



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, NORTHWESTERN DIVISION
PO BOX 2870
PORTLAND OR 97208-2870

15 APR 2013

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CENWD-RBT

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Portland District (CENWP-PM-PM/George Miller)

SUBJECT: Review Plan (RP) Approval for John Day Mitigation Post-Authorization Change (PAC) Report and Design Documentation Report (DDR)

1. References:

- a. RP for John Day Mitigation PAC Report and DDR (Encl).
- b. EC 1165-2-214 Civil Works Review, 15 December 2012.

2. Reference 1.a. above has been prepared in accordance with reference 1.b. above.

3. The RP has been coordinated with the Business Technical Division and the Planning, Environmental Resources, Fish Policy and Support Division, Northwestern Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The RP includes District Quality Control and Agency Technical Review (ATR) of the DDR and the PAC Report. NWP will be requesting a waiver of the Type I Independent External Peer Review. NWD will be the Review Management Organization for the ATR.

4. I hereby approve this RP, which is subject to change as circumstances require, consistent with the study development process and the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this RP or its execution will require written approval from this office.

5. For further information, please contact Mr. Steve Bredthauer at (503) 808-4053.

ANTHONY C. FUNKHOUSER, P.E.
BG, USA
Commanding

Encl

CF: PDS (w/encl)

PROJECT REVIEW PLAN

Review Plan for Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products Northwestern Division (NWD)

Project Name: Portland District John Day Mitigation

Project Location: Portland District – John Day Dam

Project P2 Number: 112434

Project Manager or POC Name: George Miller

NWD Original Approval Date: XX

NWD Revision X Approval Date: XX

General Document Information

The first two pages of this document are the Cover sheet and the Table of Contents and are not numbered.

Review Plan Template. Information provided in **PAGES 3-8** is Review Plan Template information for ATR for Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products. Do not alter. The controlled (approved) version of this template will be maintained on the NWD SharePoint site. Districts must use the most current version from the NWD SharePoint site and avoid shared versions outside of the NWD SharePoint. See the footer information in the template for document location.

Attachment 1 provides the review plan Review Plan Specifics that supplement the RP Template. These specifics are prepared by the District team and as coordinated with the NWD.

Attachment 2 provides acronyms and abbreviations for the document and may be altered as necessary.

Review Plan approval memorandums shall be documented with the RP and the dates recorded on the cover sheet.



US Army Corps
of Engineers ®

PROJECT REVIEW PLAN

Review Plan for

**Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products
Northwestern Division (NWD)**

PROJECT REVIEW PLAN
Review Plan for
Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products
Northwestern Division (NWD)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS	3
2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION	4
3. REVIEW FUNDAMENTALS	4
4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC).....	4
5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)	4
6. REVIEW DOCUMENTATION.....	5
7. RISK INFORMED DECISIONS	6
8. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW	7
9. TEMPLATE APPROVAL.....	8
ATTACHMENT 1 – REVIEW PLAN SPECIFICS	9
A-1. PROJECT INFORMATION.....	
A-2. REVIEW SCHEDULE AND COSTS	
A-3. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT.....	
A-4. PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM (PDT) ROSTER.....	
A-5. ATR TEAM ROSTER.....	
A-6. REVIEW PLAN SPECIFICS APPROVAL	
ATTACHMENT 2 - ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	
B-1. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	

Review Plan for Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS.

a. Purpose. This Review Plan (RP) Template and attachments describe requirements for the project identified on the cover sheet of this document. The RP Template and the completed RP Specifics attachment together describe the risks considered and the review plan proposed for this project or product.

b. General Process. The PDT considers the project risks and selects an appropriate RP Template based on the risks per EC 214. The risk consideration process is determined by Districts as appropriate to develop a risk informed review plan strategy.

1) When the District has considered the project risks and determined the applicability of this template, the PM/PDT prepares the "RP Specific" information in Attachment 1 and submits with the RP Template to NWD for approval. The RP Specifics provide the essential elements of the RP such as the scope, project cost, the review team and capabilities, review schedules and budgets and points of contacts.

2) The RP Specifics are coordinated with the appropriate levels of management in the District and the NWD. Potentially the RP may also need to be coordinated with the Risk Management Center (RMC) and others such as the relevant Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) if required. This may be necessary in cases where there is debate on the project risks, required review levels, the review team composition and areas of responsibility.

3) The approved RP Specifics and RP Template information together shall describe the project scope, review plan, schedule and budget in sufficient detail to allow review and approval for the RP. The RP information is a component of the Quality Management Plan within the Project Management Plan. Once approved, the RP is documented in the project PMP/QMP and project files and also placed on the District Website for a minimum of 30 days.

c. Applicability. Applicability of the review plan template is determined by NWD. If any of the criteria listed below are met, this RP template is not appropriate. This review plan template is applicable, ONLY, for projects that;

- Are agreed to require ATR review based on risk-informed decision process.
- Are agreed to NOT require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) or Safety Assurance Review (SAR) based on a risk-informed decision process.
- Do NOT require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project.
- And, the project for this review plan is NOT producing decision documents.

d. References

Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review Policy, 15 Dec 2012
Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007
ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007

Review Plan for Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products

2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION

The RMO for **ATR** is Northwestern Division (NWD) unless determined otherwise. The USACE Risk Management Center (RMC) shall serve as the RMO for Dam Safety Modification projects and Levee Safety Modification projects. NWD will coordinate and approve the review plan. The home District will post the approved review plan on its public website.

3. REVIEW FUNDAMENTALS

- a. The USACE review process is based on a few simple but fundamental principles:
 - Peer review is key to improving the quality of work in planning, design and construction;
 - Reviews shall be scalable, deliberate, life cycle and concurrent with normal business processes;
 - A review performed outside the home district shall be completed on all decision and implementation documents. For other products, a risk informed decision as described in EC 214 will be made whether to perform such a review.

- b. The EC 214 outlines four general levels of review: District Quality Control/Quality Assurance (DQC), Agency Technical Review (ATR), Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), and Policy and Legal Compliance Review.

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)

The RMO for DQC is the home District. In accordance with EC 214 all work products and reports, evaluations, and assessments shall undergo necessary and appropriate District Quality Control (DQC).

DQC is the internal review process of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the project Quality Management Plan (QMP) of the Project Management Plan (PMP).

The DQC is the internal quality control process performed by the supervisors, senior staff, peers and the PDT within the home District and is managed by the home District. DQC consists of;

- a. Quality Checks and reviews. These are routine checks and reviews carried out during the development process by peers not responsible for the original work. These are performed by staff such as supervisors, team leaders or other senior designated to perform internal peer reviews.
- b. PDT reviews. These are reviews by the production team responsible for the original work to ensure consistency and coordination across all project disciplines.

DQC will be performed on the products in accordance with the QMP within the PMP.

Review Plan for Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

A risk informed process was completed for this project in accordance with EC 214. **See paragraph 7, RISK INFORMED DECISIONS.**

The objective of ATR is to ensure consistency with established criteria, guidance, procedures, and policy. The ATR will assess whether the analyses presented are technically correct and comply with published USACE guidance, and that the document explains the analyses and results in a reasonably clear manner for the public and decision makers.

ATR will be conducted by a qualified team from outside the home District that is not involved with the day-to-day production of the project/product. ATR teams will be comprised of senior USACE personnel and may be supplemented by outside experts as appropriate. The ATR team lead will be from outside the home MSC. In limited cases, when appropriate and independent expertise can be secured from Centers or Laboratories or when proper expertise cannot be secured otherwise, NWD may approve exceptions.

6. REVIEW DOCUMENTATION

a) Documentation of ATR. DrChecks review software will be used to document all ATR comments, responses and associated resolutions accomplished throughout the review process. Comments should be limited to those that are required to ensure adequacy of the product. The four key parts of a quality review comment will normally include:

- (1) The review concern – identify the product’s information deficiency or incorrect application of policy, guidance, or procedures;
- (2) The basis for the concern – cite the appropriate law, policy, guidance, or procedure that has not been properly followed;
- (3) 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;
- (4) Where appropriate, provide a suggested action needed to resolve the comment or concern.

In some situations, especially addressing incomplete or unclear information, comments may seek clarification in order to then assess whether further specific concerns may exist.

The ATR documentation in DrChecks will include the text of each concern, the PDT response, a brief summary of the pertinent points in any discussion, including any vertical team coordination (the vertical team includes the district, RMO, MSC, and HQUSACE), and the agreed upon resolution. If an ATR concern cannot be satisfactorily resolved between the ATR team and the PDT, it will be elevated to the vertical team for further resolution in accordance with the policy issue resolution process described in either ER 1110-2-12 or ER 1105-2-100, Appendix H, as appropriate. Unresolved concerns can be closed in DrChecks with a notation that the concern has been elevated to the vertical team for resolution.

ATR shall be certified when all ATR concerns are either resolved or referred to the vertical team for resolution and the ATR documentation is complete. The ATR Lead will prepare a Statement of Technical

Review Plan for Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products

Review certifying that the issues raised by the ATR team have been resolved (or elevated to the vertical team).

7. RISK INFORMED DECISIONS

a. **ATR:** (Source: EC 214, paragraph 15). The process and methods used to develop and document the risk-informed decisions are at the discretion of the District but must be appropriate for the risk and complexity of the project. The following questions and additional appropriate questions were considered;

1. Does it include any design (structural, mechanical, hydraulic, etc)?
2. Does it evaluate alternatives?
3. Does it include a recommendation?
4. Does it have a formal cost estimate?
5. Does it have or will it require a NEPA document?
6. Does it impact a structure or feature of a structure whose performance involves potential life safety risks?
7. What are the consequences of non-performance?
8. Does it support a significant investment of public monies?
9. Does it support a budget request?
10. Does it change the operation of the project?
11. Does it involve ground disturbances?
12. Does it affect any special features, such as cultural resources, historic properties, survey markers, etc, that should be protected or avoided?
13. Does it involve activities that trigger regulatory permitting such as Section 404 or stormwater/NPDES related actions?
14. Does it involve activities that could potentially generate hazardous wastes and/or disposal of materials such as lead based paints or asbestos?
15. Does it reference use of or reliance on manufacturers' engineers and specifications for items such as prefabricated buildings, playground equipment, etc?
16. Does it reference reliance on local authorities for inspection/certification of utility systems like wastewater, stormwater, electrical, etc?
17. Is there or is there expected to be any controversy surrounding the Federal action associated with the work product?

*Note: A "yes" answer to questions above does not necessarily indicate ATR is required, rather it indicates an area where reasoned thought and judgment should be applied and documented in the recommendation.

Decision on ATR: The District considered the risks and determined that **ATR is required** considering the project risks. ATR will be performed on the products in accordance with the District QMP and this RP. **See Attachment 1** for RP Specifics.

b. **INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR).** The District considered risks and risk triggers for Type I IEPR and Type II IEPR, also referred as a Safety Assurance Review (SAR) as described in EC 1165-2-214.

I. **Type I IEPR** is required for decision documents under most circumstances.

Review Plan for Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products

Decision on Type I IEPR: A waiver for IEPR of the PAC Report is being sought as the only project trigger is the cost of \$56M. This project is a fish hatchery which has been completed by USACE routinely, does not impact life safety and will not negatively impact the environment.

- II. **Type II IEPR (SAR).** Type II IEPR, or Safety Assurance Review (SAR), are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on design and construction activities for hurricane, storm, and flood risk management projects or other projects where existing and potential hazards pose a significant threat to human life. Type II IEPR panels will conduct reviews of the design and construction activities prior to initiation of physical construction and, until construction activities are completed, periodically thereafter on a regular schedule. The reviews shall consider the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities in assuring public health safety and welfare.
- Any project addressing **hurricane and storm** risk management and **flood risk** management or;
 - any other project where Federal action is justified by **life safety** or;
 - the failure of the project would pose a **significant threat to human life**.
 - This applies to new projects and to the major repair, rehabilitation, replacement, or modification of existing facilities (based on identified risks and threats).

Other Factors to consider for Type II IEPR (SAR) review of a project, or components of a project;

- The project involves the use of innovative materials or techniques where the engineering is based on novel methods, presents complex challenges for interpretations, contains precedent-setting methods or models, or presents conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices
- The project design requires redundancy, resiliency, and robustness.
- The project has unique construction sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design and construction schedule; for example, significant project features accomplished using the Design-Build or Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) delivery systems.

Decision on Type II IEPR: The District considered these risks and determined that **Type II IEPR (SAR) is not required** considering the risks triggers.

8. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW

All documents will be reviewed throughout the process for their compliance with law and policy. These reviews culminate in determinations that the recommendations in the reports and the supporting analyses and coordination comply with law and policy, and warrant approval or further recommendation to higher authority by the home MSC Commander. 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.

This review plan template is not intended to describe requirements and processes to conduct policy and legal compliance review, or legal sufficiency reviews.

**Review Plan for
Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products**

9. TEMPLATE APPROVAL

NWD is responsible for maintaining the current version of this Review Plan template and ensuring the information accurately describes the criteria and considerations necessary to arrive at a risk informed decision. The review plan template is a living document and is subject to change.

The home District is responsible to complete the Review Plan Template Cover page, adjust the Table of Contents and the complete Review Plan specifics in **Attachment 1**. Significant changes to the review plan specifics (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) should be re-approved by NWD. The completed Template information and the Attachment 1 will be submitted to the NWD for coordination and approval.

END OF TEMPLATE INFORMATION

Review Plan for Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products

ATTACHMENT 1 **Review Plan Specifics**

The information in this attachment is prepared by the District PM/PDT for the project specific information required for this review plan. The DQC is managed by the District and is described in the PMP/QMP. This document should be attached or included in the PMP/QMP to document the ATR.

A-1. PROJECT INFORMATION

a. **Study/Project Description.** The purpose of the John Day mitigation (JDM) program is to offset mainstem fall Chinook production losses that resulted from construction of The Dalles and John Day dams. Since implementation of the JDM program in 1978, adjustments to the program related to the specific stock of Chinook salmon as well as the production, rearing, and release locations have occurred. Currently mitigation is provided by a combination of adult egg take, incubation, and juvenile rearing using a combination of Priest Rapids and Ringold Springs Washington State Hatcheries, Little White Salmon and Spring Creek National Fish Hatcheries, Bonneville and Umatilla Oregon State Fish Hatcheries, and the Prosser Tribal Fish Hatchery. A little less than half of the fall Chinook mitigation fish are upriver bright (URB) Chinook, which are released into the Columbia River from several facilities in a reach that stretches from just below Bonneville Dam to as far as Priest Rapids Dam upstream of McNary Dam. The remaining production is comprised of tule fall Chinook, which are released in the Bonneville pool and just below Bonneville Dam.

Provisions to evaluate additional changes to the JDM program to minimize impacts on Lower Columbia River Chinook salmon and to mitigate losses "*in-place and in-kind*" have been included in the 2008 Federal Columbia River Power System Biological Opinion and also identified in the 2008 Columbia Basin Fish Accords Memorandum of Agreement between the Action Agencies (Bonneville Power Administration, USACE, and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation) and Columbia Basin Treaty Tribes. In-place and in-kind mitigation for the JDM program will ensure that the stocks of fall Chinook salmon that utilized the habitat affected by the John Day and The Dalles dams (in-kind) are mitigated through hatchery production so that they have access and return to this area (Zone 6 fishery) of affected habitat (in-place).

The Post-Authorization Change (PAC) Report will document the need and justification for modifying the JDM program and evaluate whether changes are consistent with current authorization or specific authorizing language is required. Included shall be an evaluation of five preliminary alternatives to meet the in-place and in-kind objectives while minimizing the effects on ESA listed Lower Columbia River Chinook, alternative recommendation, comparison of recommendation to authorization, and documentation of public involvement and coordination with U.S. v Oregon parties.

The Design Documentation Report (DDR) will document design of the above recommendation. Features of the facilities in the DDR will include water supply intake, distribution tower, fish ladders, sorting ponds/facilities, holding and rearing ponds, return flume and incubation building.

**Review Plan for
Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products**

This RP includes ATR of both the DDR and PAC Report.

IEPR Requirement. A waiver for IEPR of the PAC Report is being sought as the only project trigger is the cost of \$56M. This project is a fish hatchery which has been completed by USACE routinely, does not impact life safety and will not negatively impact the environment. Below are questions that were answered during the PDT risk-informed decision process to determine the required level of review.

b. Current Total Project Cost. Current project cost is \$56M for design and construction. The cost estimate will be reviewed by the Civil Works Cost Engineering and ATR MCX.

c. Required ATR Team Expertise. ATR team and required expertise;

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead shall be a senior professional with extensive experience in design and construction of hatchery facilities and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process.
Biologist	The biologist shall have extensive experience in operations of hatchery facilities and design features.
Structural	The structural engineer shall have experience in civil works design and construction, water intake structures and hatchery facilities.
Hydraulic	The hydraulic engineer shall have experience in civil works design and construction, water intake structures and hatchery facilities.
NEPA	The NEPA compliance reviewer shall be an expert in the environmental requirements of NEPA with experience in permitting of in-water structures such as hatchery facilities.
Planning	The planner shall have extensive experience in operations of hatchery facilities and design features.
Mechanical	The mechanical engineer shall have extensive experience in operations of hatchery facilities and design features.
Electrical	The electrical engineer shall have extensive experience in operations of hatchery facilities and design features.
Civil/Geotech	The civil engineer shall have extensive experience in operations of hatchery facilities and design features.

A-2. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. ATR/Review Schedule.

Review Milestone	Review Products	Date Planned
ATR review	90% PACR & DDR	March 04-15, 2013
ATR Backcheck	90% PACR & DDR	March 16-26, 2013
ATR Certification	90% PACR & DDR	April 05, 2013

b. ATR COSTS - Labor/Expenses.

**Review Plan for
Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products**

Review Milestone	#reviewers/total hours	Approximate cost/hr	Totals
ATR Review (PACR & DDR)	9/216	\$100	\$21,600
ATR Backcheck (PACR & DDR)	9/56	\$100	\$5,600
Total ATR costs			\$27,200

A-3. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

The Review Management Organization for ATR will be NWD unless noted otherwise.

Public questions and/or comments on this review plan can be directed to the following points of contact:

Contact	Role	Title	Office/District/Division	Phone
George Miller	Project Manager	Community Planner	CENWP-PM-FP, US Army Corps of Engineers	503-808-4704
Stephen Bredthauer	RMO - Business Technical (DDR)	Technical Review Program Manager	Northwestern Division, US Army Corps of Engineers	503-808-4053
Rebecca Weiss	RMO - Planning (PAC Report)	Quality Manager	Northwestern Division, US Army Corps of Engineers	503-808-3728

A-4. PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM (PDT) ROSTER. Before posting to websites for public disclosure of the RP, it may be necessary to remove names and contact information for Corps employees to comply with security policies.

PDT Roster				
Name	Discipline/Role	District/Agency	email	Phone
Matthew Hanson	Structural/Technical Lead	CENWP-EC-DS	Matthew.D.Hanson@usace.army.mil	503-808-4934
Mehdi Roshani	Structural	CENWP-EC-DS	Mehdi.Roshani@usace.army.mil	503-808-4988
Bernard Klatte	Operations/Biology	CENWP-OD-T	Bernard.A.Klatte@usace.army.mil	503-808-4318
Carolyn Schneider	Environmental	CENWP-PM-E	Carolyn.B.Schneider@usace.army.mil	541-298-6699
David Leonhardt	Fisheries Biologist	CENWP-PM-E	David.S.Leonhardt@usace.army.mil	503-808-4786
Jennifer Richman	Attorney	CENWP-OC	Jennifer.R.Richman@usace.army.mil	503-808-4538
Enrique	Real Estate	CENWP-RE	Enrique.Godinez@usace.army.mil	503-808-

**Review Plan for
Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products**

PDT Roster				
Name	Discipline/Role	District/Agency	email	Phone
Godinez				4670
Tina Lundell	Water Quality	CENWP-EC-HR	Tina.M.Lundell@usace.army.mil	503-808-4878
Ross Foster	Mechanical Engineer	CENWP-EC-DM	Ross.R.Foster@usace.army.mil	503-808-4929
David Scofield	Civil Engineer	CENWP-EC-DC	David.H.Scofield@usace.army.mil	503-808-4867
Elizabeth Roy	Hydraulic Engineer	CENWP-EC-HD	Elizabeth.W.Roy@usace.army.mil	503-808-4849
Joseph Russell	Civil Engineer	CENWP-EC-CC	Joseph.B.Russell@usace.army.mil	503-808-4917

A-5. ATR TEAM ROSTER. Before posting to websites for public disclosure of the RP, it may be necessary to remove names and contact information for Corps employees to comply with security policies.

Agency Technical Review (ATR) Team				
Name	Discipline/Role	District/Agency	email	Phone
Paul Schimelfenyg	ATR Lead	SPD	Paul.Schimelfenyg@usace.army.mil	415-503-6916
Peter LaCivita	Biologist	SPD	Peter.E.LaCivita@usace.army.mil	415-503-6864
Paul Surace	Structural	LRP	Paul.A.Surace@usace.army.mil	412-395-7287
James Kosky	Hydraulic	LRP	James.A.Kosky@usace.army.mil	412-395-7346
William Brostoff	NEPA	SPD	William.N.Brostoff@usace.army.mil	415-503-6867
John Grothaus	Planning	NWK	John.J.Grothaus@usace.army.mil	816-389-3110
Michael Scott	Mechanical	NWK	Michael.G.Scott@usace.army.mil	816-389-3639
John Nites	Electrical	LRP	John.Nites@usace.army.mil	412-395-7268
Richard Garrison	Civil/Geotech	NWS	Richard.O.Garrison@usace.army.mil	206-764-3312

**Review Plan for
Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products**

A-6. REVIEW PLAN SPECIFICS - APPROVAL

The information provided in the Review Plan Template and the Review Plan Specifics in **Attachment 1** are hereby submitted for approval.

NWD will review this plan and route by NWD staffing sheet. If the plan is complete and appropriate for the risk and complexity of the project/products, the NWD will recommend approval by the NWD Commander. The NWD approval memorandum will be sent to the District PM responsible for the plan. The NWD approval memorandum shall be documented with the review plan, and the approval date should be noted on the cover sheet of this document.

Approved revisions should be recorded in the A-7 block below.

A-7 REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number	Date Approved
Original			
Revision 1			

**Review Plan for
Implementation Documents, Decision Documents and Other Work Products**

ATTACHMENT 2

B-1. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<u>Acronyms</u>	<u>Defined</u>
ATR	Agency Technical Review
CAP	Continuing Authorities Program
DCW	Director of Civil Works
DQC	District Quality Control
EC	Engineering Circular
ECI	Early Contractor Involvement
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ER	Engineering Regulation
FAQ's	Frequently Asked Questions
HQUSACE	Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review
NWD	Northwestern Division
MSC	Major Subordinate Command
PCX	Planning Center of Expertise
PDT	Project Delivery Team
PMP	Project Management Plan
QA	Quality Assurance
QMP	Quality Management Plan
QMS	Quality Management System
RIT	Regional Integration Team
RMC	Risk Management Center
RMO	Review Management Organization
RP	Review Plan
SES	Senior Executive Service
SAR	Safety Assurance Review (also referred as Type I IEPR)