DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN

USING THE NATIONAL PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW PLAN MODEL

for

Continuing Authorities Program
Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 Projects

Sunnyside Wetland Ecosystem Restoration Project
Sunnyside, Washington

Section 206 Project

US Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District

MSC Approval Date: *June 24, 2011*
Last Revision Date: *None*

US Army Corps
of Engineers ®

DECISION DOCUMENT REVIEW PLAN
USING THE NATIONAL PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW PLAN MODEL

Sunnyside Wetland Ecosystem Restoration Project, Sunnyside, Washington
Section 206 Project

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS

a. Purpose. This Review Plan defines the scope and level of peer review for the Sunnyside Wetland Ecosystem Restoration Project, Sunnyside, Washington, Section 206 project decision document.

Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, Public Law 104-305, authorizes the Secretary of the Army to carry out a program of aquatic ecosystem restoration with the objective of restoring degraded ecosystem structure, function, and dynamic processes to a less degraded, more natural condition considering the ecosystem's natural integrity, productivity, stability and biological diversity. This authority is primarily used for manipulation of the hydrology in and along bodies of water, including wetlands and riparian areas. This authority also allows for dam removal. It is a Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) which focuses on water resource related projects of relatively smaller scope, cost and complexity. Traditional USACE civil works projects are of wider scope and complexity and are specifically authorized by Congress. The Continuing Authorities Program is a delegated authority to plan, design, and construct certain types of water resource and environmental restoration projects without specific Congressional authorization.

Additional Information on this program can be found in Engineering Regulation 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F.

b. Applicability. This review plan is based on the model National Programmatic Review Plan for Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 project decision documents, which is applicable to projects that do not require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), as defined in ER 1165-2-209 Civil Works Review Policy. A Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 project does not require IEPR if ALL of the following specific criteria are met:

- The project does not involve a significant threat to human life/safety assurance;
- The total project cost is less than $45 million;
- There is no request by the Governor of an affected state for a peer review by independent experts;
- The project does not require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS),
- The project/study is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the size, nature, or effects of the project;
- The project/study is not likely to involve significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project;
- The information in the decision document or anticipated project design is not likely to be based on novel methods, involve the use of innovative materials or techniques, present complex challenges for interpretation, contain precedent-setting methods or models, or present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices;
- The project design is not anticipated to require redundancy, resiliency, and/or robustness, unique construction sequencing, or a reduced or overlapping design construction schedule; and
- There are no other circumstances where the Chief of Engineers or Director of Civil Works determines Type I IEPR is warranted.

If any of the above criteria are not met, the model National Programmatic Review Plan is not applicable and a study specific review plan must be prepared by the home district, coordinated with

the appropriate Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) and approved by the home Major Subordinate Command (MSC) in accordance with EC 1165-2-209.

Applicability of the model National Programmatic Review Plan for a specific project is determined by the home MSC. If the MSC determines that the model plan is applicable for a specific study, the MSC Commander may approve the plan (including exclusion from IEPR) without additional coordination with a PCX or Headquarters, USACE. The initial decision as to the applicability of the model plan should be made no later than the Federal Interest Determination (FID) milestone (as defined in Appendix F of ER 1105-2-100, F-10.e.1) during the feasibility phase of the project. A review plan for the project will subsequently be developed and approved prior to execution of the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) for the study. In addition, per EC 1165-2-209, the home district and MSC should assess at the Alternatives Formulation Briefing (AFB) whether the initial decision on Type I IEPR is still valid based on new information. If the decision on Type I IEPR has changed, the District and MSC should begin coordination with the appropriate PCX immediately.

This review plan does not cover implementation products. A review plan for the design and implementation phase of the project will be developed prior to approval of the final decision document in accordance with EC 1165-2-209.

c. References

(1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-209, Civil Works Review Policy, 31 Jan 2010
(2) EC 1105-2-407, Model Certification, 31 May 2005
(3) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, Quality Management, 30 Sep 2006
(4) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2, 31 Jan 2007
(5) ER 1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix H, Policy Compliance Review and Approval of Decision Documents, Amendment #1, 20 Nov 2007

d. Requirements. This programmatic 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 1105-2-407).

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 Section 206 decision documents is the home MSC. The MSC will coordinate and approve the review plan and manage the ATR. The home District will post the approved review plan on its public website. A copy of the approved review plan (and any updates) will be provided to the ECO-PCX to keep the PCX apprised of requirements and review schedules.

3. STUDY INFORMATION

a. Decision Document. The Sunnyside Wetland Ecosystem Restoration Project, Sunnyside, Washington decision document will be prepared in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix F. The approval level of the decision document (if policy compliant) is the home MSC. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared along with the decision document.

b. Study/Project Description. The proposed project site is located approximately five miles southwest of the City of Sunnyside, on the east side of the Yakima River between river mile 72.5 and 73.5 (See Figures 1 and 2). The project site is located along the Lower Yakima River, which has a broad floodplain and a highly meandering channel. The project vicinity is dominated by agricultural crops such as hops, wheat, and corn, and other agricultural uses such as pastureland for dairy farms and cattle feed lots.

The Port of Sunnyside (Port) is the non-Federal sponsor. The Port has proposed the use of constructed wetlands to dispose of treated agricultural processing effluent from their wastewater treatment plant prior to release into the Yakima River. The Port needs a method to dispose of treatment plant effluent without a direct outfall into the river and at the same time is looking to restore wetland and riparian functions along the Yakima River. Thus, this project proposes to construct wetlands for habitat restoration, water quality improvements, and promote groundwater recharge. Effluent infiltrated through the proposed conditioning ponds, habitat ponds, and infiltration trench to the underlying soils and aquifer will cool to the ambient temperature of the underlying aquifer, recharging the groundwater table. The estimated cost of the project is $4,506,696.

c. Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review. Fish and wildlife habitats and populations have been dramatically reduced in the Yakima basin. Restoration of key habitats such as floodplain and riparian wetlands will provide multiple benefits to numerous fish and wildlife species. The types of habitats included in the proposed project will be designed to mimic natural floodplain wetlands in the Yakima Valley. The proposed project has a high likelihood of success because the primary hydrologic source has a known quantity. This study is being conducted under the assumption that the sponsor will ensure that the treated wastewater meets state surface water quality standards for class A water, prior to discharge into the project area.

The Sunnyside Wetland Ecosystem Restoration Project falls under the Model Programmatic Review Plan based on the factors as described in Section 1.b above. There are no identified risks with the undertaking of this project. Further, the Detailed Project Report (DPR) will not require a Type I IEPR and will not likely require a Type II IEPR during the design. In addition, due to the low anticipated impact of the project, it is unlikely that an EIS will be required. It is not expected that the DPR will contain any novel or influential scientific information.

Risk for this project is considered low overall because:

- The Corps has completed studies and projects of this nature recently and successfully;
- This restoration project will employ accepted design and will have very low risk for design and maintenance issues; and
- Human safety factors are currently believed to be minimal.

The PDT has determined that the study / project:

- Is not expected to be controversial:
    - NWS does not anticipate there to be any public dispute as to the size, nature or effects of the project;
    - NWS does not anticipate there to be any public dispute as to the economic or environmental cost or benefit of the project; and
    - The Port and Sunnyside community is expected to benefit by increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the Port's Industrial Wastewater Treatment Facility (IWWTF) allowing the industries that utilize the IWWTF to grow and expand in the Sunnyside area. It will also allow new industries seeking this type of service to locate in Sunnyside helping to stabilize the local economy.

- Is not expected to have adverse impacts on any fish or wildlife species or their habitat whether or not they are listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.
    - Currently, the project site is fallow farm fields which would gain significant environmental benefits from the proposed restoration efforts;
    - There will be temporary noise disturbances to wildlife in the vicinity due to operation of heavy equipment during excavation and construction of the restoration site. Construction will be timed to avoid bald eagle nesting season; and
    - Overflow outlet construction below the ordinary high water mark of the Yakima River will occur during low flows and all actual work will be isolated from the river. Best management practices will be employed to prevent runoff of sediment or pollutant laden water into the river.

- Is not likely to contain influential scientific information or to contain highly influential scientific information. After the project is built, monitoring will be done by the Corps and the project sponsor; however, none of the data obtained will be used for scientific study or knowledge. The project is for ecosystem restoration purposes only.

- Is not based on novel methods, does not present complex challenges for interpretation, does not contain precedent-setting methods or models, and will not present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices. This project is an ecosystem restoration project with the intent to create wetland and riparian habitat. The Corps has executed projects similar to the Sunnyside Wetland Ecosystem Restoration Project.

- Has minimal life safety risk.
    - There is no population center below the project area;
    - There are a small number of structures immediately adjacent to the project site; and
    - Source water will meet state surface water quality standards for class A water, prior to discharge into the project area.

The Sunnyside Wetland Ecosystem Restoration Project, Sunnyside, Washington does not have major interagency interest. The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington State Department of Ecology, and the Yakama Nation are generally supportive of the project due to its

improvement of habitat for multiple species. The team does not predict future interagency interest.

d. In-Kind Contributions. Products and analyses provided by non-Federal sponsors as in-kind services are subject to DQC and ATR, similar to any products developed by USACE. The sponsor will be providing in-kind services by attending meetings, preparing for meetings, and reviewing documents. No products produced from the Sponsor will be considered for DQC or ATR.

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.

DrChecks[sm] review software will be used to document all DQC comments, responses, and associated resolutions accomplished throughout the review process. Relevant DQC records will be provided to the ATR team during each ATR event and the ATR team will provide comments as to the adequacy of the DQC effort for the associated product. A final review of the products will be conducted by 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. Seattle District will recommend people to serve on the ATR team, for MSC approval

a. Products to Undergo ATR. ATR will be performed throughout the study in accordance with the District and MSC Quality Management Plans. The ATR shall be documented and discussed at the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) milestone. Certification of the ATR will be provided prior to the District Commander signing the final report. Products to undergo ATR include the Integrated Detailed Project Report/Environmental Assessment. The report will include a planning alternatives analysis, the 35% design for the recommended plan, a M2 cost estimate, and the environmental assessment.

b. Required ATR Team Expertise. The current ATR plan is to include 6 reviewers. This number is based on the following disciplines required to develop the DPR:

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional preferably with experience in preparing Section 206 decision documents and

	conducting ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. Typically, the ATR lead will 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 and familiarity with ecosystem restoration projects for riverine and wetland systems.
Economics	The Economics reviewer should have experience in CE/ICA and ecosystem restoration benefits calculation.
Environmental Resources	The Environmental Resources reviewer should be a senior biologist/archaeologist/environmental coordinator with significant knowledge of riverine and wetland habitats and experience in NEPA, ESA, and NHPA (Section 106).
Hydraulics and Hydrology (H&H)	The H&H engineering reviewer will be an expert in the field of hydraulics and hydrology and have a thorough understanding of riverine and wetland systems, application of infiltration trenches, and computer modeling techniques that will be used such as HEC-SSP and HEC-RAS.
Civil Engineering	The civil engineering reviewer should have experience with hydraulic designs and ecosystem restoration projects.
Geotechnical Engineering	The geotechnical engineer reviewer will need to have an understanding of wetland systems, infiltration rates and application of infiltration trenches.
Cost Engineering	Cost DX Staff or Cost DX Pre-Certified Professional with experience preparing M2 cost estimates for ecosystem restoration projects.
Real Estate	The real estate reviewer shall be a certified real estate specialist.

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 1110-2-12 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.

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 prior to the District Commander signing the 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.

For Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 decision documents prepared under the model National Programmatic Review Plan, Type I IEPR is not required.

- 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.

  For Section 14, 107, 111, 204, 206, 208 and 1135 decision documents prepared under the model National Programmatic Review Plan, Type II IEPR is not anticipated to be required in the design and implementation phase, but this will need to be verified and documented in the review plan prepared for the design and implementation phase of the project.

a. Decision on 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. If any of the criteria outlined in paragraph 1(b) are not met, the model National Programmatic Review Plan is not applicable and a study specific review plan must be prepared by the home district, coordinated with the appropriate PCX and approved by the home MSC in accordance with EC 1165-2-209.

b. Products to Undergo Type I IEPR. Not applicable.

c. Required Type I IEPR Panel Expertise. Not Applicable.

d. Documentation of Type I IEPR. Not Applicable.

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. For decision documents prepared under the National Programmatic Review Plan Model,

Regional cost personnel that are pre-certified by the DX will conduct the cost engineering ATR. The DX will provide the Cost Engineering DX certification. The RMO will coordinate with the Cost Engineering DX on the selection of the cost engineering ATR team member.

9. MODEL CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

EC 1105-2-407 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 and ATR.

EC 1105-2-407 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 and ATR.

a. Planning Models. The following planning models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document:

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Certification / Approval Status
Habitat Evaluation Procedure (HEP)	A HEP is comprised of one or more Habitat Suitability Indices (HSI), which are models for calculating the habitat suitability of an area for a single species or assemblage of species. The mathematical models used for this HEP are derived from existing models, developed by the USFWS. HSI's will yield an overall index score for a species which will then be multiplied by the area of habitat that may be affected by a project to derive a habitat unit (HU). The future with- and without-project HU's will be compared to determine the net difference (either positive or negative) between alternatives.	Certified
Hydrogeomorphic (HGM)	The HGM methods are intended to assess the level at which a wetland performs a function (level of performance). The HGM method will be used to quantify the functioning of the wetland habitats proposed to be created/restored and also guide the wetland design to ensure that important functions are included in the design.	Certified
IWR Planning Suite	Software designed to assist with the formulation and	Certified

	comparison of alternative plans for ecosystem restoration. Performs Cost Effectiveness/ Incremental Cost Analysis (CE/ICA).	

b. Engineering Models. The following engineering models are anticipated to be used in the development of the decision document:

Model Name and Version	Brief Description of the Model and How It Will Be Applied in the Study	Approval Status
HEC-RAS	The Hydrologic Engineering Center's River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) program is a one-dimensional steady state backwater computational model for open channel systems. HEC-RAS will be used to conduct a hydraulic analysis of the main stem Yakima River to determine floodplain inundation and hydraulic characteristics for extreme events, stage duration curves for riparian planting plans, and to provide boundary conditions for the groundwater model.	HH&C CoP Preferred Model
HEC-SSP	The Hydrologic Engineering Center's Statistical Software Package (HEC-SSP) performs statistical analyses of hydrologic data. It will be used to conduct a flood frequency analysis.	HH&C CoP Preferred Model
MII	USACE required cost estimating software.	Certified

10. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. ATR Schedule and Cost.

Task	Date	Estimated Cost
Draft DPR/EA ATR	April 2011	$16,000

b. Type I IEPR Schedule and Cost. Not applicable.

c. Model Certification/Approval Schedule and Cost. For decision documents prepared under the model National Programmatic Review Plan, use of existing certified or approved planning models is encouraged. Where uncertified or unapproved model are used, approval of the model for use will be accomplished through the ATR process. The ATR team will apply the principles of EC 1105-2-407 during the ATR to ensure the model is theoretically and computationally sound, consistent with USACE policies, and adequately documented. If specific uncertified models are identified for repetitive use within a specific district or region, the appropriate PCX, MSC(s), and home District(s) will identify a unified approach to seek certification of these models.

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

State and Federal resource agencies may be invited to participate in the study covered by this review plan as partner agencies or as technical members of the PDT, as appropriate. Agencies with regulatory review responsibilities will be contacted for coordination as required by applicable laws and procedures. The ATR team will be provided copies of public and agency comments. The public will not have the opportunity to comment on the development of the decision document. The public will be able to

comment on the EA when it is available for public comment. 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. Any significant and relevant public comments received will be provided to the ATR team with the decision document, or upon receipt if the comments are received after the decision document has been provided to the ATR team.

12. REVIEW PLAN APPROVAL AND UPDATES

The home MSC Commander is responsible for approving this review plan and ensuring that use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan is appropriate for the specific project covered by the plan. 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. Significant changes may result in the MSC Commander determining that use of the Model Programmatic Review Plan is no longer appropriate. In these cases, a project specific review plan will be prepared and approved in accordance with EC 1165-2-209. The latest version of the review plan, along with the Commanders' approval memorandum, will be posted on the home district's webpage.

13. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

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

- Chris Behrens, Project Manager, Seattle District, 206-764-6917
- Valerie Ringold, Northwestern Division, 503-808-3984

ATTACHMENT 1: TEAM ROSTERS

Project Delivery Team Roster

Discipline	Name	Organization
Project Manager	Chris Behrens	CENWS-PM-PL-PF
Planner	Melissa Leslie	CENWS-PM-PL-PF
Economist	Don Bisbee	CENWS-PM-PL
Environmental Coordinator	James Thomas	CENWS-PM-PL-ER
Cultural Resource Specialist	Ashley Dailide	CENWS-PM-PL-ER
Civil Engineer	Deborah Black	CENWS-EC-DB-CS
Hydraulic Engineer	Kenneth Brettmann	CENWS-EN-HH-WM
Real Estate	Kevin Kane	CENWS-RE-RS
Geotechnical	Gregory Segal	CENWS-EC-ES-SS
Public Affairs	Andrea Takash	CENWS-PAO
Cost Engineering	Jim Jetton	CENWW-EC-X
Tribal Liaison	Diane Lake	CENWS-PM
Office of Counsel	TBD	CENWS-OC
Project Manager (Non-Fed sponsor)	Amber Hansen	Port of Sunnyside

ATR Team Roster

Discipline	Name	Years Experience
ATR Lead	TBD	
Planning	TBD	
Economics	TBD	
Environmental Resources	TBD	
Hydrology & Hydraulics	TBD	
Civil Engineering	TBD	
Cost Engineering	TBD	
Real Estate	TBD	

ATTACHMENT 2: SAMPLE STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL REVIEW FOR DECSION DOCUMENTS

COMPLETION OF AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW

The Agency Technical Review (ATR) has been completed for the Integrated Detailed Project Report/Environmental Assessment for Sunnyside Wetland Ecosystem Restoration Project, Sunnyside, 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[sm].

SIGNATURE _____ Date _____
Name
ATR Team Leader
Office Symbol/Company

SIGNATURE _____ Date _____
Chris Behrens
Project Manager, Seattle District
CENWS-PM-PL-PF

SIGNATURE _____ Date _____
Marc Schulte
Architect Engineer Project Manager[1]
Tetra Tech, Inc., Seattle, WA

SIGNATURE _____ Date _____
Name
Review Management Office Representative
Office Symbol

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 _____ Date _____
Name
Chief, Engineering Division (home district)
Office Symbol

SIGNATURE _____ Date _____
Name
Chief, Planning Division (home district)
Office Symbol

[1] Only needed if some portion of the ATR was contracted

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number