

REVIEW PLAN

March 2021

Project Name: Honey Creek Aquatic (Section 206) Ecosystem Restoration, City of Wauwatosa, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin

P2 Number: 404209

Decision Document Type: Feasibility Report

Project Type: Ecosystem Restoration

District: Detroit (LRE)/Chicago (LRC)

District Contact: Mike Allis PM Micheal.K.Allis@usace.army.mil (313) 226-2225 or Nicole Toth PM Nicole.L.Toth@usace.army.mil (312) 846-5517

Major Subordinate Command (MSC): LRD

Review Management Organization (RMO): Planning Office Detroit District

RMO Contact: Nick Zager Nicholas.J.Zager@usace.army.mil (313) 226-3394

Key Review Plan Dates

Date of RMO Endorsement of Review Plan: March 2015

Date of MSC Approval of Review Plan: March 2015

Date of IEPR Exclusion Approval: N/A

Has the Review Plan changed since PCX Endorsement? No

Date of Last Review Plan Revision: April 2021

Date of Review Plan Web Posting: April 2015

Date of Congressional Notifications: N/A

Milestone Schedule

	Scheduled	Actual	Complete
Federal Interest Determination:	<i>(13 Sep 2013)</i>	<i>(16 Jun 2014)</i>	<i>(Yes)</i>
Tentatively Selected Plan:	<i>(enter date)</i>	<i>(enter date)</i>	<i>(Yes/No)</i>
Release Draft Report to Public:	<i>(enter date)</i>	<i>(enter date)</i>	<i>(Yes/No)</i>
Commanders Briefing:	<i>(enter date)</i>	<i>(enter date)</i>	<i>(Yes/No)</i>

Project Fact Sheet: N/A

Project Name: Honey Creek (Section 206) Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, City of Wauwatosa, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin

Location: Wauwatosa, Wisconsin

Authority: Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration project decision document developed under Section 206, Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1996, as amended.

Sponsor: Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District

Type of Study: Feasibility

SMART Planning Status: N/A

Project Area: Honey Creek is a small subwatershed (11 square miles) of the larger Menomonee River watershed, located in southeast Wisconsin in the Milwaukee metropolitan area. The Honey Creek drainage area resides in a highly-urbanized area which includes paved streets, curbs and gutters, and attendant storm sewers that convey stormwater runoff to Honey Creek. Despite being a small sub-watershed, the Creek remains perennial. Honey Creek flows primarily in a northerly direction for a distance of approximately 8.8 miles, until joining the mainstem of the Menomonee River, at approximately 72nd Street, in the City of Wauwatosa (**Figure 1**).

Problem Statement: Human activity over the past two centuries has altered the geomorphology, hydrology, hydraulics, sediment transport, groundwater recharge/discharge, soils and plant communities historically present within the watershed, floodplain and river channel of Honey Creek. These modifications have subsequently caused structural habitat degradation, fragmentation, pollution and invasive species issues, all of which are intertwined. Although common animal species such as beaver, fox, coyote and residential city birds are frequently observed in these ruderal (human induced) thicket habitats, alterations to the system have significantly reduced species richness, abundance and distribution of native plant and animal assemblages, and suppressed biodiversity as a whole.

Federal Interest: There is Federal Interest in this study since it affords ecosystem restoration benefits consistent with the goals of a CAP Section 206 Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration project. The cost of restorative solutions ranges from 3.5 to 14.0 million dollars.

Risk Identification: Overall, there is very low risk associated with the restoration alternatives not performing as predicted and the ecosystem restoration of Honey Creek does not pose a significant threat the human life or the environment. Sufficient investigations to the level of project complexity were performed to ensure that the restored aquatic habitat and plant communities would succeed and be sustained, are informed by (a) lessons learned from constructed similar plant restoration projects (i.e. Underwood Creek 506, Menomonee River 506), and (b) designing native plant communities to the target hydrology and geomorphology, instead of planting communities not appropriate for the location and characteristics of the site.

1. FACTORS AFFECTING THE LEVELS OF REVIEW

Scope of Review. The Honey Creek (Section 206) Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration project is similar to other small urban restoration projects and is well suited to development under the Section 206 authority. As such, the programmatic CAPO Review Plan model and level of review is ideally suited for this project.

The greatest challenge to providing aquatic ecosystem restoration for Honey Creek will be developing effective measures that will produce benefits that far outweigh the cost. Identifying the resources/species upon which to measure that benefit is of major importance. Another challenge to developing the stream measures will be accurately determining the likely response of the resources to the proposed measures. It is anticipated that this study will not be unique, controversial, or precedent setting, nor will it have significant national importance. This project is considered to have low overall risk and health and human safety factors are minimal.

This project study does not require an IEPR and will not include an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), since the PDT has determined that the study/project:

- does not involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance due to the type of project it is and the relatively small amount of water that is impacted by the project; is not expected to be controversial; is not expected to create any public dispute as to the size, nature or effects of the project, based on the type of project that it is and its relatively small size;
- is not expected to have any public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project. The Non-Federal Sponsor, the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD), has partnered with LRE on several Milwaukee area projects, including an ongoing ecosystem restoration project downstream of the Honey Creek study area;
- will not generate a request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts;
- is not expected to have adverse impacts on scarce or unique cultural or historic or Tribal resources.
- Further, the information in the decision document or anticipated project design is not likely to be based on novel methods, involve the use of innovative materials or techniques, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices, because of the simple and small nature of the project.
- The project design is not anticipated to require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule because of the simple and straight-forward nature of the project.
- The estimated cost is less than \$200 million dollars.

2. REVIEW PLAN EXECUTION

This section describes each level of review to be conducted. Based upon the factors discussed in Section 1, and, in accordance with EC 1165-2-217, this study will undergo the following types of reviews:

District Quality Control. All decision documents (including data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) will undergo DQC. This internal review process covers basic planning, science and engineering work products. It fulfils the project quality requirements of the Project Management Plan.

Agency Technical Review. ATR is to be performed by a qualified team from outside the home District that is not involved in the day-to-day production of the project/product. These teams will be comprised of certified USACE personnel. The ATR Team Lead, in coordination with the Review Management Organization (RMO), will be from outside the home MSC. If significant life safety issues are involved in a study or project, a Safety Assurance Review should be conducted during ATR.

Independent External Peer Review. Type I IEPR may be required for decision documents under certain circumstances. This is the most independent level of review and is applied in cases that meet criteria where the risk and magnitude of the project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of USACE is warranted. A risk-informed decision is made as to whether Type I IEPR is appropriate.

Cost Engineering Review. All decision documents shall be coordinated with the Cost Engineering Mandatory Center of Expertise (MCX). The MCX will assist in determining the expertise needed on the ATR and IEPR teams. The MCX will provide the Cost Engineering Certification. The RMO is responsible for coordinating with the MCX for the reviews. These reviews typically occur as part of ATR.

Model Review and Approval/Certification. EC 1105-2-412 mandates the use of certified or approved models for all planning work to ensure the models are technically and theoretically sound, compliant with USACE policy, computationally accurate, and based on reasonable assumptions.

Policy and Legal Review. All decision documents will be reviewed for compliance with law and policy. ER 1105-2-100, Appendix H provides guidance on policy and legal compliance reviews. These reviews culminate in determinations that report recommendations and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy, and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority by the home District Commander. These reviews are not further detailed in this section of the Review Plan.

a. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The home District Commander is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the CAP Programmatic Review Plan is appropriate for the specific project covered by the plan. The review plan is a living document and may change as the study progresses. The home District is responsible for keeping the review plan up to date. Minor changes to the review plan since the last approval are documented in Attachment 3. Significant changes to the review plan (such as changes

to the scope and/or level of review) should be re-approved by the District Commander following the process used for initially approving the plan. Significant changes may result in the District Commander determining that use of the CAP Programmatic Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-217 and Director of Civil Works' Policy Memorandum #1. The latest version of the review plan, along with the District Commander's approval memorandum, will be posted on the home District's webpage.

Table 1 provides the schedules and costs for reviews. The specific expertise required for the teams are identified in later subsections covering each review. These subsections also identify requirements, special reporting provisions, and sources of more information.

Table 1: Levels of Review *(Include a table listing each product, the review type, and review schedule and cost. Indicate if the review is complete.) (Update this table at each IPR and SMART Planning Milestone meeting and present it to the Vertical Team.)*

Product(s) to undergo review	Review Level	Start Date	End Date	Cost	Complete
Draft Feasibility Report and EA	District Quality Control	09/01/20	09/20/20	\$15,000	Yes
Draft Feasibility Report and EA	Agency Technical Review	10/01/20	11/01/20	\$32,000	Yes
Draft Feasibility Report and EA	Policy and Legal Review	11/09/20	02/09/21	N/A	Yes

NOTE: This table may also be used to identify future review work in follow-on phases of a project. This may include products prepared during the pre-construction engineering and design phase or products prepared as part of planning for the Operations and Maintenance phase of a project.

b. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL

The home District shall manage DQC and will appoint a DQC Lead to manage the local review (see EC 1165-2-217, section 8.a.1). The DQC Lead should prepare a DQC Plan and provide it to the RMO and MSC prior to starting DQC reviews. Table 2 identifies the required expertise for the DQC team.

Table 2: Required DQC Expertise

Table 2a. DQC Team Technical Disciplines and Expertise		
Technical Discipline	Peer DQC Reviewer	Chief Level DQC Reviewer
Plan Formulation	Each peer-level DQC reviewer will have no production role in the study/project and will have the necessary expertise/experience to thoroughly review the study products identified in Table (1).	Chief PLP
Economist		Chief H&H-HE
Civil Engineer		
Cost Estimator		Chief
Structural Engineer		
Mechanical Engineer		Chief
Real Estate Specialist		Chief
Biologist/Cultural Resources		Chief
Geotechnical Engineer		Chief
Hydraulic Engineer		Chief PLE
Environmental Engineer		

DQC Team Disciplines	Expertise Required
DQC Lead	A senior professional with extensive experience preparing Civil Works decision documents and conducting DQC. The lead may also serve as a reviewer for a specific discipline (such as planning, economics, environmental resources, etc).
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner, with special emphasis on ecosystem restoration studies.
Economic	The Economics Team member should have extensive experience with calculating Cost Effective (CE) and conducting an Incremental Cost Analysis (ICA) for restoration projects.
Environmental Resources	The team member should have extensive knowledge of the integration of environmental evaluation and compliance requirements, pursuant to national environmental statutes (NEPA), applicable executive orders and other Federal planning requirements, into the planning of Civil Works comprehensive plans and implementation projects. The team member should also have a thorough understanding of riverine restoration projects and any environmental software used for this project.
Hydraulic Engineering	Team member will have a thorough understanding of open channel dynamics in relation to ecosystem restoration projects, application of detention/retention basins and computer modeling

	techniques that will be used such as Hydrologic Engineering Center - River Analysis System (HEC-RAS).
Geotechnical Engineering	The Geotechnical Engineering reviewer should be a senior civil or geotechnical engineer with experience designing grading plans, bank-protection, excavation or modification, and habitat structures.
Civil Engineering	Team member will be knowledgeable in the art and science of ecosystem restoration projects, including the design of channels and detention ponds. Should also be a licensed Professional Engineer.
Cost Engineering	Team member should be familiar with the most recent version of Micro-Computer Aided Cost Estimating System II (MCACES II) software and total project cost summary. The Cost Reviewer should be either Walla Walla Cost DX staff or Cost Professional Pre-certified by the Cost DX and is required to coordinate with the Cost DX for further cost engineering review and resulting certification.
Real Estate	Team member(s) should have planning/appraisal/acquisition experience involving ecosystem restoration projects, including, (but not limited to) knowledge of estates to be acquired, induced flooding, zoning/buffer ordinances, and NFS acquisition responsibilities.
Climate Preparedness and Resiliency	The C-P-R review should be completed by a Certified C-P-R Reviewer, which may be conducted by one of the reviewers listed above, if they possess that certification

Documentation of ATR. DrChecks will be used to document all ATR comments, responses and resolutions. Comments should be limited to those needed to ensure product adequacy. If a concern cannot be resolved between the ATR team and PDT, it will be elevated to the vertical team for resolution using the EC 1165-2-217 Issue Resolution Process. Concerns can be closed in DrChecks by noting the concern has been elevated for resolution. The ATR Lead will prepare a Statement of Technical Review (see EC 1165-2-217, Section 9), for the draft and final reports, certifying that review issues have been resolved or elevated. ATR may be certified when all concerns are resolved or referred to the vertical team and the ATR documentation is complete.

****Recommended Best Planning Practice: All members of the ATR team should use the four-part comment structure (see EC 1165-2-217, Section 9(k)(1)).****

c. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

(i) Type I IEPR.

Type I IEPR is managed outside of the USACE and conducted on studies. Type I IEPR panels assess the adequacy and acceptability of the economic and environmental assumptions and projections, project evaluation data, economic analysis, environmental analyses, engineering analyses, formulation of alternative plans, methods for integrating risk and uncertainty, models used in the

evaluation of environmental impacts of proposed projects, and biological opinions of the project study.

Decision on Type I IEPR. The Honey Creek (Section 206) Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration project does not involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance due to the type of project it is and the relatively small amount of water that is impacted by the project; is not expected to be controversial; there is not an expectation that there will be any public dispute as to the size, nature or effects of the project, based on the type of project that it is and the relatively small size.

Products to Undergo Type I IEPR. Type I IEPR is not required and will not be conducted on the Honey Creek Section 206 Integrated Feasibility Report (IFR).

Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise. Panels will consist of independent, recognized experts from outside of the USACE in disciplines representing a balance of areas of expertise suitable for the review being conducted. Table 4 lists the required panel expertise.

Table 4: Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise

IEPR Panel Member Disciplines	Expertise Required
Economics (<i>an economist is required; the PDT may specify one or more specific disciplines for the panel – e.g. Navigation Economist and Agricultural Economist</i>)	<i>Add the specific experience/ credentials required for the reviewer.</i>
Environmental (<i>an env. member is required; the PDT may specify one or more specific disciplines for the panel—e.g. NEPA Compliance and Fisheries Biologist</i>)	<i>Add the specific experience/ credentials required for the reviewer.</i>
Engineering (<i>an engineer is required; the PDT may specify one or more disciplines for the panel</i>)	<i>Extensive experience in geotechnical evaluation of flood risk management structures such as slope stability.</i>
<i>Others (may include real estate, planning, construction)</i>	<i>Add the expertise required based on the study</i>

Documentation of Type I IEPR. The OEO will submit a final Review Report no later than 60 days after the end of the draft report public comment period. USACE shall consider all recommendations in the Review Report and prepare a written response for all recommendations. The final decision document will summarize the Review Report and USACE response and will be posted on the internet.

****Recommended Best Planning Practice:** Begin coordination with the RMO very early in the study to allow adequate time for scoping and contracting for the Type I IEPR.**

****Recommended Best Planning Practice:** Follow the Type I IEPR SOP, Appendix C, for step-by-step guidance on how to seek an IEPR exclusion. A copy of the SOP is available on the Planning Community Toolbox at:
<https://planning.erdc.dren.mil/toolbox/library/Misc/Type%20I%20IEPR%20SOP%20Final-2016.pdf> **

(ii) Type II IEPR.

The second kind of IEPR is Type II IEPR. These Safety Assurance Reviews are managed outside of the USACE and are conducted on design and construction for hurricane, storm and flood risk management projects or other projects where existing and potential hazards pose a significant threat to human life. A Type II IEPR Panel will be convened to review the design and construction activities before construction begins, and until construction activities are completed, and periodically thereafter on a regular schedule.

Decision on Type II IEPR. Type II IEPR is not required and will not be conducted on the Honey Creek Section 206 IFR.

c. MODEL CERTIFICATION OR APPROVAL

EC 1105-2-412 mandates the use of certified or approved models for all planning activities to ensure the models are technically and theoretically sound, compliant with USACE policy, computationally accurate, and based on reasonable assumptions. Planning models are any models and analytical tools used to define water resources management problems and opportunities, to formulate potential alternatives to address the problems and take advantage of the opportunities, to evaluate potential effects of alternatives and to support decision making. The use of a certified/approved planning model does not constitute technical review of a planning product. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR.

Table 5: Planning Models. The following models may be used to develop the decision document:

Table 3a. Planning Models		
Model Name and Version	Model Description and How It Will Be Used	Certification / Approval Status & Date
HEC-FDA 1.4.2 (Flood Damage Analysis)	The Hydrologic Engineering Center's Flood Damage Reduction Analysis (HEC-FDA) program provides the capability for integrated hydrologic engineering and economic analysis for formulating and evaluating flood risk management plans using risk-based analysis methods. The program will be used to evaluate and compare the Future Without- and With-Project plans along the Honey Creek.	Certified
FQI (Floristic Quality Index)	This assessment tool was designed to be used as an all-inclusive method for assessing the quality of plant communities. The FQI was originally developed for the Chicago Region, but has since been developed for regions and states throughout North America. This method assesses the sensitivity of individual plant species that inhabit an area. Each native species is assigned a coefficient of conservatism ranging from "0 to 10, with "0" assigned to species that are highly tolerant to disturbance and are considered general in their habitat distribution and "10" assigned to species with a very low tolerance to disturbance and displaying a very specific relationship to a certain habitat type. This model will be used to assess the ecological value of the existing site condition, determine whether there is a need for mitigation, and evaluate proposed mitigation measures, based on the function of the plant community.	Certified

EC 1105-2-412 does not cover engineering models used in planning. The responsible use of well-known and proven USACE developed and commercial engineering software will continue. The professional practice of documenting the application of the software and modeling results will be followed. The USACE Scientific and Engineering Technology Initiative has identified many engineering models as preferred or acceptable for use in studies. These models should be used when appropriate. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR.

Table 6: Engineering Models. These models may be used to develop the decision document:

Table 3b. Engineering Models		
Model Name and Version	Model Description and How It Will Be Used	Approval Status
HEC-RAS 5.0 (River Analysis System)	The software performs 1-D steady and unsteady flow river hydraulics calculations and has capability for 2-D (and combined 1-D/2-D) unsteady flow calculations. It will be used for steady flow analysis to evaluate the Future Without-Project and Future With-Project Conditions.	HH&C CoP Preferred Model
HEC-HMS 4.3 (Hydrologic Modeling System)	The Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS) is designed to simulate the complete hydrologic processes of dendritic watershed systems. The program will be used to generate hydrographs for the watershed to be used as inputs to the HEC-RAS hydraulic models.	HH&C CoP Preferred Model
MII	MII is the second generation of the Micro-Computer Aided Cost Estimating System (MCACES). It is a detailed cost estimating software application that was developed in conjunction with Project Time & Cost LLC. MII provides an integrated cost estimating system (software and databases) that meets the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) requirements for preparing cost estimates.	Enterprise Model

****Recommended Best Planning Practice:** Hold an early coordination call (prior to the Alternatives Milestone) with the appropriate Planning Center(s) of Expertise to discuss model applications and any review needs for approval or certification of the planning models to be employed. **

d. POLICY AND LEGAL REVIEW

Policy and legal compliance reviews for CAP 206 draft and final planning decision documents are delegated to the Detroit District (see Director's Policy Memorandum 2020--##).

(i) Policy Review.

All decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and planning and policy guidance. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. These reviews culminate in determinations that the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with the authorized project purposes, laws and policies, and warrant approval or further recommendation or coordination with their MSC by the home District Commander.

Approval of Section 206 CAP decision documents is delegated by the MSC to District Commander in an LRD Memorandum dated 23 November 2020 and a DIRECTOR'S POLICY MEMORANDUM dated 3 September 2020.

DQC and ATR augment and complement the policy review processes by addressing compliance with pertinent published Army policies, particularly policies on analytical methods and the presentation of findings in decision documents.

- The LRD Policy Review Team will be invited to participate in key meetings during the development of decision documents as well as SMART Planning Milestone meetings. These engagements may include In-Progress Reviews, Issue Resolution Conferences or other vertical team meetings, plus all milestone events.
- The input from the LRD Policy Review team shall be documented in a Memorandum for Record (MFR) produced for each engagement with the team. The MFR should be distributed to all meeting participants.
- In addition, it is advised that teams should capture policy review input in a Risk Register and/or a Decision Log, as appropriate. These items should be highlighted at future meetings until the issues are resolved. Any key decisions on how to address risk or other considerations should be documented in an MFR.

(ii) Legal Review.

The Office of Counsel (OC) of the home District will conduct the legal review and certification of the project. The home District OC may coordinate with members of the MSC and HQUSACE to participate in the review of complicated or controversial legal matters. The home District Chief of Planning will coordinate membership and participation with the MSC office chiefs.

- In some cases, legal review input may be captured in the MFR for the particular meeting or milestone. In other cases, a separate legal memorandum may be used to document the input from the Office of Counsel.
- The home District's Chief Counsel will determine how to document legal review input.

3. *OPTIONAL – FUTURE REVIEWS*

This section is available to highlight future review work in follow-on phases after the planning phase is complete. Teams may choose to highlight the types of reviews that will be required in the pre-construction engineering and design phase or the development of products to support operations and maintenance work.

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS

PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
Project Manager		313-226-2225	CELRE-PPM-PM
Project Manager		312-846-5517	CELRC-PM-PM
Planner/C-P-R Analyst		312-846-5598/313-226-6815	CELC-PMD-EP/CELRE-PLP
Environmental Resources		312-846-5578	CELRC-PM-PLE
Cultural Resources		313-226-3510	CELRE-PLE
Geotechnical Engineer		312-846-5477	CELRC-TS-D-G
Civil Engineer		312-846-5403	CELRC-TS
Cost Engineer		312-846-5425	CELRC-TS-D-C
Hydraulic Engineer/CPR Analyst		312-846-5511	CELRC-TS-D-HH
Environmental Engineer		312-846-5506	CELRC-TS-D-HE
Real Estate		313-226-1318	CELRE-RE

DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC) TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
Planner		312-846-5589	CELC-PM-PL-E
Biologist & Cult. Resources*		312-846-5506	CELRC-PMD-EF
Civil Engineer		312-846-5477	CELRC-TS-D-G
Cost Engineer		312-846-5428	CELRC-TS-DC
Hydraulic Engineer		313-226-2230	CELRE-HH-HE
Real Estate		313-226-7504	CELRE-RE

AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) TEAM			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
ATR Lead		218-788-6419	MVP
Planning Reviewer		218-788-6419	MVP
Economics Reviewer		309-794-5006	MVR
Civil Engineering Reviewer		309-794-5886	MVR
Geotechnical Engineering Reviewer		651-290-5192	MVP
Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering		651-290-5634	MVP
Environmental Reviewer		901-544-3455	MVM
Climate Reviewer		503-808-4969	NWP
Cost Engineering Reviewer		509-527-7585	NWW
Real Estate Reviewer		206-316-4417	NWS

--

MSC / Policy and Legal Compliance Vertical Team			
Function/Discipline	Name (Last, First)	Phone	Office
Review Manager		(513) 684-2049	CELRD-PD-S
Planning Reviewer		(513) 684-3008	CELRD-PD-S
Risk Assessment		(312) 806-3760	CELRD-PD-S
Technical Design Reviewer		(513) 684-6200	CELRD-RBT
Environmental Reviewer		(513) 684-6050	CELRD-PDS-P
Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering/Climate Reviewer		(513) 684-4360	CELRD-RB-W
Cost Engineering Reviewer		(513) 684-6899	CELRD-RBT
Real Estate Reviewer		(513) 684-6232	CELRD-PDS-R