Quality Assurance Checklist
Review Plans

Originating District:
Project/Study Title:
District POC:
PCXIN Reviewer:

Any evaluation boxes checked 'No' indicate the RP may not comply with ER 1105-2-410 and should be explained. Additional coordination and issue resolution with the PCXIN may be required prior to approval of the Review Plan.

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	EVALUATION
1. Is the Review Plan (RP) a stand alone document?	EC 1105-2-410, Para 8a	Yes ☐ No ☐
a. Does it include a cover page identifying it as a RP and listing the project title, originating district or office, and date of the plan? b. Does it include a table of contents? c. Is the purpose of the RP clearly stated and EC 1105-2-410 referenced? d. Does it reference the Project Management Plan (PMP) of which the RP is a component? e. Does it succinctly describe the three levels of peer review: District Quality Control (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), and Independent Technical Peer Review (IEPR)? f. Does it clearly state that DQC and ATR are required for all decision documents and that IEPR may be required?		a. Yes ☐ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐ c. Yes ☐ No ☐ d. Yes ☐ No ☐ e. Yes ☐ No ☐ f. Yes ☐ No ☐ g. Yes ☐ No ☐ h. Yes ☐ No ☐ **Comments:**
g. Does it include a paragraph stating the title, subject, and purpose of the decision document to be reviewed? h. Does it list the names and disciplines of the Project Delivery Team (PDT)?* **Note: It is highly recommended to put all team*	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4a	

member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.		
2. Is the RP detailed enough to assess the necessary level and focus of peer review?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 3a	Yes ☐ No ☐
a. Does it indicate which parts of the study will likely be challenging?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 3a	a. Yes ☐ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐
b. Does it provide a preliminary assessment of where the project risks are likely to occur and what the magnitude of those risks might be?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 3a	c. Yes ☐ No ☐ d. Yes ☐ No ☐ e. Yes ☐ No ☐
c. Does it indicate if the project/study will include an environmental impact statement (EIS)? *Is an EIS included? Yes ☐ No ☐* *If yes, IEPR is generally required.*	EC 1105-2-410 Para 7c & 8f	
d. Does it address if the project report is likely to contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment? *Is it likely? Yes ☐ No ☐* *If yes, IEPR is required.*	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4b	
e. Does it address if the project is likely to have significant economic, environmental, and social affects to the nation, such as (but not limited to):	EC 1105-2-410, Para 6c	
• more than negligible adverse impacts on scarce or unique cultural, historic, or tribal resources?	EC 1105-2-410 Para 8f	
• substantial adverse impacts on fish and wildlife species or their habitat, prior to implementation of mitigation?	EC 1105-2-410 Para 8f	
• more than negligible adverse impact on species listed as endangered or threatened, or to the designated critical habitat of such species, under the Endangered Species Act, prior to implementation of mitigation?	EC 1105-2-410 Para 8f	

Is it likely? Yes ☐ No ☐ *If yes, IEPR is required.* f. Does it address if the project/study is likely to have significant interagency interest? *Is it likely? Yes ☐ No ☐* *If yes, IEPR is required.* g. Does it address if the project/study likely involves significant threat to human life (safety assurance)? *Is it likely? Yes ☐ No ☐* *If yes, IEPR is required.* h. Does it provide an estimated total project cost? *What is the estimated cost: _____* *(best current estimate; may be a range)* *Is it > $45 million? Yes ☐ No ☐* *If yes, IEPR is required.* i. Does it address if the project/study will likely be highly controversial, such as if there will be a significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project or to the economic or environmental costs or benefits of the project? *Is it likely? Yes ☐ No ☐* *If yes, IEPR is required.* j. Does it address if the information in the decision document will likely be based on novel methods, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices? *Is it likely? Yes ☐ No ☐* *If yes, IEPR is required.*	EC 1105-2-410, Para 6c EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 1b EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 1b EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 1b EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 1b	f. Yes ☐ No ☐ g. Yes ☐ No ☐ h. Yes ☐ No ☐ i. Yes ☐ No ☐ j. Yes ☐ No ☐ **Comments:**
3. Does the RP define the appropriate level of peer review for the project/study?	EC 1105-2-410, Para 8a	Yes ☐ No ☐
a. Does it state that DQC will be managed by the home district in accordance with MSC	EC 1105-2-410, Para 7a	a. Yes ☐ No ☐

and the district Quality Management Plans?		
b. Does it state that ATR will be conducted or managed by the lead CX?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 3a	b. Yes ☐ No ☐ c. Yes ☐ No ☐
c. Does it state whether IEPR will be performed? *Will IEPR be performed? Yes ☐ No ☐*	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4b	d. Yes ☐ No ☐ e. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☐ **Comments:**
d. Does it provide a defensible rationale for the decision on IEPR?		
e. Does it state that IEPR will be managed by an Outside Eligible Organization, external to the Corps of Engineers?	EC 1105-2-410, Para 7c	
4. Does the RP explain how ATR will be accomplished?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4k	Yes ☐ No ☐
a. Does it identify the anticipated number of reviewers?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4f	a. Yes ☐ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐
b. Does it provide a succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed for the review?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4g	c. Yes ☐ No ☐ d. Yes ☐ No ☐
c. Does it indicate that ATR team members will be from outside the home district?	EC 1105-2-410, Para 7b	e. Yes ☐ No ☐ f. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☐
d. Does it indicate that the ATR team leader will be from outside of the MSC?	EC 1105-2-410, Para 7b	**Comments:**
e. Does the RP state that the lead CX is responsible for identifying the ATR team members and indicate if candidates will be nominated by the home district?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4k(1)	
f. If the reviewers are listed by name, does the RP describe the qualifications and years of relevant experience of the ATR team members?* **Note: It is highly recommended to put all team member names and contact information in an appendix for easy updating as team members change or the RP is updated.*	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4k(1)	

5. Does the RP explain how IEPR will be accomplished?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4k and Appendix D	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **n/a** ☐
a. Does it identify the anticipated number of reviewers? b. Does it provide a succinct description of the primary disciplines or expertise needed for the review? c. Does it indicate that the IEPR reviewers will be selected by an Outside Eligible Organization and if candidates will be nominated by the Corps of Engineers? d. Does it indicate the IEPR will address all the underlying planning, safety assurance, engineering, economic, and environmental analyses, not just one aspect of the project?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4f EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4g EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4k(1) & Appendix D, Para 2a EC 1105-2-410, Para 7c	a. Yes ☐ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐ c. Yes ☐ No ☐ d. Yes ☐ No ☐ **Comments:**
6. Does the RP address peer review of sponsor in-kind contributions?		Yes ☐ No ☐
a. Does the RP list the expected in-kind contributions to be provided by the sponsor? b. Does it explain how peer review will be accomplished for those in-kind contributions?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4j	a. Yes ☐ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☐ **Comments:**
7. Does the RP address model certification requirements?	EC 1105-2-407	Yes ☐ No ☐
a. Does it list the models anticipated to be used in developing recommendations? b. Does it indicate the certification/approval status of those models and if certification or approval of any model(s) will be needed? c. If needed, does the RP propose the appropriate level of certification/approval for the model(s) and how it will be	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4i	a. Yes ☐ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐ c. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☐ **Comments:**

accomplished?		
8. Does the RP address how the peer review will be documented?		Yes ☐ No ☐
a. Does the RP address the requirement to document ATR and IEPR comments using DrChecks? b. Does the RP explain how the IEPR will be documented in a Review Report? c. Does the RP document how written responses to the IEPR Review Report will be prepared? d. Does the RP detail how the district/PCX will disseminate the final IEPR Review Report, USACE response, and all other materials related to the IEPR on the internet and include them in the applicable decision document?	EC 1105-2-410, Para 8g(1) EC1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4k(13)(b) EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4l EC 1105-2-410, Para 8g(2) & Appendix B, Para 4l	a. Yes ☐ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☐ c. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☐ d. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☐ **Comments:**
9. Does the RP present the tasks, timing and sequence (including deferrals), and costs of reviews?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4c & Appendix C, Para 3d	Yes ☐ No ☐
a. Does it provide a schedule for ATR including review of the Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM) materials, Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) materials, draft report, and final report? b. Does it include interim ATR reviews for key technical products? c. Does it present the timing and sequencing for IEPR? d. Does it include cost estimates for the reviews?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix C, Para 3g EC 1105-2-410, Appendix C, Para 3g	a. Yes ☐ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐ c. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☐ d. Yes ☐ No ☐ **Comments:**
10. Does the RP address opportunities for public participation?		Yes ☐ No ☐
a. Does it indicate how and when there will	EC 1105-2-410,	a. Yes ☐ No ☐

be opportunities for public comment on the decision document? b. Does it indicate when significant and relevant public comments will be provided to reviewers before they conduct their review? c. Does it address whether the public, including scientific or professional societies, will be asked to nominate potential external peer reviewers? d. Does the RP list points of contact at the home district and the lead CX for inquiries about the RP?	Appendix B, Para 4d EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4e EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4h EC 1105-2-410, Appendix B, Para 4a	b. Yes ☐ No ☐ c. Yes ☐ No ☐ d. Yes ☐ No ☐ **Comments:**
11. Does the RP address coordination with the appropriate Centers of Expertise?	EC 1105-2-410, Para 8a	Yes ☐ No ☐
a. Does it state if the project is single or multi-purpose? Single ☐ Multi ☐ b. Does it identify the lead CX for peer review? c. If multi-purpose, has the lead CX coordinated the review of the RP with the other CXs as appropriate?	 EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 3c	a. Yes ☐ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐ c. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☐ **Comments:**
12. Does the RP address coordination with the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) in Walla Walla District for ATR of cost estimates, construction schedules and contingencies for all documents requiring Congressional authorization?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 3	Yes ☐ No ☐
a. Does it state if the decision document will require Congressional authorization? b. If Congressional authorization is required, does the state that coordination will occur with the Cost Engineering DX?		a. Yes ☐ No ☐ b. Yes ☐ No ☐ n/a ☐ **Comments:**
13. Other Considerations: This checklist highlights the minimum requirements for an RP based on EC 1105-2-410. Additional factors to consider in preparation of the RP include, but may not be limited to: a. Is a request from a State Governor or the head of a Federal or state agency to	 EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D,	**Comments:**

conduct IEPR likely?	Para 1b	
b. Is the home district expecting to submit a waiver to exclude the project study from IEPR?	EC 1105-2-410, Appendix D, Para 1d	
c. Are there additional Peer Review requirements specific to home MSC or district (as described in the Quality Management Plan for MSC or the district)?		
d. Are there additional Peer Review needs unique to the project study?		
Additional Comments:		