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

30 JAN 2013

CENWD-RBT

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Walla Walla District (CENWW-PM-PD/Stan Heller)

SUBJECT: Review Plan (RP) Approval for Lower Granite Juvenile Fish Facility Upgrade Phase 1 Project, Pomeroy, Washington, Walla Walla District, Northwestern Division

1. References:

a. Memorandum, CENWW-PM-PD, 14 December 2012, subject: Lower Granite Juvenile Fish Facility Upgrade Phase 1 Project, Pomeroy, Washington, Walla Walla District, Northwestern Division, Agency Technical Review (ATR) Plan Submittal

b. EC 1165-2-209, Change 1, Civil Works Review Policy, 15 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 (NWD), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Review Plan includes District Quality Control and Agency Technical Review (ATR), and is a component of the Columbia River Fish Mitigation Project (CRFMP). NWD is the Review Management Office (RMO) 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, NWD Technical Review Program Manager, at (503) 808-4053.

Encl

for ANTHONY C. FUNKHOUSER
COL(P), EN
Commanding

Printed on Recycled Paper

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
WALLA WALLA DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
201 NORTH THIRD AVENUE
WALLA WALLA, WA 99362-1876

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CENWW-PM-PD (1105)

14 DEC 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Northwestern Division (Steve Bredthauer/CENWD-RBT), P.O. Box 2870, Portland, OR 97209

SUBJECT: Lower Granite Juvenile Fish Facility Upgrade Phase 1 Project, Pomeroy, Washington, Walla Walla District, Northwestern Division, Agency Technical Review (ATR) Plan Submittal

1. Enclosed for Major Subordinate Command (MSC) Commander approval is the Lower Granite Juvenile Fish Facility Upgrade Phase I work product ATR Plan. This ATR Plan has been prepared according to EC 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy.

2. This work product falls under the Columbia River Fish Mitigation Project (CRFMP) and in accordance with the overarching CRFMP Review Plan, a risk based assessment determined that an ATR in addition to District Quality Control is appropriate for this work product.

3. If you have any further questions please of contact Mr. Stan Heller, Project Manager, at 509-527-7728 or email at Stanley.G.Heller@usace.army.mil, or Mr. Randy Chong, Columbia River Fish Mitigation Program Manager at 509-527-7524 or email at Randy.R.Chong@usace.army.mil.

Encl.

ANDREW D. KELLY
LTC, EN
Commanding

Printed on Recycled Paper

ATR REVIEW PLAN
USING THE NWD ATR REVIEW PLAN TEMPLATE

Project Name: Lower Granite Juvenile Fish Facility Upgrade Phase 1
Project Location: Lower Granite Lock and Dam, WA
Project P2 Number: 372857
Project Manager or POC Name: Stan Heller
NWD Original Approval Date: 30 Jan 2013
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 ®

DQC/ATR REVIEW PLAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ATR Review Plan for
Lower Granite Juvenile Fish Facility Upgrade Phase 1

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.

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).

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;
(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?
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.

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. 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** for the products or project

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.

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.

ATR Review Plan for
Lower Granite Juvenile Fish Facility Upgrade Phase 1

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.

Reiterate Decision on Type II IEPR (SAR): This document has stated this project does not involve the production of decision documents and therefore does not reiterate a decision to exclude Type I IEPR. The project covered under this plan is excluded from Type II IEPR (SAR) because it does not meet the Type II IEPR triggers and other factors necessary to consider as described in EC 1165-2-209. The District considered these risks and determined that **Type II IEPR (SAR) is not required** for the products or project.

The District PM/PDT performed a risk informed analysis by using the risk informed review selection tool. Type II IEPR (SAR) is not required because the project risks do not meet the thresholds for Type II IEPR (SAR). The project was rated as being a moderate risk to workers and no risk to the public, and therefore does not pose a significant threat to human life.

A-1. PROJECT INFORMATION

a. **Study/Project Description.** DQC and ATR will be conducted on the plans and specifications for this project. The project daylights the juvenile fish transportation piping from the dam to the juvenile fish facility, which is currently below ground, to above ground. The system continuously conveys and provides for all of the water and fish in the system, even during the failure of individual components.

The system provides additional water through electrically controlled, hydraulically operated overflow weirs (16); and enlarged 14 inch orifice (16), which requires concrete removal. To accommodate the added water flow, concrete mining is required to the enlarge (and deepen slightly) the existing JFF collection channel and the existing transportation channel from 72 inch to 114 inch width. The existing downwell and some of the buried piping would be decommissioned with a concrete fill plug. The transportation channel in the dam transitions to an exterior elevated concrete channel which connects to the new elevated concrete dewatering unit. Excess water is diverted to new buried piping and valves for adult fish ladder attraction piping, or emergency water supply that outfalls to the river on existing piers supports. The dewatered fish and remaining water are conveyed from the dewatering unit through an elevated 36 inch corrugated metal flume, with walkway and handrail, to the elevated PIT tag system (4 aluminum antennae enclosures, fiberglass corrugated pipe; electrical power and fiber optic wire) and continues through an elevated flume loop with structural support to the elevated flume switchgate (primary). Water and fish are either diverted to the existing fish facility with a side dewatering (secondary) unit, and a concrete flume transition entrance; or

diverted through two elevated corrugated flume loops with structural support which transitions to smooth buried pipe with access hatches that continues to the river outfall (inriver pier supports and footings) with a water cannon (pump and piping).

b. **Current Total Project Cost.** $38M (includes 14% risk based contingency; $32M construction contract)

c. **Required ATR Team Expertise.**

ATR Team Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional with experience in Civil Works construction projects and conducting ATRs. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process.
Hydraulics	The Hydraulics reviewer should be a senior engineer with either 20 years experience, or professional registration and 5 years experience, in hydraulic design related to fish passage.
Structural	The Structural reviewer should be a senior engineer with either 20 years experience, or professional registration and 5 years experience, in structural design and dam safety, including construction of new and/or modification of existing fish facilities..
Mechanical	The Mechanical reviewer should be a senior engineer with either 20 years experience, or professional registration and 5 years experience, in mechanical aspects of fish facilities.
Electrical	The reviewer should be a senior electrical engineer with experience in the electrical aspects of fish transportation facilities.
Cost	The Cost PCX Staff or Cost PCX Pre-Certified Professional should have experience with preparing cost estimates for the construction of new, or modification of existing, fish facilities.
Geotech/ Civil	The Civil/Geotechnical reviewer should have familiarity with civil design, geotechnical analyses, and material properties, with either 20 years experience, or professional registration and 5 years experience in civil design.. Specifically, the civil design will focus on alignment (horizontal and vertical), utility interface, and roadway repair; the geotechnical analyses includes drilled shafts (both on-land and in-water), spread footings, retaining walls, and excavations; the materials expertise requires familiarity with various concrete mixes and responses with other more traditional pipe materials.
Fish Biologist	The Fish Biologist reviewer should be a senior biologist with experience in aquatic ecosystem restoration, fish biology, and fish passage at hydroelectric projects.

A-2. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. ATR Schedule.

Review Milestone	Review Products	Date Planned
60% ATR review	60% P&S	March 8 – 22, 2013
60% backcheck	60% P&S	April 8 – 15, 2013
90% ATR review	90% P&S	August 13 – 27, 2013
90% backcheck	90% P&S	September 10-17, 2013
100% ATR review	100% P&S	December 5-19, 2013
100% backcheck	100% P&S	January 3-10, 2014
ATR Certification	ATR report	February 15, 2014

b. ATR COSTS – Estimated Labor/Expenses. (revise when team members are identified).

Review Milestone	#reviewers/total hours	Approximate cost/hr	Totals
60% ATR review	5/30	$120	$3,600
60% backcheck	5/8	$120	$960
90% ATR review	5/30	$120	$3,600
90% backcheck	5/8	$120	$960
100% ATR review	5/30	$120	$3,600
100% backcheck	5/8	$120	$960
ATR Certification	1/8	$120	$3,600
ATR Expenses (travel etc)	NA	NA	$0
Total ATR costs			$17,280

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

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Approval Status
NA	NA	NA

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
Stan Heller	Project Manager	Environmental Engr	CENWW-PM-PD-PF, US Army Corps of Engineers	509-527-7258
Steve Bredthauer	RMO - Point of contact	Technical Review Program Manager	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**	**Email (@usace.army.mil)**	**Phone**
Kelli Zak	Technical Lead	CENWW	Kelli.S.Zak	509-527-7554
Lynn Reese	Hydraulics	CENWW	Lynn.A.Reese	509-527-7531
Bruce Collison	Structural	CENWW	Bruce.G.Collison	509-527-7551
Kevin Renshaw	Mechanical	CENWW	Kevin.M.Renshaw	509-527-7570
Jeff Lyons	Electrical	CENWW	Jeffery.R.Lyons	509-527-7562
John Gent	Geotech	CENWW	John.M.Gent	509 527-7610
Curtis Been	Civil	CENWW	Curtis.B.Been	509-527-7241
David Trachtenbarg	Fish Biologist	CENWW	David.A.Trachtenbarg	509-527-7238
Carl Bender	Cost	CENWW	Carl.C.Bender	509-527-7542
Larry Swenson	Hydraulics	NMFS	Larry.Swenson@noaa.gov	503-230-5448

A-5. ATR TEAM ROSTER (complete when team members are identified). 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 (@usace.army.mil)**	**Phone**
	ATR team lead			
	Hydraulics			
	Structural			
	Mechanical			
	Electrical			
	Cost			
	Geotech/Civil			
	Fish Biologist			

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 MSC Commander 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			
Revision 1			

ATR Review Plan for
Lower Granite Juvenile Fish Facility Upgrade Phase 1

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
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)

ATTACHMENT 3

C-1. COMPLETION OF AGENCY REVIEW

EC 1165-2-209
31 Jan 10
C-10
Attachment C-1
COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW
The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the Plans and Specifications for construction contract advertisement for the Lower Granite Juvenile Fish Facility Upgrade Phase 1, Pomeroy, Washington. The ATR was conducted as defined in the project's Review Plan to comply with the requirements of EC 1165-2-209. During the ATR, compliance with established policy principles and procedures, utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of: assumptions, methods, procedures, and material used in analyses, alternatives evaluated, the appropriateness of data used and level obtained, and reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing US Army Corps of Engineers policy. The ATR also assessed the District Quality Control (DQC) documentation and made the determination that the DQC activities employed appear to be appropriate and effective. All comments resulting from the ATR have been resolved and the comments have been closed in DrChecks.

_____ _____
[Name] Date
ATR Team Leader
[Office Symbol]

_____ _____
Stan Heller Date
Project Manager CENWW-PM-PD-PF

_____ _____
Steve Bredthauer Date
Review Management Office Representative
CENWD-RBT

CERTIFICATION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW
Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows:
[Describe the major technical concerns and their resolution]
As noted above, all concerns resulting from the ATR of the project have been fully resolved.

_____ _____
Brian Miller Date
Chief, Engineering Division CENWW- EC
Add appropriate additional signatures (Operations, Construction, AE principal for ATR solely conducted by AE, etc).