



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
1100 COMMERCE STREET
DALLAS TX 75242-0216

CESWD-RBT

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Ft. Worth District

SUBJECT: Safety Assurance Review Plan for Interstate 30 and 35 Bridge Replacement (Dallas Horseshoe Project) Over the Dallas Floodway System, Dallas, TX

1. The enclosed Safety Assurance Review Plan as mandated by Section 2035 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 is hereby approved for design and construction work that will be performed by Texas Department of Transportation and North Central Texas Council of Governments. This is part of the bigger Project Pegasus to reduce traffic congestion and improve safety. This review plan has been reviewed and coordinated with RMC.
2. The point of contact for this action is Michael Jordan at Michael.Jordan@usace.army.mil or office phone 469-487-7035.

Encl

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chas. H. Klinge".

CHARLES H. KLINGE
Colonel, EN
Acting Commander

Review Plan for: Dallas Horseshoe Project

North Central Texas Counsel of Governments (NCTCOG)
Dallas District – Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)
Fort Worth District - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

9 April 2012

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1	Project Information	3
1.2	Review Team	5
2.	Requirement.....	5
3.	References.....	5
4.	Summary of Required Level of Review	6
4.1	Quality Control (QC).....	6
4.2	District Quality Control (DQC)	6
4.3	Agency Technical Review (ATR).....	6
4.4	Type II Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) Safety Assurance Review	7
5.	Execution Plan	8
5.1	Quality Review	8
5.2	ATR.....	8
5.3	Type II IEPR SAR	11
6.	Change Management.....	14
7.	Review Schedule	14
8.	Cost Estimate.....	15
	Exhibit A – Map of Project Area	16
	Appendix A – Review Team Roster.....	17

1. Introduction

This Review Plan is for determining the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities associated with the proposed Interstate Highway (IH) 30/ IH 35E Horseshoe project with respect to the function of the levees, floodway and sump components of the Dallas Floodway System for the purpose of assuring public health, safety and welfare. This plan has been developed in accordance with Section 2035 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007 and EC 1165-2-209, published January 31, 2010, Appendix E (Type II – IEPR, Safety Assurance Review (SAR)).

1.1 Project Information

Project Title: Dallas Horseshoe (IH30 / IH35E Bridges)

General Background:

The Dallas Horseshoe Project is a part of the bigger Project Pegasus, which is an estimated \$2.1 billion reconstruction project of the IH 35E and IH 30 near Downtown Dallas, with a goal to reduce traffic congestion and improve safety. The project corridor was originally designed and constructed between 1958 and 1962, with no significant improvements to roadway capacity since. There are many locations within the corridor in which there are insufficient designs, including inadequate acceleration/deceleration length, interchanges and ramps located too close together, horizontal and vertical clearance issues, and sight distance issues, which result in forced lane changes, abrupt and unexpected merges, short weaves, and quick exits. The interchange also lacks direct connections from eastbound IH 30 to southbound IH 35E and northbound IH 35E to westbound IH 30. These issues, compounded with an increasing commuter population, have resulted in peak travel periods of more than 6 hours on an average day, average speeds of 20 miles per hour, high volume of traffic accidents, and increasing air pollution. The proposed Dallas Horseshoe project is bounded by the limits: IH 30 from Sylvan Avenue to west of IH 45 and IH 35E from north of Eighth Street to north of IH 30 in Dallas County. See Exhibit A for vicinity map.

Purpose and Need:

The primary need of the Dallas Horseshoe Project is to replace the existing deteriorated Interstate 30 and Interstate 35E Bridges crossing the Dallas Floodway as well as help relieve traffic congestion and improve safety through the IH 30/IH 35E “mix-master” interchange. The purpose for this project is to reconfigure and rebuild the inadequate and deteriorating infrastructure.

Proposed Modifications to Federal Flood Risk Reduction Project (Dallas Floodway Levees) Requiring USACE Review and Approval:

1. Proposed modifications directly adjacent to and within the Dallas Floodway:

- Construction of reinforced concrete drilled shafts to support bridge pier columns and overhead sign bridge foundations for the proposed IH 30 and IH 35E bridges across the Dallas Floodway;
 - Construction of reinforced concrete drilled shafts to support relocated and/or additional Oncor overhead electric transmission towers adjacent to the West and East Levees of the Dallas Floodway;
 - Construction of swales for hydraulic and/or wetland mitigation;
 - Realignment of levee access roads under proposed bridges from levee top to landside toe to maintain 15 foot minimum vertical clearance;
 - Construction of concrete riprap under proposed bridges for slope protection on levee slopes (flood and landside); and
 - Construction of concrete and sand filter collars around proposed bridge columns adjacent to landside levee toe of slope;
 - Construction of temporary and permanent erosion control measures;
 - Construction of temporary shoring towers for erection of tied arch bridge structures;
 - Removal of existing bridge structures for IH 30 and IH 35E across the Dallas Floodway.
2. Proposed modifications to Able Pump Station Sump Ponds 2 and 3:
- Embankment, pavement and bridge substructure construction within existing pond limits delineated as elevation 392.5 and below;
 - Cross drainage structures to maintain pond connectivity; and
 - Excavation for additional pond storage capacity to mitigate storage volume loss due to proposed construction.
3. The following temporary modifications may be requested by the design-build contractor to facilitate construction within the Dallas Floodway:
- Construction of temporary earth berth berms to support equipment for construction of drilled shafts on levee slopes;
 - Construction of temporary earth crane pads for lifting bridge girders and related operations;
 - Construction of temporary bridge(s) to facilitate maintenance of traffic through construction;
 - Construction of temporary bridge(s) over the Trinity River Channel for moving equipment within the floodway during construction of the proposed IH 30 and IH 35E bridges; and
 - Construction of temporary access roads into the Dallas Floodway.

1.2 Review Team

A review management team and three separate review teams will be established to review the Section 408 permit for the Project. The three separate review teams will be the Quality Control Team comprised of TxDOT and TxDOT consultant staff, the District Quality Control (DQC) Team comprised of USACE Fort Worth District Staff, the Agency Technical Review (ATR) Team comprised of other USACE staff, and the Safety Assurance Review (SAR) Team comprised of consultants contracted by the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG). See Appendix A for a listing of designated members for each team.

2. Requirement

This Review Plan defines the scope of quality management activities and peer review for the proposed IH 30 and IH 35E bridge structures over the Dallas Floodway. Quality management activities consist of: Quality Control Review (QC) (USACE and TxDOT), Agency Technical Review (ATR) (USACE), and Type II Independent External Peer Review (IEPR).

This Review Plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, which established the procedures for ensuring the quality and credibility of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) documents through independent review. The EC's outline includes three levels of review: QC, ATR, and IEPR.

This Review Plan will be reviewed and approved by USACE . After approval, this Review Plan will be posted on the USACE Fort Worth District website at: www.swf.usace.army.mil.

3. References

- EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
- ER 1110-2-1150, Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects, 31 Aug 1999
- ER 1110-1-12, Engineering and Design Quality Management, 21 Jul 2006
- WRDA 2007 H. R. 1495 Public Law 110-114, 8 Nov 2007
- EC 1105-2-410, Review of Decision Documents, 22 Aug 08
- Army Regulation 15–1, Committee Management, 27 November 1992 (Federal Advisory Committee Act Requirements)
- National Academy of Sciences, Background Information and Confidential Conflict of Interest Disclosure, BI/COI FORM 3, May 2003

4. Summary of Required Level of Review

4.1 Quality Control (QC):

- Purpose: Review of science and engineering work products
- Reviews will be Managed by: TxDOT Project Engineer
- Performed by: TxDOT and TxDOT General Engineering Consultant (GEC)
- Required for: All work products, reports, evaluations, and assessments
- Documentation: Review Comment/Response Report

4.2 District Quality Control (DQC):

- Purpose: Review of science and engineering work products
- Reviews will be Managed by: SWF Project Delivery Team (PDT) Lead
- Performed by: Fort Worth District (SWF)
- Required for:
 - Initial Section 408 submittal (summary report, geotechnical report, hydraulic report, environmental assessment, and 35 percent complete plan sheets applicable to proposed substructure and other ancillary construction within 200 foot of levee toes of slope and within the Dallas Floodway);
 - Intermediate contingency review at approximately 60 percent complete if sufficient changes are made by the design-build contractor to the initial submittal (35 percent complete design) to warrant this additional review as determined by the USACE; and
 - Construction approval review of completed plan sheets and special provisions/ specifications (if any) applicable to proposed substructure and other ancillary construction within 200 feet of levee toes of slope and within the Dallas Floodway.

Note: Plans for proposed construction within the floodway but not subject to review and approval by the DQC (i.e. bridge piers, superstructure, overhead sign bridge structures and Oncor transmission towers), will be submitted for information only.

- Documentation: DrChecks

4.3 Agency Technical Review (ATR):

- Purpose: Ensure the quality and credibility of the government's scientific information and verify compliance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other environmental compliance documents
- Managed by: USACE RMO (USACE, Southwestern Division) and ATR PDT Lead

- Performed by: Senior USACE Technical Team Members, preferably recognized subject matter experts
- Required for:
 - Initial Section 408 submittal (summary report, geotechnical report, hydraulic report, environmental assessment, and 35 percent complete plan sheets applicable to proposed substructure and other ancillary construction within 200 foot of levee toes of slope and within the Dallas Floodway);
 - Intermediate contingency review at approximately 60 percent complete if sufficient changes are made by the design-build contractor to the initial submittal (35 percent complete design) to warrant this additional review as determined by the USACE; and
 - Construction approval review of completed plan sheets and special provisions/ specifications (if any) applicable to proposed substructure and other ancillary construction within 200 feet of levee toes of slope and within the Dallas Floodway.

Note: Plans for proposed construction within the floodway but not subject to review and approval by the ATR (i.e. bridge piers, superstructure, overhead sign bridge structures and Oncor transmission towers), will be submitted for information only.
- Documentation: DrChecks and completion of Agency Technical Review Certification
- Risk Management Office: USACE. Southwestern Division; Risk Management Center

4.4 Type II Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) Safety Assurance Review:

- Purpose: Ensure the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities in assuring public health, safety, and welfare. Safety Assurance Review (SAR) activities continue through construction and O&M manual development.
- Performed by: Independent Technical Experts (External to TxDOT and USACE)
- Selection of Panel Members: Follow National Academies of Science policy
- Required for:
 - Initial Section 408 submittal (summary report, geotechnical report, hydraulic report, environmental assessment, and 35 percent complete plan sheets applicable to proposed substructure and other ancillary construction within 200 foot of levee toes of slope and within the Dallas Floodway);

- Intermediate contingency review at approximately 60 percent complete if sufficient changes are made by the design-build contractor to the initial submittal (35 percent complete design) to warrant this additional review as determined by the USACE;
- Construction approval review of completed plan sheets and special provisions/ specifications (if any) applicable to proposed substructure and other ancillary construction within 200 feet of levee toes of slope and within the Dallas Floodway; and
- Midpoint of construction activities within 200 foot of levee toes of slope and within the Dallas Floodway.
- When: During the aforementioned submittals and periodically during construction activities within 200 of levee toes of slope and within the Dallas floodway.
- Documentation: IEPR Review Report

5. Execution Plan

5.1 Quality Control and District Quality Control

The Quality Control and District Quality Control reviews will be conducted in accordance with the respective quality control plans for USACE, TxDOT, TxDOT GEC, and TxDOT Consultant HNTB. Review comments and responses for TxDOT reviews will be documented in a comment/response report. USACE will review comments and responses will be documented in DrChecks.

Revisions to report pages and/or preliminary plans sheets from the TxDOT Quality Control review will be incorporated into the Initial Section 408 review package prior to submittal to the USACE Fort Worth District for District Quality Control review. Revised report pages and preliminary plan sheets resulting from the District Quality Control review will be uploaded to DrChecks for backcheck and subsequent closing of comments by the Fort Worth District.

The Initial Section 408 submittal will not be revised for ATR. The ATR will be conducted following completion of the District Quality Control review and the ATR team will be provided with Initial Section 408 submittal package along with corresponding DrChecks reports and attachments from the District Quality Control Review.

5.2 ATR

Subject matter experts from within USACE will conduct the ATR. Selections will be based on expertise, experience, and skills, including specialists from multiple disciplines as necessary to ensure comprehensive review. The ATR team will be comprised of senior USACE personnel, preferably recognized subject matter experts with the appropriate technical expertise, and may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate.

ATR reviewers shall be formed into panels that are sufficiently broad and diverse to fairly represent the relevant scientific and engineering perspectives and fields of knowledge. Review Management Office (RMO) shall ensure that ATR reviewers who are Federal employees (including special government employees) comply with applicable Federal ethics requirements. In selecting ATR reviewers who are not Federal government employees, the National Academy of Sciences' policy for committee selection with respect to evaluating the potential for conflicts (e.g., those arising from investments; agency, employer, and business affiliations; grants, contracts and consulting income) shall be adopted or adapted.

The RMO shall coordinate the ATR review teams with USACE Communities of Practice, other relevant USACE Centers of Expertise, and other relevant USACE offices to ensure that an ATR review team with appropriate expertise is assembled and a cohesive and comprehensive review is accomplished.

The TxDOT shall provide reviewers with sufficient information, including background information about the project, to enable them to understand the data, analytic procedures, and assumptions. ATR reviewers shall be informed of applicable access, objectivity, reproducibility and other quality standards under the federal laws governing information access and quality.

The products will be reviewed against published guidance, including Engineering Regulations, Engineering Circulars, Engineering Manuals, Engineering Technical Letters, Engineering Construction Bulletins, Policy Guidance Letters, implementation guidance, project guidance memoranda, and other formal guidance memoranda issued by USACE Headquarters. Any justified and approved waivers should have been obtained from USACE Headquarters for any deviations from USACE guidance.

Key considerations include:

- All relevant engineering and scientific disciplines have been effectively integrated.
- Appropriate computer models and methods of analysis were used and basic assumptions are valid and used for the intended purpose.
- The source, amount, and level of detail of the data used in the analysis are appropriate for the complexity of the project.
- The project complies with accepted practice within USACE.
- Project documentation is appropriate and adequate for the project phase.

DrChecks will be used to document the DQC and ATR comments, conduct evaluations, and backcheck comments. Each review comment should be succinct and enable timely resolution of the concern. Comments should be

limited to those that are required to ensure adequacy of the product. The four key parts of a quality review comment normally include:

- The review concern – identify the product's information deficiency or incorrect application of policy, guidance, or procedures;
- The basis for the concern – cite the appropriate law, Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)/USACE policy, guidance or procedure that has not been properly followed;
- The significance of the concern – indicate the importance of the concern with regard to its potential impact on the plan selection, recommended plan components, efficiency (cost), effectiveness (function/outputs), implementation responsibilities, safety, Federal interest, or public acceptability; and
- The probable specific action needed to resolve the concern – identify the action(s) that must be taken to resolve the concern.

The ATR leader shall prepare an ATR Review Report that shall:

- Disclose the names of the ATR reviewers, their organizational affiliations, and include a short paragraph on both the credentials and relevant experiences of each reviewer.
- Include the charge to the ATR reviewers.
- Describe the nature of their review and their findings and conclusions.
- Include a verbatim copy of each reviewer's comments (either with or without specific attributions), or represent the views of the group as a whole, including any disparate and dissenting views.

Written responses to the ATR Review Report will be prepared to explain the agreement or disagreement with the views expressed in the report, the actions undertaken or to be undertaken in response to the report, and the reasons those actions are believed to satisfy the key concerns stated in the report (if applicable). The revised submittal will be provided to the RMO with the USACE response and all other materials related to the review.

When policy and/or legal concerns arise during ATR efforts that are not readily and mutually resolved by the Review Management Team and the ATR reviewers, the USACE Fort Worth District will seek issue resolution support from the major subordinate commands and USACE Headquarters in accordance with the procedures outlined in ER 1105-2-100. The ATR leader must complete a statement of technical review for all final products and final documents.

5.3 Type II IEPR SAR

The IEPR will be performed by a panel contracted by the NCTCOG. NCTCOG and TxDOT will jointly select the panel and will provide the USACE with the final independent external expert reviewer list, including their credentials for approval. Expert reviewers shall have experience in design and construction of projects similar in scope to the project. Expert reviewers shall be registered professional engineers in the United States. The expert reviewers must have an engineering degree, and hands-on relevant engineering experience in the listed disciplines is also important. Expert reviewers shall have a minimum of 15 years experience and responsible charge of engineering work in the following disciplines (one at a minimum):

- (1) Geotechnical Engineer will be a recognized expert in the field of geotechnical engineering analysis, design and construction of levees with extensive experience in subsurface investigations, soil mechanics, seepage and slope stability evaluations, erosion protection design, and construction and earthwork construction.
- (2) Civil/Construction Engineer with extensive experience in the design, layout, and construction of flood control structures. The Civil/Construction Engineer must demonstrate knowledge regarding levees, interior drainage facilities, earthwork, concrete placement, design of access roads, and relocation of underground utilities. The Civil/Construction Engineer must be familiar with USACE regulations and building codes.
- (3) Hydraulic Engineer with extensive experience in the analysis and design of levees. The Hydraulic Engineer must have performed work in hydrologic analysis and design of hydraulic structures.
- (4) Structural Engineer must demonstrate experience in the design of vehicular bridges, retaining wall, levee, pier penetrations of levees embankments, and diaphragm walls.

In addition, at least one of the expert reviewers shall have recent and relevant experience on multi-million dollar projects verifying the constructability of the proposed designs.

The NCTCOG in conjunction with TxDOT will approve the panel members selected. The NCTCOG may disapprove a selected panel member if the member does not meet the objective criteria established in this Review Plan.

The IEPR team shall perform reviews of the (and site visits, as necessary) at the completion of the plans, specifications, and cost estimate and at the midpoint of potential construction items listed in Section 1.1.

When selecting panel members, the National Academy of Sciences' policy for committee selection with respect to evaluating the potential for conflicts (e.g., those arising from investments; agency, employer, and business affiliations; grants, contracts and consulting income) shall be adopted or adapted. IEPR members shall not have participated in development of the submittal to be reviewed. IEPR panel will be paid labor and any necessary travel and per diem expenses in accordance with their contract.

The IEPR panel will be advised whether information about them (name, credentials, and affiliation) will be disclosed. The NCTCOG shall notify IEPR panel in advance regarding the extent of disclosure and attribution planned. The NCTCOG shall comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act. The IEPR review shall be conducted in a manner that respects confidential business information and intellectual property.

The RMO will prepare the charge to the IEPR panel, containing the instructions regarding the objective of the IEPR review and the specific advice sought. IEPR panel shall be charged with reviewing scientific and technical matters, leaving policy determinations for TxDOT and USACE. The charge should specify the structure of the review comments to fully communicate the reviewer's intent by including: the comment, why it is important, any potential consequences of failure to address, and suggestions on how to address the comment. It should include specific technical questions while also directing reviewers to offer a broad evaluation of the overall document. The charge should be determined in advance of the selection of the reviewers.

The RMO and/or TxDOT shall provide reviewers with sufficient information, including background information about the project, to enable them to understand the data, analytic procedures, and assumptions. IEPR panel shall be informed of applicable access, objectivity, reproducibility and other quality standards under the federal laws governing information access and quality. Information distributed for review must include the following disclaimer: "This information is distributed solely for the purpose of pre-dissemination review under applicable information quality guidelines. It has not been formally disseminated by the TxDOT or USACE. It does not represent and should not be construed to represent any agency determination or policy."

The IEPR panel established for a review for the project shall:

- Conduct the review of the products developed by TxDOT's consultant for preliminary design and by TxDOT's design-build contractor for the final design of the subject project in a timely manner in accordance with the study and outlined schedules;
- Follow the "Charge," but when deemed appropriate by the team lead, request other products relevant to the project and the purpose of the review.

- Receive from TxDOT any public written and oral comments provided on the project;
- Provide timely written and oral comments throughout the development of the project, as requested;
- Assure the review avoids replicating an ATR and focuses on the questions in the “Charge,” but the panel can recommend additional questions for consideration. The IEPR panel may recommend to the USACE additional or alternate questions.
- Offer any lessons learned to improve the review process.
- Submit reports in accordance with the review plan milestones.
- The IEPR Team Leader shall be responsible for insuring that comments represent the group, be non-attributable to individuals, and where there is lack of consensus, note the non-concurrence and why.
- Record of Review. The IEPR review team will prepare an IEPR Review Report. All IEPR panel comments shall be entered as team comments that represent the group and be non- attributable to individuals. The IEPR Team Leader is to seek consensus, but where there is a lack of consensus, note the non-concurrence and why. A suggested report outline is an introduction, the composition of the review team, a summary of the review during design, a summary of the review during construction, any lessons learned in both the process and/or design and construction, and appendices for conflict of disclosure forms, for comments to include any appendices for supporting analyses and assessments of the adequacy and acceptability of the methods, models, and analyses used. All comments in the report will be finalized by the panel prior to their release to the TxDOT and/or USACE for each review plan milestone.

The IEPR Team Leader shall prepare an IEPR Review Report in Microsoft Word, signed by all members that shall:

- Disclose the names of the reviewers, their organizational affiliations, and include a short paragraph on both the credentials and relevant experiences of each reviewer.
- Include the charge to the reviewers.
- Describe the nature of their review and their findings and conclusions.
- Include a verbatim copy of each reviewer's comments (either with or without specific attributions), or represent the views of the group as a whole, including any disparate and dissenting views.

Written responses to the IEPR Review Report will be prepared by TxDOT and/or USACE to explain the agreement or disagreement with the views expressed in the report, the actions undertaken or to be undertaken in

response to the report, and the reasons those actions are believed to satisfy the key concerns stated in the report (if applicable). The revised IEPR Review Report will be provided with TxDOT and/or USACE responses and all other materials related to the review.

The revised IEPR Review Report with TxDOT and/or USACE responses shall be submitted to the Southwestern District USACE District Commander for approval. After the District Commander's approval, the USACE will make the report and responses available to the public on the USACE Fort Worth District's website.

6. Change Management

TxDOT is procuring the final design and construction of the subject project through design-build. Consequently, changes to the preliminary design analyses and plans included in the initial Section 408 submittal are possible. The following summarizes key actions taken or planned to facilitate USACE review and potential approval of proposed changes by the selected design-build contractor:

- (1) The geotechnical analyses and studies documented in the initial Section 408 submittal will include seepage results for lateral and longitudinal variations of proposed foundation locations within and directly adjacent to the levee template. Worst case scenarios will be modeled to provide data for USACE reference in determining impacts of proposed changes in the foundation locations depicted in the 35 percent complete plans.
- (2) A stakeholder coordination plan will be developed and implemented by the selected design-build contractor. The USACE will be a key stakeholder in this plan. Through regular coordination meetings, the USACE will be kept abreast of potential design changes within and adjacent to the Dallas Floodway. The USACE shall inform TxDOT if another intermediate technical review is required prior to submittal of completed plans for construction approval review.
- (3) An intermediate contingency review is planned and will be conducted if, as determined by the USACE, it is necessary. The documents required for this review will be as directed by the USACE and could include 60 percent complete plans and specifications, revised hydraulic analyses, and/or revised levee geotechnical analyses.
- (4) The design-build contractor will be required to submit for USACE review and approval any temporary items needed for construction including temporary access roads, bridges, shoring towers, fills and earth berms.

7. Review Schedule

The following schedule is preliminary and subject to change.

June 1, 2012 – Initial Section 408 Submittal for USACE Fort Worth District Quality Control review and SAR review consisting of Summary Report, Geotechnical Report,

Hydraulic Report, Environmental Assessment, and 35 percent complete applicable construction plan sheets.

July 2, 2012 – Initial Section 408 Submittal for USACE ATR. (Note – Initial Section 408 Submittal package will not be revised following USACE Fort Worth District Quality Control Review. DrChecks reports and attachments from District Quality Control review will be provided to ATR).

July 31, 2012 – USACE Section 408 major/minor determination.

September 4, 2012 – Section 408 minor approved or Section 408 major submittal to USACE HQ (unless postponed awaiting final environmental document approval).

Dates to be determined:

- Section 408 major approved within 45 days of submittal to USACE HQ;
- Intermediate contingency review (if required);
- Construction approval review; and
- Midpoint of construction activities.

8. Cost Estimate for Section 408 Reviews:

- **QC:** Quality Control review costs will be determine by the TxDOT and USACE, respectively
- **ATR:** The ATR review costs will be determined by USACE.
- **Type II IEPR:** Type II IEPR cost will be determined by NCTCOG in conjunction with TxDOT and USACE. Funding for IEPR has been identified and will be paid for by the NCTCOG.
- **Work-in-Kind:** No work-in-kind services are planned for the Project.

EXHIBIT A Project Information and Status

Map of Project Area

