



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20314-1000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

CECW-PC

26 March 04

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDERS, MAJOR SUBORDINATE COMMANDS

SUBJECT: Delegation of Approval Authority for Certain Post-Authorization Decision Documents

1. The enclosed EC 1165-2-205 is provided for immediate use. The authority delegated under this EC has been approved by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works).
2. This engineer circular reflects our responsibility and accountability to produce the highest quality products. It requires your direct oversight to ensure resources are available to provide an accountable process that will facilitate your approval of actions under this delegation. This EC provides checklists the project manager will use to ensure policy and legal compliance. In all cases, the checklists are designed to assure early vertical team coordination as issues arise. They require active participation by senior management to review and understand what they are signing. Fundamental to this process is a requirement that you ensure that the individual TAPES standards for officials involved in the review and approval process, at both the district and major subordinate command levels, reflect the corporate responsibility we have to adhere to policy and law.
3. For projects added by Congress, please ensure that your video tele-conference process addresses, at a minimum, the authority to proceed to a project cooperation agreement, the type of decision document that the project cooperation agreement (PCA) will be based on, the level of approval of the decision document and PCA, and the manner in which outstanding policy/legal issues will be resolved.
4. Preparation of this engineer circular considered and addressed USACE 2012 implementation requirements. Accordingly, EC 1165-2-205 is in full compliance with USACE 2012.
5. My point of contact on this action is Doug Lamont who can be reached by e-mail at douglas.w.lamont@HQ02.usace.army.mil or by phone at 202-761-8647.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Carl A. Strock".

CARL A. STROCK
Major General, USA
Director of Civil Works

Encl
EC 1165-2-205

CECW-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Washington, D.C. 20314-1000

Circular
No. 1165-2-205

31 March 2004

EXPIRES 31 March 2006
Water Resources Policies and Authorities
DELEGATION OF REVIEW AND APPROVAL AUTHORITY FOR
POST-AUTHORIZATION DECISION DOCUMENTS

1. **Purpose.** This circular provides guidance on the delegated review and approval of Post-Authorization Decision Documents. A post-authorization decision document is a report that would serve as the basis for construction funding, or in the case of congressional adds, the report to support the PCA.
2. **Applicability.** This circular applies to all HQUSACE elements, Major Subordinate Commands (MSC) and district commands having Civil Works responsibility. It does not apply to the Continuing Authorities Program. This EC does not rescind existing delegations of specific projects or programs previously provided by HQUSACE that allow District Commanders to approve certain post-authorization decision documents. Additionally, the guidance provided under those existing delegations is not affected by this EC.
3. **Distribution.** Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.
4. **References.**
 - a. ER 5-1-11, subject: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Project Management Business Process.
 - b. ER 405-1-12, subject: Real Estate Handbook
 - c. ER 1105-2-100, subject: Planning Guidance Notebook.
 - d. Memorandum, CECW-ZA, dated 19 December 2002, subject: Proposed Delegation of the Approval of Post-Authorization Decision Documents and Project Cooperation Agreements (PCAs).
 - e. Memorandum, CECW-ZA, dated 24 March 1999, subject: Delegation of Approval Authority for Post-Authorization Decision Documents (Rescinded, see paragraph 4. below)

EC 1165-2-205
31 March 2004

f. Memorandum, CECW-L/CECW-E, dated 17 November 1992, subject: Development and Approval Process for Project Cooperation Agreements.

g. Memorandum, CECW-A/CECW-B, dated 27 May 1997, subject: Decision Document and Project Cooperation Agreements for Congressional Adds for Specifically Authorized Projects.

5. Reference 4.e. is hereby rescinded. Effective 19 March 2004, review and approval authority of post-authorization decision documents that are in accordance with law and policy are delegated to the MSCs with the exception of dam safety reports and any reports requiring action by the Chief of Engineers, Secretary of the Army (acting through the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works (ASA(CW)) or specific congressional modification. This approval authority would include any decision document that has all policy issues resolved through coordination with the vertical team, which includes OASA(CW) (Project Planning & Review). Further delegation by the MSC is not authorized.

6. The District Commanders are responsible for technical, policy and legal compliance. District Commanders will ensure that decision documents will be prepared with full multidisciplinary involvement in accordance with the Project Management Business Process (PMBP). The District Commanders are responsible for the preparation of decision documents utilizing the procedures and policies set forth in the references. The key to success is full compliance with all applicable laws, policies and regulations. It is critical that all policy and legal issues be identified, addressed and resolved early-on during the development of the decision document. District personnel must be knowledgeable of Civil Works policies and will prepare the enclosed Project Study Issue Checklist (Appendix A) early in the project development phase. Preparation of the Project Study Issue Checklist at the earliest stages in decision document development will facilitate identification and resolution of technical, policy and legal issues with the MSC and the vertical team (i.e. District, MSC, HQUSACE RIT, and OASA(CW)) as appropriate (Appendix B). When the decision document is ready to be forwarded for approval it will include the Decision Document Checklist (Appendix C). MSCs will ensure that the decision document addresses all items required by the Decision Document Checklist. Once all policy and legal issues have been identified through the use of Appendix A and coordinated and resolved through the vertical team, the MSC Commander is authorized to approve the post-authorization decision document. If unresolved issues remain, the report must be forwarded to HQUSACE for further action. The district/MSD Planning Chiefs are responsible for documenting policy quality control and quality assurance, respectively, and for ensuring the resolution of all policy and technical issues. District and MSD Counsel will be involved in documenting and ensuring legal sufficiency of decision documents.

7. The District Commanders are responsible for fully documenting technical, policy, and legal reviews and compliance of the decision document to the MSC. Delegated decision

documents will be forwarded to the MSC for review and approval. Non-delegated decision documents will be forwarded through the MSC to HQUSACE for review and approval by HQUSACE, ASA(CW) or Congress, as appropriate. The MSC transmittal will include a completed Project Study Issue Checklist and Decision Document Checklist. Consistent with this delegation, District Counsel will be required to include in the report a legal opinion documenting the authority for all post authorization changes and will continue to certify the legal sufficiency of all reports.

8. Division Commanders are responsible for ensuring technical, policy and legal compliance and approving delegated decision documents. Division Commanders will provide on-going technical, policy and legal compliance support. The MSC will establish decision document review procedures and processes that ensure high quality decision documents in accordance with technical, policy and legal requirements. Non-delegated decision documents will be forwarded to HQUSACE with the District Commander's documentation of technical, policy, and legal compliance and the MSC Commander's recommendations. Division Counsel will be responsible for reviewing and providing written concurrence with all District Counsel opinions.

9. Procedure.

a. District Responsibilities. The district will:

(1) Prepare and forward the Project Study Issue Checklist (Appendix A) through the MSC to HQUSACE during the development of a project. During the early study phase (i.e., within the first 3 months of initiation to identify potential technical, policy, or legal issues and when the recommended plan is identified) or similar project development phase, the district will forward the Project Study Issue Checklist through the MSC to HQUSACE to ensure upward reporting of potential policy sensitive issues for resolution through the vertical team, MSC, HQUSACE, and OASA(CW).

(2) Based on vertical team assistance facilitated through preparation of the Project Study Issue Checklist, develop and finalize the decision document and the Decision Document Checklist.

(3) Forward the decision document and the final Decision Document Checklist to the MSC with the request for approval of the decision document. The District's request for approval will include the District Commander's documentation of technical, policy and legal compliance of the report, including the Independent Technical Review (ITR) documentation showing resolution of all issues, in the transmittal to the MSC Commander.

b. MSC Responsibilities. The MSC will:

EC 1165-2-205

31 March 2004

(1) Review and approve/certify the Project Study Issue Checklist from the district and facilitate resolution of outstanding issues with HQUSACE and OASA(CW), as appropriate.

(2) Review the Decision Document Checklist and delegated decision documents. In the approval of the delegated decision document, the MSC Commander will certify that the project report meets technical, policy and legal compliance with an affirmative statement. The entire district and MSC documentation record will be placed in the MSC files for audit purposes. Please note that if ASA(CW) is to sign a PCA based upon a MSC approved delegated decision document, then a copy of the approved Decision Document, together with the Decision Document Checklist, must accompany the PCA.

(3) Forward non-delegated decision documents to HQUSACE for review and ASA(CW) approval as appropriate. The transmittal will include the District Commander's documentation of technical, policy and legal compliance, ITR documentation, all appropriate checklists, and MSC Commander's recommendations from a quality assurance perspective.

10. Accountability. Each MSC will institute internal audit procedures for delegated approval of post-authorization decision documents. Spot inspections may be conducted in conjunction with other HQUSACE staff visits.

a. Project Study Issue Checklists. The Project Study Issue Checklist and Decision Document Checklist are required and must be completed and signed on every Project before the Post-authorization Decision Document can be approved. Until all the issues in the checklist have been resolved, the MSC cannot approve the Decision Document. In such instances where there are unresolved issues, the Decision Document must be submitted for HQUSACE and/or OASA(CW) approval as appropriate. Checklists are also required for Post-authorization Decision Documents requiring action by HQUSACE, OASA(CW), or Congress.

b. Internal Audits: Each MSC has an on-going oversight role in addition to their approval role for delegated decision documents. On a fiscal year basis, each MSC Commander will report to HQUSACE each Post-authorization Decision Document approved under delegated authority the previous year and perform a compliance assessment of use of delegated authority to approve Post-authorization Decision Documents. The report will identify any Post-authorization Decision Documents intended for delegated authority approval which did not qualify and the reason delegated authority approval was not appropriate. The assessment should address lessons learned and any corrective actions needed in order to foster intra-MSC and HQUSACE process improvements, nationwide. The report and the results of these audits will be reported to HQUSACE within 60 days of the end of the fiscal year. HQUSACE will forward the report to OASA(CW).

c. **OASA(CW) Audits.** Based on the results of the Corps audit, OASA(CW) may identify a selected number of projects and ask that the entire approval package (i.e., the decision document, ITR, review documentation, legal certification, checklists, and all approvals) be forwarded to OASA(CW) for a review to ensure the appropriate use of the delegation authority.

d. **List/Records.**

(1) **List of Post-authorization Decision Documents to be approved.** Each MSC will provide a list of Post-authorization Decision Documents each district anticipates to be approved under delegated authority during the FY within 60 days of the budget being approved to the appropriate HQUSACE RIT and OASA(CW). This list will specifically identify the Post-authorization Decision Document that each district intends to approve under delegated authority during that fiscal year. This list will include the date of the approval of the original decision document, who approved (MSC, Chief, ASA(CW) or Congress) the document and the date it was approved, and the proposed date of approval of the Post-authorization Decision Document.

(2) **Records.** The division will maintain a file on each Post-authorization Decision Document approved under delegated authority. This file will document all actions and contain all component items supporting the Post-authorization Decision Document package including signed approvals of the Post-authorization Decision Document, and the original decision document the Post-authorization Decision Document is based upon. This includes all accompanying documentation relevant to the decision including all checklists, resolutions, and other pertinent information.

e. **An Audit Team of CECW personnel may perform audits of MSC files on Post-authorization Decision Documents approved under delegated authority during staff visits to the MSC.**

f. **The Engineer Inspector General may be requested to conduct periodic, independent spot checks of MSC activities under the delegated authority procedures.**

FOR THE COMMANDER:



CARL A. STROCK
Major General, USA
Director of Civil Works

3 Appendices
App A - Project Study
 Issue Checklist
App B - Post-Authorization Report Process
App C- Decision Document
 Checklist

Appendix A

PROJECT STUDY ISSUE CHECKLIST

Sensitive Policy Areas Which Require Vertical Team Coordination with MSC/HQUSACE to Washington: (Issues not previously accounted for in an Administration approved Feasibility/Chiefs Report)

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name: (State, County, River Basin/Waterbody under Study)

Project Description: (Need project description with general details, such as a fact sheet attached--if project is the same as authorization attach a summary, if different provide a description of what differs from original authorization, the authorizing language, and dimensions to give perspective of the change in scope and scale. If there was an authorizing report, what level approved it—i.e., OMB, ASA(CW), HQUSACE (include date of approval). If no prior reports, give a more detailed description.)

Cost Sharing: (Describe the cost sharing for the project to be constructed. Describe whether the cost sharing follows general law or if there is other special cost sharing for the project)

1. Has a NEPA document been completed?

Response: YES ____ NO __*

Remarks:

2. Will the NEPA Documentation be more than 5 years old at the time of PCA signing or construction initiation?

Response: YES * ____ NO ____

Remarks:

3. Will the ESA Findings be more than 3 years old at the time of PCA signing or construction initiation? [Note: Findings refers to Corps documentation and/or US Fish and Wildlife Service's opinions and recommendations]

Response: YES * ____ NO ____

Remarks:

* Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.

4. Is ESA coordination complete?

Response: YES ___ NO ___ *

Remarks:

5. If an EIS/EA was completed for the project, has the Record of Decision/Finding of No Significant Impact been signed?

Response: YES ___ NO ___ *

Remarks:

6. Is the proposed project consistent with the ROD/FONSI?

Response: YES ___ NO ___ *

Remarks:

7. Have there been any changes in Federal environmental laws or Administration or Corps policy since original project authorization that make updating necessary? [e.g., change to the Clean Air Act status for the project area...going from attainment to non-attainment]

Response: YES * ___ NO ___

Remarks:

8. Is there a mitigation plan?

Response: a. Fish and Wildlife: YES ___ * ___ NO ___
b. Flood Damage: YES ___ * ___ NO ___
c. Cultural and Historic Preservation: YES ___ * ___ NO ___
d. Recreation: YES ___ * ___ NO ___

Remarks: [If yes, identify and describe what is being mitigated and cost shared. Describe the authority for the cost sharing.]

9. Are the mitigation plan(s) that are now being proposed the same as the authorized plan?

Response: a. Fish and Wildlife YES ___ NO ___ *
d. Flood Damage YES ___ NO ___ *
e. Cultural and Historic Preservation YES ___ NO ___ *
f. Recreation YES ___ NO ___ *

Remarks:

* Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.

10. Is there an incremental analysis/cost effectiveness analysis of the fish and wildlife mitigation features based on an approved method and using an accepted model?

Response: YES _____ NO _____*

Remarks:

11. Is it expected that the project's fully funded cost would exceed the cost limit of Section 902 of WRDA 1986? [Note: for hurricane and storm damage reduction projects there are two separate 902 limits, one for initial project construction and one for periodic renourishment]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks: [In this section provide the authorized project cost, price level, and current and fully funded project cost estimates and price levels]

12. Does the project involve HTRW clean-up?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

13. Does the work involve CERCLA covered materials?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

14. Are the project purposes now being proposed different than the authorized project? [Note: different than specifically noted in authorization or noted in Chief's report and is it measured by project outputs]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

15. Are there any proposed scope changes to the authorized project? [Reference: ER 1105-2-100]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks: [Describe the authority that would enable the project to proceed without additional Congressional modification]

* Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.

16. Is Non-Federal work-in-kind included in the project? [Note: Credit to a non-Federal sponsor for work-in-kind must be based upon having an existing authority. Need to identify the authority and if not a general authority such as Sec 215, provide a copy of the authority.]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____
Remarks:

17. Does project have work-in-kind authority? [Note: If there is no existing authority, as determined in conjunction with District Counsel, the only other vehicle is to propose work-in-kind and rationale in the decision document and submit to HQUSACE for specific Congressional authorization.]

Response: YES _____ NO _____*
Remarks:

18. Are there multiple credit authorities (e.g., Sec. 104 & 215) including LERRDs, Work-In-Kind and Ability to Pay? [Note: See App. B of ER 1165-2-131. Describe the authority for work-in-kind and if authority exists, the PM should submit a completed App. B through the vertical team.]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____
Remarks:

19. Is an Ability to Pay cost sharing reduction included in the proposed project? [If yes, fully describe the proposal, citing how this authority is applicable. Include a table showing the cost sharing by project purpose and expected Ability to Pay reductions.]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____
Remarks:

20. Is the recommended plan different from the NED plan? [Note: if this answer is yes, then a series of questions arise that will need to be addressed in the Remarks section...is plan less costly than NED plan, is the plan more costly with the same cost sharing as NED plan (exception), is plan more costly with all costs exceeding the cost of the NED plan at 100% non-Federal cost, or has ASA(CW) already granted an exception]

Response: YES* _____ NO _____
Remarks:

21. Was a standard accepted Corps methodology/model used to calculate NED benefits?

Response: YES _____ NO _____*
Remarks:

*** Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

22. Are there non-standard benefit categories? [Reference ER 1105-2-100].

Response: YES NO

Remarks:

NAVIGATION COMPONENT (INLAND OR HARBOR)

23. Is there a navigation component in the project?

Response: YES NO

(If Yes, answer each of the following questions)

24. Is there land creation?

Response: YES NO

Remarks:

25. Is there a single owner and/or beneficiary which is not a public body? [Public body as defined by Section 221 of WRDA 1970]

Response: YES NO

Remarks:

26. Are there proposals for Federal cost sharing of Local Service Facilities [e.g., dredging of non-Federal berthing areas] work?

Response: YES NO

Remarks:

27. Is there sediment remediation proposed under Sec. 312 authority? [i.e., Section 312 of WRDA 1990 as amended by Section 205 of WRDA 1996]

Response: YES NO

Remarks:

28. Is there dredged material placement on beaches where the use is not the least costly environmentally acceptable plan?

Response: YES NO

Remarks:

*** Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

EC 1165-2-205
31 March 2004

29. Will the dredged material be used for ecosystem restoration where the recommended plan is not the least costly environmentally acceptable plan?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

30. Does the project have recreation navigation benefits?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

31. Does the project involve inland navigation harbor development?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

32. Can the resale or lease of lands used for disposal of excavated material recover the cost of the improvements?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

33. Will acquisition of land outside the navigation servitude be necessary for construction of the improvements (either the project or non-Federal facilities that will use or benefit from the project) and will this permit local entities to control access to the project. [The latter case is assumed to exist where the proposed improvement consists of a new channel cut into lands.]

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION COMPONENT

34. Is there a flood damage reduction component in the project?

Response: YES NO

(If Yes, answer each of the following questions)

35. Is the project for protection of a single property or beneficiary?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

*** Response where a “*” requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

36. Is the project producing land development opportunities/benefits? [If land creation benefits are expected to occur, describe whether special cost sharing should apply.]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

37. Is there any recommendation to cost share any interior drainage facilities?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

38. Are there any windfall benefits that would accrue to the project sponsor or other parties? [If windfall benefits are expected to occur, describe whether special cost sharing should apply.]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

39. Are there non-structural buyout or relocation recommendations?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks: [If yes list the authority and describe what is proposed]

40. Are the reallocation studies likely to change the existing allocated storage in lake projects ?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION COMPONENT

41. Is there a Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction component in the project?

Response: YES _____ NO _____

[If Yes, answer each of the following questions]

42. Does the project provide for protection of privately owned shores?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

*** Response where a “*” requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

43. Does the project provide for protection of undeveloped lands?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____
Remarks:

44. Does the project provide for protection of Federally owned shoreline at Federal cost?
[If yes, describe what is to be protected and who bears the federal cost.]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____
Remarks:

45. Does the project involve tidal or fluvial flooding, i.e. is it clear what the project purpose is and has the project been formulated as a hurricane and storm damage reduction project or flood damage reduction project?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____
Remarks:

46. Is there any recommendation to cost share any interior drainage facilities?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____
Remarks:

47. Is recreation > 50% of total project benefits needed to justify the project?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____
Remarks:

48. Are there any parking or public access issues [no public access or none provided within 1/2 mile increments]?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____
Remarks:

49. Are easements being provided to ensure public use and access?

Response: YES _____ NO * _____ NA _____
Remarks:

50. Is there a Sec. 934 of WRDA 1986 extension of the period of authorized Federal participation?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____
Remarks:

*** Response where a “*” requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

51. Are there any Sec. 111 of Rivers and Harbors Act of 1958, as amended proposals?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION COMPONENT

52. Is there an ecosystem restoration component of the project?

Response: YES NO

(If Yes, answer each of the following questions)

53. Has the project been formulated using cost effectiveness and incremental analysis techniques?

Response: YES NO *

Remarks:

54. Was "IWR Plan" used to do cost effectiveness/incremental analysis?

Response: YES NO *

Remarks:

55. Are all the benefits aquatic?

Response: YES NO *

Remarks:

56. Is the project purpose for restoration of cultural or historic resources as opposed to ecosystem restoration?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

57. Is there mitigation authorized or recommended?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

58. Are there recommendations for other than restoring a degraded ecosystem [e.g., creating new habitat where it has never been]?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

*** Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

EC 1165-2-205
31 March 2004

59. Has the significance of the habitat been clearly identified? [Note: Under Remarks, describe the basis for determining the significance.]

Response: YES _____ NO ___*

Remarks:

60. Has the restoration project been formulated for biological/habitat values? As opposed to, for example, water quality.

Response: YES _____ NO ___*

Remarks:

61. Is the project on non-public lands?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

62. Does the project involve land acquisition where value > 25% of total project cost?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

63. Are all the proposed recreation features in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix E, Exhibit E-3?

Response: YES _____ NO ___*

Remarks:

64. Are there recommendations to include water quality improvement?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

65. Is the monitoring & adaptive management period proposal beyond 5 years after completion of construction?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

*** Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

66. Does the proposal involve land acquisition in other than fee title?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

67. Are there recommendations for non-native species?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

68. Does the project propose the use of navigation servitude?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

RECREATION COMPONENT

69. Is there a recreation component as part of the project?

Response: YES NO

(If Yes, answer each of the following questions)

70. Is the cost of proposed recreation development > 10 % of the Federal project cost without recreation, [except for nonstructural flood damage reduction and hurricane and storm damage projects]?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks: [Describe the proposal and whether ASA(CW) approval has been granted.]

71. Are there recreation features located on other than project lands?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

72. Does the project involve/provide for waterfront development?

Response: YES * NO

Remarks:

*** Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

EC 1165-2-205
31 March 2004

73. Does the project involve the need to reallocate authorized storage [Sec III, App E, ER 1105-2-100]?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

74. Does the project include non-standard recreation facilities? [refer to ER 1105-2-100, Appendix E, Exhibit E-2]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

WATER SUPPLY COMPONENT

75. Is there a water supply component as part of the project?

Response: YES _____ NO _____

(If Yes, answer each of the following questions)

76. Does the project use non-standard pricing for reallocated storage?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

77. Are there exceptions to model contract/agreement language?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

* Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.

CONCURRENCE

Project Manager

Date: _____

Chief, Planning Division

Date: _____

District Counsel

Date: _____

DDE (PM)

Date: _____

Planning and Policy CoP (MSC)

Date: _____

MSC Counsel

Date: _____



US Army Corps
of Engineers

Summary of Post-Authorization Report Process

(refer to EC 1165-2-205 for complete description)

- ASA(CW):
 - No change, would continue to review/approve post-authorization reports requiring ASA(CW) or Congressional action
 - Interact early with HQs in setting course for Congressional Adds (i.e., document type, issues, report approval level) and reports with policy-sensitive matters

HQUSACE:

- Delegates review/approval to MSC of all post-authorization reports, except— those requiring action by Chief, ASA(CW), Congress, or having policy-sensitive issues
- Coordinates policy-sensitive issues through the Vertical Team (including OASA(CW))
- Reviews policy-sensitive reports and reports requiring action by the Chief/ASA(CW)/Congress

MSC:

- MSC Commander reviews/approves delegated post-authorization reports
- Identifies/refers policy-sensitive reports to HQs
- Certifies policy/legal compliance
- Refers/coordinates policy-sensitive issues thru the Vertical Team

District:

- District Commander documents policy/legal compliance; includes legal analysis on post-authorization changes
- Identifies/refers policy-sensitive issues to MSC early in the process

h. Date of Latest Economic Analysis:

i. Current Economics: BCR @ % FY (Note: list period of analysis)
RBRCR na, % FY

III. COST SHARING SUMMARY:

Purpose (s)	Non- Fed Cash	Non-Fed LERRD	Non-Fed Const. Credit	Total Non-Fed Share	Federal Share (%)	Total Project Cost
-------------	------------------	------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

Total

- a. Projected Credit for Section 215 Work and Date 215 Agreement Signed:
- b. Projected Credit for Section 104 or Other Authorized Creditable Work and Date Work Approved by ASA(CW) or Agreement Addressing Work Signed:
- c. Annual Non-Fed OMRR&R Costs (1 Oct FY Price Levels):

IV. FUNDING HISTORY

- a. Appropriations History for Project/Separable Element:

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Budget Amount</u>	<u>Appropriated Amount</u>
--------------------	----------------------	----------------------------

V. CERTIFICATION FOR DELEGATED DECISION DOCUMENTS: YOU MUST ANSWER "YES" TO ALL OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS TO APPROVE THE DECISION DOCUMENT UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY.

- a. PROJECT PLAN

Has the project study issue checklist been completed and all issues resolved? Yes No
(Note: Is the project the same as contained in the project report supporting authorization; if not, is it within the 902 limit, who has the authority to allow the change by regulation ... district, division, Chief, Congress)

Does the non-Federal sponsor concur in the project plan as submitted? Yes No

Has project plan as submitted been reviewed and concurred in by the non-Federal sponsor's counsel?

Yes No

b. AUTHORITY

Has authority been delegated to the MSC for approval of the project report?

Yes No

Is authority adequate to complete the project as proposed? — Yes No

c. POLICY/LEGAL/TECHNICAL COMPLIANCE

Has the District Counsel reviewed and approved the decision document for legal sufficiency? Yes (Certification included in decision document package submittal) — No

Have all aspects of ITR been completed with no unresolved issues remaining?

Yes No

Has the District Commander documented policy/legal/technical compliance of the decision document? Yes No

Has the MSC certified the policy/legal/technical compliance of the decision document?

Yes No

EC 1165-2-205
31 March 2004

VI. AUTHENTICATION:

Project Manager	Date:
Chief, Planning Div	Date:
District Counsel	Date:
DDE (PM)	Date:
District Commander	Date:
Planning and Policy CoP (MSC)	Date:
MSC Counsel	Date:
MSC Commander	Date: