



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers®**

---

## Review Plan for Folly Beach, SC Preconstruction Engineering and Design Implementation Documents

RECOMMENDED BY:

BATH.STEVEN.M.105816  
2643

Digitally signed by  
BATH.STEVEN.M.1058162643  
Date: 2024.11.18 15:39:08 -05'00'

Steven Bath  
Chief, Engineering Division  
Charleston District

APPROVED BY:

CHRISTOPHER T. SMITH, P.E.  
Chief, Engineering and Construction Division  
South Atlantic Division

## **Review Plan for Folly Beach, SC Preconstruction Engineering and Design Implementation Documents**

1. **Date:** November 18, 2024
2. **Review plan revision date, if applicable:** N/A
3. **References:**
  - a. ER 1165-3-217, Civil Works Review Policy, Sep 2024
4. **Project name:** Folly Beach, SC Preconstruction Engineering and Design
5. **Project location:** Folly Beach, SC
6. **Project P2 number:** 498811
7. **Review Management Organization (RMO):** South Atlantic Division
8. **Expected in-kind contributions/services to be provided by the non-Federal sponsor:** \$0
9. **Construction delivery method:** Design-Bid-Build
10. **Construction contract acquisition strategy:** IFB
11. **Target construction contract award date(s):** 2027-2029 – Award date is based on the condition of the beach.
12. **Estimated construction contract value(s) (range):** \$25,000,000 - \$40,000,000.
13. **Project description:** Beach fill with sand from an offshore borrow area. The project objective is to reduce damages resulting from erosion, flooding, and wave attack associated with coastal storms while minimizing or avoiding impacts to natural resources.
14. **Designer of Record:** Charleston District
15. **Documents to be reviewed:** Construction plans and specifications, Design Document Report

**16. Engineering and design risk and uncertainty:**

- a. Project performance risk:** The required reviews indicated below will ensure that the likelihood of poor project performance, once constructed, is as low as reasonably practical. However, the performance of beach fill projects is inherently unpredictable, and the coastal environment, including storms, will dictate the actual schedule of future nourishments.
- b. Life safety risk:** The questions below regarding the need for a Safety Assurance Review specifically address life safety risk.

**17. Required reviews:** Refer to reference 3.a.

- a.** District Quality Control Review
- b.** Agency Technical Review (ATR)
- c.** Biddability, Constructability, Operability, Environmental, and Sustainability Review

**18. Site visits by review teams:** None.

**19. Justification to waive ATR, if applicable:** N/A

**20. ATR team disciplines and qualifications:**

Team Leader: Must be external to SAD and must have led or participated in previous ATRs. May be combined with another team member.

Coastal Engineer: Shall have a minimum of 5 years of coastal engineering experience.

Geotechnical Engineer/Geologist: Shall have a minimum of 5 years of geotechnical engineering or geology experience. Must be familiar with sediment sampling practices and how the information is used in design of CSRM projects.

Civil Engineer: Shall be a registered Professional Engineer with 5 years of dredging operations and/or site-civil work experience that includes dredging and disposal operations for shore protection projects.

Construction Manager. Shall have a minimum of 5 years of construction management experience with dredging and disposal operations for shore protection projects.

Environmental Resource Specialist: Should be a biologist with at least 5 years of experience in NEPA compliance. The reviewer shall be familiar with the impacts from CSRM beach nourishment projects and understand CBRA of 1982.

Real Estate Specialist: Shall have experience with the easement requirements on CSRM projects. The Real Estate reviewer must have expertise in the real estate planning process for cost shared and full federal civil works projects, relocations, report preparation and acquisition of real estate interests.

**21. Considerations regarding the need for a SAR:**

- a. For new projects, if the project includes a feature or component that will impound water permanently or temporarily, could the failure or misoperation of that feature or component result in flooding-related loss of human life? N/A.
- b. For new projects, if the project includes a feature or component that will impound water permanently or temporarily, will the design of that feature or component deviate from USACE guidance or be based on uncommon analytical methods or material types? N/A.
- c. For existing projects, if repairing, rehabilitating, or otherwise modifying a project feature or component that impounds water permanently or temporarily, could the probability of failure of that feature or component be temporarily increased during construction? N/A.
- d. For existing projects, if repairing, rehabilitating, or otherwise modifying a project feature or component, is that work critical to the future performance of the project? N/A.

**22. Determination regarding the need for a SAR:** The District Chief of Engineering has determined that a SAR not warranted.

**23. Numerical modeling software to be utilized:**

Software	Description	Approval Status
ArcGIS and Desktop	Geospatial data mapping tool.	Allowed for use

**24. Schedule and cost of reviews:**

Work Products	Review	Schedule	Cost
Preliminary (30%) construction plans and specifications, DDR	DQC review	May - June 2025	\$30K
Intermediate (60%) construction plans and specifications, DDR	DQC review	Jan - Feb 2026	\$30K
	ATR	Feb - Mar 2026	\$20K
	BCOES review	Mar – Apr 2026	\$15K
Draft final (90%) construction plans and specifications, DDR	DQC review	TBD	\$30K
	ATR	TBD	\$20K
	BCOES review	TBD	\$15K
Final (100%) construction plans and specifications, DDR	ATR (backcheck)	TBD	\$5K
	BCOES review (backcheck)	TBD	\$5K