

APPENDIX A

PLAN FORMULATION

A.1

DECISION MANAGEMENT PLAN

**Decision Management Plan
Milestone 3 – Agency Decision Milestone
For
American River Common Features, California
General Reevaluation Report**



February 2015

**Decision Management Plan
Milestone 3 – Agency Decision Milestone
for
American River Common Features, California
General Reevaluation Report**

Contents

Planning Decision to Be Made.....	1
Sequence of Events Required.....	1
Criteria for Deciding.....	1
Decision Makers.....	2
Schedule for Decision.....	2
Decision Summary.....	2

Planning Decision to Be Made

This Decision Management Plan addresses moving the American River Common Features Project from the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) Milestone to the Agency Decision Milestone (ADM). The TSP Milestone was successfully completed on 2 May 2014 with vertical concurrence on the selection of the TSP. The ADM is a decision milestone where a headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (HQUSACE) Senior Leader Panel will be asked to endorse the recommended plan and approve the way forward for feasibility-level design. The majority of the ADM discussion will focus on the study and project risks that are being carried forward in the study or that have arisen since the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) Milestone meeting.

After discussions, the Panel will make a recommendation on the endorsement of the recommended plan and path forward to completion of the study (the schedule, scope, and cost of the feasibility level analysis phase). A majority vote by the Panel is needed to proceed.

Sequence of Events Required

The following events will need to be completed to accomplish the goals of Milestone #3:

1. Finalize Draft General Reevaluation Report (GRR) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/ Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
2. Undergo concurrent technical, legal, and policy reviews to obtain permission to release for public review
3. Undergo public review
4. Consider all review comments, conducting IPRs as necessary, and update Decision Log, as needed
5. Update Risk Register, including project study issue checklist
6. Update the team's process documents as needed
7. Prepare and submit RAH for Agency Decision Milestone

Criteria for Deciding

The following criteria will aid in making the decision to accept the proposed TSP and release the draft integrated feasibility report for review:

- A. The analyses in the draft report and the recommendations as a result of the concurrent reviews are compliant with policy
- B. There is a capable non-Federal sponsor ready to support project implementation

Decision Makers

Panel of senior HQUSACE leaders chaired by the DCG-CEO will determine whether the selected plan should be endorsed

Schedule for Decision

Milestone#2 - TSP Milestone	May 2014
Document Released for Concurrent Reviews	February 2015
OEO Delivers Preliminary Final IEPR Report	May 2015
PDT Coordinates Comment Responses	June 2015
Final IEPR Report	June 2015
Milestone#3 – Agency Decision Milestone	July 2015

Decision Summary

(to be completed when decision is made)

A.2

DECISION LOG

AMERICAN RIVER COMMON FEATURES GRR DECISION LOG

ID	Topic	Description/Discussion	Trigger Event	Resolved	Date Resolved	Resolution/Discussion	Required Action
1	Concurrent ATR, IEPR, Policy and Public Review	In an effort to streamline the study schedule, reviews were aligned concurrently.	20 July 2012 IPR <i>(Frentzen)</i>	X	20 July 2012 IPR	Vertical coordination was conducted to ensure efficiency of review and calibrate expectations. District will send the package to DST for completeness check 3 business days prior to submission to HQ.	None
2	Variance for Vegetation ETL conducted during PED	Under planning modernization, variance process doesn't fit with the study phase. Normally, study would not initiate variance until after the tentatively recommended plan is identified at the AFB, which is too late in the study phase under 3x3x3. Variance could take up to 1 year and funding is limited. The level of detail needed for the variance is not appropriate in the study phase.	20 July 2012 IPR <i>(Conforti)</i>	X	20 July 2012 IPR	SPK needs a high level of certainty that the variance will be approved in order to get the Resource Agencies on board with the TSP. Need HQ to do the national-level socializing on 3x3x3 to ensure the success of this approach. Variance would only be requested for certain segments where it would apply. The designs must meet Corps standards but also comply with NEPA & ESA.	None
3	Engineering rationale for development of variance in PED	The analysis during the study phase would include identification of the tree species, size, root ball size, scour potential if tree were to fall, increase in seepage gradient, reduction in stability factor of safety, and conclusions regarding rationale for variance approval.	20 July 2012 IPR <i>(Conforti)</i>	X	25 July 2012 IPR	Develop Cross sections to help scope the level of Engineering Analysis appropriate for the study phase to determine if a variance is necessary and to support the development of the variance in PED. Review these cross sections with Kevin Holden.	None
4	Compliance with Vegetation ETL	Update: The State of California is in agreement with USACE and submitted a Letter of Intent (LOI) on 1-OCT-2013 to submit a System Wide Improvement Framework (SWIF) plan. The LOI was approved by HQUSACE on 14-MAY-2014, requiring the SWIF plan to be complete by 14-MAY-2016. Previous Decision: The State of California passed a resolution as part of the adoption of the CVFPP to publically announce that it will not implement the Corps' vegetation policy. Concern existed regarding whether or not the State sign on to the full set of Items of Local Cooperation to maintain levees that have been improved as part of the project in compliance with Corps policies.	20 July 2012 IPR <i>(Conforti)</i>		ongoing	Update: Focus has shifted to SWIF plan development. Previous Discussion: Senior level SPK management met with the State of California on several occasions to discuss the path forward. Topics of discussion included developing mutually acceptable solutions on a case by case basis upon identification of the TSP, at which point site specific parameters of the variance request would be known. The TSP was identified May 2, 2014. The PDT developed alternatives that did not take into account the State's position; however, the PDT did develop a broad enough array of identified USACE and State alternatives.	Coordination will continue.
5	Design Optimization	With planning modernization, the PDT will not be optimizing specific improvements, but must still identify the most cost effective solution.	20 July 2012 IPR <i>(Nicholson)</i>		ongoing	Optimization of benefits, costs, B/C ratio and net benefits would occur during the study phase but design refinements, based on specific site conditions would occur in PED.	Benefits and Costs have been developed and support optimization of the alternatives, leading to identification of the NED.
6.	Cost of ETL compliance	For sections of levees where active construction will take place to reduce seepage and stability problems, clearing and grubbing of vegetation on the levee within the construction footprint will remove the non-compliant vegetation as part of the project cost.	January 2013 <i>(PDT)</i>		ongoing	Per discussion with SPK Office of Counsel, the cost of compliance with the ETL within the construction footprint could be considered a cost-shared project cost. ETL compliance outside of the construction footprint would be a non-federal non-project cost.	Need vertical team concurrence.

ID	Topic	Description/Discussion	Trigger Event	Resolved	Date Resolved	Resolution/Discussion	Required Action
7.	Hydraulic Baseline	Update: For the TSP, for the widened Sacramento weir, operation will be based on the release from Folsom Dam being increased above 115,000 cfs. Previous Decision: The Sacramento Bypass Widening and I Street Control Structure alternatives would route more flows from the Sacramento and American Rivers into the Sacramento and Yolo Bypasses as compared to existing conditions.	March 2009 FSM	X	Update: Jan 2015 Previous Decision: March 2009 FSM	Update: Update: For the TSP, in order to minimize concerns in areas along and within the Yolo Bypass, the widened Sacramento Weir will be operated based on the release from Folsom Dam. Specifically, the new weir will be utilized when the release from Folsom Dam is increased above the current objective release of 115,000 cfs. Previous Discussion: The PGM from the 2009 FSM conference provides direction that the need for hydraulic mitigation should be determined within the context of the net impacts of the combined Common Features and Folsom modifications (PGM, page 1-15). Therefore, the water surface elevation that existed before any Common Features or Folsom improvements were implemented will be used to evaluate hydraulic impacts.	None
8.	Upstream Detention	Consideration of upstream detention near Auburn as an alternative.	Vertical Team	X		Congress has authorized the downstream levee improvements in lieu of construction of Auburn Dam. Congressional Direction is adequate reason to not carry the alternative forward.	The alternative will be discussed and Congressional direction will be used as the reason for not carrying this alternative forward to the final array.
9.	Tentatively Selected Plan	Alternative 1 is the NED and Alternative 2 is the Locally Preferred Plan and the Tentatively Selected Plan. Approval to move forward to release Draft Feasibility Report for Public Review pending approval of the NED Waiver Request.	2 May 2014 (Tab Brown)	X	2 May 2014	Based on review of the American River Common Features GRR read ahead material and discussions at the TSP milestone conference Tab Brown endorsed Alternative 2 as the Locally Preferred Plan and Tentatively Selected Plan.	Move forward to release the Draft Feasibility Report for Public Review pending approval from the OASA(CW).

A.3

RISK REGISTER

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
Milestone	Risk Number	Date	Scoping Choice or Event	Risk and its cause	Risk Type	Consequence	Consequence rating	Evidence for Consequence rating	Likelihood rating	Evidence for likelihood rating	Uncertainty rating	Risk Rating	Risk Management Options	Conclusion/ Recommendation	POC	Affected Study Component
SMART milestone or IPR (for summary sheet only)	Id number	Date entry was last updated	This is the scoping choice (task, decision, problem, question, issue) or event (action, hazard or opportunity) that is to be managed.	Briefly identify the risk. Considering the entry in column D, what can go wrong as a result of the scoping choice or event and how can it happen?	Select: Study Risk (Analytical error, study delays, study cost increase, poor planning decision), Implementation Risk (schedule and cost of implementation, redesign), or Outcome Risk (hazard risk and project performance risk)	Describe the consequence of the column E risk. If things do "go wrong" in the way described what is the specific consequence for the study or project outcomes? (List the most significant consequence first if more than one.)	If the most significant consequence in column G occurs what is its potential magnitude?	Enter specific evidence used to support the consequence rating in column H. If relying on an event from a previous study, list study and date.	What is the likelihood that the most significant consequence in column G will occur?	Enter specific evidence used to support the likelihood rating in column J. If relying on an event from a previous study, list study and date.	How great is the uncertainty about either the consequence or likelihood of the risk identified in column E?	Qualitative risk rating from lookup table.	Enter options for reducing the risk and estimate time/cost impacts associated with the management option.	Identify any preferred recommendation for managing the risk. Tolerating the risk is the default option.	Name(s) of person(s) assessing the task and responsible for task	What other analyses of the study are affected by this risk? For example, what other analyses use outputs from the scoping choice as their input.
ADM	PF-01	21-Nov-14	Concurrent Reviews	New Guidance on HQ review time was added resulting in an increase to the overall schedule. Concurrent ATR, IEPR, Policy, & Public reviews	Study Risk	No reviews resulted in substantial changes that would require another public review. The Schedule and budget impacts have been captured and communicated	High	If decision later is to re-link the West Sac and ARCF schedule impacts would occur.	Low	Reviews not likely to require substantial changes to plan formulation	Low	Medium	Early and ongoing coordination with Vertical Team		A. Planner	
ADM	PF-02	21-Nov-14	Policy Comments	Risk from policy review comments discussing the relationship of this Project to ARCF.	Study Risk	If decision later is to re-link the West Sac and ARCF schedule impacts will occur.	High	If decision later is to re-link the West Sac and ARCF schedule impacts will occur.	Medium to High	This risk has resurfaced throughout the review process from pre-TSP Milestone and resulted in excessive delays and expenditures	Medium to High	High	Continued and ongoing coordination with Vertical Team		The PM and a Planner	
ADM	PF-03	21-Nov-14	Consideration of Upstream Storage alternative	Reviewers asking to have upstream storage evaluated as an alternative.	Study Risk	Congressional intent, reduce flood risk to Sacramento through modification to Folsom & addressing levee problems. No sponsor. Considered as a measure screened early due to congressional actions and un-implementable	High	The suggestion of upstream storage would lower water surface elevations; however, it would not lower them enough that the primary risk of through seepage would be alleviated	Medium	It is not likely that an error would occur	Medium	High	Has been evaluated as an alternative. Screened out because it wasn't efficient; still need to improve existing levees		A. Planner	
ADM	Env-01	21-Nov-14	NMFS Consultation	Depending on alternatives, footprints, will only know impacts on programmatic level	Study Risk	Programmatic level description- could result in additional mitigation at a later date.	High	Jeopardy opinion not likely, schedule delays as additional mitigation determined.	Low	Lack of staff and turnover impacts what can be accomplished at agencies	Medium	Medium	1. Early coordination 2. supplemental environmental document		A. Env. Planner	
ADM	Env-02	21-Nov-14	NMFS Consultation	ESA Consultation with NMFS due to their resource constraints. Communication with agency indicates a jeopardy opinion unlikely	Study Risk	Delays in the BO form NMFS could impact the schedule for the GRR and the 408 Projects.	Medium	Jeopardy opinion not likely, schedule delays are possible with delay of the BO	Medium	Lack of staff and turnover impacts what can be accomplished at agencies	Medium	Medium	Continued coordination between NMFS and USACE		A. Env. Planner	
ADM	CR-01	21-Nov-14	Undertake cultural resource surveys prior to PED	The "Madera Decision" means that the local sponsor could be open for litigation if CR inventories are not completed prior to finalization of the environmental document	Study Risk	Undertaking complete surveys for all project alternatives would be more costly than surveying for the selected alternative only. Conducting these surveys would be time consuming and could result in schedule delays. Costly delays from litigation for sponsors for CEQA compliance.	Medium	Other studies have been impact. Will conduct surveys during PED	Medium	Other studies have been impacted	Low	Medium	1. Coordination with SHPO, Native American Tribes 2. execution of predictive model 3. records and literature search 4. prepare Programmatic Agreement		A. Cultural Res. Specialist	
ADM	Eng-05	21-Nov-14	GeoTechnical Performance	Following USACE Guidance (ETL 1110-2-556) levee performance curves it's acknowledged that the geotechnical probability of poor performance is a conservative estimation likely overstating the risk of inundation.	Study Risk	While there is not updated guidance to resolve this, there are emerging ideas from the Risk Management Center regarding the state of practice.	Low	Our damage estimates are likely conservative because of curves. Awaiting updated guidance	Low	Only model approved to determine damages	Low	Low	Need to wait for updated model/guidance		A. Geotechnical Engineer	
ADM	CR-01	21-Nov-14	Undertake cultural resource surveys prior to PED	The "Madera Decision" means that the local sponsor could be open for litigation if CR inventories are not completed prior to the environmental document being final	Study Risk	Surveys for all project alternatives is more costly than surveying for only the selected alternative. Conducting these surveys is time consuming and could result in schedule delays. Litigation could result in delays for sponsors for CEQA compliance.	Medium		Medium		Low	Medium	1. Coordination with SHPO, Native American Tribes 2. execution of predictive model 3. records and literature search 4. prepare Programmatic Agreement			