



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

CENWD-RBT

30 NOV 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Portland District (CENWP-PM-FP/Natalie Richards)

SUBJECT: Review Plan (RP) Approval for Adult Passive Integrated Transducer (PIT) Tag Detection System, P2 353174, The Dalles Dam, Portland District

1. References:

a. Memorandum, CENWP-HD, 17 October 2012, subject: The Dalles Dam, Adult Passive Integrated (PIT) Tag Detection System, P2 353174, The Dalles Dam, Oregon, NWP District, Northwestern Division, Plan Review Submittal for Other Work Product (Encl).

b. EC 1165-2-209 Change 1, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 January 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, Northwestern Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Review Plan includes District Quality Control and Agency Technical Review. NWD will serve as the Review Management Organization for the Agency Technical Review.

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.

Encl

ANTHONY C. FUNKHOUSER, P.E.
COL, EN
Commanding

CF: CENWD-PDS

903 100 92



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, PORTLAND DISTRICT
PO BOX 2946
PORTLAND OR 97208-2946

CENWP-HD

17 OCT 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Northwestern Division (CENWD-DE)
(Stephen Bredthauer, Quality Assurance Manager, CENWD/RBT)

SUBJECT: The Dalles Dam, Adult Passive Integrated (PIT) Tag Detection System, P2 353174,
The Dalles Dam, Oregon, NWP District, Northwestern Division, Plan Review Submittal for
Other Work Product

1. Enclosed for Major Subordinate Command (MSC) Commander approval is The Dalles Dam,
Adult Passive Integrated Transducer (PIT) Tag Detection System, Alternatives Study thru Plans
and Specifications, P2 353174. This Plan Review has been prepared according to
EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy.

2. The District point of contact (POC) for questions or requests for additional information may
be referred to Natalie Richards, Project Manager, at (503) 808-4755 or email at
natalie.a.richards@usace.army.mil. A secondary POC is Technical Lead Marie Phillips, at
(503) 808- 4812 or email at marie.j.phillips@usace.army.mil.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

LANCE A. HELWIG, P.E.
Chief, Engineering & Construction Division

Encl

CF:
CENWD-RBT (Bredthauer)



PROJECT REVIEW PLAN

ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies

Project Name: The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies
Project Location: The Dalles
Project P2 Number: 353174 (The Dalles)
Project Managers: Natalie Richards
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 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®

Approved Version: 31 May 2011. Printed Copies are for "Information Only". The controlled version resides on the shared documents folder of the NWD SharePoint site at:
<https://kme.usace.army.mil/NWD/RPP/default.aspx>

PROJECT REVIEW PLAN

ATR Review Plan for The Dalles Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies

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)	5
6. REVIEW DOCUMENTATION.....	5
7. RISK INFORMED DECISIONS	6
8. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW	8
9. TEMPLATE APPROVAL	9
ATTACHMENT 1 – REVIEW PLAN SPECIFICS.....	10
A-1. PROJECT INFORMATION.....	10
A-2. REVIEW SCHEDULE AND COSTS	12
A-3. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT	13
A-4. PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM (PDT) ROSTER	13
A-5. ATR TEAM ROSTER	14
A-6. REVIEW PLAN SPECIFICS APPROVAL	15
A-7. REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS	15
ATTACHMENT 2 - ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	16
B-1. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	16

Approved Version: 31 May 2011. Printed Copies are for "Information Only". The controlled version resides on the shared documents folder of the NWD SharePoint site at:

<https://kme.usace.army.mil/NWD/RPP/default.aspx>

ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS.

a. Purpose. This ATR Review Plan (RP) Template and attachments describe requirements for the project identified on the cover sheet of this document. This RP describes Agency Technical Review (ATR) associated with implementation documents, or other work products. 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 209. 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. Refer to the criteria provided below. 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.

**ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies**

d. References

Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
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

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 209 will be made whether to perform such a review.
- b. The EC 209 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 209 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).

**ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies**

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.

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

A risk informed process was completed for this project in accordance with EC 209. 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;

**ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies**

- (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 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 209, 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?

**ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies**

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 1165-2-209.

- i. **Type I IEPR** is required for decision documents under most circumstances. This project does not involve the production of decision documents.

Decision on Type I IEPR: The District considered these risks and determined that **Type I IEPR is not required.**

- 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.

ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies

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: Based on the information and analysis provided in the preceding paragraphs of this review plan, the project covered under this plan is excluded from IEPR because it does not meet the mandatory IEPR triggers and does not warrant IEPR based on a risk-informed analysis. 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.

**ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies**

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

**ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies**

**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 this project is to evaluate feasibility, determine suitable locations, and develop cost estimates for installing PIT (Passive Integrated Transducer) detection at both fish ladders at The Dalles and John Day dams. The products are two alternatives studies, one for The Dalles and one for John Day. The study for each dam will evaluate both fish ladders (North and East for The Dalles, North and South for John Day). This project is part of the Columbia River Fish Mitigation (CRFM) program. The goal of the CRFM program is to evaluate, test, and implement operational and configuration measures to improve passage efficiency and survival of adult and juvenile anadromous fish and lamprey migrating through dams and reservoirs on the lower Columbia and Snake Rivers and in the estuary. The 2009 FCRPS Adaptive Management Implementation Plan and 2010 FCRPS Supplemental BiOP requires the Corps to initiate this study to determine cost-effective designs for adult PIT detection systems at The Dalles and John Day Dams:

The potential for additional adult PIT tag detection at The Dalles and John Day dam fishways should be evaluated to assess whether additional detections at either or both of these dams could substantially improve inter-dam adult loss estimates in the lower Columbia River, and detectors should be added, if warranted.¹

Under RPA Action 52, the Action Agencies will enhance fish population monitoring. As part of this action, in February 2011 the Corps will initiate a study at The Dalles and John Day Dams to determine a cost effective adult PIT tag detection system design and whether installation of PIT tag detectors will improve inter-dam adult survival estimates. The study will be completed by December 2012. Following the results of the study, by April 2013, the Action Agencies will determine in coordination with NOAA if one or both of these PIT

¹ From 2010 FCRPS Supplemental BiOp, paragraph 2.2.2.3.

**ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies**

tag detectors substantially improve inter-dam adult loss estimates. If warranted, the Action Agencies will proceed to construction. Funding will be scheduled consistent with the RPA requirement and priorities for performance standard testing and achievement of these performance standards at the projects.²

b. **Purpose:** The purpose of this review plan (RP) is to define the scope and level of review for The Dalles & John Day Dams Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies. This RP is a component of the Project Management Plan (PMP). It will be referenced as an appendix to any updates to the PMP dated June 2011.

c. **Products for Review:** The Product Delivery Team (PDT) is responsible for a complete review of all products to assure the overall integrity of the report, design, costs, and construction. 30%, 60%, and 90% Study Reviews are anticipated. WBS products and deliverables shall be reviewed as they are developed to ensure they meet project and customer objectives, comply with regulatory and engineering guidance, and meet customer expectations of quality. Informal reviews, consisting of project delivery team (PDT) presentations and discussions, shall be documented with meeting minutes. Formal reviews, consisting of review comments, review conferences, and back checking, shall be documented using Dr. Checks. Formal reviews will involve all members of the PDT (to include ITR members).

d. **Current Total Project Cost.** \$700,000.

e. **Required ATR Team Expertise.** ATR team and required expertise;

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead / Structural Engineer	The ATR lead should be a senior professional with experience in structural engineering and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process and fish passage experience.
Hydraulic Engineer	The reviewer should be a senior hydraulic engineer with fish passage background.
Fisheries Biologist	The reviewer should be a senior fisheries biologist with PIT detection background.
Mechanical Engineer	The reviewer should be a senior mechanical engineer with expertise in fish ladder operation.
Electrical Engineer	The reviewer should be a senior electrical engineer with expertise in fish ladder electrical systems.

² From 2010 FCRPS Supplemental BiOp, paragraph 3.2, Adaptive Management Implementation Plan (AMIP), Amendment 2

**ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies**

Cost Engineer	The reviewer should be a senior cost engineer with fish ladder expertise.
---------------	---

A-2. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. ATR Schedule

Review Milestone	Review Products	Date Planned Complete*
ATR of 30% Alternatives Study	30% Alternatives Report	November 25, 2011
ATR of 60% Alternatives Study	60% Alternatives Report	March 12, 2012
ATR of 90% Alternatives Study	90% Alternatives Report	June 12, 2012
Final Backcheck		July 9 2012

- 2 week review period assumed
- DDR and P&S schedule to be determined

b. ATR COSTS - Labor/Expenses

Review Milestone	#reviewers/total hours	Approximate cost/hr	Totals
ATR of 30% Alternatives Study	7/112	\$104	\$11,650
ATR of 60% Alternatives Study	7/112	\$104	\$11,650
ATR of 90% Alternatives Study	7/112	\$104	\$11,650
Subtotal ATR costs			\$35,000
ATR of 30% DDR	7/112	\$104	\$11,650
ATR of 60% DDR	7/112	\$104	\$11,650
ATR of 90% DDR	7/112	\$104	\$11,650
Subtotal ATR costs			\$70,000
ATR of 30% P&S	7/112	\$104	\$11,650
ATR of 60% P&S	7/112	\$104	\$11,650
ATR of 90% P&S	7/112	\$104	\$11,650
Total ATR costs			\$105,000

**ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies**

c. **Engineering Models.** The following engineering models are anticipated to be used in the development of the implementation documents or other work products:

Not Applicable.

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
Natalie Richards	Project Manager	Electrical Engineer	Portland District, US Army Corps of Engineers	503-808-4293
Stephen Bredthauer	RMO - Point of contact	NWD Quality Manager	Northwestern Division, US Army Corps of Engineers (currently located at NWW)	503-808-4053

A-4. PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM (PDT) ROSTER

PDT Roster				
Name	Discipline/Role	District/Agency	email	Phone
Natalie Richards	Project Manager	CENWP	Natalie.a.richards@usace.army.mil-	503-808-4755-
Mike Langeslay	Program Manager	CENWP	Mike.j.langeslay@usace.army.mil-	- 503-808-4774
Sean Tackley	Biologist	CENWP	Sean.c.tackley@usace.army.mil-	503-808-4751 -
Marie Phillips	Team Lead (Engineering, Hyd.)	CENWP	marie.j.phillips@usace.army.mil	503-808-4812 -
Rick Reiner / Bob Cordie	Project Support (TD)	CENWP	Richard.l.reiner@usace.army.mil/Robert.p.cordie@usace.army.mil-	541-506-7805 /541-506-7800 -
Alden Associates	Engineering, Hyd.	CENWP	-	-

**ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies**

PDT Roster				
Name	Discipline/Role	District/Agency	email	Phone
Jordan Reimer	Engineering, Struct.	CENWP	Jordan.d.reimer@usace.army.mil	503-808-4941 -
Ricky Russell	Engineering, Cost	CENWP	Rick.l.russell@usace.army.mil	503-808-4791 -
Jay Dallas	Engineering, Mech.	CENWP	Jay.m.dallas@usace.army.mil	503-808-4959 -
Brandt Bannister	Engineering, Elec.	CENWP	Brandt.d.bannister@usace.army.mil	503-808-4924

A-5. ATR TEAM ROSTER

Agency Technical Review (ATR) Team				
Name	Discipline/Role	District/Agency	email	Phone
**Brad Ninnis	ATR Lead/Structural	CESPK	william.b.ninnis2@usace.army.mil	916-557-7251
Lynn Reese	Hydraulic Engineer	CENWW	lynn.a.reese@usace.army.mil	509-527-7531
Brad Trumbo	Fisheries Biologist	CENWW	Bradly.a.trumbo@usace.army.mil	509-527-7253
Chuck Palmer	Mechanical Engineer	CENWW	Chuck.r.palmer@usace.army.mil	509-527-7571
Stuart Gregory	Electrical Engineer	CENWW	Stuart.a.gregory@usace.army.mil	509-527-7582
Mike Jacobs	Cost Engineer	CENWW	Michael.p.jacobs@usace.army.mil	509-527-7516
Jon Lomeland	Structural Engineer	CENWW	Jon.a.lomeland@usace.army.mil	509-527-7652

****NOTE-ATR Lead completed by Mike Jacobs after Brad Ninnis backed out of ATR Lead just before 60% Review.**

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

**ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies**

approval by the appropriate Senior Executive Service (SES) in NWD. 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	3/14/2012		None needed
Revision 1	9/4/2012	1	NWD Needed

**ATR Review Plan for
The Dalles
Adult PIT Detection Alternatives Studies**

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)