MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Los Angeles District, ATTN: CESPL-PD-C. Mr. Ed Louie

Subject: Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project, San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles County, California

1. The Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project, San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles County, California, Review Plan that is enclosed is in accordance with Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Review of Decision Documents, dated 31 Jan 2012. The South Pacific Division, Planning and Policy Division and Los Angeles District Support Team have reviewed the Review Plan that has been submitted. The South Pacific Division approves the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project, San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles County, California, Review Plan.

2. With MSC approval the Review Plan will be made available for public comment via the internet and the comments received will be incorporated into future revisions of the Review Plans. The Review Plan does not require independent external peer review.

3. I hereby approve the Review Plan which is subject to change as study circumstances require. This is consistent with study development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to the Review Plan after public comment or during project execution will require new written approval from this office.

4. Point of contact for this action is Kurt Keilman, CESPD-PDS-P, 415-503-6596, Kurt.Keilman@usace.army.mil.

Building Strong From New Mexico All The Way To The Pacific!

Encl
Review Plan

JOSEPH CALCARA, P.E.
Director
Programs
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1. INTRODUCTION.

A. Purpose. This Review Plan (RP) defines the scope and level of quality management activities for the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project in San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles County, California.

B. References.

1. EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
2. ER 1110-2-1150, Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects, 31 Aug 1999
3. ER 1110-1-12, Engineering and Design Quality Management, 21 Jul 2006
4. ER 1110-1-8155, Engineering and Design Specifications, 10 Oct 2003
5. ER 1105-2-100, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, 20 Nov 2007
6. CESPL OM 1105-1-2, Los Angeles District Quality Management Plan, 12 Sep 2003
8. WRDA 2007 H. R. 1495 Public Law 110-114, 8 Nov 2007Army Regulation 15–1, Committee Management, 27 Nov 1992 (Federal Advisory Committee Act Requirements)
9. 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 or Corps) decision and implementation documents through independent review. This RP describes the scope of review for the current phase of work. All appropriate levels of review (DQC, ATR, and IEPR) will be included in this RP and any levels not included will require documentation in the RP 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.


B. Project Location. The Hansen Dam Basin is located at the confluence of the Big and Little Tujunga Washes on the northeastern edge of the San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles County, California. It is located approximately 15 miles northwest of downtown Los Angeles, California. The basin is within the limits of the City of Los Angeles. The Foothill Freeway (I-210), a major transportation corridor in the region is located to the immediate north of the basin.
C. Project History. Hansen Dam was constructed by the Corps under authority of the Flood Control Act of 1936 (Public Law 74-738), and completed in 1940. Recreation facilities were not developed at that time. The Flood Control Act of 1944, as amended (Public Law 78-534), authorized the Corps to construct, maintain, and operate public parks and recreation facilities at such water-resource development projects. This law also permits the Corps to authorize local interests to construct, maintain, and operate recreation facilities. Section 2 of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, approved July 9, 1965 (Public Law 89-72, as amended), established the development of recreational potential at Federal water resources projects as a full project purpose. In the late 1940s, the City of Los Angeles (the City or Non-Federal Sponsor) began to lease approximately 1,450 acres within the Hansen Dam Basin for recreation use and initiated phased development of the basin. Construction of recreation amenities at Hansen Dam Basin has continued over the last several decades as funds have been made available through Federal appropriations by the Congressional member (Berman) and cost-shared by the City. All other recreation features not cost-shared with the Federal Government were funded and constructed by the City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks, except the Lake View Terrace Recreation Center and the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project which were funded and constructed jointly between the Corps and City.

The Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project was authorized without a report by the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 1992. Initial features included a swim lake, recreation lake, and associated facilities. Project design occurred prior to the Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA), consistent with the former Corps policy. In 1994, the Corps executed a PCA for construction of the recreational development at Hansen consisting of roads, parking lots, boat launch, lake excavation for both the swim and recreation lakes, flood control channel and water well, storm drain, energy dissipater, restrooms, picnic tables, grills, trash receptacles, signage, lighting, and fencing, as described in the master plan, feature design memorandum, and supplement to the feature design memorandum. The PCA has been amended three times, the last of which was in 1999. The initial features of the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project were completed in 2002 after several setbacks including reconstruction of the swim lake after a construction defect was discovered after acceptance of the contractor’s work.

In 2003, additional funds were appropriated for the expansion and improvement of recreation facilities consistent with the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Master Plan. The appropriation language states, “That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use $3,160,000 of the funds appropriated herein to undertake work to expand or improve recreational facilities and undertake environmental restoration activities at the Hansen Dam Recreation Area, California, consistent with the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Master Plan” (Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003, Division D, Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Title I).

The Corps worked with the City of Los Angeles and two agencies, the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (SMMC) and Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA), to develop a plan for additional recreation features. The SMMC, MRCA, City, and the Corps identified four conceptual measures of development which it combined as various area development scenarios were proposed. These measures included a new campground, planting of native species for wildlife improvement and aesthetic value, renovation of an existing parking lot and construction of a new parking lot, and safety features that meet resource use objectives.

The resulting plan formulated from the conceptual measures includes three main new features of the project: (1) a campground, (2) a recreation support “green” parking lot renovation with native plant species, and (3) a
parking lot with landscaping and safety features adjacent to the City’s new ranger station. The new features are part of the overall Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project and the subject of the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project Post Authorization Change Report ("PAC Report"), dated August 2010 and approved by the Commander, South Pacific Division, on September 17, 2010.

The Non-Federal Sponsor is responsible for constructing the following project features: The entire “Green” parking lot feature and the entire Ranger-Station-adjacent parking lot feature including landscaping and safety lighting; a portion of the campground feature that includes shrub planting, concrete dining pad, and amphitheater with concrete benches. The “Green” parking lot feature is so named because it includes green principles by incorporating a bio-swale, created by removing a width of approximately 10 feet wide by 650 feet length of asphalt from the existing parking lot. The sponsor proposed to go forward with construction of some of the in-kind work prior to execution of the applicable cost sharing agreement or amendment. The sponsor signed an In-Kind Memorandum of Understanding with the Corps on December 22, 2010 prior to constructing the two parking lot features. The construction contract for the “Green” parking lot was awarded in early February 2011 and construction started in March 2011. The Ranger-Station-adjacent parking lot feature started construction in September 2011. An Integral Determination Report for the sponsor’s in-kind contributions was approved by the ASA(CW) in March 2011.

![FIGURE 1 - HANSEN DAM RECREATION AREA PROJECT OVERVIEW MAP](image)
D. **Project Description.** The portion of the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project covered under this Review Plan is the campground feature (FIGURE 2). This includes design documents, site preparation followed by the construction of decomposed granite (DG) tent pads to serve twelve tents; a DG path connecting campground features; a four-stall, unisex prefabricated restroom (floodable); a concrete pad to serve a dining tent; a natural amphitheatre with concrete benches; a 15 space DG parking lot to serve the campground; a two space DG parking lot to serve the restroom area that is compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards; planting of 15 new large trees and approximately 1100 shrubs; installation of a temporary irrigation system; and 750 feet of fencing. To support the campground facilities, a potable water pipeline, 2,700-foot long sewer connection, electrical connection, and a sewer lift station will also be constructed. Temporary irrigation will be maintained for two years for planting establishment.

The Corps will design and construct the DG path, two DG parking lots (one with two ADA compliant spaces and the other with 15 spaces), the perimeter fence, 15 tree plantings and temporary irrigation system. The Corps will contract with an A-E consultant to design the potable water pipeline, sewer line, electrical connection, restroom, and lift station. The Non-Federal Sponsor will design and construct the shrub plantings around the campground area.

The Non-Federal Sponsor has already completed construction of the concrete dining pad and the amphitheater with concrete benches.

E. **Operation of the Campground.** Since the campground will be located inside of an active flood risk management basin, precautions are being taken to ensure the safety of its potential users. The campground will be located on approximately 10 acres on the western side of the basin between the elevations of 1,015 feet to 1,029 feet. Operation of the campground will have a seasonal approach that will limit the months of operation from April 15th to October 15th. Based on the period of record (65 years) for the maximum daily water surface elevations (WSEs) for Hansen Dam and assuming a non-flood season of April through October, there has only been two years with a WSE greater than 1,014.5 feet and 0 years with a WSE greater than 1,022.8 feet. The records show that if the period of analysis is limited to only the months of operation, the risk of flooding during operation is very low. The restroom facilities, sewer line and lift station will be above elevation 1,022.8 feet and have a very low risk of flooding during operation, while the remainder of the project components has roughly a 3% risk of flooding. Because the restroom facility is a permanent structure and is susceptible to the full period of the annual frequency analysis, it will be located just above the elevation of the annual flood risk of 2% exceedance probability to be in compliance with the constraints of operating within the flood risk management basin.

The Corps will prepare an evacuation and flood risk management plan for inclusion in the O&M Manual. The plan will include the necessary actions the campground operator is required to take during a emergencies, including regular patrols of the area (if warranted), warning systems, their triggering mechanisms, their thresholds and minimum warning times based on the hydrology of the watershed, mobilization of equipment and manpower for evacuation of humans, animals and/or records, utilities and equipment, emergency notifications (phone number and personnel lists), access roads and escape routes, and clean-up and repair. The close proximity to the new ranger station will ensure prompt enactment of the evacuation and flood risk management plan if necessary. The campground and restrooms are located approximately 1/3 mile from the ranger station and 1/2 mile from the basin exit.
FIGURE 2 - HANSEN DAM RECREATION AREA PROJECT CAMPGROUND FEATURE
3. WORK PRODUCTS.

A. **Description of Work Products.** The work products for this project include, a Design Document Report (DDR), Plans and Specifications (P&S), and an Operation and Maintenance (O&M) manual.

1. Design Document Report – The DDR for the campground feature will serve as a summary of the design to be used by the Project Delivery Team (PDT) during the development of the P&S. The A-E contractor will prepare the DDR and will incorporate the landscape and irrigation design technical appendices provided by CESPL-ED. It will contain a full record of design decisions, assumptions, and methods used.

2. Plans & Specifications – The P&S for the potable water pipeline, sewer line, electrical connection, restroom and lift station will be prepared by an A-E Consultant, Genterra Consultants, Inc. The P&S for the campground DG features, fencing, landscape and irrigation will be prepared by CESPL-ED.

3. Operation and Maintenance Manual – CESPL-ED will prepare the O&M manual. An evacuation and flood risk management plan will be included in the O&M manual and will undergo all required levels of review.

B. **Required Level of Review.**

1. The DDR is an implementation document. The DDR for the campground feature of the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project will undergo District Quality Control (DQC) and Agency Technical Review (ATR). A risk informed decision has been made not to undergo a Type II Independent External Peer Review (Type II IEPR) as documented in section 4C – Scope of Review.

2. The P&S are implementation documents. The P&S for the campground feature of the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project will undergo DQC and ATR. A risk informed decision has been made not to undergo a Type II Independent External Peer Review (Type II IEPR) as documented in section 4C – Scope of Review.

3. The O&M manual is an implementation document. The O&M manual for the campground feature of the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project will undergo DQC and ATR. A risk informed decision has been made not to undergo a Type II Independent External Peer Review (Type II IEPR) as documented in section 4C – Scope of Review.
4. **SCOPE OF REVIEW.**

The scope of this Review Plan is for the review of the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project Campground Feature. The A-E contractor will prepare P&S for construction of the potable water pipeline, sewer line, electrical connections, prefabricated restroom, and lift station. The Corps will prepare P&S for construction of the DG trail, two DG parking lots, the perimeter fence and fifteen trees with a buried irrigation system. The Corps will also prepare the O&M manual for the entire project.

A. **District Quality Control Activities.** DQC activities for the DDR, P&S, and O&M manual will consist of Quality Checks and Reviews, Supervisory Reviews, PDT Reviews, including input from the Non-Federal Sponsor, and Bidability, Constructability, Operability, and Environmental (BCOE) reviews, as required by the District’s Quality Management Plan, CESPL OM 1105-1-2. Prior to the DQC review, all products being designed by the A-E consultant will undergo their own internal review process. The A-E consultant will prepare a Quality Control Plan (QCP) which will outline their review and documentation process. The A-E will submit the QCP for review by the Engineering Division Team Leader and approval by the Chief, Engineering Division within 10 days from the notice to proceed.

1. A QCP will be developed by the A-E, which describes the procedures that will be implemented by the AE to assure quality control. The QCP will include the breakdown of the responsibilities of each member of the A-E design staff and the A-E review team. The QCP will be in accordance with the USACE regulation CESPD R 1110-1-8 Quality Management Plan and the guidance provided by USACE-SPL. The QCP will be submitted to the Contracting Officer's Representative for review and approval as an initial item of work. The A-E is responsible for ensuring that product development and independent technical review are carried out in accordance with the approved QCP. The A-E will execute a Quality Control Certification in accordance with CESPD R 1110-1-8 Quality Management Plan to document compliance with all review requirements outlined in the QCP.

B. **Agency Technical Review.** The ATR team will review the DDR, P&S, and O&M Manual. A brief description of the points of emphasis for each document is below, followed by general review guidelines for the ATR team.

1. **Emphasis of Review for Work Products.**
   
   (a) When reviewing the DDR, the ATR team should verify that it is sufficiently detailed for each technical specialty. In this way, the criteria which were used, the critical assumptions which were made, and the analytical methods which were used will be evident for the purpose of review and historical documentation. Verify that it contains summaries of important calculation results and selected example calculations for all critical elements of the design.

   (b) When reviewing the P&S, the ATR team should verify that they are prepared in accordance with ER 1110-1-8155 and the Architect/Engineering/Construction CADD Standards and the Tri-Service Spatial Data Standards. Verify that the Plans & Specs contains all the necessary information required to bid and construct the plan detailed in the engineering appendix and documented in the Design Documentation Report. Review the design for Biddability, Constructability, Operability and Environmental aspects of the design.
(c) When reviewing the O&M manual, the ATR team should verify that the requirements adequately maintain the conditions assumed during design and validated during construction and verify that the project monitoring will adequately reveal any deviations from the assumptions made for performance.

(d) General Review Guidelines. ATR is undertaken to "ensure the quality and credibility of the government's scientific information" in accordance with ER 1110-1-12 and EC 1165-2-209. The review shall focus on compliance with established policy, principles and procedures using clearly justified and valid assumptions. It includes the verification of assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses based on the level of complexity of the analysis. The ATR should verify the alternatives evaluated, appropriateness of data used, level of data obtained, functionality of the project and verify the reasonableness of the results including whether the project meets the customer’s needs consistent with law and existing policy and engineering and scientific principles. The ATR should also determine if the proposed project is feasible, safe, functional, constructible, and environmentally sustainable within the Federal interest, and whether the concepts and project costs are valid. The final review will confirm whether all relevant engineering and scientific disciplines have been effectively integrated and that the content is sufficiently complete for the current phase of the project.

2. ATR Team Responsibilities.

(a) Reviewers shall review project design documents to confirm that the work was done in accordance with established professional principles, practices, codes, and criteria and for compliance with laws and policy. Comments on the design documents shall be submitted into Document Review and Checking System (DrChecks).

(b) Reviewers shall pay particular attention to one’s discipline but may also comment on other aspects, as appropriate. Reviewers that do not have any significant comments pertaining to their assigned discipline shall provide a comment stating this.

(c) Grammatical and editorial comments shall not be submitted into DrChecks. Comments should be submitted to the ATR manager via electronic mail using tracked changes feature in the Word document or as a hard copy mark-up. The ATR manager shall provide these comments to the Study Manager.

(d) Structure of review comments will be described in the charge.

(e) The “Critical” comment flag in DrChecks shall not be used unless the comment is discussed with the ATR manager and/or the Technical Project Leader first.
3. PDT Responsibilities.

(a) The PDT shall review comments provided by the ATR team in DrChecks and provide responses to each comment using “Concur”, “Non-Concur”, or “For Information Only”. Concur responses shall state what action was taken and provide revised text from the report, if applicable. Non-Concur responses shall state the basis for the disagreement or clarification of the concern and suggest actions to negotiate the closure of the comment. Team members shall contact the PDT and ATR managers to discuss any “Non-Concur” responses prior to submission.

C. Type II Independent External Peer Review. EC 1165-2-209 requires that a Type II IEPR (also known as a Safety Assurance Review) shall be conducted for any project addressing hurricane and storm risk management or flood risk management or any other project where the Federal action is justified by life safety or the failure of the project would pose a significant threat to human life. Other factors to consider for conducting a Type II review of a project or components of a project are:

1. The project involves the use of innovative materials or techniques where the engineering is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretations, contains precedent-setting methods or models, or presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices.

2. The project design requires redundancy, resiliency, and robustness.

(a) Redundancy. Redundancy is the duplication of critical components of a system with the intention of increasing reliability of the system, usually in the case of a backup or failsafe.

(b) Resiliency. Resiliency is the ability to avoid, minimize, withstand, and recover from the effects of adversity, whether natural or manmade, under all circumstances of use.

(c) Robustness. Robustness is the ability of a system to continue to operate correctly across a wide range of operational conditions (the wider the range of conditions, the more robust the system), with minimal damage, alteration or loss of functionality, and to fail gracefully outside of that range.

3. The project has unique construction sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule; for example, significant project features accomplished using the Design-Build or Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) delivery systems.

The campground feature of the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project is a recreation project and is not being constructed for the purposes of hurricane and storm risk management or flood risk management. The project is not justified by life safety. The failure of the project is not likely to pose a significant threat to human life. The project does not involve the use of innovative materials or techniques where the engineering is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretations, contains precedent-setting methods or models, or presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices. The project design does not require redundancy, resiliency, and robustness. The project does not have unique construction sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule.

While the campground is located inside of an active flood risk management basin and could be subjected to
flooding, it has a restricted operational period outside of the traditional flood season in the Los Angeles area. The O&M manual will include an evacuation and flood risk management plan that will outline user requirements and responsibilities during emergency situations. Multiple evacuation routes will be outlined in the plan.

The Los Angeles District realizes that flooding in the basin can occur outside of the traditional flood season and has made a risk-informed decision, based on the operational period of the campground, the record of water surface elevations during the time of operation and the Non-Federal Sponsor’s security and emergency procedure plan, to not subject the DDR, P&S and O&M manual to an Type II Independent External Peer Review.

5. REVIEW TEAM.

In addition to the A-E’s own independent reviewers, the PDT team that will review the design for the campground feature of the Hansen Dam Recreation Area project consists of City of Los Angeles staff from their Department of Recreation and Parks, Planning and Construction Division and SPL staff from Engineering and Planning divisions. The following is a list of the review team members from each agency their technical discipline or expertise used during the review:

A. USACE Project Delivery Team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Agency/Office</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed Louie</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>CESPL-PM-C</td>
<td>213-452-4002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Walker</td>
<td>Landscape Architect/Team Leader</td>
<td>CESPL-ED-DA</td>
<td>213-452-3687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Lamb</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>CESPL-PD-RL</td>
<td>213-452-3798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Dahncke</td>
<td>Soils Engineer</td>
<td>CESPL-ED-GD</td>
<td>213-452-3597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Structural Engineer</td>
<td>CESPL-ED-DS</td>
<td>213-452-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafiqul Talukder</td>
<td>Cost Engineer</td>
<td>CESPL-ED-DS</td>
<td>213-452-3745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned Araujo</td>
<td>Reservoir Regulations</td>
<td>CESPL-ED-HR</td>
<td>213-452-3527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. City of Los Angeles Project Delivery Team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Shull</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon Barrajas</td>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Pleasant</td>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. A-E Project Delivery Team. TBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph J. Kulikowski, PE, GE</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>949-753-8766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. A-E Independent Technical Review Team. TBD
E. Los Angeles District Quality Control (DQC) Review Team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Agency/Office</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Lei</td>
<td>DQC Manager</td>
<td>CESPL-ED-DB</td>
<td>213-452-3702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Willis</td>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>CESPL-ED-DA</td>
<td>213-452-3638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Wong</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>CESPL-PD-RL</td>
<td>213-452-3867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anabel Ronquillo</td>
<td>Soils Engineer</td>
<td>CESPL-ED-GD</td>
<td>213-452-3605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Wong</td>
<td>Structural Engineer</td>
<td>CESPL-ED-DS</td>
<td>213-452-3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Hernandez</td>
<td>Cost Engineer</td>
<td>CESPL-ED-DS</td>
<td>213-452-3529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Sweeten</td>
<td>Reservoir Regulations</td>
<td>CESPL-ED-HR</td>
<td>213-452-3532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Stears</td>
<td>Water/Wastewater Engineer</td>
<td>CESPK-ED-DP</td>
<td>602-230-6889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. USACE Agency Technical Review (ATR) Team. The ATR team will be established per ER 1110-1-12 and EC 1165-2-209. The Corps will manage the ATR internally and it will be conducted by individuals and organizations that are separate and independent from those that accomplished the work, in accordance with policy. As discussed with the RMO, the PDT will assemble the ATR team and request RMO support, if necessary. The RMO will procure the ATR Lead. The major subordinate command (MSC) is the RMO for this project. ATR members will be sought from the following sources: regional technical specialists (RTS); appointed subject matter experts (SME) from other districts; senior level experts from other districts; Center of Expertise staff; appointed SME or senior level experts from the responsible district; experts from other Corps commands; contractors; academic or other technical experts; or a combination of the above. Special emphasis will be put on the Wastewater Engineer team positions since the most critical component of the project is the sewer line extension. The ATR Team Leader will be a Corps of Engineers employee outside SPD. The disciplines and required experience for the ATR team are included below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Agency/Office</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ron Jansen</td>
<td>ATR Manager/Civil Engineer/Wastewater Engineer</td>
<td>CENWK-ED-GC</td>
<td>816-389-3610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Harden</td>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>CENWK-ED-DA</td>
<td>816-389-2447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Parker</td>
<td>Reservoir Regulations</td>
<td>CENWK-ED-HC</td>
<td>816-389-3145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATR Team Members/Disciplines</th>
<th>Expertise Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATR Lead</td>
<td>The ATR lead should be a senior professional with extensive experience in preparing Civil Works decision documents and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. The ATR lead should also serve as a reviewer for a specific discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Wastewater Engineer</td>
<td>The team member should have 10 or more years experience in the evaluation and design of sanitary sewer systems including lift stations and connections to existing systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>The team member should have 10 or more years experience with civil/site work projects to include design and evaluation of site grading, drainage, shallow foundations, retaining walls and utility connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>The team member should have 10 or more years experience as a landscape architect with experience in the evaluation and design of irrigation systems, pedestrian circulation and site development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reservoir Regulations | The team member should have 10 or more years experience in reservoir regulations with experience evaluating development in flood control basins and emergency evacuation plans.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT.

To ensure that the peer review approach is responsive to the wide array of stakeholders and customers, both within and outside the Federal Government, this Review Plan will be published on the district’s public internet site following approval by SPD at: http://spl.usace.army.mil/review_plans. This is not a formal comment period and there is no set timeframe for the opportunity for public comment. If and when comments are received, the PDT will consider them and decide if revisions to the review plan are necessary. The public will be invited to review and submit comments on the plan as described on the web site.

7. SCHEDULE and FUNDING.

A. Schedule. The project schedule is dependent on the PPA being approved by USACE HQ and ASA(CW). Once the PPA is approved, the final draft DDR, P&S and O&M manual are expected to be submitted for DQC reviews within 28 days of issuing the notice to proceed to the A-E consultant. The recommended project schedule is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AE Contract Award</td>
<td>9-Jul-2012</td>
<td>13-Jul-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR Certification</td>
<td>28-Aug-2012</td>
<td>31-Aug-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE Certification Complete</td>
<td>4-Sep-2012</td>
<td>7-Sep-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of DDR, P&amp;S and O&amp;M manual</td>
<td>10-Sep-2012</td>
<td>14-Sep-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP to POCA Contractor</td>
<td>17-Sep-2012</td>
<td>20-Sep-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Objective Memorandum (POM)</td>
<td>22-Oct-2012</td>
<td>24-Oct-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Breaking</td>
<td>8-Nov-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Walkthrough with Corps and Sponsor</td>
<td>10-Jan-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribbon Cutting Event</td>
<td>17-Jan-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Funding. It is anticipated that the total cost for the review efforts described in this plan will be approximately $25,000. SPL will provide labor funding by cross charge labor codes. Funding for travel, if needed, will be provided by way of a government order. The Project Manager will work with the DQC and ATR team leaders to ensure that adequate funding is available and is commensurate with the level of review needed. Any funding shortages will be negotiated on a case by case basis and in advance of a negative charge occurring.
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The DQC and ATR team leaders shall provide organization codes for each team member and a responsible financial point of contact (CEFMS responsible employee) for creation of labor codes. Reviewers shall monitor individual labor code balances and alert the DQC and ATR team leaders to any possible funding shortages.

8. **DOCUMENTATION OF REVIEW.**

A. **DQC and ATR Documentation.** DrChecks review software will be used to document all DQC and ATR comments, responses and associated resolutions accomplished through the review process. Comments should be limited to those that are required to ensure adequacy of the product. The four key parts of a quality review comment will normally include:

1. The review concern – identify the product’s information deficiency or incorrect application of policy, guidance, or procedures.

2. The basis for the concern – cite the appropriate law, policy, guidance, or procedure that has not been properly followed.

3. The significance of the concern – indicate the importance of the concern with regard to its potential impact on the plan selection, recommended plan components, efficiency (cost), effectiveness (function/outputs), implementation responsibilities, safety, Federal interest, or public acceptability.

4. The probable specific action needed to resolve the concern – identify the action(s) that the reporting officers must take to resolve the concern.

In some situations, especially addressing incomplete or unclear information, comments may seek clarification in order to then assess whether further specific concerns may exist.

The DQC and ATR documentation in DrChecks will include the text of each concern, the PDT response, a brief summary of the pertinent points in any discussion, including any vertical team coordination (the vertical team includes the district, RMO, MSC, and HQUSACE), and the agreed upon resolution. If an DQC or ATR concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the DQC or ATR team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the vertical team for further resolution in accordance with the policy issue resolution process described in either ER 1110-2-12 or ER 1105-2-100, Appendix H, as appropriate. Unresolved concerns can be closed in DrChecks with a notation that the concern has been elevated to the vertical team for resolution.

B. **DQC and ATR Reports.** At the conclusion of each review effort, the DQC and ATR teams will prepare a Review Report summarizing the review. Review Reports will be considered an integral part of the ATR documentation and shall:

1. Identify the document(s) reviewed and the purpose of the review.

2. Disclose the names of the reviewers, their organizational affiliations, and include a short paragraph on both the credentials and relevant experiences of each reviewer.

3. Include the charge to the reviewers.
4. Describe the nature of their review and their findings and conclusions.

5. Identify and summarize each unresolved issue (if any).

6. Include a verbatim copy of each reviewer’s comments (either with or without specific attributions), or represent the views of the group as a whole, including any disparate and dissenting views.

C. **DQC and ATR Certification.** To fully document the DQC and ATR process, a statement of technical review will be prepared for each product reviewed. The DQC and ATR documentation will include the text of each comment, the PDT response, a brief summary of the pertinent points in the ensuing discussion, including any vertical coordination, and the agreed upon resolution. Certification by the DQC and ATR team leaders and the Technical Project Leaders will occur once issues raised by the reviewers have been addressed to the review team’s satisfaction. Indication of this concurrence will be documented by the signing of a certification statement.

9. **POINTS OF CONTACT.**

Questions about this Review Plan may be directed to the Los Angeles District Project Delivery Team, Landscape Architect, Mr. Derek Walker at (213) 452-3687, or to the Project Manager, Mr. Ed Louie at (213) 452-4002. The Chief, Engineering Division is Mr. Richard J. Leifield, PE at (213) 452-3629.

Questions may also be directed to the Major Subordinate Command (MSC), Mr. Paul Devitt, Risk Management Center (RMC), Mr. Colin Krumdieck at (702) 215-5545 and Reservoir Operations, Mr. Boni Bigornia at (415) 503-6567.

10. **REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL.**

The RMO for work products of the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project – Campground Feature is the MSC.

As described above, the Los Angeles District recommends DQC and ATR for the campground feature of the Hansen Dam Recreation Area Project. In addition, a Type II Independent External Peer Review (Safety Assurance Review) is not required for this project.

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.