

NAME OF STUDY
SECTION 905(b) (WRDA 86) ANALYSIS

1. STUDY AUTHORITY

a. This Section 905(b) (WRDA) Analysis was prepared as an initial response to the (authority/authorities), which reads as follows:

“Provide the full text of the principle resolution(s) or other study authority.”

b. Funds in the amount of \$100,000 or other amount were appropriated in Fiscal Year 1999 to conduct the reconnaissance phase of the study.

2. STUDY PURPOSE

The purpose of the reconnaissance phase study is to determine if there is a Federal (Corps) interest in participating in a cost shared feasibility phase study to determine if there is a Federal interest in providing purposes improvements to indicate where. In response to the study authority, the reconnaissance study was initiated on indicate date. The reconnaissance study has resulted in the finding that there is a Federal interest in continuing the study into the feasibility phase. The purpose of this Section 905(b) Analysis is to document the basis for this finding and establish the scope of the feasibility phase. As the document that establishes the scope of the feasibility study, the Section 905(b) Analysis is used as the chapter of the Project management plan that presents the reconnaissance overview and formulation rationale.

3. LOCATION OF STUDY, NON-FEDERAL SPONSOR AND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

a. The study area is located short paragraph description.

b. The non-Federal sponsor for the feasibility phase of the study is name of proposed sponsor.

c. The study area lies within the jurisdiction of the following Congressional Districts:

1)

2)

4. PRIOR REPORTS AND EXISTING PROJECTS

a. The following reports were being reviewed as a part of this study:

1) Short paragraph discussion of each report.

2)

b. This study is investigating potential modifications of the following project(s):

1) Short paragraph discussion

2)

5. PLAN FORMULATION

During a study, six planning steps that are set forth in the Water Resource Council's Principles and Guidelines are repeated to focus the planning effort and eventually to select and recommend a plan for authorization. The six planning steps are: 1) specify problems and opportunities, 2) inventory and forecast conditions, 3) formulate alternative plans, 4) evaluate effects of alternative plans, 5) compare alternative plans, and 6) select recommended plan. The iterations of the planning steps typically differ in the emphasis that is placed on each of the steps. In the early iterations, those conducted during the reconnaissance phase, the step of specifying problems and opportunities is emphasized. That is not to say, however, that the other steps are ignored since the initial screening of preliminary plans that results from the other steps is very important to the scoping of the follow-on feasibility phase studies. The sub-paragraphs that follow present the results of the initial iterations of the planning steps that were conducted during the reconnaissance phase. This information will be refined in future iterations of the planning steps that will be accomplished during the feasibility phase.

a. National Objectives

1) The national or Federal objective of water and related land resources planning is to contribute to national economic development consistent with protecting the nation's environment, pursuant to national environmental statutes, applicable executive orders, and other Federal planning requirements. Contributions to National Economic Development (NED) are increases in the net value of the national output of goods and services, expressed in monetary units. Contributions to NED are the direct net benefits that accrue in the planning area and the rest of the nation.

2) The Corps has added a second national objective for Ecosystem Restoration in response to legislation and administration policy. This objective is to contribute to the nation's ecosystems through ecosystem restoration, with contributions measured by changes in the amounts and values of habitat.

b. Public Concerns: A number of public concerns have been identified during the course of the reconnaissance study. Initial concerns were expressed in the study authorization. Additional input was received through coordination with the (*potential*) sponsor(s), and some initial coordination with other agencies. The public concerns that are related to the establishment of planning objectives and planning constraints are:

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)

c. Problems and Opportunities: The evaluation of public concerns often reflects a range of needs, which are perceived by the public. This section describes these needs in the context of problems and opportunities that can be addressed through water and related land resource management. For each problem and opportunity, the existing conditions and the expected future conditions are described, as follows:

1) *Provide a discussion of each problem and opportunity, including a description of existing and expected future conditions. Include any critical findings and assumptions regarding the without project conditions.*

- 2)
- 3)

d. Planning Objectives: The national objectives of National Economic Development and National Ecosystem Restoration are general statements and not specific enough for direct use in plan formulation. The water and related land resource problems and opportunities identified in this study are stated as specific planning objectives to provide focus for the formulation of alternatives. These planning objectives reflect the problems and opportunities and represent desired positive changes in the without project conditions. The planning objectives are specified as follows:

1) *To reduce ... objectives should be achievable and specific in time and location, but should not be stated in terms of specific measures or level of output – “to reduce flood damages in the xxx portion of the study area over a xx-year period of analysis” – not “to improve channel/build levees/remove structures for the floodplain, etc”.*

2) *To increase*

e. Planning Constraints: Unlike planning objectives that represent desired positive changes, planning constraints represent restrictions that should not be violated. The planning constraints identified in this study are as follows:

1) *Compliance with local land use plans (specify)*

2) *Applicable Executive Orders, Statutes and Regulations (specify)*

f. Measures to Address Identified Planning Objectives. A management measure is a feature or activity at a site, which address one or more of the planning objectives. A wide variety of measures were considered, some of which were found to be infeasible due to technical, economic, or environmental constraints. Each measure was assessed and a determination made regarding whether it should be retained in the formulation of alternative plans. The descriptions and results of the evaluations of the measures considered in this study are presented below:

1) No Action. The Corps is required to consider the option of “No Action” as one of the alternatives in order to comply with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). No Action assumes that no project would be implemented by the Federal Government or by local interests to achieve the planning objectives. No Action, which is synonymous with the Without Project Condition, forms the basis from which all other alternative plans are measured.

(2) *Non-Structural*

(3) *Structural*

(4) *Separable Features - such as for recreation or restoration if not already included above.*

(5) *Additional Measures for Complete Alternatives – secondary features to make a alternative complete, such as dredging methods, interior drainage, etc.*

g. Preliminary Plans. Preliminary plans are comprised of one or more management measures that survived the initial screening. The descriptions and results of the evaluations of the preliminary plans that were considered in this study are presented below:

1) Preliminary Plans Eliminated from Further Consideration

2) Preliminary Plans for further Consideration

3) Alternative Implementation Authorities

h. Conclusions from the Preliminary Screening. The preliminary screening indicates that alternatives that summarize characteristics of plans for further consideration have the greatest potential for implementation. The potential magnitude and types of benefits from the proposed actions would qualitative evaluation with any numbers or ranges that may be available. Likewise, the environmental effects are describe significant environmental impacts that would include describe potential mitigation measures as mitigation. Costs of the alternatives would qualitative evaluation with any numbers or ranges that may be available. Based on this information, alternatives to address the planning objectives appear viable.

i. Establishment of a Plan Formulation Rationale. The conclusions from the preliminary screening form the basis for the next iteration of the planning steps that will be conducted in the feasibility phase. The likely array of alternatives that will be considered in the next iteration includes describe and provide rationale for the likely array of alternatives. Future screening and reformulation will be based on the following factors: include factors.

6. FEDERAL INTEREST

Since project purpose(s) is an output with a high budget priority and that project purposes is the primary output of the alternatives to be evaluated in the feasibility phase, there is a strong Federal interest in conducting the feasibility study. There is also a Federal interest in other related outputs of the alternatives including other project purposes that could be developed within existing policy. Based on the preliminary screening of alternatives, there appears to be potential project alternatives that would be consistent with Army policies, costs, benefits, and environmental impacts. (expand as to why this conclusion is reached)

7. PRELIMINARY FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

As the local sponsor, name of sponsor will be required to provide 50 percent of the cost of the feasibility phase. The local sponsor is also aware of the cost sharing requirements for potential project implementation. A letter of intent from the local sponsor stating a willingness to pursue the feasibility study and to share in its cost, and an understanding of the cost sharing that is required for project construction is included as Attachment number.

8. ASSUMPTIONS AND EXCEPTIONS

a. Feasibility Phase Assumptions: The following critical assumptions will provide a basis for the feasibility study:

1) Without Project Condition Assumptions

2) _____

b. Policy Exceptions and Streamlining Initiatives: The study will be conducted in accordance with the Principles and Guidelines and the Corps of Engineers regulations. Exceptions to established guidance have been identified that will streamline the feasibility study process that will not adversely impact the quality of the feasibility study. Approval of the Section 905(b) Analysis by HQUSACE results in the approval of the following policy exceptions and streamlining initiatives:

1) Simplified methods, default values, use of related study results, etc.

2) _____

c. Other Approvals Required: Include items that require HQUSACE approval such as model studies and new benefit categories.

9. FEASIBILITY PHASE MILESTONES

Milestone	Description	Duration (mo)	Cumulative (mo)
Milestone F1	Initiate Study	0	0
Milestone F2	Public Workshop/Scoping	2	2
Milestone F3	Feasibility Scoping Meeting	11	13
Milestone F4	Alternative Review Conference	9	22
Milestone F4A	Alternative Formulation Briefing	5	27
Milestone F5	Draft Feasibility Report	3	30
Milestone F6	Final Public Meeting	1	31
Milestone F7	Feasibility Review Conference	1	32
Milestone F8	Final Report to SPD	3	35
Milestone F9	DE's Public Notice	1	36
-	Chief's Report	4	40
-	Project Authorization	4	44

10. FEASIBILITY PHASE COST ESTIMATE

WBS#	Description	Cost
JAA00	Feas - Surveys and Mapping except Real Estate	
JAB00	Feas - Hydrology and Hydraulics Studies/Report (Coastal)	
JAC00	Feas - Geotechnical Studies/Report	
JAE00	Feas - Engineering and Design Analysis Report	
JB000	Feas - Socioeconomic Studies	
JC000	Feas - Real Estate Analysis/Report	
JD000	Feas - Environmental Studies/Report (Except USF&WL)	
JE000	Feas - Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report	
JF000	Feas - HTRW Studies/Report	
JG000	Feas - Cultural Resources Studies/Report	
JH000	Feas - Cost Estimates	
JI000	Feas - Public Involvement Documents	
JJ000	Feas - Plan Formulation and Evaluation	
JL000	Feas - Final Report Documentation	
JLD00	Feas - Technical Review Documents	
JM000	Feas - Washington Level Report Approval (Review Support)	\$50,000
JPA00	Project Management and Budget Documents	
JPB00	Supervision and Administration	
JPC00	Contingencies	
L0000	Project Management Plan (PMP)	
Q0000	PED Cost Sharing Agreement	
Total		\$50,000

11. VIEWS OF OTHER RESOURCE AGENCIES

Because of the funding and time constraints of the reconnaissance phase, only limited and informal coordination has been conducted with other resource agencies. Views that have been expressed are as follows:

- a.
- b.

12. POTENTIAL ISSUES AFFECTING INITIATION OF FEASIBILITY PHASE

a. Continuation of this study into the cost-shared feasibility phase is contingent upon an executed FCSA. Failure to achieve an executed FCSA within 18 months of the approval date of the Section 905(b) Analysis will result in termination of the study. Issues that could impact the initiation of the feasibility phase include Explain any issues related to the signing of the FCSA.

b. The schedule for signing the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) is Month/Year. Based on the schedule of milestones in Paragraph 9., completion of the feasibility report would be in Month/Year, with a potential Congressional Authorization in a WRDA year.

13. PROJECT AREA MAP

A map of the study area is provided as Enclosure A.

14. RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that the Name of proposed feasibility study study proceed into the feasibility phase.

Date _____

Name of District Commander
Colonel
Corps of Engineers
District Engineer