coastal Engineering	SPL - Coastal Engineering Section
Ron Spencer	Surveyor	Surveys	SPL - Surveying Section

Approval of P&S

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
Arthur Jung, P.E.	Design Branch, Chief	Civil Engineer	SPL – Design Branch
Arthur Shak, P.E.	Assistant Chief, Engineering Div	Civil Engineer	SPL – Engineering Division
Richard Leifield, P.E.	Chief, Engineering Division	Civil Engineer	SPL – Engineering Division

FONSI

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
Colonel Mark R. Toy, P.E.	District Engineer	Civil Engineer	SPL-Commander

6. SCHEDULE/COSTS

The RP schedule is shown below. No extraordinary costs for reviews are anticipated.

Draft P&S	17-June-2011
DQC Review of Draft Completed	15-July-2011
Final P&S Package Completed	22-July-2011
Complete QA Back Check Review	22-July-2011
QC/QA Certification by SPL	22-July-2011
BCOE Certification Complete	01-Aug-2011
Approve Plans and Specifications	29-July-2011
EA/FONSI Approval	08-July-2011
Advertise Construction Contract	01-Aug-2011
Open Bids	31-Aug-2011
Construction Contract Award	16-Sep-2011

7. DOCUMENTATION OF REVIEW

The District Quality Control activities for Newport Bay Harbor maintenance dredging will be completed by the Los Angeles District. The Agency Technical Review external to the MSC is waived due to the minimal risk involved with the dredging activities. The Document Review and Checking System (DrChecks) will document the review process, including recording of comments, responses and back-checking. A copy of the DrChecks comments and their responses for this project will be maintained on file at Los Angeles District.

In addition, a Quality Control Certification and BCOE will be prepared once the process is completed and issues resolved. Indication of this concurrence will be documented by the signing of a quality assurance certification statement by the Los Angeles District Chief, Engineering Division.

8. POINTS OF CONTACT

Questions about this Review Plan may be directed to the Los Angeles District Project Delivery Team, Lead Engineer, Joe Ryan, 213-452-3679. The Chief, Engineering Division is Richard J. Leifield, 213-452-3629.

9. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL

The Los Angeles District requests that the South Pacific Division endorse the above recommendations and approve this Review Plan as described in Appendix B of EC 1165-2-209.

10. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION TO SUPPORT RISK INFORMED DECISIONS ON APPROPRIATE REIVEIWS

Paragraph 15 of EC 1165-2-209 Risk Informed Decisions on Appropriate Reviews is duplicated below, with the PDT's evaluation of questions to consider in arriving at the recommendation to not conduct an ATR for Newport Bay Harbor maintenance dredging.

a. Appropriate Reviews. All work products must undergo DQC. Beyond DQC, however, there is some level of judgment involved in determining whether ATR and/or IEPR levels of review are appropriate for any work product. Therefore, the RP for all work products shall include documentation of risk-informed decisions on those levels of review. Additional details on the various levels of review are provided below.

b. ATR. All decision and implementation documents are required to undergo ATR, regardless of the originating organization (Planning, Engineering, Construction, or Operations). In deciding whether to undertake ATR for other work products, answering a series of questions will aid the PDT to help identify work products as decision or implementation documents, even if they are not identified as such. Also, this process provides a basis for making a recommendation whether undertaking ATR is appropriate for products that are not either a decision or implementation document. A "yes" answer does not necessarily indicate ATR is required, rather it indicates an area where reasoned thought and judgment should be applied and documented in the recommendation. The following questions, and any appropriate additional questions, shall be explicitly considered:

(1) Does it include any design (structural, mechanical, hydraulic, etc)?

There are no new structural, mechanical, hydraulic or geotechnical designs for this maintenance dredging activity.

(2) Does it evaluate alternatives?

No, other than the " no-action" .

(3) Does it include a recommendation?

No, the plans and specifications do not contain recommendations.

(4) Does it have a formal cost estimate?

There will be a feature budget estimate, and a fair and reasonable Government construction cost estimate to evaluate bids upon. But no formal cost estimate for an authorization decision.

(5) Does it have or will it require a NEPA document?

Dredging and the placement of dredge material in EPA approved deep ocean disposal site will require an Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact. It is anticipated that all adverse impacts can be mitigated to insignificance through construction timing and environmental controls.

(6) Does it impact a structure or feature of a structure whose performance involves potential life safety risks?

No – Newport Bay Harbor maintenance dredging will not affect any structural features and will have no impact to potential life safety risks. Appropriate controls to separate the public from work areas will be implemented to minimize risks to the public during construction.

(7) What are the consequences of non-performance?

Sedimentation and shoaling in Newport Bay Harbor will continue, and navigational safety in the harbor will be adversely affected.

(8) Does it support a significant investment of public monies?

No .

(9) Does it support a budget request?

No.

(10) Does it change the operation of the project?

No.

(11) Does it involve ground disturbances?

No.

(12) Does it affect any special features, such as cultural resources, historic properties, survey markers, etc, that should be protected or avoided?

No.

(13) Does it involve activities that trigger regulatory permitting such as Section 404 or stormwater/NPDES related actions?

No.

(14) Does it involve activities that could potentially generate hazardous wastes and/or disposal of materials such as lead based paints or asbestos?

No.

(15) Does it reference use of or reliance on manufacturers' engineers and specifications for items such as prefabricated buildings, playground equipment, etc?

No.

(16) Does it reference reliance on local authorities for inspection/certification of utility systems like wastewater, stormwater, electrical, etc?

No.

(17) Is there or is there expected to be any controversy surrounding the Federal action associated with the work product?

No.

(18) Indicate if any models were (or are being) used. Confirm that ATR beyond DQC is deemed not warranted.

No models were or are being used. No ATR beyond DQC is warranted.

(19) Indicate if vertical datum is an issue or not. Confirm that ATR beyond DQC is deemed not warranted.

Vertical datum is not an issue. No ATR beyond DQC is warranted.

(20) Indicate if VE study was performed (even programmatically).

Yes, Newport Bay Harbor was addressed in a value engineering study performed in 2007. Reference: Value Engineering Report on the South Pacific Division Operation and Maintenance Dredging, 2007.

Review Plan

San Diego Harbor Maintenance Dredging
San Diego County, CA

Prepared by:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles District

21 April 2011

San Diego Harbor Maintenance Dredging San Diego County, CA

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION 1
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION 1
3. WORK PRODUCTS 2
4. SCOPE OF REVIEW 2
5. REVIEW TEAM 2
6. SCHEDULE/COSTS 3
7. DOCUMENTATION OF REVIEW 3
8. POINTS OF CONTACT 3
9. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL 3
10. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION TO SUPPORT RISK INFORMED DECISIONS ON APPROPRIATE REIVEIWS 4

REVIEW PLAN
San Diego Harbor Maintenance Dredging
San Diego County, CA

1. INTRODUCTION

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of quality management activities for the Plans and Specifications (P&S) and Environmental Assessment (EA) for San Diego Harbor maintenance dredging.

b. References.

(1) ER 1110-2-1150, Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects, 31 Aug 1999
(2) ER 1110-1-12, Engineering and Design Quality Management, 21 Jul 2006
(3) WRDA 2007 H. R. 1495 Public Law 110-114, 8 Nov 2007
(4) EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
(5) Army Regulation 15–1, Committee Management, 27 November 1992 (Federal Advisory Committee Act Requirements)
(6) National Academy of Sciences, Background Information and Confidential Conflict Of Interest Disclosure, BI/COI FORM 3, May 2003

c. Review Requirements. This review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, which establishes the procedures for ensuring the quality and credibility of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) decision and implementation documents through independent review. This Review Plan describes the scope of review for the current phase of work. All appropriate levels of review (DQC, ATR, IEPR and Policy and Legal Review) will be included in this Review Plan and any levels not included will require documentation in the Review Plan of the risk-informed decision not to undertake that level of review. The RP identifies the most important skill sets needed in the reviews and the objective of the review and the specific advice sought, thus setting the appropriate scale and scope of review for the individual project.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

a. Project Authority. San Diego Harbor was authorized by 1852 River and Harbor Act, Modification in the 1968 River and Harbor Act (House Doc. 365, 90th Congress, 2nd Session)

b. Location and Description. San Diego Harbor is a natural harbor and deepwater port located in San Diego County, California. Authorized channel depths range from -35 ft to -55 ft MLLW. The approach channel has an authorized channel depth of -55 ft to accommodate Navy aircraft carriers.

The scope of work is to remove approximately 400,000 cubic yards of “clean” material from the approach channel, and place the material at the Imperial Beach nearshore placement site, 9 miles south.

The approach channel was last dredged in the late 1990s by the Navy for their deepening project. The last O&M dredging of the approach channel was performed in 1996, when approximately 120,000 cubic yards of material was removed and placed in the nearshore at adjacent Silver Stand Beach.

3. WORK PRODUCTS

Plans and Specifications and the Environmental Assessment will be developed for San Diego Harbor maintenance dredging. Supporting products include a Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP), coordinated with resource agencies, for clearing dredge material and dredge material placement site(s). The SAP is external to the scope of this RP.

4. SCOPE OF REVIEW

The Scope of the review for maintenance dredging of San Diego Harbor is to ensure constructability, compliance with environmental commitments, and adherence to the authorized project limits. District Quality Control (DQC) activities will review the draft and final P&S, the draft and final EA, along with Bidability, Constructability, Operability and Environmental (BCOE) review. DQC activities are adequate for the review of this routine project.

Based on the de minimis risk to life safety and property loss, no separate ATR beyond DQC is required. Likewise, a SAR or IEPR is not warranted.

5. REVIEW TEAM

District Quality Control Activities. This is the list of the reviewers who will perform the DQC activities. DQC will be managed by the Los Angeles District, Engineering Division in accordance with South Pacific Division and SPL Quality Management Plans.

Review Review Plan Document

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
George Domurat	Chief, Program Support Division	Chief, Operations/Regulatory	SPD - PDS

DQC Review P&S and EA Documents

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
TBD	Construction Representative	Construction	SPL - So Cal Area Office
Joy Jaiswal	C, Ecosystem Planning Section	Environmental	SPL - Environmental Resources
Scott John	Project Manager	Project Management	SPL - Project Management
Jane F. Grandon	Coastal Engineer	Coastal Engineering	SPL - Coastal Engineering Section
Ron Spencer	Surveyor	Surveys	SPL - Surveying Section

Approval of P&S

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
Arthur Jung, P.E.	Design Branch, Chief	Civil Engineer	SPL – Design Branch
Arthur Shak, P.E.	Assistant Chief, Engineering Div	Civil Engineer	SPL – Engineering Division
Richard Leifield, P.E.	Chief, Engineering Division	Civil Engineer	SPL – Engineering Division

FONSI

Name	Title	Discipline	Organization
Colonel Mark R. Toy, P.E.	District Engineer	Civil Engineer	SPL-Commander

6. SCHEDULE/COSTS

The RP schedule is shown below. No extraordinary costs for reviews are anticipated.

Draft P&S	10-Aug-2011
DQC Review of Draft Completed	26-Aug-2011
Final P&S Package Completed	02-Sep-2011
Complete QA Back Check Review	02-Sep-2011
QC/QA Certification by SPL	02-Sep-2011
BCOE Certification Complete	20-Sep-2011
Approve Plans and Specifications	06-Sep-2011
EA/FONSI Approval	10-Aug-2011
Advertise Construction Contract	07-Sep-2011
Open Bids	07-Oct-2011
Construction Contract Award	25-Oct-2011

7. DOCUMENTATION OF REVIEW

The District Quality Control activities for San Diego Harbor maintenance dredging will be completed by the Los Angeles District. The Agency Technical Review external to the MSC is waived due to the minimal risk involved with the dredging activities. The Document Review and Checking System (DrChecks) will document the review process, including recording of comments, responses and back-checking. A copy of the DrChecks comments and their responses for this project will be maintained on file at Los Angeles District.

In addition, a Quality Control Certification and BCOE will be prepared once the process is completed and issues resolved. Indication of this concurrence will be documented by the signing of a quality assurance certification statement by the Los Angeles District Chief, Engineering Division.

8. POINTS OF CONTACT

Questions about this Review Plan may be directed to the Los Angeles District Project Delivery Team, Lead Engineer, Joe Ryan, 213-452-3679. The Chief, Engineering Division is Richard J. Leifield, 213-452-3629.

9. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL

The Los Angeles District requests that the South Pacific Division endorse the above recommendations and approve this Review Plan as described in Appendix B of EC 1165-2-209.

10. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION TO SUPPORT RISK INFORMED DECISIONS ON APPROPRIATE REIVEIWS

Paragraph 15 of EC 1165-2-209 Risk Informed Decisions on Appropriate Reviews is duplicated below, with the PDT's evaluation of questions to consider in arriving at the recommendation to not conduct an ATR for San Diego Harbor maintenance dredging.

a. Appropriate Reviews. All work products must undergo DQC. Beyond DQC, however, there is some level of judgment involved in determining whether ATR and/or IEPR levels of review are appropriate for any work product. Therefore, the RP for all work products shall include documentation of risk-informed decisions on those levels of review. Additional details on the various levels of review are provided below.

b. ATR. All decision and implementation documents are required to undergo ATR, regardless of the originating organization (Planning, Engineering, Construction, or Operations). In deciding whether to undertake ATR for other work products, answering a series of questions will aid the PDT to help identify work products as decision or implementation documents, even if they are not identified as such. Also, this process provides a basis for making a recommendation whether undertaking ATR is appropriate for products that are not either a decision or implementation document. A "yes" answer does not necessarily indicate ATR is required, rather it indicates an area where reasoned thought and judgment should be applied and documented in the recommendation. The following questions, and any appropriate additional questions, shall be explicitly considered:

(1) Does it include any design (structural, mechanical, hydraulic, etc)?

There are no new structural, mechanical, hydraulic or geotechnical designs for this maintenance dredging activity.

(2) Does it evaluate alternatives?

No, other than the " no-action".

(3) Does it include a recommendation?

No, the plans and specifications do not contain recommendations.

(4) Does it have a formal cost estimate?

There will be a feature budget estimate, and a fair and reasonable Government construction cost estimate to evaluate bids upon. But no formal cost estimate for an authorization decision.

(5) Does it have or will it require a NEPA document?

Dredging and the placement of dredge material in nearshore waters for a beneficial re-use will require an Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact. It is anticipated that all adverse impacts can be mitigated to insignificance through construction timing and environmental controls.

(6) Does it impact a structure or feature of a structure whose performance involves potential life safety risks?

No – San Diego Harbor maintenance dredging will not affect any structural features and will have no impact to potential life safety risks. Appropriate controls to separate the public from work areas will be implemented to minimize risks to the public during construction.

(7) What are the consequences of non-performance?

Sedimentation and shoaling in the approach / entrance channel to San Diego Harbor will continue, and pose a navigation hazard to the Navy's aircraft carriers.

(8) Does it support a significant investment of public monies?

No .

(9) Does it support a budget request?

No.

(10) Does it change the operation of the project?

No.

(11) Does it involve ground disturbances?

No.

(12) Does it affect any special features, such as cultural resources, historic properties, survey markers, etc, that should be protected or avoided?

No.

(13) Does it involve activities that trigger regulatory permitting such as Section 404 or stormwater/NPDES related actions?

No.

(14) Does it involve activities that could potentially generate hazardous wastes and/or disposal of materials such as lead based paints or asbestos?

No.

(15) Does it reference use of or reliance on manufacturers' engineers and specifications for items such as prefabricated buildings, playground equipment, etc?

No.

(16) Does it reference reliance on local authorities for inspection/certification of utility systems like wastewater, stormwater, electrical, etc?

No.

(17) Is there or is there expected to be any controversy surrounding the Federal action associated with the work product?

No.

(18) Indicate if any models were (or are being) used. Confirm that ATR beyond DQC is deemed not warranted.

No models were or are being used. No ATR beyond DQC is warranted.

(19) Indicate if vertical datum is an issue or not. Confirm that ATR beyond DQC is deemed not warranted.

Vertical datum is not an issue. No ATR beyond DQC is warranted.

(20) Indicate if VE study was performed (even programmatically).

Yes, San Diego Harbor was addressed in a value engineering study performed in 2007. Reference: Value Engineering Report on the South Pacific Division Operation and Maintenance Dredging, 2007.