



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

CENWD-RBT

13 DEC 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Portland District (CENWP-PM-FP/Jeffrey Ament)

SUBJECT: Review Plan (RP) Approval for Detroit Dam Long Term Temperature Facility Including Fish Passage Alternative Study, Detroit, Oregon, NWP District, Northwestern Division

1. References:

a. Memorandum, CENWP-DE, subject: Detroit Dam Long Term Temperature Facility Including Fish Passage Alternative Study, Detroit, Oregon, NWP District, Northwestern Division, Plan Review submittal, for Implementation Document (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



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
PORTLAND DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
333 SW FIRST AVENUE  
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

CENWP-DE

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

SUBJECT: Detroit Dam Long Term Temperature Facility Including Fish Passage Alternative Study, Detroit, Oregon, NWP District, Northwestern Division, Plan Review submittal, for Implementation Document

1. Enclosed for Major Subordinate Command (MSC) Commander approval is the Detroit Dam Long Term Temperature Facility Including Fish Passage Review Plan for Detroit Dam. This Review Plan 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 Jeff Ament, Project Manager, at (503) 808-4713 or email at Jeffrey.M.Ament@usace.army.mil. A secondary POC is Technical Lead Sean Askelon, at (503) 808- 4882 or email at Sean.K.Askelon@usace.army.mil.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lance A. Helwig", is written over the typed name and title.

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

Encl

CF:  
CENWD-RBT (Bredthauer)



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
 PORTLAND DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
 333 SW FIRST AVENUE  
 PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

REPLY TO  
 ATTENTION OF

CENWP-DE

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

SUBJECT: Detroit Dam Long Term Temperature Facility Including Fish Passage Alternative Study, Detroit, Oregon, NWP District, Northwestern Division, Plan Review submittal, for Implementation Document

1. Enclosed for Major Subordinate Command (MSC) Commander approval is the Detroit Dam Long Term Temperature Facility Including Fish Passage Review Plan for Detroit Dam. This Review Plan 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 Jeff Ament, Project Manager, at (503) 808-4713 or email at Jeffrey.M.Ament@usace.army.mil. A secondary POC is Technical Lead Sean Askelson, at (503) 808- 4882 or email at Sean.K.Askelon@usace.army.mil.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

Encl

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

CF:  
 CENWD-RBT (Bredthauer)

HELWIG CENWP-EC	<i>[Signature]</i>
Mark Sawka CENWP-EC-D	<i>MS</i> 3 DEC 2012
Robert Buchholz CENWP-EC-H	<i>[Signature]</i> 12-3-12
HICKS CENWMP-PM-F	<i>all</i> 11-11-12
Dasso CENWP-PM-FP	<i>[Signature]</i> 11/6/12
Jeff Ament CENWP-PM-FP	<i>[Signature]</i> 11/5/12
Sean Askelson CENWP-EC-HD	<i>[Signature]</i> 5-20-12

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

**Project Name:** Detroit Dam Long Term Temperature Facility including Fish  
Passage Alternative Study

**Project Location:** NWP

**Project P2 Number:** 337502

**Project Manager or POC Name:** Jeff Ament

**NWD Original Approval Date:**

**NWD Revision 1 Approval Date:**

---

**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.

---

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



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers®**

**PROJECT REVIEW PLAN**  
**ATR Review Plan for**  
**Implementation 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.....	

## ATR Review Plan for Implementation Documents and Other Work Products

### 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. 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) 1165-2-209, 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

## **ATR Review Plan for Implementation Documents and Other Work Products**

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).

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)**

## ATR Review Plan for Implementation Documents and Other Work Products

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

**ATR Review Plan for  
Implementation Documents and Other Work Products**

**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?
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 1165-2-209.

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

## ATR Review Plan for Implementation Documents and Other Work Products

**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. 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  
Implementation 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**

# ATR Review Plan for Implementation 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.** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) 2008 Willamette Biological Opinion describes several Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives (RPAs) for minimizing water quality effects associated with operations of certain Willamette Project dams, and provide downstream fish passage at certain dams. RPAs need to be evaluated and implemented within the next 15 years. NMFS considers these measures essential to avoid jeopardy of Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed fish in the Willamette basin.

RPA 5.2 requires investigation of the feasibility of improving downstream temperatures and reducing Total Dissolved Gas (TDG) exceedances in the North Santiam River for ESA-listed fish species. Interim steps must begin no later than 2010, which may include feasibility studies, a design report, authorization and appropriation, and plans and specifications if appropriate. As part of the effort, evaluation of alternatives to achieve both temperature control and downstream fish passage will be required (see RPA 4.12.3). A Major Milestone date near the end of 2011 will be established to determine a "go/no go" on the feasibility of temperature control facilities at Detroit Dam. The goal is to complete construction of any structural temperature control facilities by December 2018, with permanent temperature control operations beginning by March 2019. Downstream fish pas-sage is required to be completed by December 2023.

To meet the RPA 5.2 objectives, the Detroit Dam Long Term Temperature Control Facility Alternatives Study will be conducted to develop and evaluate alternatives for temperature control and reduction of TDG exceedances below Detroit Dam. Interim temperature control operations have been attempted annually since 2008, utilizing existing project facilities and operating equipment. Results from interim operations indicate a need for improvements to existing operating equipment or addition of a separate structural alternative to meet BiOp goals. If a structural alternative is selected, downstream passage fish will also be considered in the design. A preferred alternative will be selected for further study in the Design Documentation Report (DDR) phase.

Detroit Dam is located in the Willamette River drainage basin, on the North Santiam River, approximately 50 miles southeast of Salem, Oregon. Detroit Dam is a 450-foot-high, 1,457-foot-long concrete gravity structure. It has 6 spillway control tainter gates, four regulating outlets (at two elevations) through the structure under the spillway, and a separate two-unit powerhouse. The drainage area above the dam is 438 mi<sup>2</sup>. Maximum Pool for the reservoir is 1574.0 ft and contains 472,600 acre-ft of storage. Maximum Conservation Pool is 1569 ft and contains 436,000 acre-ft.

The objective is to prepare an Alternatives Report (AR) that addresses the feasibility of and project-specific alternatives for achieving long term temperature control (e.g. using existing equipment with upgrades, or with a new permanent facility) that can provide target water temperatures for listed

## ATR Review Plan for Implementation Documents and Other Work Products

species in the North Santiam River, and minimize the number of TDG exceedances in the North Santiam River. Additionally, alternatives will be developed to include fish passage as a product to work in concert with recommended structural and/or operational temperature control and TDG reduction alternatives.

The AR shall develop a broad range of temperature control structures and TDG reduction alternatives, evaluate, prioritize, and refine those alternatives, and present relative costs. Fish passage alternatives will also be developed, evaluated, prioritized, refined and presented in relative costs in to work in concert with the proposed temperature control structures and TDG reduction alternatives, if feasible. Fish passage alternatives may also be developed independent of temperature control structures and TDG reduction alternatives (incompatible flow requirements, incompatible locations, location of hydraulic flow nets, etc), which will be included as an alternative option. Potential requirements and costs to model and prototype field test alternatives studied in this report are also part of the scope, but call for much less detail.

Findings and recommendations from the AR will be incorporated into the larger Willamette Valley Configuration and Operations Plan (COP).

b. **Current Total Project Cost.** This project is to be completed under CRFM funding, the Total Project Cost for this effort has not yet been determined. This will be revised as more information becomes available.

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

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional with experience in high head design or downstream juvenile fish passage and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process.
Cost Engineer	The cost estimation reviewer should be a senior Cost Engineer with experience in cost estimation.
Hydraulic Design	The Hydraulic Design reviewer should be a senior hydraulic engineer with experience in high head facility design and downstream juvenile fish passage design.
Fisheries Biologist	The fisheries biologist reviewer should be a senior biologist with experience in juvenile downstream fish passage.
Structural Engineer	The structural design reviewer should be a senior structural engineer with experience in juvenile high head facility design and downstream juvenile fish passage design.
Water Quality Specialist	The water quality specialist reviewer should be a senior water quality specialist with experience in temperature control and TDG management.
Mechanical Design (90/100% only)	The mechanical design reviewer should be a senior mechanical engineer with experience in juvenile high head facility design and downstream juvenile fish passage design.
Electrical Design (90/100% only)	The electrical design reviewer should be a senior electrical

**ATR Review Plan for  
Implementation Documents and Other Work Products**

	engineer with experience in juvenile high head facility design and downstream juvenile fish passage design.
--	---

**A-2. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS**

**a. ATR Schedule.**

Review Milestone	Review Products	Date Planned
60% ATR review	60% Draft EDR (alternatives report)	2-MAR-2012
60% backcheck		22-JUN-2012
75% ATR review	75% Draft EDR (alternatives report to include recommended Temp Control Alternative)	15-Nov-2012
75% backcheck		15-Jan-2013
90% ATR review	90% Draft EDR (alternatives report to include recommended D/S passage Alternative)	TBD (pending RM&E results)
90% backcheck		TBD (pending RM&E results)
100% backcheck	Final EDR (alternatives report)	TBD (pending RM&E results)
ATR Certification		TBD (pending RM&E results)

**b. ATR COSTS - Labor/Expenses.**

Review Milestone	#reviewers/total hours	Approximate cost/hr	Totals
60% ATR review	5/50	\$120	\$6000
60% backcheck	5/15	\$120	\$1800
90% ATR review	8/80	\$120	\$9600
90% backcheck	8/24	\$120	\$2880
100% backcheck	8/24	\$120	\$2880
ATR Certification	1/10	\$120	\$1200
ATR Expenses (travel etc)			\$N/A
<b>Total ATR costs</b>			<b>\$24,500</b>

**c. Engineering Models.** No engineering models are anticipated to be used in the development of the implementation documents or other work products.

**A-3. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT**

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

**ATR Review Plan for  
Implementation Documents and Other Work Products**

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
Jeff Ament	Project Manager	Project Manager	CENWP-PM-PM, US Army Corps of Engineers	503.808.4713
StephenBredthauer	RMO - Point of contact	Quality Assurance Manager	CENWD-RBT, Northwestern Division, US Army Corps of Engineers	503.808.4053

**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
Sean Askelson	Technical Lead/Hydraulic Design	CENWP-EC-HD	<a href="mailto:Sean.K.Askelson@usace.army.mil">Sean.K.Askelson@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4882
Jeffrey Ament	Project Manager	CENWP-PM-F	<a href="mailto:Jeffrey.M.Ament@usace.army.mil">Jeffrey.M.Ament@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4713
Mary Karen Scullion	Reservoir Regulation	CENWP-EC-HR	<a href="mailto:Mary.K.Scullion@usace.army.mil">Mary.K.Scullion@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4869
Kathryn Tackley	Water Quality	CENWP-EC-HR	<a href="mailto:Kathryn.L.Tackley@usace.army.mil">Kathryn.L.Tackley@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4883
James Burton	Hydrology	CENWP-EC-HY	<a href="mailto:James.C.Burton@usace.army.mil">James.C.Burton@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4852
Carolyn Flaherty	Dam Safety	CENWP-EC-HC	<a href="mailto:Carolyn.A.Flaherty@usace.army.mil">Carolyn.A.Flaherty@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4848
Mehdi Roshani	Structural Design	CENWP-EC-DS	<a href="mailto:Mehdi.Roshani@usace.army.mil">Mehdi.Roshani@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4988
James Calnon	Mechanical Design	CENWP-EC-DM	<a href="mailto:James.D.Calnon@usace.army.mil">James.D.Calnon@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4928
William Fortuny	Electrical Design	CENWP-EC-DE	<a href="mailto:William.B.Fortuny@usace.army.mil">William.B.Fortuny@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4794
Jeffrey A Sedey	Cost and Constructability	CENWP-EC-CC	<a href="mailto:Jeffrey.A.Sedey@usace.army.mil">Jeffrey.A.Sedey@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4423
Doug Swanson	GIS	CENWP-EC-TG	<a href="mailto:Doug.C.Swanson@usace.army.mil">Doug.C.Swanson@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4858
Thomas Hackett	Economics	CENWP-PM-F	<a href="mailto:Thomas.W.Hackett@usace.army.mil">Thomas.W.Hackett@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4769
Robert Wertheimer	Fisheries Biologist	CEWNP-PM-E	<a href="mailto:Robert.H.Wertheimer@usace.army.mil">Robert.H.Wertheimer@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4709
Greg Smith	Environmental Permitting	CENWP-PM-E	<a href="mailto:Gregory.M.Smith@usace.army.mil">Gregory.M.Smith@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4783
David Bardy	WV Project Rep	CENPW-OD-V	<a href="mailto:David.M.Bardy@usace.army.mil">David.M.Bardy@usace.army.mil</a>	541.973.2131 X154

**ATR Review Plan for  
Implementation Documents and Other Work Products**

PDT Roster				
Name	Discipline/Role	District/Agency	email	Phone
Gregory Taylor	WV Project Biologist	CENPW-OD-V	<a href="mailto:Greg.A.Taylor@usace.army.mil">Greg.A.Taylor@usace.army.mil</a>	541.973.2131 X146
Steven Gardner	WV Project Rep	CENPW-OD-V	<a href="mailto:Steven.R.Gardner@usace.army.mil">Steven.R.Gardner@usace.army.mil</a>	541.367.5124
Ian Chane	Operations Biologist	CENWP-OD-S	<a href="mailto:Ian.B.Chane@usace.army.mil">Ian.B.Chane@usace.army.mil</a>	503.808.4305

**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
Stuart Gregory	Electrical	NWW	<a href="mailto:Stuart.A.Gregory@usace.army.mil">Stuart.A.Gregory@usace.army.mil</a>	509.527.7582
Chuck Palmer	Mechanical	NWW	<a href="mailto:Chuck.R.Palmer@usace.army.mil">Chuck.R.Palmer@usace.army.mil</a>	509.527.7571
Marvin Parks	Structural	NWW	<a href="mailto:Marvin.L.Parks@usace.army.mil">Marvin.L.Parks@usace.army.mil</a>	509.527.7578
Steve Juul	Water Quality	NWW	<a href="mailto:Steve.T.Juul@usace.army.mil">Steve.T.Juul@usace.army.mil</a>	509.527.7281
Lynn Reese	Hydraulic Design	NWW	<a href="mailto:Lynn.A.Reese@usace.army.mil">Lynn.A.Reese@usace.army.mil</a>	509.527.7531
Chris Pinney	Fisheries Biologist	NWW	<a href="mailto:Chris.A.Pinney@usace.army.mil">Chris.A.Pinney@usace.army.mil</a>	509.527.7284
TBD	Cost	NWW		
Mike Lin	Hydraulic Design/ATR Lead	SPK	<a href="mailto:Mike.C.Lin@usace.army.mil">Mike.C.Lin@usace.army.mil</a>	916.557.7967

**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 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**

**ATR Review Plan for  
Implementation Documents and Other Work Products**

<b>Revision Date</b>	<b>Description of Change</b>	<b>Page / Paragraph Number</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>
Original			
Revision 1	Updated PM/POC, identified team ATR members		

**ATR Review Plan for  
Implementation Documents and Other Work Products**

**ATTACHMENT 2**

**B-1. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

Acronyms	Defined
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
HQSACE	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)