

REVIEW PLAN

San Clemente Storm Damage and Shoreline Protection Feasibility Study

May 2009

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles District**

Review Plan for San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study

Date: May 15, 2009

Subject: Review Plan Approval for *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study*

The attached Review Plan for the San Clemente Shoreline Protection Feasibility Study has been prepared in accordance with EC 1105-2-410, *Review of Decision Documents* (22 Aug 2008).

The Review Plan has been made available for public comment, and the comments received have been incorporated into the Review Plan. The Review Plan has been coordinated with the Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Planning Center of Expertise of the North Atlantic Division, which is the lead office to execute this plan. For further information, contact the PCX at (718) 765-7071. The review plan includes independent external peer review.

I hereby approve this Review Plan, which is subject to change as study circumstances require, consistent with study development under the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this Review Plan or its execution will require new written approval from this office.

Janice L Dombi
Colonel, US Army
South Pacific Division Commander
US Army Corps of Engineers

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS	1
1 BACKGROUND	2
1.1 Purpose of Review Plan	2
1.2 Study and Decision Documents	2
1.3 Levels of Review	2
1.4 Why IEPR is Needed	4
1.5 Project Delivery Team (PDT).....	5
1.6 Coordination with Planning Centers of Expertise	5
2 EXECUTION PLAN.....	5
2.1 District Quality Control (DQC)	6
<i>DQC of Sponsor In-kind Contributions.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>DQC of Products Developed Under Contract</i>	<i>7</i>
2.2 Agency Technical Review (ATR)	7
<i>Documentation of ATR.....</i>	<i>9</i>
2.3 Independent External Peer Review (IEPR)	9
<i>Documentation of IEPR</i>	<i>9</i>
2.4 Review and Model Certifications.....	10
<i>Review Certifications</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Model Certifications</i>	<i>11</i>
2.5 Tasks, Timing, Sequence, and Costs.....	11
3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	12
3.1 Review Plan.....	12
3.2 Decision Documents	12

Acronyms

ASA (CW)	Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works
ATR	Agency Technical Review
DQC	District Quality Control
DX	Directory of Expertise
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review
MSC	Major Subordinate Command
NEPA	National Environmental Protection Act
OEO	Outside Eligible Organization
PCX	Planning Center of Expertise
PCX-CSDR	Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Planning Center of Expertise
PDT	Project Delivery Team
PMP	Project Management Plan
SPD	South Pacific Division
SPL	Los Angeles District
USACE	US Army Corps of Engineers

1 Background

1.1 Purpose of Review Plan

This Review Plan describes the scope and execution of review for the *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study*, in accordance with Engineering Circular 1105-2-410, *Review of Decision Documents* (August 22, 2008). This Review Plan is a stand-alone component of the *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study Project Management Plan* (PMP), which was last updated in 2007.

1.2 Study and Decision Documents

The San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study area is located along the Pacific Ocean coastline in the City of San Clemente, Orange County, California. San Clemente is the southernmost city in Orange County and is bounded by the Camp Pendleton Marine Base and San Onofre State Beach Park to the south; and to the north, by the communities of Capistrano Shores and Dana Point. The original total study area encompasses the City of San Clemente and extends from San Mateo Point, located at the southern boundary of the City, to Dana Point Harbor for a total distance of approximately 7.5 miles (12.1 kilometers). After analysis of each section it was determined that only reach 6 of the original 10 reaches has the potential for a justified project based on economic analysis.

Running along the entire length of the San Clemente shoreline is a portion of the Lossan (Los Angeles to San Diego) railroad corridor, a major passenger rail line linking San Diego to the rest of the United States, owned by the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA). This commuter rail corridor is among the busiest in the country and separates the beach from the bluff.

The recommended plan is developed by considering the storm damage reduction and recreational potential of various beach fill configuration alternatives and optimization based on the average annual benefits and the benefit/cost ratio. Primary optimization parameters of each alternative are the dimensions of the beach width and if needed a sacrificial beach width of the cross-sectional design profile. An array of base beach widths and sacrificial beach widths, ranging from 0 to 40 meters, yields a matrix of project alternatives.

A draft feasibility report and an environmental impact statement/environmental impact report (EIS/EIR) for the study are underway.

Feasibility reports and EIS/EIRs are decision documents. That is, they are documents prepared for the purpose of obtaining Congressional authorization. All USACE decision documents are subject to review.

1.3 Levels of Review

The decision documents prepared for the *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study* will be subject to four types of review: District Quality Control (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), public review, state and agency review, and Washington-level Policy and Compliance Reviews.

DQC is the review of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the PMP Quality Control Plan. DQC will be managed in the Los Angeles District (SPL). DQC applies the tools outlined in the quality management plans for SPL and the South Pacific Division (SPD), the district's Major Subordinate Command (MSC). Basic quality control tools include a Quality Management Plan providing for seamless review, quality checks and reviews,

supervisory reviews, Project Delivery Team (PDT) reviews, etc. Additionally, the PDT is responsible for a complete reading of the report to assure the overall integrity of the report, technical appendices and the recommendations before approval by the District Commander.

ATR is an in-depth review that ensures the proper application of clearly established criteria, regulations, laws, codes, principles, and professional practices. ATR also assures that all work products coherently fit together. ATR will be managed within USACE and conducted by a qualified team from outside of the home district. The lead Corps Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) for the study, the Coastal Storm Damage Reduction PCX (PCX-CSDR), will identify the ATR team leader and members. ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel (Regional Technical Specialists (RTS), etc.), and may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate. The ATR team leader shall be outside of SPD. Candidates may be nominated by the home district.

IEPR addresses all planning, engineering, economics, and environmental analyses in the feasibility study. This review evaluates the assumptions that support the analyses, as well as the soundness of models, surveys, investigations, and methods. IEPR will be coordinated through the PCX-CSDR. The PCX will select an outside eligible organization (OEO) to manage the IEPR. The OEO will assemble a panel of independent experts to conduct IEPR.

IEPR is applied in cases that meet certain criteria where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of USACE is warranted. The criteria for application of IEPR are:

- (1) The total project cost exceeds \$45 million
- (2) There is a significant threat to human life
- (3) It is requested by a State Governor of an affected state
- (4) It is requested by the head of a Federal or state agency charged with reviewing the project if he/she determines the project is likely to have a significant adverse impact on resources under the jurisdiction of his/her agency after implementation of proposed mitigation (the Chief has the discretion to add IEPR under this circumstance)
- (5) There is significant public dispute regarding the size, nature, effects of the project
- (6) There is significant public dispute regarding the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project
- (7) Cases where information is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretation, contains precedent-setting methods or models, or presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices
- (8) Any other circumstance where the Chief of Engineers determines IEPR is warranted.

IEPR may be appropriate for feasibility studies; reevaluation studies; reports or project studies requiring a Chiefs Report, authorization by Congress, or an EIS; and large programmatic efforts and their component projects. IEPR is managed by an outside eligible organization (OEO) that is described in Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3), is exempt from Federal tax under section 501(a), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; is independent; is free from conflicts of interest; does not carry out or advocate for or against Federal water resources projects; and has experience in establishing and administering IEPR panels. The scope of review will address all the underlying planning, engineering, including safety assurance, economics, and environmental analyses performed, not just one aspect of the project.

SAR In accordance with Section 2034 and 2035 of WRDA 2007, EC 11052-410, and pending additional guidance requires that all projects addressing flooding or storm damage reduction undergo a SAR during design and construction. Safety assurance factors (significant threat to human life, project cost thresholds, etc) must be considered in the planning and studies phases and in all reviews for those studies. Updated

guidance on the civil works review process including implementation guidance for Section 2034 and 2035 is under development. This study will address safety assurance factors, which at a minimum will be included in the draft report and appendixes for public and agency review. Prior to preconstruction engineering and design (PED) of the identified for construction, a PMP will be developed that will include SAR's with the selection of external panels to perform the independent external peer reviews during design and construction.

The SAR shall focus on the quality of the surveys and investigations, quality of in-kind-contributions and whether it is certifiable for credit in accordance with EC 1165-2-208, the range of alternatives considered, the models used to assess hazards, the level of uncertainty in assessments, and whether the quality and quantity of engineering per ER 1110-2-1150 are sufficient to ensure public welfare, safety, and health. The purpose of the Safety Assurance Review is to ensure that good science, sound engineering, and public health, safety, and welfare are the most important factors that determine a project's fate. The IEPR for the feasibility report would address SAR of engineering items and assumptions in the report. The Review Plan would be revised, if required, to comply with current Corps guidance on SAR.

Release of the draft document for public review will occur after issuance of the AFB policy guidance memo and concurrence by HQUSACE. A public meeting where oral presentations on scientific issues can be made to the reviewers by interested members of the public. ATR and IEPR reviewers will be provided with all public comments. Public review of this document will occur after the completion of the ATR process and issuance of the HQUSACE policy guidance memo. The public review period will last 45 days.

A formal State and Agency review will occur after the release of the final report is approved by the Civil Works Review Board. However, intensive coordination with these agencies will occur concurrently with the planning process. There may be possible coordinating parties' regarding this project but no specific issues have been raised to date. Upon completion of the review period, comments will be consolidated in a matrix and addressed, if needed. A summary of the comments and resolutions will be included in the document.

Washington-level Policy and Compliance Reviews determine whether the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy, and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority by the Chief of Engineers. Washington-level policy and compliance review is completed before the draft feasibility report and EIS/EIR are released for public review and again before the Chief of Engineers signs his report. The review is conducted by personnel working for USACE headquarters (HQUSACE). Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed further in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. The technical review efforts addressed in this Circular are to augment and complement the policy review processes by addressing compliance with published Army policies pertinent to planning products, particularly policies on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents. DQC and ATR efforts are to include the necessary expertise to address compliance with published planning policy.

1.4 Why IEPR is Needed

The final decision as to whether to conduct IEPR or to request a waiver from the Chief of Engineers rests with the SPD Commander. The vertical team (Los Angeles District, SPD, PCX-CSDR, and Headquarters staff involved in the study) will advise the SPD Commander that IEPR is appropriate for the *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study*. IEPR is required when at least one or more of the eight "trigger factors" in Appendix D of the USACE's Water Resources Policies and Authorities Report EC 1105-2-410 are present. In addition, IEPR is required for any project in which the Chief of Engineers determines that circumstances warrant IEPR.

It should be noted that the estimated cost of the project is \$22M, with \$9M included for initial construction and \$13M to cover the cost of renourishment over a 50-yr timeline. IEPR may be necessary for the *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study* due to the following applicable trigger factors:

- The project area may experience potential adverse impacts to the existing nearshore habitat and species prior to implementation of mitigation;
- The feasibility study will include an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR);

1.5 Project Delivery Team (PDT)

The Project Delivery Team (PDT) for the *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study* is listed in Table 1. The list will be updated as needed.

Table 1 Project Delivery Team

Role	Office/Agency Symbol
Project Manager	CESPL-PM-N
Project Manager	City of San Clemente
Budget Analyst	CESPL-PM-P-M
Project Scheduler	CESPL-PM-PC
Project Financial Manager	CESPL-PM-P-M
Lead Planner	CESPL-PD-WS
Economic Evaluation	CESPL-PD-E
Coastal Engineer	CESPL-ED-DC
Biologist & Environmental Coordinator	CESPL-PD-RL
Geologist	CESPL-ED-GG
Cost Estimator	CESPL-ED-DS
Real Estate	CESPL-RE-A

1.6 Coordination with Planning Centers of Expertise

The *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study* is a single purpose project. The lead Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) for the study is the Coastal Storm Damage Reduction PCX (PCX-CSDR).

The budgeted total costs for PCX coordination and review for the study are:

Activity	Budget
PCX Coordination & Review Draft Report	\$10,000
Coordination & Review Final Report	\$5,000
PCX Coordination, Post-Final Report	\$5,000

If additional project purposes are identified later, the Los Angeles District will initiate coordination with the appropriate PCX.

2 Execution Plan

This chapter of the Review Plan explains how DQC, ATR, and IEPR will be carried out for the study.

2.1 District Quality Control (DQC)

Procedures for DQC for the *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study* are outlined in the:

- *South Pacific Division Quality Management Plan*, CESP R 1110-1-8 (December 30, 2002):
 - o Appendix C, *Quality Management of Planning Products* (September 20, 2004);
- *Los Angeles District Quality Management Plan*, CESPL OM 1105-1-2, (January 25, 2000):
 - o Appendix A, *Planning Subplan* (January 25, 2000); and
- “Quality Control Plan”, in *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study Project Management Plan* (2007).

The quality control objectives for the study include ensuring that feasibility phase products and analyses:

- meet customer (Federal and non-Federal sponsor) requirements;
- comply with applicable laws, regulations, policies, and sound technical practices of the disciplines involved;
- are of adequate scope and level of detail;
- are consistent, logical, accurate, and comprehensive;
- are based on convincing and consistent assumptions, especially those related to the probable/most likely future with and without-project conditions;
- adequately describe the problems and opportunities, planning objectives and constraints, existing conditions, future without-project conditions, and future with-project conditions to support recommendations;
- tell a coherent planning story; and
- address outstanding action items from milestone conferences, issue resolution conferences, and other reviews.

The PDT and each team member’s supervisors will be responsible for DQC.

Design checks and other internal reviews will be carried out as routine management practices in technical divisions. This includes checking work to assure basic assumptions and calculations are error-free. These checks will be performed by staff responsible for the work.

Supervisory review will be managed by section chiefs and branch chiefs to ensure that appropriate criteria is established, correct methodology is followed, appropriate data is used, and computations are accurate.

Additionally, PDT members will be responsible for assuring the overall integrity of the feasibility report, EIS/EIR, technical appendices, and recommendations before approval by the District Commander.

The Los Angeles District’s Office of Counsel is responsible for the legal review of the feasibility report and EIS/EIR. Legal review involves a critical examination of the documents to ensure compliance with applicable laws, policies, and regulations.

DQC of Sponsor In-kind Contributions

Sponsor is responsible for quality control of In-Kind contributions, presented in Table 2. The responsible technical PDT member will be responsible for DQC of the Sponsor’s In-kind work products via seamless single and product reviews. Upon completion of the In-kind work products, the Sponsor shall request credit, for which the Los Angeles District will then determine the reasonableness, allocability and allowability in accordance with the PMP and FCSA. Quality assurance review of the products developed under contract for the *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study* will be performed by the ATR team, through seamless single discipline and product reviews. This process will ensure that products developed under contract are in compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and sound technical practices.

Table 2 Sponsor In-Kind Credit

Project Delivery Team	Total	Non-Labor	Totals
Work Group	Labor	e.g. Travel	(Rounded)
Study Start to F3 Milestone (Baseline Conditions)			
Sponsor In-Kind	\$152,000	\$0	\$153,000
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$152,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$152,000</i>
F-3 to F-4 Milestone Work (Analysis of Alt Plans)			
Sponsor In-Kind	\$35,000	\$0	\$35,000
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$35,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$35,000</i>
F-4 Milestone to Public Draft Report			
Sponsor In-Kind	\$0		\$0
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>
Public Draft to Final Report (F-5 to F-8 Milestone)			
Sponsor In-Kind	\$32,500		\$32,500
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$32,500</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$32,500</i>
Final Report Processing (to Chief's Report)			
Sponsor In-Kind	\$0		\$0
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$219,500</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$219,500</i>

DQC of Products Developed Under Contract

Contractors are responsible for the quality control of products developed under contract. The responsible function chief at the Los Angeles District will review and approve the sponsor's quality control plan. The sponsor will then be responsible for managing and providing input to the contractor and ensuring that the contractor meets the requirements of the contract. Quality assurance review of the products developed under contract for the *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study* will be performed by the ATR team, through seamless single discipline and product reviews. This will ensure that products developed under contract are in compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and sound technical practices.

DQC will also include single discipline seamless peer review and multi-discipline product review. These are forms of ATR, described in the next section.

2.2 Agency Technical Review (ATR)

The purpose of ATR is to:

- ensure that the appropriate problems and opportunities are addressed;
- confirm that appropriate solutions are considered;
- confirm that the appropriate solution is recommended;
- assure that accurate cost, scheduling, and associated risks are presented;
- confirm that the recommended solution:

- warrants USACE participation,
- is in accord with current policies,
- can be implemented in accordance with environmental laws and statutes, and
- has a sponsor willing and able to fulfill the non-Federal responsibilities; and to
- ensure that the decision document appropriately represents the views of the Corps of Engineers, the Army, and the President.

The budgeted total costs for ATR are as follows:

Activity	Budget	Start	Finish
ATR of Draft Report	\$30,000	August 2009	September 2009

The PDT estimates that approximately nine reviewers will be needed for ATR of the *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study*, based on the disciplines required to develop the feasibility report and EIS/EIR. Table 3 presents the proposed ATR team.

Table 3 Proposed ATR Team

Name	Discipline	Office	Qualifications	Years of Experience
TBA	ATR Team Leader	NAD (tentative)		TBD
TBA	Plan Formulation	NAD		TBD
TBA	Environmental	SPK		TBD
TBA	Coastal Engineering	SPN		TBD
TBA	Cultural Resources	SPK		TBD
TBA	Geotechnical	NAB		TBD
TBA	Economics	SPD		TBD
TBA	Cost Engineering	NWW		TBD
TBA	Real Estate	SPD		TBD

Table 3 will be updated as ATR team members are finalized, to show their names, qualifications, and years of experience.

The ATR team will conduct ATR in two stages: seamless single discipline review and product review.

Seamless Single Discipline Review is the on-going review of interim work products. As these work products are completed, and before they are shared with other members of the PDT or integrated into the overall study, PDT members should contact their ATR team counterparts for review. ATR team members provide immediate review consistent with the scope and complexity of the products. Interim work products may be reviewed once or iteratively.

Product Review is the review of the draft and final feasibility report, technical appendices, and EIS/EIR. Recommendations and comments will be provided by the ATR team. ATR of these products will occur before they are released for public comment and review.

Documentation of ATR

For seamless review, ATR team members will use the software system DrChecks to document their reviews. Additionally, for each review, team members should file a memorandum recording the nature and scope of the review with the Review Team Leader. The purpose of this documentation is to minimize re-review.

For product review, DrChecks will be used to document all review comments, PDT responses, and associated resolutions. The ATR team will meet to sort, review, compare, and reconcile their individual comments into a draft assessment of the decision document. This assessment will raise technical issues and questions concerning the document and make suggestions for modifying the document. The PDT and local sponsor's representatives will be given an opportunity to comment on the draft assessment. The final assessment will be submitted to the Planning Division Chief at the home district. Review team files will be readily available to all members of the review team and PDT and to HQUSACE during quality assurance reviews.

2.3 Independent External Peer Review (IEPR)

The PCX-CSDR will contract with an outside eligible organization (OEO) to manage IEPR. The OEO will select IEPR panel members using the National Academy of Science's policy for selecting reviewers. The IEPR panel will consist of recognized independent experts from outside of USACE, with disciplines appropriate for the type of review being conducted. The PCX-CSDR will make the final decision regarding the disciplines and number of panel members.

The *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study* PDT anticipates that the following disciplines or expertise will be needed for IEPR:

- Economics-Coastal Storm Risk Management
- Coastal Engineering
- Marine Biology

Documentation of IEPR

DrCheckssm will be used to document all IEPR comments and to aid in the preparation of a Review Report.

The Review Report shall include the following:

- the names of reviewers, their organizational affiliations, and their credentials and relevant experiences;
- the charge to the reviewers;
- a description of the nature of the panel's review and its findings and conclusions; and
- a verbatim copy of each reviewer's comments, or a summary of the views of the panel, including any disparate and dissenting views.

The Los Angeles District, with assistance from the PCX, will prepare a proposed written response to the Review Report that explains:

- the agreement or disagreement with the views expressed in the report;
- the actions undertaken or to be undertaken in response to the report; and

- the reasons those actions are believed to satisfy the key concerns stated in the report (if applicable).

The proposed response will be coordinated with the SPD support teams and HQUSACE to ensure consistency with law, policy, project guidance, ongoing policy and legal compliance review, and other USACE or National considerations. Upon satisfying its concerns, HQUSACE will determine the appropriate command level for issuing the formal USACE response to the IEPR Review Report.

The PCX shall disseminate the final Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the review on its website. These materials will also be included in the applicable decision document. The IEPR comments and responses will be discussed at the Civil Works Review Board with an IEPR panel or OEO representative in attendance. The Chief of Engineers' report for the decision document will summarize the Review Report and USACE responses.

2.4 Review and Model Certifications

Review Certifications

Draft and final decision documents submitted to higher authority should be accompanied by review documentation and certifications that technical, legal and policy compliance review have been completed.

The completion of DQC will be certified by the Planning Division Chief and the District Commander.

The legal sufficiency of decision documents will be certified by the SPL Office of Counsel.

For products developed in whole or part by a contractor, a principal of the contractor will sign a quality control certification. The responsible function chief will then sign a quality assurance certification, and recommend to the District Commander that a certification that quality control and quality assurance are complete be signed and that any significant technical concerns have been considered and resolved.

The SPL Quality Management Plan (CESPL OM 1105-1-2), Appendix A, Attachment I contains example certifications for DQC, legal review, and contractor quality control/quality assurance.

The completion of ATR for interim work products may be certified by the responsible function chief. The completion of ATR for the final decision documents will be certified by the Planning Division Chief and the District Commander. The ATR certification should note, and reference the location of, any unresolved concerns in the review documentation.

The Engineering Division Chief will certify that the total project cost estimate submitted with the final decision documents is in accordance with current guidance and has been coordinated with and reviewed by the Cost Engineering DX. The review of real estate costs should be certified as well.

The SPD Quality Management Plan (CESPD R 1110-1-8), Appendix I, contains examples of ATR and cost estimate certifications.

The Los Angeles District will attach a certification of IEPR to the IEPR documentation.

The Project Manager is responsible for ensuring that certification requirements are met prior to approval of the project by the District Commander or transmittal of the project to SPD or HQUSACE.

The project summary accompanying the final feasibility report and EIS/EIR will:

- present the dates of the certifications of the technical and legal adequacy of the final report;
- describe the involvement of the PCX;
- summarize the involvement of the Cost Engineering DX in the approval of the total project cost estimate; and
- summarize the review and approval of real estate cost estimates.

HQUSACE is responsible for confirming the technical, policy, and legal compliance of planning products; supporting the resolution of issues requiring HQUSACE, ASA(CW) or OMB decisions; continuously evaluating the overall project development process, including the review and policy compliance processes; and recommending appropriate changes when warranted.

Model Certifications

The PCX has already coordinated with the PDT on the Economics and Storm Damage model to be utilized for this study. This model was accepted for use in the evaluation of alternatives for the San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study as of June 2006.

See EC 1105-2-407, *Planning Models Improvement Program* (May 31, 2005).

2.5 Tasks, Timing, Sequence, and Costs

The anticipated tasks, timing, sequence, and costs for the review of the *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study* are included in P2 under project number 104713. The schedule will be updated as the study progresses.

The planned schedule for review of the draft feasibility report is presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Tasks, Timing, Sequence, and Costs of Review of the Feasibility Report

Review Milestone	ATR Team Involvement	Scheduled/Actual Date
SPD Planning Milestone F1		July 2003
ATR of Draft F3 Report	ATR Team	October 2004
SPD Planning Milestone F3/Feasibility Scoping Meeting	ATR Team	Dec 2004
ATR of Draft F4 Report	ATR Team	March 2008
F4 Milestone Review Conference	ATR Team	July 2008
IEPR	To be identified by Coastal-PCX	TBA
ATR of AFB Report		June 2009
SPD Planning Milestone F4a/Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB)	Coastal-PCX ATR Team	July 2009
ATR of Draft Report	Coastal-PCX ATR Team	August 2009
In Progress Review (IPR)	Coastal ATR Team (if needed)	August 2009
Public Review of Draft Report		September 2009
Civil Works Review Board (CWRB)	Coastal-PCX ATR Team	December 2009
State and Agency Review of Draft Report		January 2010
ATR of Final Report	Coastal-PCX ATR Team (if needed)	TBA
Final Report Submission		April 2010

The planned study cost for the San Clemente feasibility study is presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Estimated Study Cost

Description	Total
Program Man	\$257,000
Cost Eng	\$62,700
Geotechnical	\$327,000
Coastal Eng	\$565,000
ATR	\$103,000
Econ	\$364,000
RE	\$40,000
Env	\$375,000
Plan Form	\$898,300
Public Inv	\$23,000
Study Report	\$220,000
PM	\$92,000
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>\$3,200,000</u>

3 Public Participation

The Los Angeles District and local sponsor, the City of San Clemente, will work together to ensure that all interested organizations and members of the public are kept informed of the study progress and results. Individuals and organizations will be notified in advance of the release of key documents and public meetings.

3.1 Review Plan

This Review Plan for the *San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study* will be posted on the Los Angeles District’s public webpage for the study:

http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1140&Itemid=32

The public will be able to submit their comments on the Review Plan via the webpage. For inquiries about this Review Plan, the points of contact are:

Los Angeles District:
 Project Manager (213) 452-3829
 Lead Planner (213)452-3810

Coastal Storm Damage Reduction PCX:
 PCX Project Team Member (718) 765-7071

3.2 Decision Documents

The draft feasibility report and EIS/EIR will be released for public review and posted on the Los Angeles District’s public webpage for the study:

http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=section&id=5&Itemid=31
 Information about how to submit comments will be posted on the webpage.

A public meeting will be held just after the release of the draft feasibility report and EIS/EIR. At the meeting, the Los Angeles District will present the results of the study, conclusions, and recommendations. The public will be invited to present their questions, concerns, and opinions. A transcript of the meeting will be prepared. This transcript will be summarized and included in the final feasibility report and EIS/EIR.

Public comments on the draft decision documents will be accepted and the PDT will respond to public comments. Dates for these reviews will be posted on the website mentioned above. The public comments and PDT responses will be sent to HQUSACE for review. Public comments and PDT responses will be compiled or summarized and included in the final feasibility report and EIS/EIR.

USACE will publish a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register when it releases the final feasibility report and EIS/EIR. HQUSACE will review the final report after it is released and the Civil Works Review Board Briefing will be held. Federal and state agencies will then have another opportunity to review the documents. After this the Chief of Engineers will prepare a report to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) recommending a course of action. The ASA (CW) will then prepare a memorandum for the Office of Management and Budget.

At the conclusion of the feasibility study, a Record of Decision (ROD) will be signed and published in the Federal Register or on the USACE webpage for the study.