

# ATR REVIEW PLAN

## USING THE NWD ATR REVIEW PLAN TEMPLATE

**Project Name:** Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000  
**Project Location:** Marysville, Washington  
**Project P2 Number:** 142460  
**Project Manager or POC Name:** XXXXXXXXX  
**NWD Original Approval Date:** XX  
**NWD Revision X Approval Date:** XX

---

### General Document Information

The first two pages of this document are the Cover sheet and the Table of Contents and are not numbered.

**Review Plan Template.** Information provided in **PAGES 3-8** is Review Plan Template information for ATR for Implementation Documents and Other Work Products. Do not alter. The controlled (approved) version of this template will be maintained on the NWD SharePoint site. Districts must use the most current version from the NWD SharePoint site and avoid shared versions outside of the NWD SharePoint. See the footer information in the template for document location.

**Attachment 1** provides the review plan Review Plan Specifics that supplement the RP Template. These specifics are prepared by the District team and as coordinated with the NWD.

**Attachment 2** provides acronyms and abbreviations for the document and may be altered as necessary.

Review Plan approval memorandums shall be documented with the RP and the dates recorded on the cover sheet.

---



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers** ®

*Approved Version: 13 July 2011. Printed Copies are for "Information Only". The controlled version resides on the shared documents folder of the NWD SharePoint site at:*

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

# DQC/ATR REVIEW PLAN

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS.....	3
2. REVIEW MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (RMO) COORDINATION.....	4
3. REVIEW FUNDAMENTALS .....	4
4. DISTRICT QUALITY CONTROL (DQC).....	4
5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR) .....	5
6. REVIEW DOCUMENTATION .....	5
7. RISK INFORMED DECISIONS .....	6
8. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW.....	8
9. TEMPLATE APPROVAL.....	8
ATTACHMENT 1 - REVIEW PLAN SPECIFICS .....	9
A-1. PROJECT INFORMATION .....	9
A-2. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS .....	12
A-3. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT .....	13
A-4. PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM (PDT) ROSTER. ....	14
A-5. ATR TEAM ROSTER .....	14
A-6. REVIEW PLAN SPECIFICS - APPROVAL.....	15
A-7. REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS.....	15
ATTACHMENT 2 - ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	15
B-1. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....	15

**ATR Review Plan for  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

**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

**ATR Review Plan for  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

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;

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.

**ATR Review Plan for  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

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.

**ATR Review Plan for  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

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?

**ATR Review Plan for  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

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;

**ATR Review Plan for  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

- 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  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

**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 PDT prepared a memorandum titled: "Risk-informed recommendation for a determination that Type II Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) Safety Assurance Review (SAR) is not required for the design and implementation phase for the Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project, Marysville, Washington." The memorandum was approved by the Chief of Engineering at the Seattle District and is included as an appendix to this RP. Discussion of the steps to make this risk-informed decision are discussed in the Appendix.

**A-1. PROJECT INFORMATION**

a. **Study/Project Description.** The Qwuloolt Estuary is located within the Snohomish River floodplain approximately three miles upstream from its outlet to Puget Sound. The project is located on the right bank of Ebey Slough, near Marysville, Washington. The Tulalip Tribes of Washington is the non-Federal project sponsor.

The goal of the project and the overall restoration efforts are to restore tidal processes to 400 acres of currently fallow pasturelands. This will improve local streams and wetlands for fish such as endangered Chinook salmon, bull trout and steelhead. Fish will also be able to access the project area for refuge, feeding and spawning. The project site will also provide habitat for wildlife that utilize or are dependent on estuarine marshes, including various bird and mammal species. The overall purpose of the Qwuloolt project is to restore the natural resources of the former estuarine marsh to as close to pre-settlement conditions as possible. In order to achieve this purpose, restoration of historic hydrologic processes and functions such as tidal exchange, tidal channel formation and migration, deposition and marsh plain development and other associated functions is required.

**Factors Affecting the Scope and Level of Review.** The proposed project consists of the restoration of Allen Creek for fish passage, one levee breach (a 400 foot breach and lowering of

**ATR Review Plan for  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

1600 feet of existing dike), and construction of an approximately 4,000 foot long set-back levee (cross levee) to insure existing level of flood risk protection to existing structures adjacent to the project area. This restoration project employs accepted design and has very low risk for design and maintenance issues. The following features were built into the project to deal with risk-based issues:

i. Flood risk reduction:

Provide the same level of flood protection to adjacent properties as is currently provided by the existing levees while updating levee design and crest height to current engineering standards. The levee crest height will be at the ten year event plus wave run up expected due to increased fetch as well as an additional half foot for expected sea level rise over the next fifty years in Puget Sound. A cross levee is proposed for construction at the west end of the project to protect adjacent industrial and commercial businesses.

ii. Erosion Protection:

Hydrological analysis of the proposed breach showed the potential for high erosion once the site was opened to tidal inundation. The initial breach site was located at the mouth of Allen Creek. To avoid potential erosion problems in proximity to a City of Marysville property, the breach was placed about 1,200 feet upstream of the mouth of Allen Creek. The existing tide gates at the mouth of Allen Creek will be sealed and the creek re-routed to the breach. This will allow for better fish passage at all tidal elevations through the new breach area and it will reduce the risk of erosion at the mouth of Allen Creek area once the dike is breached.

iii. Phased Construction:

The project is proposed to be constructed during two to three years. The first year is scheduled for site preparation, re-alignment of Allen Creek, and placement of material for a cross levee. The cross levee will be constructed to full height and loaded with a surcharge of soil in the first year. The full construction of the cross levee in the first year is possible due to the inclusion of geogrid in the levee foundation. Project site conditions are such that three to four feet of settlement are expected. The second year includes removal of the surcharge and construction of stability berms adjacent to the levee, the lowering of portions of the existing dike and finally a breach of the dike to allow for tidal inundation. If necessary, construction adjustments will be conducted the third year.

In-Kind Contributions. The Tulalip Tribes of Washington (sponsor) will receive credit for the following activities, not to exceed the authorized amount of in-kind credit:

- Project Management;
- Permitting;
- Geotechnical analysis;

**ATR Review Plan for  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

- Cultural resources;
- Design; and
- Monitoring plan

All in-kind products may be subject to DQC and ATR review.

Sponsor cost-share shall be met by crediting sponsor in-kind contributions, lands, easements, rights-of-way, rights of entry, relocations, and disposal sites (LERRD), and cash up to the maximum authorized amount. The sponsor may voluntarily waive credit for LERRD costs that exceed the maximum amount of sponsor cost share.

b. **Current Total Project Cost.** \$9,000,000.

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

<b>ATR Team Members/Disciplines</b>	<b>Expertise Required</b>
ATR Lead	The ATR Lead should be a senior professional with experience in levee and stormwater design/construction projects and conducting ATR. The Lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process.
Environmental/Biological	The environmental/biological reviewer should be a senior scientist or biologist with experience in riparian aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, cultural surveys, and biological surveys.
Hydrology & Hydraulics (H&H)	This reviewer should be a senior hydraulic engineer or river engineer with experience in flood risk management; understanding of flood hydrology, urban drainage, and analysis and design of large levee systems; and understanding of estuary and tidal marsh hydraulics.
Geotechnical	This reviewer should be a senior geotechnical engineer with experience in design of new levees on soft soil foundations subject to frequent inundation, and west coast seismic design criteria and current USACE requirements for levee design.
Civil	This reviewer should be a senior civil engineer with experience in levee and stormwater design/construction projects.

**ATR Review Plan for  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

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

**a. ATR Schedule.**

Review Milestone	Review Products	Date Planned
95% ATR review	DDR, Plans, Specs	16 - 25 May 2012
95% backcheck	DDR, Plans, Specs	25 May – 4 June 2012
ATR Certification	DDR, Plans, Specs	4 June 2012

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

Review Milestone	#reviewers/total hours	Approximate cost/hr	Totals
95% ATR review	5/160	\$120	\$19,200
95% backcheck	5/40	\$120	\$4,800
ATR Certification			
ATR Expenses (travel etc)			
<b>Total ATR costs</b>			<b>\$25,000</b>

**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
HEC-RAS 4.1	The Hydrologic Engineering Center's River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) program provides the capability to perform one-dimensional steady and unsteady flow river hydraulics calculations. The program will be used for steady and unsteady flow analysis to evaluate the future without-and with-project conditions.	Certified

**ATR Review Plan for  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

Western Washington Hydraulic Model (WWHM) V.3	The Western Washington Hydrology Model (WWHM) was developed for the State of Washington Department of Ecology by AQUA TERRA Consultants to size stormwater control facilities in western Washington, based on flow duration standards. The program will be used for the design of Storm Drainage Features	Certified
Bentley InRoads V8i Version 8.11	InRoads provides complete drafting capabilities, powerful mapping tools, and design automation for civil transportation professionals. InRoads features constraint-driven, 3D parametric modeling with an innovative approach to designing civil components in a total-project context. This program was used for the modeling of grading and earthwork	Certified
Microputer Aided Cost Engineering System (MCACES) II	<p>MII is the second generation of the Micro-Computer Aided Cost Estimating System (MCACES). MII is used by the USACE for the preparation of detailed construction cost estimates. The software is used for the preparation of programming estimates, current working estimates, bid opening estimates and construction modification estimates in support of the MILCON, Civil Works, and Hazardous, Toxic Waste programs.</p> <p>MII is one of several modules of an integrated suite of cost engineering tools called Tri-Services Automated Cost Engineering System (TRACES). It interfaces with other PC based support modules and databases used by the Tri-Service Cost Engineering community. MII provides an integrated cost estimating system (software and databases) that meets the USACE requirements for preparing cost estimates.</p> <p>MII will be used to develop construction and operation and maintenance cost estimates.</p>	Certified

**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:

**ATR Review Plan for  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

Contact	Role	Title	Office/District/Division	Phone
	Project Manager	Project Manager	Seattle District, US Army Corps of Engineers	
	RMO - Point of contact	Technical Review Program Manager	Northwestern Division, US Army Corps of Engineers	

**A-4. PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM (PDT) ROSTER.**

Before posting to websites for public disclosure of the RP, it may be necessary to remove names and contact information for Corps employees to comply with security policies.

PDT Roster				
Name	Discipline/Role	District/Agency	email	Phone
	Project Manager	CENWS-PM-CP-CJ		
	Plan Formulation	CENWS-PM-PL-PF		
	Program Manager	CENWS-PM-CP		
	Environmental Coordination	CENWS-PM-PL-ER		
	Cultural Resources	CENWS-PM-PL-ER		
	Cost Estimator	CENWS-EN-ES-CE		
	Civil Engineer	CENWS-EC-DB-CS		
	Geotechnical Engineer	CENWS-EC-DB-AS		
	Economic Analyst	CENWS-PM-PL		
	Hydraulic Engineer	CENWS-EC-TB-HE		
	Real Estate	CENWS-RE-RO		
	HTRW	CENWS-ED-GB-ET		
	Office of Counsel	CENWS-OC		
	Sponsor Point of Contact	Tulalip Tribes of Washington		

**A-5. ATR TEAM ROSTER**

Before posting to websites for public disclosure of the RP, it may be necessary to remove names and contact information for Corps employees to comply with security policies.

**ATR Review Plan for  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

Agency Technical Review (ATR) Team				
Name	Discipline/Role	District/Agency	email	Phone
	Review Team Lead	CESPK		
	Environmental	CESPK		
	H&H	CENWP		
	Geotechnical	CESPK		
	Civil	CESPK		

**A-6. REVIEW PLAN SPECIFICS - APPROVAL**

The information provided in the Review Plan Template and the Review Plan Specifics in **Attachment 1** are hereby submitted for approval.

NWD will review this plan and route by NWD staffing sheet. If the plan is complete and appropriate for the risk and complexity of the project/products, the NWD will recommend approval by the appropriate Senior Executive Service (SES) in NWD. The NWD approval memorandum will be sent to the District PM responsible for the plan. The NWD approval memorandum shall be documented with the review plan, and the approval date should be noted on the cover sheet of this document.

Approved revisions should be recorded in the A-7 block below.

**A-7. REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS**

Revision Date	Description of Change	Page / Paragraph Number	Date Approved
Original			
Revision 1			

**ATTACHMENT 2 - ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

**B-1. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

<u>Acronyms</u>	<u>Defined</u>
ATR	Agency Technical Review
CAP	Continuing Authorities Program
DCW	Director of Civil Works
DQC	District Quality Control

**ATR Review Plan for  
Qwuloolt Ecosystem Restoration Project  
Section 544, WRDA 2000**

<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>Defined</b>
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)