



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

CENWD-RBT

24 OCT 2013

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Kansas City District (CENWK-PM-CJ\Seth LaLiberty)

SUBJECT: Review Plan (RP) Approval for the Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation (OMRR&R) Manual for the Dalbey Bottoms Project of the Missouri River Recovery Program, Atchison County, Kansas, Kansas City District, Northwestern Division

1. References:

a. RP for the Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation (OMRR&R) Manual for the Dalbey Bottoms Project of the Missouri River Recovery Program, Atchison County, Kansas, Kansas City District, Northwestern Division (Encl).

b. EC 1165-2-214, Civil Works Review, 15 December 2012.

2. Reference 1.a. above has been prepared in accordance with reference 1.b. above.

3. The RP has been coordinated with the Business Technical Division, Northwestern Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Review Plan includes District Quality Control and Agency Technical Review.

4. I hereby approve this RP, which is subject to change as circumstances require, consistent with the study development process and the Project Management Business Process. Subsequent revisions to this RP or its execution will require written approval from this office.

5. For further information, please contact Mr. Steve Bredthauer, NWD Technical Review Program Manager, at (503) 808-4053.

Encl


JOHN S. KEM
BG, USA
Commanding

CF: PDS

ATR REVIEW PLAN

USING THE NWD ATR REVIEW PLAN TEMPLATE

Project Name: Dalbey Bottoms MRRP Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation Manual

Project Location: Atchison County, KS

Project P2 Number: 150388

Project Manager or POC Name: Seth LaLiberty

NWD Original Approval Date: TBD



Dalbey Bottoms, 9 May 2012. Photo courtesy KDWPT



**US Army Corps
of Engineers** ®

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
8. POLICY AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW.....	8
ATTACHMENT 1, Review Plan Specifics	10
A-1. PROJECT INFORMATION	11
A-2. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS	12
A-3. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT	13
A-4. PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM (PDT) ROSTER.	13
A-5. ATR TEAM ROSTER.	13
A-6. REVIEW PLAN SPECIFICS - APPROVAL.....	14
A-7. REVIEW PLAN REVISIONS.....	14
ATTACHMENT 2, ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	15

ATR Review Plan for Dalbey Bottoms MRRP OMRR&R Manual

1. PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS.

a. Purpose. This Agency Technical Review (ATR) Review Plan (RP) Template and attachments describe requirements for the project identified on the cover sheet of this document. This RP describes 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 1165-2-214. 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 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:

1) Are agreed to require ATR review based on risk-informed decision process.

2) Are agreed to NOT require Independent External Peer Review (IEPR) or Safety Assurance Review (SAR) based on a risk-informed decision process.

3) Do NOT require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project.

4) And, the project for this review plan is NOT producing decision documents.

d. References

ATR Review Plan for Dalbey Bottoms MRRP OMRR&R Manual

- 1) Engineering Circular (EC) 1165-2-214, *Civil Works Review Policy*, 15 Dec 12
- 2) Engineering Regulation (ER) 1110-1-12, *Quality Management*, 31 Mar 11
- 3) ER 1105-2-100, *Planning Guidance Notebook, Appendix F, Continuing Authorities Program, Amendment #2*, 31 Jan 2007
- 4) 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) serves 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:

- 1) Peer review is key to improving the quality of work in planning, design and construction;
- 2) Reviews must be scalable, deliberate, life cycle and concurrent with normal business processes;
- 3) A review performed outside the home district must be completed on all decision and implementation documents. For other products, a risk informed decision as described in EC 1165-2-214 will be made whether to perform such a review.

b. EC 1165-2-214 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)

a. The RMO for DQC is the home District. In accordance with EC 1165-2-214 all work products and reports, evaluations, and assessments must undergo necessary and appropriate District Quality Control (DQC).

ATR Review Plan for Dalbey Bottoms MRRP OMRR&R Manual

b. 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).

c. 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 & reviews and PDT reviews:

1) 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.

2) PDT reviews. These are reviews by the production team responsible for the original work to ensure consistency and coordination across all project disciplines.

d. DQC will be performed on the products in accordance with the QMP within the PMP.

5. AGENCY TECHNICAL REVIEW (ATR)

a. A risk informed process was completed for this project in accordance with EC 1165-2-214. See paragraph 7, Risk Informed Decisions.

b. 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.

c. 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 (www.projnet.org) 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:

ATR Review Plan for Dalbey Bottoms MRRP OMRR&R Manual

- 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.
 - b. In some situations, especially addressing incomplete or unclear information, comments may seek clarification in order to then assess whether further specific concerns may exist.
 - c. 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.
 - d. ATR must 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:** 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.
 - 1) The following questions and additional appropriate questions were considered;
 - a) Does it include any design (structural, mechanical, hydraulic, etc)?
 - b) Does it evaluate alternatives?
 - c) Does it include a recommendation?
 - d) Does it have a formal cost estimate?
 - e) Does it have or will it require a NEPA document?

ATR Review Plan for Dalbey Bottoms MRRP OMRR&R Manual

- f) Does it impact a structure or feature of a structure whose performance involves potential life safety risks?
- g) What are the consequences of non-performance?
- h) Does it support a significant investment of public monies?
- i) Does it support a budget request?
- j) Does it change the operation of the project?
- k) Does it involve ground disturbances?
- l) Does it affect any special features, such as cultural resources, historic properties, survey markers, etc, that should be protected or avoided?
- m) Does it involve activities that trigger regulatory permitting such as Section 404 or stormwater/NPDES related actions?
- n) Does it involve activities that could potentially generate hazardous wastes and/or disposal of materials such as lead based paints or asbestos?
- o) Does it reference use of or reliance on manufacturers' engineers and specifications for items such as prefabricated buildings, playground equipment, etc?
- p) Does it reference reliance on local authorities for inspection/certification of utility systems like wastewater, stormwater, electrical, etc?
- q) 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.

2) 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 1165-2-1165-2-214.

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

2) Decision on Type I IEPR: The District considered these risks and determined that Type I IEPR is not required.

3) 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

ATR Review Plan for Dalbey Bottoms MRRP OMRR&R Manual

construction activities are completed, periodically thereafter on a regular schedule. The reviews must consider the adequacy, appropriateness, and acceptability of the design and construction activities in assuring public health safety and welfare.

- a) Any project addressing hurricane and storm risk management and flood risk management or;
- b) Any other project where Federal action is justified by life safety or;
- c) The failure of the project would pose a significant threat to human life.
- d) This applies to new projects and to the major repair, rehabilitation, replacement, or modification of existing facilities (based on identified risks and threats).

4) Other Factors to consider for Type II IEPR (SAR) review of a project, or components of a project;

- a) 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
- b) The project design requires redundancy, resiliency, and robustness.
- c) 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.

5) 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

a. 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.

b. 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

**ATR Review Plan for
Dalbey Bottoms MRRP OMRR&R Manual**

a. 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.

b. 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
Dalbey Bottoms MRRP OMRR&R Manual**

ATTACHMENT 1, REVIEW PLAN SPECIFICS

a. The information in this attachment is prepared by the District PM/PDT for the Dalbey Bottoms Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation (OMRR&R) manual with 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.

b. **Reiterated Decision on Type II IEPR (SAR):** This project does not involve the production of decision documents and therefore does not require 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 1165-2-1165-2-214. The District considered these risks and determined that Type II IEPR (SAR) is not required for the products or project.

c. The PDT conducted a risk analysis on the project and developed a list of risks included in the PMP. This list included considerations on the level of review. The PDT also developed a quality control plan as part of the PMP which describes the district-internal and district-external reviews required for the project. The project conforms to the quality review procedures described in the District's Business Quality Procedures (BQP's). District leadership then approved the PMP. Risk levels for each of the questions listed in Paragraph 7 were considered in the decision on whether or not to conduct ATR and Type II IEPR.

d. All questions in Paragraph 7 were considered in the decision to conduct ATR, however, except for the questions below, none of the other questions contributed to the decision to conduct ATR. Risk levels for the following questions contributed to the decision to conduct ATR.

1) What are the consequences of non-performance? Infrastructure, including a county road, a Union Pacific rail line, two Union Pacific railroad bridges, and two Walnut Creek Township road bridges are adjacent to the project. This infrastructure could be impacted by non-performance. Also, river navigation interests could be impacted by non-performance. It is critical that Operation and Maintenance considerations address these risks.

2) Does it change the operation of the project? The OMRR&R manual doesn't change the operation of the project, but it will establish the baseline for future project operation.

e. All questions in Paragraph 7 were considered in the decision to conduct Type II IEPR, however, none of the risks met the threshold to conduct Type II IEPR. The project does not pose a significant threat to human life, does not involve the use innovative materials or techniques, is not based on novel methods, does not present complex challenges for interpretations, does not contain precedent-setting methods or models, and does not present conclusions that are likely to change prevailing practices.

ATR Review Plan for Dalbey Bottoms MRRP OMRR&R Manual

1) The project is already constructed, so redundancy, resiliency, and robustness of the design were not considered, however these were considered in the operation and maintenance of the project. The project features do not require redundancy, resiliency, or robustness in order to achieve project success.

2) The project did not utilize unique construction sequencing or a reduced or overlapping design and construction schedule

A-1. PROJECT INFORMATION

a. **Project Description.** The review plan is for the OMRR&R Manual for the Dalbey Bottoms project of the Missouri River Recovery Program (MRRP) (“Dalbey”). The Dalbey project constructed three flow-through chutes for shallow water habitat, as well as a diversion of Walnut Creek, a revetment chute, a scour hole, protective berms, and several other minor features. Construction was completed in the fall of 2012. Development of the OMRR&R manual is the last phase of the project and will set the operation and maintenance requirements for the project’s future. All OMRR&R costs will be federally funded.

b. **Current Total Project Cost.** \$9.5M (actual design and construction cost)

c. **Required ATR Team Expertise.**

ATR Team Members/Disciplines	Expertise Required
ATR Lead	The ATR lead should be a senior professional with extensive experience in planning, river engineering, or operations & maintenance of river structures, and in the conduct of an ATR. The lead should also have the necessary skills and experience to lead a virtual team through the ATR process. The ATR team leader must have either 15 years of planning experience OR hold a professional license in geotechnical or civil engineering with a BS degree or higher in civil, hydraulic, or geotechnical engineering. The team leader must be a recognized leader with good communication skills and demonstrated ability to lead a diverse review team. The ATR leader may also serve as a reviewer for one of the specific disciplines below, if qualified.
River Engineering	The reviewer for River Engineering must be a registered professional engineer with a BS degree or higher in civil or hydraulic engineering and at least 5 years of large river engineering experience.
Geotechnical Engineering	The reviewer for geotechnical features must be a registered professional engineer with a BS degree or higher in civil or

**ATR Review Plan for
Dalbey Bottoms MRRP OMRR&R Manual**

	geotechnical engineering. Reviewer must have a minimum of 10 years experience in subsurface investigations, levee and underseepage berm design, riprap placement, seepage and slope stability evaluations, erosion protection design, construction and earthwork, dredging, and exploratory drilling. The reviewer must be familiar with USACE regulations and standards.
Operations	Reviewer should be a senior level operations specialist with extensive experience working with the operations and maintenance of river structures or river/shallow water habitat restoration projects. The Operations reviewer should have a minimum of 10 years of experience.

A-2. REVIEW SCHEDULES AND COSTS

a. ATR Schedule.

Review Milestone	Review Products	Date Planned
Review Plan Approval (NWK)	Review Plan	30 Sep 13
Review Plan Approval (NWD)	Review Plan	7 Oct 13
ATR Charge Approved	ATR Charge	8 Oct 13
ATR review	OMRR&R Manual	25 Nov 13 – 25 Dec 13
Evaluate ATR comments	OMRR&R Manual	1 Jan 14 – 31 Jan 14
Backcheck	OMRR&R Manual	1 Feb 14 – 15 Feb 14
ATR Certification	OMRR&R Manual	1 Mar 14

b. ATR COSTS - Labor/Expenses.

Review Milestone	#reviewers/total hours	Approximate cost/hr	Totals
ATR review	4/200	\$100	\$20,000
Evaluate Comments	5/20	\$100	\$2,000
Backchecks	3/12	\$100	\$1,200
Total ATR costs			\$23,200

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

**ATR Review Plan for
Dalbey Bottoms MRRP OMRR&R Manual**

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

A-3. REVIEW PLAN POINTS OF CONTACT

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

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

Contact	Role	Title	Office/District/Division	Phone
Seth LaLiberty	Project Manager	Project Manager	Civil Works, Kansas City District, US Army Corps of Engineers	816.389.3023
Steve Bredthauer	RMO - Point of contact	Quality Assurance Manager	Northwestern Division, US Army Corps of Engineers	503.808.4053

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

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

Name	Discipline/Role	District/ Agency	email	Phone
Seth LaLiberty	Project Manager	CENWK-PM-CJ	Seth.j.laliberty@usace.army.mil	816.389.3023
Heather Hill	River Engineering/ Tech Lead	CENWK-ED-HR	Heather.b.hill@usace.army.mil	816.389.2305
James Campbell	Operations Division/ Missouri River Area Office	CENWK-FO-MO	James.d.campbell@usace.army.mil	816.389.3680
Andrew Marske	Civil Engineer	CENWK-ED-GC	Andrew.n.marske@usace.army.mil	816.389.3371
Patrick Schaub	Geotechnical Engineer	CENWK-ED-GD	Patrick.c.schaub@usace.army.mil	816.389.3256
John Skelton	Operations Division/ Missouri Riv. Area Office	CENWK-FO-MO	John.a.skelton@usace.army.mil	816.389.3968

A-5. ATR TEAM ROSTER.

**ATR Review Plan for
Dalbey Bottoms MRRP OMRR&R Manual**

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.

Name	Discipline/Role	District/Agency	email	Phone
Michelle Kniep	ATR Leader	MVS	Michelle.r.kniep@usace.army.mil	314.331.8404
TBD	Geotechnical Engineer			
TBD	River Engineer			
TBD	Operations Specialist			

A-6. REVIEW PLAN SPECIFICS - APPROVAL

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

b. 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 NWD Commander. The NWD approval memorandum will be sent to the District PM responsible for the plan. The NWD approval memorandum must be documented with the review plan, and the approval date should be noted on the cover sheet of this document.

c. 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			

**ATR Review Plan for
Dalbey Bottoms MRRP OMRR&R Manual**

ATTACHMENT 2, ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym	Definition
ATR	Agency Technical Review
BiOP	2003 Amended Biological Opinion on the Corps Operation of the Missouri River Mainstem Reservoir System
BSNP	Bank Stability and Navigation Program
CAP	Continuing Authorities Program
DCW	Director of Civil Works
DQC	District Quality Control
EC	Engineering Circular
ECI	Early Contractor Involvement
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ER	Engineering Regulation
FAQ's	Frequently Asked Questions
HQUSACE	Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
IEPR	Independent External Peer Review
NWD	Northwestern Division
MSC	Major Subordinate Command
MRRP	Missouri River Recovery Program
OMRR&R	Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation
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)
SWH	Shallow Water Habitat
TBD	To Be Determined
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
WRDA	Water Resources Development Act