

REVIEW PLAN

**Albeni Falls Dam, Bull Trout Passage Study, Bonner County, Idaho
Post-Authorization Change Decision Document**

Seattle District

MSC Approval Date: 14 December 2012

Last Revision Date: 3 December 2012



**US Army Corps
of Engineers®**

REVIEW PLAN

Albeni Falls Dam, Bull Trout Passage Study, Bonner County, Idaho
Post-Authorization Change Decision Document

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS..... 1

2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION 1

3. STUDY INFORMATION..... 2

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC) 3

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) 3

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)..... 6

7. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW 8

8. COST ENGINEERING DIRECTORY OF EXPERTISE (DX) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION..... 9

9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL..... 9

10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS 9

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION 10

12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES..... 10

13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT 11

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS..... 12

ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS..... 13

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS..... 14

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS 15

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Albeni Falls Dam (AFD), Bull Trout Passage Study, Post-Authorization Change (PAC) Decision Document.

b. References

- (1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
- (2) EC 1105-2-412, Assuring Quality of Planning Models, 31 Mar 2011
- (3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
- (4) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007
- (5) PMP for Albeni Falls Dam, Bull Trout Passage Study, Bonner County, Idaho, Post-Authorization Change Decision Document (PMP to be revised FY13)

c. Requirements. This review plan was developed in accordance with EC 1165-2-209, which establishes an accountable, comprehensive, life-cycle review strategy for Civil Works products by providing a seamless process for review of all Civil Works projects from initial planning through design, construction, and operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and rehabilitation (OMRR&R). The EC 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. In addition to these levels of review, decision documents are subject to cost engineering review and certification (per EC 1165-2-209) and planning model certification/approval (per EC 1105-2-412).

2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION

The RMO is responsible for managing the overall peer review effort described in this Review Plan. The RMO for decision documents is typically either a Planning Center of Expertise (PCX), the Risk Management Center (RMC) or the MSC, depending on the primary purpose of the decision document. The RMO for the peer review effort described in this Review Plan is Northwestern Division (NWD). The AFD Bull Trout Passage Study is O&M funded. Per the Ecosystem Restoration PCX, the MSC serves as the RMO for O&M projects.

The RMO will coordinate with the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise (DX) to ensure the appropriate expertise is included on the review teams to assess the adequacy of cost estimates, construction schedules and contingencies. The RMO will also coordinate with the Ecosystem Restoration PCX and RMC, as needed.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

a. Decision Document.

- (1) Study/project name: Albeni Falls Dam (AFD) Bull Trout Passage Study, Bonner County, Idaho.
- (2) Decision document: Post-Authorization Change (PAC) Decision Document.
- (3) Purpose of the document is to present the evaluation of alternatives and a recommended plan for upstream fish (bull trout) passage at AFD.
- (4) Level of approval of the PAC Decision Document is anticipated to be the MSC (Northwestern Division (NWD)).
- (5) Seattle District has construction authority; additional Congressional authorization for construction is not anticipated at this time.
- (6) The NEPA document for this study is anticipated to be an Environmental Assessment (EA).

b. Study/Project Description. AFD is located in Bonner County, Idaho at river mile 90 on the Pend Oreille River, two miles east of Oldtown, Idaho, near the Washington-Idaho border, 50 miles northeast of Spokane Washington. The study purpose is to determine the feasibility of establishing passage for Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed as threatened Columbia River System bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) at AFD. This study has no non-federal sponsor.

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review.

- AFD serves multiple purposes, including; flood control, power generation, navigation, recreation, and fish and wildlife conservation. The PAC Decision Document and EA are likely to be challenging due to the difficulty of determining an acceptable fish passage alternative, given the limited body of knowledge surrounding bull trout passage, that does not impede the other authorized purposes of the dam or affect the other uses of the Project.
- AFD is considered a high hazard potential dam due to likely loss of life associated with a dam failure. Adding a fish passage facility at AFD is a modification to an existing structure.
- The total project cost is anticipated to be less than \$45 million, based on review of other upstream fish passage facilities in the Pacific Northwest.
- The Governor of an affected state has not requested an independent peer review.
- The Project Delivery Team (PDT) will develop a Risk Register as part of the study scoping/scheduling process, which will identify project/study risks, the magnitude of the risks, and how the PDT plans to mitigate for those project/study risks.
- The project/study is not likely to be highly controversial, it is not anticipated that there will be public dispute to the size, nature, economic costs, environmental costs and other factors associated with the project.
- The PAC Decision Document may contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment.
- Information in the PAC Decision Document may be based on novel methods, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices.
- At this time, Seattle District intends to prepare an environmental assessment (EA) that describes and evaluates the probable effects, including an assessment of the site-specific and cumulative effects, if any, of the proposed action and alternatives. The EA preparation will be supported by a scoping process, including public involvement to ensure identification and analysis of all

pertinent issues. Although the current intent is to prepare an EA, there is a possibility that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be required.

- Significant interagency involvement is expected from the following groups:
 - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 - Kalispel Tribe of Indians
 - Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
 - Idaho Department of Fish and Game
 - Bureau of Indian Affairs
 - Bonneville Power Administration

d. In-Kind Contributions. This project has no non-federal sponsor. Albeni Falls Project operation and maintenance (O&M) is providing funds to develop the feasibility level PAC Decision Document.

4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC)

All decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.) shall undergo DQC. DQC is an internal review process of basic science and engineering work products focused on fulfilling the project quality requirements defined in the Project Management Plan (PMP). The home district shall manage DQC. Documentation of DQC activities is required and should be in accordance with the Quality Manual of the District and the home MSC.

- a. Documentation of DQC.** DrChecks review software will be used to document all DQC comments, responses and associated resolutions accomplished throughout the review process. Relevant DQC records will be reviewed during each ATR event and the ATR team will provide comments as to the adequacy of the DQC effort for the associated product.
- b. Products to Undergo DQC.** The draft PAC Decision Document, including all appendices and the design of the recommended plan, and the draft EA will undergo DQC prior to release from the District for external reviews and for design to go from 35% design in the PAC Decision Document to the design phase, when the design would go from 35% to 65% or 95%. All DQC reviews will be complete and closed out before external reviews (i.e. ATR and Type I IEPR) are initiated.
- c. Required DQC Expertise.** Required expertise for DQC includes individuals from Planning Branch, Environmental and Cultural Resources Branch, Design Branch, Geotechnical Engineering, Operations, Hydraulic Engineering, Cost Engineering, Dam Safety, Office of Counsel.

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

ATR is mandatory for all decision documents (including supporting data, analyses, environmental compliance documents, etc.). 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 is managed within USACE by the designated RMO and is conducted by a qualified team from outside the home district that is not involved in 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.

- a. Products to Undergo ATR.** The draft PAC Decision Document, including all appendices, the design of the recommended plan, and the draft EA will undergo ATR.
- b. Required ATR Team Expertise.** Below is a list of anticipated disciplines for the ATR Team. This list will be revised if the expertise needed for the review changes as the study progresses.

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional with extensive experience in preparing Civil Works decision documents – including PAC Decision Documents - and conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. The ATR lead may also serve as a reviewer for a specific discipline (such as planning, economics, environmental resources, etc).
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in plan formulation, including least cost analysis and fish passage. The Planning reviewer will determine If plan selection is appropriate.
Economics	The economist reviewer will be an expert in the field of economics and have a thorough understanding of incremental analysis, life-cycle cost analysis and least cost analysis. The Economist reviewer will determine If plan selection is appropriate and if plan is cost effective.
Environmental Resources	The environmental resources reviewer will be an expert in the field of fish passage, with knowledge of bull trout behavior, and performance requirements for bull trout, and will have a thorough understanding of fish passage for anadromous and resident migratory fish in the Pacific Northwest.
Hydraulic Engineering	The hydraulic engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of hydraulics and have a thorough understanding of passage of anadromous juvenile ESA-listed fish in the Pacific northwest.
Geotechnical Engineering	The geotechnical engineering reviewer will be an expert in soil engineering and foundation design for riverine and hydraulic structures. This expert should also review constructability issues.
Civil Engineering	The civil engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of civil engineering, facility layout, and site design with accessibility requirements.
Structural Engineering	The structural engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of structural engineering and have a thorough understanding of Civil Works and Hydraulic structures, current pertinent USACE CW criteria, structural needs of fish passage facilities, and will also review constructability issues.
Electrical Engineering	The electrical engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of electrical engineering and have a thorough understanding of electrical systems specifically required for fish passage and its operation.
Mechanical Engineering	The mechanical engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of mechanical engineering and have a thorough understanding of mechanical systems specifically required for fish passage and its operation.
Cost Engineering	The cost engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of cost engineering and have a thorough understanding of the construction of large civil works projects, the formal Cost and Schedule Risk Analysis Process, and Primavera P6 scheduling.

Construction	The construction reviewer will be an expert in the field of construction, specifically for fish passage at dams.
Operations	The operations reviewer will be an expert in the field of operations at dams and for fish passage facilities for anadromous and resident migratory fish.
Dam Safety	The dam safety reviewer will be an expert in the field of dam safety and will meet qualifications set forth in NWDR 1110-1-3.

c. 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) The probable specific action needed to resolve the concern – identify the action(s) that the reporting officers must take to resolve the 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 ATR 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 1110-1-12 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.

At the conclusion of each ATR effort, the ATR team will prepare a Review Report summarizing the review. Review Reports will be considered an integral part of the ATR documentation and shall:

- Identify the document(s) reviewed and the purpose of the review;
- Disclose the names of the reviewers, their organizational affiliations, and include a short paragraph on both the credentials and relevant experiences of each reviewer;
- Include the charge to the reviewers;
- Describe the nature of their review and their findings and conclusions;
- Identify and summarize each unresolved issue (if any); and
- Include a verbatim copy of each reviewer’s comments (either with or without specific attributions), or represent the views of the group as a whole, including any disparate and dissenting views.

ATR may 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). A Statement of Technical Review should be completed, based on work reviewed to date, for the AFB, draft report, and final report. A sample Statement of Technical Review is included in Attachment 2.

6. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW (IEPR)

IEPR may be required for decision documents under certain circumstances. IEPR is the most independent level of review, and is applied in cases that meet certain criteria where the risk and magnitude of the proposed project are such that a critical examination by a qualified team outside of USACE is warranted. A risk-informed decision, as described in EC 1165-2-209, is made as to whether IEPR is appropriate. IEPR panels will consist of independent, recognized experts from outside of the USACE in the appropriate disciplines, representing a balance of areas of expertise suitable for the review being conducted. There are two types of IEPR:

- **Type I IEPR.** Type I IEPR reviews are managed outside the USACE and are conducted on project studies. Type I IEPR panels assess the adequacy and acceptability of the economic and environmental assumptions and projections, project evaluation data, economic analysis, environmental analyses, engineering analyses, formulation of alternative plans, methods for integrating risk and uncertainty, models used in the evaluation of environmental impacts of proposed projects, and biological opinions of the project study. Type I IEPR will cover the entire decision document or action and will address all underlying engineering, economics, and environmental work, not just one aspect of the study. For decision documents where a Type II IEPR (Safety Assurance Review) is anticipated during project implementation, safety assurance shall also be addressed during the Type I IEPR per EC 1165-2-209.
 - **Type II IEPR.** 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.
- a. Decision on IEPR.** Based on the information in Section 3.c. above (Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review), and the PAC Decision Document meeting the mandatory trigger of life safety issues described in EC 1165-2-209, a Type I IEPR will be conducted on the PAC Decision Document.
- While the cost of a fish passage facility at AFD is anticipated to be below the \$45 million trigger for Type I IEPR described in EC 1165-2-209, AFD is considered a high hazard potential dam due to likely loss of life associated with a dam failure. Adding a fish passage facility at AFD is a modification to an existing structure. Based on these considerations, a Type I IEPR will be conducted.
 - Significant interagency involvement is expected from several groups (see Section 3.c.)

- The PAC Decision Document may contain influential scientific information or be a highly influential scientific assessment.
- Information in the PAC Decision Document may be based on novel methods, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices.

Type II IEPR is not anticipated to be required on the PAC Decision Document and 35% design of recommended plan. Type II IEPR will be required for 95% design. The Review Plan will be updated for the design phase following approval of the PAC Decision Document.

- b. Products to Undergo Type I IEPR.** The products for this study that will undergo Type I IEPR include the draft PAC Decision Document, all appendices and the design of the recommended plan.
- c. Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise.** Below is a list of anticipated disciplines for the Type I IEPR Panel. This list will be revised if the expertise needed for the review changes as the study progresses.

IEPR Panel Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
Planning	The Planning reviewer should be a senior water resources planner with experience in plan formulation, including least cost analysis and fish passage. The Planning reviewer will determine If plan selection is appropriate.
Economics	The economist reviewer will be an expert in the field of economics and have a thorough understanding of incremental analysis, life-cycle cost analysis and least cost analysis. The economist reviewer will determine If plan selection is appropriate and if plan is cost effective.
Environmental Resources	The environmental resources reviewer will be an expert in the field of fish passage with knowledge of bull trout behavior, and performance requirements for bull trout, and will have a thorough understanding of fish passage for anadromous and resident migratory fish in the Pacific Northwest.
Hydraulic Engineering	The hydraulic engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of hydraulics and have a thorough understanding of passage of anadromous juvenile ESA-listed fish in the Pacific northwest.
Geotechnical Engineering	The geotechnical engineering reviewer will be an expert in soil engineering and foundation design for riverine and hydraulic structures. This expert should also review constructability issues.
Civil Engineering	The civil engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of civil engineering, facility layout, and site design with accessibility requirements.
Structural Engineering	The structural engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of structural engineering and have a thorough understanding of Civil Works and Hydraulic structures, current pertinent USACE CW criteria, structural needs of fish passage facilities, and will also review constructability issues.
Electrical Engineering	The electrical engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of electrical engineering and have a thorough understanding of electrical systems specifically required for fish passage and its operation.
Mechanical Engineering	The mechanical engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of mechanical engineering and have a thorough understanding of mechanical

	systems specifically required for fish passage and its operation.
Cost Engineering	The cost engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of cost engineering and have a thorough understanding of the construction of large civil works projects, the formal Cost and Schedule Risk Analysis Process, and Primavera P6 scheduling.
Construction	The construction reviewer will be an expert in the field of construction, specifically for fish passage at dams.
Operations	The operations reviewer will be an expert in the field of operations at dams and for fish passage facilities for anadromous and resident migratory fish.
Dam Safety	The dam safety reviewer will be an expert in the field of dam safety and will meet qualifications set forth in NWDR 1110-1-3.

d. Documentation of Type I IEPR. DrChecks review software will be used to document all IEPR comments, responses and associated resolutions accomplished throughout the review process. The IEPR panel will be selected and managed by an Outside Eligible Organization (OEO) per EC 1165-2-209, Appendix D. Panel comments will be compiled by the OEO and should address the adequacy and acceptability of the economic, engineering and environmental methods, models, and analyses used. IEPR comments should generally include the same four key parts as described for ATR comments in Section 4.d above. The OEO will prepare a final Review Report that will accompany the publication of the final decision document and shall:

- Disclose the names of the reviewers, their organizational affiliations, and include a short paragraph on both the credentials and relevant experiences of each reviewer;
- Include the charge to the reviewers;
- Describe the nature of their review and their findings and conclusions; and
- Include a verbatim copy of each reviewer's comments (either with or without specific attributions), or represent the views of the group as a whole, including any disparate and dissenting views.

The final Review Report will be submitted by the OEO no later than 60 days following the close of the public comment period for the draft decision document. USACE shall consider all recommendations contained in the Review Report and prepare a written response for all recommendations adopted or not adopted. The final decision document will summarize the Review Report and USACE response. The Review Report and USACE response will be made available to the public, including through electronic means on the internet.

7. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW

All decision documents will be reviewed throughout the study process for their compliance with law and policy. Guidance for policy and legal compliance reviews is addressed in Appendix H, ER 1105-2-100. 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.

8. COST ENGINEERING DIRECTORY OF EXPERTISE (DX) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION

All decision documents shall be coordinated with the Cost Engineering DX, located in the Walla Walla District. The DX will assist in determining the expertise needed on the ATR team and Type I IEPR team (if required) and in the development of the review charge(s). The DX will also provide the Cost Engineering DX certification. The RMO is responsible for coordination with the Cost Engineering DX.

9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

EC 1105-2-412 mandates the use of certified or approved models for all planning activities to ensure the models are technically and theoretically sound, compliant with USACE policy, computationally accurate, and based on reasonable assumptions. Planning models, for the purposes of the EC, are defined as any models and analytical tools that planners use to define water resources management problems and opportunities, to formulate potential alternatives to address the problems and take advantage of the opportunities, to evaluate potential effects of alternatives and to support decision making. The use of a certified/approved planning model does not constitute technical review of the planning product. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

EC 1105-2-412 does not cover engineering models used in planning. The responsible use of well-known and proven USACE developed and commercial engineering software will continue and the professional practice of documenting the application of the software and modeling results will be followed. As part of the USACE Scientific and Engineering Technology (SET) Initiative, many engineering models have been identified as preferred or acceptable for use on Corps studies and these models should be used whenever appropriate. The selection and application of the model and the input and output data is still the responsibility of the users and is subject to DQC, ATR, and IEPR (if required).

- a. **Planning Models.** Planning models to be used during this study will be determined as the study progresses. This section of the Review Plan will be revised accordingly.
- b. **Engineering Models.** Engineering models to be used during this study will be determined as the study progresses. This section of the Review Plan will be revised accordingly.

10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

- a. **ATR Schedule and Cost.** The PDT is in the process of scoping and scheduling this study and has not yet determined the ATR cost and schedule.

<u>Task</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Estimated Cost</u>
ATR of draft PAC Decision Document/EA (Prior to Agency Decision Milestone)	TBD	TBD
Total:		TBD

- b. Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost.** The PDT is in the process of scoping and scheduling this study and has not yet determined the Type I IEPR cost and schedule.

<u>Task</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Estimated Cost</u>
RMO Coordination of IEPR	TBD	TBD
Type I IEPR of draft PAC Decision Document/EA (Prior to Agency Decision Milestone)	TBD	TBD
Total:		TBD

- c. Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost.** Planning and Engineering models to be used during this study will be identified as the study progresses and Sections 9.a. and 9.b. above will be updated at that time. The estimated schedule and cost for any necessary certification and approval will also be revised at that time. Seattle District will coordinate with the appropriate PCX or the RMC for additional model(s), as needed, as the study progresses and will revise this section accordingly.

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

High-interest groups that may comment on the PAC Report include: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Kalispel Tribe of Indians, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bonneville Power Administration.

At this time, Seattle District intends to prepare an EA that describes and evaluates the probable effects, including an assessment of the site-specific and cumulative effects, if any, of the proposed action and alternatives. The EA preparation will be supported by a scoping process, including public involvement to ensure identification and analysis of all pertinent issues.

This Review Plan and the accompanying PMP will be posted to the District web site for public review once it is approved by the MSC. The PAC Report, if approved, will also be available on the District web site. The IEPR Report will be a part of the administrative record and available upon request.

12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The Northwestern Division (NWD) Commander is responsible for approving this Review Plan. The Commander's approval reflects vertical team input (involving district, MSC, RMO, and HQUSACE members) as to the appropriate scope and level of review for the decision document. Like the PMP, the Review Plan is a living document and may change as the study progresses. The home district is responsible for keeping the Review Plan up to date. Minor changes to the review plan since the last MSC Commander approval are documented in Attachment 3. Significant changes to the Review Plan (such as changes to the scope and/or level of review) should be re-approved by the MSC Commander following the process used for initially approving the plan. The latest version of the Review Plan, along with the Commanders' approval memorandum, should be posted on the Home District's webpage. The latest Review Plan should also be provided to the RMO and home MSC.

13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS

ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECISION DOCUMENTS

COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the [Post-Authorization Change Decision Document](#) for [Albeni Falls Dam, Bull Trout Passage Study, Bonner County, Idaho](#). 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 DrCheckssm.

SIGNATURE

Name
ATR Team Leader
Office Symbol/Company

Date

SIGNATURE

Name
Project Manager
Office Symbol

Date

SIGNATURE

Name
Architect Engineer Project Manager¹
Company, location

Date

SIGNATURE

Name
Review Management Office Representative
Office Symbol

Date

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.

SIGNATURE

Name
Chief, Engineering Division
Office Symbol

Date

SIGNATURE

Name
Chief, Planning Division
Office Symbol

Date

¹ Only needed if some portion of the ATR was contracted

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number
27 Nov 2012	New Review Plan	All

ATTACHMENT 4: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>	<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>
AFB	Alternative Formulation Briefing	NED	National Economic Development
AFD	Albeni Falls Dam	NER	National Ecosystem Restoration
ASA(CW)	Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
ATR	Agency Technical Review	O&M	Operation and maintenance
CSDR	Coastal Storm Damage Reduction	OMB	Office and Management and Budget
DPR	Detailed Project Report	OMRR&R	Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation
DQC	District Quality Control/Quality Assurance	OEO	Outside Eligible Organization
DX	Directory of Expertise	OSE	Other Social Effects
EA	Environmental Assessment	PCX	Planning Center of Expertise
EC	Engineer Circular	PDT	Project Delivery Team
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	PAC	Post Authorization Change
EO	Executive Order	PMP	Project Management Plan
ER	Ecosystem Restoration	PL	Public Law
ESA	Endangered Species Act	QMP	Quality Management Plan
FDR	Flood Damage Reduction	QA	Quality Assurance
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	QC	Quality Control
FRM	Flood Risk Management	RED	Regional Economic Development
FSM	Feasibility Scoping Meeting	RMC	Risk Management Center
GRR	General Reevaluation Report	RMO	Review Management Organization
Home District/MSD	The District or MSD responsible for the preparation of the decision document	RTS	Regional Technical Specialist
HQUSACE	Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	SAR	Safety Assurance Review
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review	USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
ITR	Independent Technical Review	WRDA	Water Resources Development Act
MSC	Major Subordinate Command		