

# FY 05 CONSOLIDATED COMMAND GUIDANCE

---

## CHAPTER 2

---

### RESOURCES

| Section  | Page         |
|--|--------------|
| <b>1. GENERAL REMARKS</b> .....                                | <b>2-3</b>   |
| <b>2. PROGRAMMATIC OVERVIEW</b>                                |              |
| <b>USACE PROGRAM SUMMARY</b> .....                             | <b>2-6</b>   |
| <b>CUSTOMER MSC/LAB OVERVIEW</b>                               |              |
| <b>MILITARY PROGRAM MANAGERS</b> .....                         | <b>2-7</b>   |
| <b>MP USACE 2012 INITIATIVES</b> .....                         | <b>2-7a</b>  |
| <b>MP CONSTRUCTION, ARMY</b> .....                             | <b>2-8</b>   |
| <b>MP CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE</b> .....                        | <b>2-9</b>   |
| <b>MP CONSTRUCTION, DoD AND OTHER</b> .....                    | <b>2-10</b>  |
| <b>MP GRD AND AFGHANISTAN DISTRICT</b> .....                   | <b>2-10a</b> |
| <b>MP INSTALLATION SUPPORT OFFICES</b> .....                   | <b>2-11</b>  |
| <b>MP OMA DERP - IRP</b> .....                                 | <b>2-12</b>  |
| <b>MP OMA DERP - FUDS</b> .....                                | <b>2-13</b>  |
| <b>MP BRAC - ER</b> .....                                      | <b>2-14</b>  |
| <b>MP EQ PROGRAM</b> .....                                     | <b>2-15</b>  |
| <b>MP OMA DERP - OTHER DoD</b> .....                           | <b>2-16</b>  |
| <b>MP DoD RECRUITING, LEASE ADMINISTRATION</b> .....           | <b>2-17</b>  |
| <b>MP DoD RECRUITING &amp; USACE GSA OCCUPIED LEASES</b> ..... | <b>2-18</b>  |
| <b>MP LEASED GOVERNMENT HOUSING PROGRAM</b> .....              | <b>2-19</b>  |
| <b>MP HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROG (LABOR &amp; WKLD)</b> .....  | <b>2-20</b>  |
| <b>MP OPERATIONS, ARMY REIMBURSABLE</b> .....                  | <b>2-21</b>  |
| <b>MP OPERATIONS, AIR FORCE REIMBURSABLE</b> .....             | <b>2-22</b>  |
| <b>MP OPERATIONS, ARMY ADMINISTRATION</b> .....                | <b>2-23</b>  |
| <b>CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM MANAGERS</b> .....                      | <b>2-24</b>  |
| <b>CW GENERAL EXPENSES</b> .....                               | <b>2-25</b>  |
| <b>CW GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS</b> .....                         | <b>2-26</b>  |
| <b>CW CONSTRUCTION GENERAL</b> .....                           | <b>2-27</b>  |
| <b>CW O&amp;M GENERAL</b> .....                                | <b>2-28</b>  |
| <b>CW MR&amp;T</b> .....                                       | <b>2-29</b>  |
| <b>CW REGULATORY PROGRAM</b> .....                             | <b>2-30</b>  |

## RESOURCES (CONT'D)

| Section  | Page  |
|--|-------|
| CW OTHER DIRECT (FUSRAP) .....                         | 2-31  |
| CW OTHER DIRECT (FCCE) .....                           | 2-32  |
| CW OTHER DIRECT (COASTAL WETLANDS) .....               | 2-33  |
| CW EPA SUPERFUND .....                                 | 2-34  |
| CW OTHER ERS .....                                     | 2-35  |
| CW OTHER INTERAGENCY & INTERNATIONAL SERVICE (IIS).... | 2-36  |
| RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM MANAGERS .....          | 2-37  |
| R&D ERDC (DIRECT AND REIMBURSABLE) .....               | 2-38  |
| <br>   |       |
| <b>3. OTHER - PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE</b>                  |       |
| HR REGIONALIZATION .....                               | 2-39  |
| USACE FINANCE CENTER RATES .....                       | 2-40  |
| INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT) .....                      | 2-43  |
| MILITARY PROGRAMS STANDARD DEFINITIONS .....           | 2-53  |
| MILITARY PROGRAMS INSTALLATION SUPPORT PROGRAM .....   | 2-62  |
| MANPOWER .....   | 2-63  |
| EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT FUNDING .....       | 2-69  |
| SUPERVISION & ADMINISTRATION (S&A) .....               | 2-70  |
| COST OF DOING BUSINESS .....                           | 2-72  |
| INFORMATION MANAGEMENT .....                           | 2-74  |
| PLANT REPLACEMENT AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (PRIP) ..... | 2-82  |
| FACILITIES GUIDANCE .....                              | 2-83  |
| CIVIL WORKS GUIDANCE .....                             | 2-89  |
| CONTRACTING OUT GUIDANCE .....                         | 2-95  |
| COMMAND STAFF REVIEWS (CSR) .....                      | 2-96  |
| CONFERENCES .....                                      | 2-97  |
| USACE MANAGEMENT CONTROL PLAN .....                    | 2-98  |
| USACE SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM .....                     | 2-99  |
| SUPPORT TO NATIONALIZED EMPLOYEES .....                | 2-100 |

## GENERAL REMARKS

1. This chapter is a road map to the resource guidance governing the allocation of resources given to USACE for mission accomplishment. This chapter identifies program managers, major sources of funds, estimated program, manpower allocations and high grade policy, supervision and administration rates, cost of doing business targets, command inspection schedules, and other guidance useful in developing Regional Business Center operating plans, local operating budgets, and measuring performance of field activities.

2. All commanders are reminded to inform their Major Subordinate Command/Center Strategic Sourcing Program Manager (SSPM) on actions involving commercial activities. Actions involving personnel or organizational action for functions or organizations for which a competition announcement has been made must be coordinated with the Headquarters Strategic Sourcing Program Office. Plans to establish a new organization to perform one or more commercial activities, or to transition a commercial activity from contractor to in-house performance, or to convert from in-house to contractor performance must be coordinated with the Headquarters Strategic Sourcing Program Office. Commands are to follow CERM-F memorandum dated 27 Aug 03, subject: Competitive Sourcing Cost Accounting and the guidance in the Strategic Sourcing Program Management Plan, Appendix B for capturing costs associated with the competitive sourcing program.

3. The **USACE Program Summary** represents a three-year macro update of program for the Command. It is provided to assist Regional Business Centers (RBCs) in developing their three-year Command Operating Budgets (COB). The Program Summary is based on the FY 03 President's Budget and latest revision to the Program Objective Memorandum (POM). The Military program amounts include both direct and reimbursable programs combined for our major customers. The program amounts for Civil Works direct appropriations and Support For Others (SFO) work are reported separately. The data shown in this summary were extracted from the USACE Integrated Command Resource Information (ICRI) Data Tables updated by USACE program managers.

4. The charts presented in the **Customer MSC/Lab Overview** Section represent USACE program managers allocation of program to MSC/Labs for the next three years. These amounts too, as in the USACE Program Summary chart, are based on the FY 03 President's Budget and latest revision to the POM. In most cases, unless otherwise indicated on the charts, the program amounts shown reflect only the USACE direct program. Also provided with each chart, is the program manager's assessment of the program, i.e., the direction of the program, what is included in the program, and significant events.

**GENERAL REMARKS (CONT'D)****USACE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES**

1. Application of the USACE Resource Management Principles and RM 2012 vision will improve our internal processes, complement the Project Management Business Process, and further demonstrate our commitment to operate as a “learning organization.” Strategy and Integration POC is L. Leonard Wolner, CESI-R, 202-761-8618. Resource Management POC is Jerry Zuppe, CERM-P, 202-761-1826.
2. The USACE Resource Committee, under the charter to propose new processes for obtaining and allocating resources for strategic purposes, developed the Resource Management Principles during FY 02. These principles, endorsed by the Issues Management Board and approved by the Command Council, are intended to remind and guide all levels of the organization to carefully consider resource implications through every stage of an initiative, program or project. The principles are consistent with existing USACE RM Operating Principles and associated laws and regulations.

# SECTION 1

# GENERAL REMARKS

## GENERAL REMARKS (CONT'D)

### USACE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

|                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1. INITIATIVE/PROGRAM FORMULATION | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Calculate Impacts on Region</li><li>• Determine Total Life Cycle Cost; provide funding &amp; acquisition strategy</li><li>• Periodically review initiatives for compliance with baseline parameters</li></ul> |
| 2. EXECUTION                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Issue funds to field ASAP</li><li>• Involve field in decisions affecting the field—initiatives &amp; programs</li></ul>   |
| 3. REPORTING                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Get formats up front</li><li>• Review existing reports for relevancy—delete where needed</li><li>• Eliminate duplication</li></ul>  |
| 4. ALLOCATION RULES               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allocate resources IAW w/Commanders intent</li><li>• Adhere to laws &amp; regulations to promote accountability &amp; good stewardship</li></ul>  |
| 5. BUSINESS PRACTICES             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identify &amp; use best business practices</li><li>• Maximize decentralized control of resources</li></ul>  |
| 6. MEASUREMENT                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Link formulation, execution with meaningful reporting measures</li></ul>  |
| 7. STRATEGIC INITIATIVES          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allocate a % of funds for strategic initiatives start-up</li><li>• Plan and Program strategic initiatives</li></ul>   |
| 8. UNEXPECTED                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Employ Commanders Reserve for out of cycle requirements</li></ul>   |

## SECTION 2

## USACE PROGRAM SUMMARY

### FY 05 CONSOLIDATED COMMAND GUIDANCE

### USACE PROGRAM SUMMARY (DIRECT + REIMB)

### FY 05-07 ESTIMATED PROGRAM (\$ MILLIONS)

SOURCE: MARCH 2004 ICRI TABLES

| USACE             | FY 05  | FY 06  | FY 07  |
|-------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Military Programs | 12,432 | 12,133 | 11,173 |
| Civil Works       | 5,755  | 6,646  | 6,646  |
| Total             | 18,187 | 18,779 | 17,819 |

| Military Programs         | FY 05 | FY 06 | FY 07 |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Army, Construction        | 2,782 | 2,834 | 2,834 |
| Air Force, Construction   | 1,159 | 1,708 | 1,708 |
| DoD                       | 1,056 | 1,029 | 1,029 |
| Environmental (DERP/BRAC) | 575   | 570   | 570   |
| Engineering & Design      | 738   | 755   | 755   |
| Real Estate               | 288   | 270   | 270   |
| RDT&E                     | 353   | 361   | 361   |
| Host Nation/FMS           | 1,281 | 1,280 | 1,280 |
| GWOT                      | 4,000 | 3,100 | 2,100 |
| Other (e.g., ED&M)        | 200   | 226   | 226   |

| Civil Works                                     | FY 05 | FY 06 | FY 07 |
|---|-------|-------|-------|
| General Investigations                          | 91    | 128   | 128   |
| Construction General                            | 1,422 | 1,801 | 1,801 |
| Operations & Maintenance                        | 1,926 | 1,977 | 1,977 |
| Flood Control, MR&T                             | 270   | 327   | 327   |
| General Expense                                 | 167   | 177   | 177   |
| Other Direct (Regulatory Prgm, FUSRAP, Non-Fed) | 777   | 1,134 | 1,134 |
| SFO Environmental                               | 340   | 340   | 340   |
| SFO All Other                                   | 762   | 762   | 762   |

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

| <u>Business Line</u>                       | <u>Military Appropriation</u>                             | <u>National Account Manager</u>   | <u>Executive Account Liaison</u> |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>MILCON</b>                              | Military Construction, Army                               |                                   | Maryann Delaney, 202-761-5775    |
|  | Military Construction, Army (MCA)                         | Maryann Delaney, 202-761-5775     |                                  |
|  | Army Family Housing (AFH)                                 | Maryann Delaney, 202-761-5775     |                                  |
|  | Army Reserves (MCAR, OMAR, REMAT)                         | Maj Richard Shevlin, 202-761-4235 |                                  |
|  | National Guard  | Maj Todd Johnson, 202-761-1928    |                                  |
|  | Planning, Program, Budget Support and Planning Charrettes | Howard Moy, 202-761-8736          |                                  |
|  | Minor MCA   | Bill Franklin, 202-761-0629       |                                  |
|  | Host Nation Funded Construction                           | Maryann Delaney, 202-761-5775     |                                  |
|  | Planning and Design Funds                                 | Maryann Delaney, 202-761-5775     |                                  |
|  | Military Construction, Air Force                          |                                   | Jane Smith, 202-761-5771         |
|  | Military Construction, Air Force (MCAF)                   | Jane Smith, 202-761-5771          |                                  |
|  | Base Realignment & Closure (BRAC)                         | Jane Smith, 202-761-5771          |                                  |
|  | Air Force Reserves  | Denise Massihi, 202-761-4657      |                                  |
|  | Air Force Family Housing                                  | Jane Smith, 202-761-5771          |                                  |
|  | <b>DOD and SFO MILCON</b>                                 | DOD Medical                       | Steve Hanson, 202-761-5773       |
| Defense Logistics Agency                   |   | Steve Hanson, 202-761-5773        |                                  |
| SOF  |   | Steve Hanson, 202-761-5773        |                                  |
| DOD Schools                                |   | Steve Hanson, 202-761-5773        |                                  |
| Energy Conservation Investment Prgm (ECIP) |   | Steve Hanson, 202-761-5773        |                                  |
| <b>Production Base Support (PBS)</b>       | Production Base Support (PBS)                             | Karlene Bodner, 202-761-5850      | Karlene Bodner, 202-761-5850     |
|  | Community Family Support Center (CFSC)                    | Karlene Bodner, 202-761-5850      | Karlene Bodner, 202-761-5850     |
| <b>Foreign Military Sales (FMS)</b>        | Foreign Military Sales (FMS)                              | John Jones, 202-761-8919          | John Jones, 202-761-8919         |
| <b>Chem Demil</b>                          | Chem Demil  | David Lee, 202-761-5786           | David Lee, 202-761-5786          |
|  | Ground-Based Midcourse Defense (GMD)                      | David Lee, 202-761-5786           | David Lee, 202-761-5786          |
|  | Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (CTR)                | David Lee, 202-761-5786           | David Lee, 202-761-5786          |
| <b>Environmental Restoration</b>           | BRAC Environmental  | Bob Fenlason, 202-761-5767        | Larry Douchand, 202-761-5789     |
|  | Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Superfund           | AviNash Sood, 202-761-8688        | Kip Huston, 202-761-4574         |
|  | Environmental Support for Others (SFO)                    | AviNash Sood, 202-761-8688        | Kip Huston, 202-761-4574         |
|  | Brownfield Program  | AviNash Sood, 202-761-8688        | Jane Mergler, 202-761-0314       |
|  | Portersfield Program                                      | AviNash Sood, 202-761-8688        | Jane Mergler, 202-761-0314       |
|  | Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS)                        | AviNash Sood, 202-761-8688        | Robert Lubbert, 202-761-7504     |
|  | Army Installation Restoration Program (IRP) Army          | Malcolm McLeod, 202-761-0632      | Larry Douchand, 202-761-5789     |
|  | Army Installation Restoration Program (IRP) Air Force     | Malcolm McLeod, 202-761-0632      | Larry Douchand, 202-761-5789     |
|  | Army Installation Restoration Program (IRP) DoD           | Malcolm McLeod, 202-761-0632      | Larry Douchand, 202-761-5789     |
|  | Environmental Quality (EQ)                                | Bob Fenlason, 202-761-5767        | Larry Douchand, 202-761-5789     |
|  | Deactivated Nuclear Power Plant Program                   | Malcolm E. McLeod, 202-761-0632   | Malcolm McLeod, 202-761-0632     |
| <b>Real Estate</b>                         | Leased Government Housing                                 | Vera Dwaileebe, 202-761-0816      | Esther Cruz, 202-761-8100        |
|  | DoD Recruiting Leases                                     | Vera Dwaileebe, 202-761-0816      | Darvin Smith, 202-761-0065       |
|  | Real Estate Homeowners Assistance Program (HAP)           | Vera Dwaileebe, 202-761-0816      | Frank Jones, 202-761-0291        |
|  | Real Estate Army Installation Support                     | Vera Dwaileebe, 202-761-0816      | Jeanne Herman, 202-761-1082      |
|  | Real Estate US Army Reserve                               | Vera Dwaileebe, 202-761-0816      | Peggy Mahoney, 202-761-4599      |
|  | Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)                       | Vera Dwaileebe, 202-761-0816      | Dave McConnell, 202-761-0441     |
| <b>Support for Others</b>                  | Support for Others  | Marilynn White, 202-761-5620      | Don Kisicki, 202-761-8880        |
| <b>Installation Support</b>                | Installation Support                                      | Marilynn White, 202-761-5620      | Jim Lovo, 202-761-7769           |
| <b>Field Force Engineering (FFE)</b>       | USACE G3 Operations (FFE)                                 | Bob Fenlason, 202-7615767         | Michael Shama, 202-761-0453      |

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

| <b>MILITARY PROGRAMS USACE 2012 – INITIATIVES ---DRAFT</b> |  |                       |                    |            |
|--|--|-----------------------|--------------------|------------|
|  | <b>Initiative</b>  | <b>Target Date to</b> | <b>Lead Office</b> | <b>POC</b> |
| <b>Military Programs Overall</b>                           |  |                       |                    |            |
| 1  | Establish a DoD Integration Team to provide direct support and liaisons to DoD and other Service Components as negotiated with the supported offices to improve communications and synchronization of programs.  | Comp                  | DOD Team           |            |
| <b>Real Estate Process Improvements</b>                    |  |                       |                    |            |
| 2  | Delegate to the HQ at the eight Regional Business Centers authorities throughout the real estate mission.  |                       | RE COP             |            |
| 3  | Streamline the business process for civil works.   |                       | CECW & RE COP      |            |
| 4  | Stand-up real estate centers of expertise.   |                       | RE COP             |            |
| 5  | Implement effective resource sharing between Regional Business Centers including use of the "sister division" concept.   |                       | SID & RE COP       |            |
| <b>G3/DCSOPS Process Improvements</b>                      |  |                       |                    |            |
| 6  | Organizationally provides a greater presence and focus for USACE at DA and DoD level.  | Comp                  | CEMP-O             |            |
| 7  | Ensures that new mission of Homeland Security and the increasing op tempo of military contingencies and long term deployment of U.S. Forces are addressed in a comprehensive manner without either mission suffering.  |                       | CEMP-O             |            |
| 8  | Integrates Intelligence capability into G-3/DCSOPS to improve ability to prepare, plan, and respond to a diversity of missions in a global environment.  |                       | CEMP-O             |            |
| <b>Environmental Programs Process Improvements</b>         |  |                       |                    |            |
| 9  | The S&A flat rate for DERP will receive and revised as appropriate. S&A, supervision and administration costs, i.e. overhead.  | Comp                  | CEMP-D             |            |
| 10   | Baseline some ED&M funding for the core environmental mission area. All other M&S budgets and funding will be negotiated with the customer/partner and manpower resources alloted will be based on this funding. All functional areas will adjust their manpower as appropriate to live within these funds.  | Comp                  | CEMP-D             |            |
| 11   | Establish deliberate partnerships with the Army Environmental Center (AEC)   |                       | Env COP            |            |
| 12   | Develop a process for establishing national environmental contracts developed to meet the needs of our national customers and partners.  |                       | Env COP            |            |
| 13   | Regional Business Centers will evaluate the workload in the Environmental Design Centers spread throughout the regions. It is believed that the number of these centers have grown to the point they are no longer efficient and in some cases affordable. In some cases expertise is being spread thinly and can no longer be massed as needed to provide the necessary level of management and oversight of our execution efforts. |                       | Env COP            |            |

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

| MILITARY PROGRAMS USACE 2012 – INITIATIVES ---DRAFT |   |                |                 |     |
|---|---|----------------|-----------------|-----|
|   | Initiative  | Target Date to | Lead Office     | POC |
|   | <b>Installation Support Process Improvements</b>  |                |                 |     |
| 14  | Create a Triad between ACSIM, IMA and USACE. The Triad would present a consolidated plan and budget for the required Installation Support functions, speaking with one voice based upon an agreed upon priority for the direct funded functions, the funding, and the resource requirements to support the functions.   |                | IS COP          |     |
| 15  | Combine the division Chief of Installation Support Office (ISO) and Regional Installation Management Agency (IMA) Liaison into one position. Currently each IMA lead Division provides a liaison for each IMA Regional office. Additionally, each Division has a Chief, ISO. The combination of these positions will result in some savings and these savings will be re-distributed to the Division ISO checkbook funds. |                | IS COP          |     |
| 16  | Increase collaboration/efficiency of Planning process-BRAC/Army Transformation. Elimination of FTE associated with Force Management and TABS after completion of the BRAC planning effort.  |                | CEMP-D & CEMP-I |     |
| 17  | Develop Installation Knowledge Online and ensure it is complementary with other USACE knowledge management initiatives and systems.   |                | IS COP          |     |
| 18  | Transfer PAX mission to PAX proponent, ACSIM. Move the function of Public Works Digest to IMA. This should be accomplished after receiving concurrence from ACSIM and IMA.  |                | IS COP & CEMP-D |     |
| 19  | Develop a unified set of metrics to identify and measure the size and execution rates of the Installation Support program   |                | CEMP-I          |     |
|   | <b>Interagency and International Services Process Improvements</b>  |                |                 |     |
| 20  | Eliminate the HQUSACE imposed requirement for MSCs to obtain HQUSACE approval to support Federal agencies when there is not an existing agreement.  |                | CEMP-C          |     |
| 21  | Only process requests to support State and local governments that are certain to receive the required "unique" certification from the ASA(CW).  |                | CEMP-C          |     |
| 22  | Improve processing of Section 607 proposals. Responsibility for the management of this activity is currently divided. USACE field personnel need a single point of entry and source of assistance in getting proposal through this process.   |                | CEMP-C          |     |
| 23  | Develop a unified set of metrics to identify and measure the size and execution rates of the IIS Program.   |                | CEMP-I          |     |
| 24  | Consolidate existing positions performing similar tasks to improve efficiencies. Currently different organizations process different agreements such as Letter of Agreements (LOA) for civil works matters under the Foreign Assistance Act and LOAs for military matters under the Arms Export Control Act. The processes, which are initially difficult to learn, are nearly identical.                                 |                | CEMP-I          |     |
| 25  | Delegate the approval level for doing work for foreign governments to a lower level, possibly even to the U.S. embassy level in the country receiving assistance. This will require a change to Dept. of State and DoD policy.  |                | CEMP-C          |     |

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

| MILITARY PROGRAMS USACE 2012 – INITIATIVES ---DRAFT |   |                |             |     |
|---|---|----------------|-------------|-----|
|   | Initiative  | Target Date to | Lead Office | POC |
|   | <b>Programs Management Process Improvements</b>   |                |             |     |
| 26  | <u>Army Programming and Budgeting</u> : Eliminate the DD1391 review and certification at the Division. Transfer quality control and quality assurance reviews of DD1391 from HQ Washington level to the Regions and Districts.  |                | CEMP-I      |     |
| 27  | Move the task of Army budget book preparation to the ACSIM after discussions and concurrence is received from ACSIM.  | Comp           | CEMP-I      |     |
| 28  | <u>Final Design and Construction Contracting</u> : Eliminate issuance of Army design directives by the Washington HQ. The Divisions will issue design directives.   |                | CEMP-I      |     |
| 29  | Consolidate command policies on one website.  |                | CEMP-I      |     |
| 30  | <u>Construction and Change Management</u> : A regional Corporate Change Group needs to be established to manage discretionary changes. This group will consist of ACSIM, IMA and USACE. The purpose is to obtain timely decisions on discretionary changes. The region will manage the full (5%) contingency funding and the region should obtain the funds directly from the Washington level HQ. A regional CEFMS database is necessary to facilitate this.   |                | CEMP-I      |     |
| 31  | <u>Army Reprogramming</u> : Eliminate HQ review of reprogramming actions. Regions will submit requests directly to ACSIM for processing and will work with ACSIM to ensure the requests are fully justified. This must be coordinated with ACSIM and DASA-I&H for concurrence prior to implementation.  |                | CEMP-I      |     |
| 32  | <u>Management of P&amp;D Funds</u> : Move the management of P&D funds to the regional level. Washington level HQ will allocate P&D funds to the Regions and the regions will be responsible for allocating and managing P&D funds between their districts.  |                | CEMP-I      |     |
| 33  | <u>Management of S&amp;A</u> : The leadership for management of S&A within HQ Washington level will be assigned to Military Programs. The Resource Management COP will have primary responsibility and accountability concerning fiscal management of the S&A revolving fund and the E&C COP will have primary responsibility concerning contract oversight and management. MP will be responsible for establishing a PDT to manage the S&A policy and doctrine on a corporate basis. Membership of the PDT must include E&C COPs and RM COPs at a minimum. |                | CEMP-I      |     |
| 34  | <u>Project Close Out</u> : Train USACE field offices in the "Red Zone" concept. Although the red zone concept has been adopted as USACE policy, it is not being used throughout USACE. Training is required to imbed the concept in project close out activities.   |                | CEMP-I      |     |
| 35  | <u>Reporting</u> : Eliminate the multi-layered reporting requirements. The continued use of PROMIS and the implementation of P2 are critical to achieving this recommendation. The CEMP metrics PDT is currently meeting to align USACE and customer/partner metrics to ensure USACE is measuring the items of importance to our customers. These metrics must be included and built into P2 to enable seamless reporting of information at each level of USACE.  |                | CEMP-I      |     |
| 36  | <u>Program Management</u> : Use the resources of the Regional Integration Teams (RIT) to resolve issues and other activities associated with Regional PM actions. The RITs will be empowered to work issues with all levels of USACE and be unencumbered by normal communication channels. The team must, however, maintain open and clear lines of information flow and communication with all levels of USACE and the customer involved in problem resolution.  |                | CEMP-I      |     |
|   | 12-Jul-04   |                |             |     |

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

CONSTRUCTION, ARMY (CEMP-II)  
TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)  
(\$000)

| MSC          | FY 05            | FY 06            | FY 07            |
|--------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| HNC          | 0                | 0                | 0                |
| LRD          | 175,443          | 193,715          | 194,097          |
| NAD          | 319,351          | 647,849          | 713,245          |
| NWD          | 263,908          | 398,861          | 334,271          |
| POD          | 605,051          | 525,002          | 441,478          |
| SAD          | 343,299          | 242,380          | 509,284          |
| SPD          | 94,000           | 87,590           | 152,450          |
| SWD          | 304,041          | 153,290          | 101,090          |
| TAC          | 0                |                  |                  |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>2,105,093</b> | <b>2,248,687</b> | <b>2,445,915</b> |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

Program figures reflect the FY 05 Present Budget Submission. MCA – Program averages \$1.6B to \$1.9B per year. AFH – Program averages \$450M to \$500M per year. MCAR – Program remains level at \$100M in FY 05 and FY 06, growing to \$150M in FY 07.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE (CEMP-II)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

| MSC          | FY 05          | FY 06            | FY 07            |
|--------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| HNC          | 0              | 0                | 0                |
| LRD          | 84,050         | 76,041           | 92,350           |
| NAD          | 102,895        | 78,673           | 120,308          |
| NWD          | 165,076        | 418,143          | 330,442          |
| POD          | 161,191        | 181,908          | 251,593          |
| SAD          | 52,150         | 149,830          | 151,886          |
| SPD          | 101,793        | 221,842          | 209,451          |
| SWD          | 86,575         | 174,875          | 135,641          |
| TAC          | 0              | 0                | 0                |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>753,730</b> | <b>1,301,312</b> | <b>1,291,671</b> |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

The Corps of Engineers is responsible for design and construction of approximately 85 percent of the annual Military Construction Air Force (MCAF) program. The Corps is responsible for a portion of the Air Force Reserve MILCON Program (MAFR), which is included in the above projections. The average for FY 05-07 is approximately \$70 million annually. Also included in the above projections is the Family Housing Air Force (FHAF) which is approximately \$316 million in FY 05, \$265 million in FY 06 and \$276 million in FY 07.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

CONSTRUCTION, DoD AND OTHER (CEMP-MD)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

| <b>MSC</b>   | <b>FY 05</b>   | <b>FY 06</b>   | <b>FY 07</b>   |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| HNC          | 82,000         | 69,000         | 56,000         |
| LRD          | 29,000         | 52,000         | 16,000         |
| NAD          | 222,000        | 75,000         | 136,000        |
| NWD          | 63,000         | 63,000         | 61,000         |
| POD          | 7,000          | 61,000         | 68,000         |
| SAD          | 87,000         | 154,000        | 61,000         |
| SPD          | 15,000         | 25,000         | 26,000         |
| SWD          | 17,000         | 5,000          | 9,000          |
| TAC          | 149,000        | 152,000        | 158,000        |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>671,000</b> | <b>656,000</b> | <b>591,000</b> |

### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

Some of the DoD & Support for Others components are listed below:

| <u>Program</u> | <u>FY 05</u> | <u>FY 06</u> | <u>FY 07</u> |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| DoDM           | \$189,000    | \$126,000    | \$160,000    |
| DLA            | \$103,000    | \$88,586     | \$74,139     |
| FMS            | \$149,000    | \$152,000    | \$158,000    |

Program figures derived from POM, customer input and PM best estimates.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

GULF REGION DIVISION AND AFGHANISTAN DISTRICT

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

| MSC                     | FY 05        | FY 06        | FY 07        |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Army, Construction      | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| Air Force, Construction | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| DOD                     | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| Environ (DERP/BRAC)     | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| Engineering & Design    | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| Real Estate             | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| RDT&E                   | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| Host Nation/FMS         | 0            | 100          | 100          |
| GWOT                    | 4,000        | 3,000        | 2,000        |
| Other (e.g., ED&M)      | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| <b>TOTAL</b>            | <b>4,000</b> | <b>3,100</b> | <b>2,100</b> |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

\*Note: Although no MILCON programmed to our knowledge, anticipate contingency construction projects on the order of \$50-75M annually (FY 05-07). Reimbursable support to US Forces, USAID, PCO would be an additional requirement that GRD should estimate.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

INSTALLATION SUPPORT PROGRAM (DIRECT)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

SRM SUPPORT TO HQ IMA, IMA REGIONAL OFFICES AND DIRECTORATES OF PUBLIC WORKS

(\$000)

| MSC          | FTEs      | FY 05        | FY 06        | FY 07        |
|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| LRD          | 4         | 626          | 628          | 639          |
| NAD          | 8         | 1,550        | 1,553        | 1,582        |
| NWD          | 8         | 1,213        | 1,215        | 1,238        |
| POD          | 8         | 1,206        | 1,209        | 1,231        |
| SAD          | 7         | 1,339        | 1,342        | 1,366        |
| SPD          | 4         | 772          | 774          | 788          |
| SWD          | 9         | 1,096        | 1,098        | 1,119        |
| HNC          | 4         | 666          | 667          | 679          |
| HQ IS        | 0         | 580          | 581          | 592          |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>52</b> | <b>9,048</b> | <b>9,067</b> | <b>9,235</b> |

#### Program Manager's Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

IS Program guidance has been coordinated with HQIMA. The USACE Installation Support Program is an integrated mix of direct and reimbursable funds. MSCs have the responsibility to build an integrated program providing both regional and customer specific support, using both direct and reimbursable funds.

The decision matrix for Resource Allocation was used. Smoothing factors were used so no MSC took more than a +/- 10% change. This matrix evaluates each MSC on the following criteria from the installations in the MSC's AO: # of primary installations, # of total square feet, # of total acres, Military population served, # of PPPs, PSPs and IBCTs in each AO.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

OMA DERP - IRP (REIMB) (CEMP-IS)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$M)

| MSC              | FY 05<br>DIR / REIMB | FY 06<br>DIR / REIMB | FY 07<br>DIR / REIMB |
|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| HNC              | 6                    | 6                    | 6                    |
| LRD              | 11.4                 | 21                   | 23                   |
| NAD              | 24                   | 24                   | 24                   |
| NWD              | 5.4                  | 3.7                  | 2.3                  |
| POD              | 1.5                  | 1.5                  | 1.5                  |
| SAD              | 26                   | 12                   | 12                   |
| SPD              | 10                   | 13.3                 | 10.2                 |
| SWD              | 12.3                 | 15.6                 | 2.2                  |
| DSMOA-<br>STATES | 8                    | 8                    | 8                    |
| HQ               | 0.5                  | 0.5                  | 0.5                  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>     | <b>109.8</b>         | <b>101.1</b>         | <b>95.2</b>          |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

Funding for the USACE portion of the Environmental Restoration, Army (ER,A) Program is received from the Army Environmental Center (AEC) via Military Interdepartmental Purchase Requests (MIPR).

Total yearly funding will decline due to the implementation of Performance Based Contracting (PBC) as the remediation strategy of choice. The above MSC estimates for any fiscal year become goals once AEC releases their Obligation Plan in Oct/Nov of that FY. The total MSC program is not known until 30 Sep of that FY. POC: Larry Douchand, CEMP-IS, 202-761-5789, Jim Strait, CEMP-IR, 202-761-5783, George Evans, CEMP-POD, 202-761-4761.

**SECTION 2****MILITARY PROGRAMS****MILITARY PROGRAMS**

OMA DERP – FUDS (DIRECT) (CEMP-RF)  
 TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)  
 (\$000)

| <b>MSC</b>   | <b>FY 05</b>     | <b>FY 06</b>     | <b>FY 07</b>     |
|--------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| HNC          | 6,505            | 6,005            | 6,005            |
| LRD          | 14,199           | 14,901           | 16,740.3         |
| NAD          | 30,571.5         | 32,988.1         | 34,714.0         |
| NWD          | 42,401.5         | 44,941           | 48,773.7         |
| POD          | 29,181.8         | 30,583.4         | 29,974.7         |
| SAD          | 16,899.6         | 17,405.0         | 18,736.1         |
| SPD          | 29,539.9         | 28,113.7         | 29,084.0         |
| SWD          | 14,925.3         | 14,132.6         | 14,031.6         |
| DSMOA-STATES | 6,000            | 6,000            | 6,000            |
| HQ           | 16,292           | 16,850           | 17,814           |
| HQDA         | 10,000           | 10,000           | 10,000           |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>216,515.6</b> | <b>221,920.1</b> | <b>231,873.1</b> |

**Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07**

POC: Nelson Labbe, CEMP-DE, 202-761-0310.

**SECTION 2****MILITARY PROGRAMS****MILITARY PROGRAMS**

BRAC – ER

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

| <b>MSC</b>   | <b>FY 05</b>  | <b>FY 06</b>  | <b>FY 07</b>  |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| HNC          | -             | -             | -             |
| LRD          | 11,401        | 20,909        | 24,000        |
| NAD          | 6,000         | 5,000         | 4,000         |
| NWD          | 2,500         | 2,000         | 1,500         |
| POD          | -             | -             | -             |
| SAD          | 13,000        | 9,000         | 8,000         |
| SPD          | 10,000        | 8,000         | 6,000         |
| SWD          | 5,000         | 4,000         | 3,000         |
| DSMOA-STATES | -             | -             | -             |
| HQ           | 1,700         | 1,700         | 1,300         |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>49,601</b> | <b>50,609</b> | <b>47,800</b> |

**Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07**

POC: Jeffrey Smith, CEMP-IR, 202-761-5769.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

EQ PROGRAM (REIMB) (CEMP-RI)  
TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)  
(\$M)

| MSC          | FY 05 | FY 06 | FY 07 |
|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| HNC          | 2     | 2     | 2     |
| LRD          | 9     | 9     | 8     |
| NAD          | 11    | 11    | 10    |
| NWD          | 34    | 32    | 30    |
| POD          | 34    | 32    | 30    |
| SAD          | 15    | 14    | 13    |
| SPD          | 37    | 36    | 33    |
| SWD          | 45    | 43    | 39    |
| TAW          | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| HQ           | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | 187   | 179   | 165   |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

Funding for the Environmental Quality Program will gradually decline as the total Army Environmental Program is reduced. The above projections are estimates. We do not receive an obligation plan for the EQ work. The USACE will execute work based on the dollar value of the work as the MIPR arrives from the customer. POC: Bob Fenlasm, CDMP-II, 202-761-5767.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

OMA DERP - OTHER DoD (REIMB) (CEMP-RI)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$M)

| MSC          | FY 05 | FY 06 | FY 07 |
|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| HNC          | 5     | 5     | 4     |
| LRD          | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| NAD          | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| NWD          | 11    | 11    | 10    |
| POD          | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| SAD          | 2     | 2     | 1     |
| SPD          | 2     | 2     | 1     |
| SWD          | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| DSMOA        | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| HQ           | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | 20    | 20    | 16    |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

Funding for the WFO – Other DoD (Reimb) shows a decline. The above are estimates. The funds are from AFRPA (BRAC-ER), DLA-ER, & DLA-BRAC. We do not receive an obligation plan for this work. The HQ no longer tracks Air Force active sites restoration ER,AF because we no longer receive M&S from HQAF. POC: Dale Jackson, CEMP-II, 202-761-5737.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

DoD RECRUITING, LEASE ADMINISTRATION  
DIRECT FUNDING  
(\$000)

| MSC                                  | FY 05  | FY 06  | FY 07   |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|
| LRD                                  | 1,538  | 1,584  | 1,663.2 |
| MVD                                  | 0      | 0      | 0       |
| NAD                                  | 4,270  | 4,398  | 4,618   |
| NWD                                  | 3,395  | 3,497  | 3,672   |
| POD                                  | 318    | 328    | 344     |
| SAD                                  | 3,236  | 3,333  | 3,500   |
| SPD                                  | 3,925  | 4,043  | 4,245   |
| SWD                                  | 2,318  | 2,388  | 2,507   |
| UNDIST/HQPRG                         | 3,000  | 3,100  | 3,255   |
| <b>TOTAL DoD REC<br/>LEASE ADMIN</b> | 22,001 | 22,671 | 23,805  |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 – FY 07

The PBG estimate for FY 06 and FY 07 is the same as FY 05 with inflation. The DoD Recruiting Program PBG will be adjusted to provide funding for actions requested by the DoD Recruiting Commands in the year before execution.

In FY 05 – FY 07 emphasis will be placed on force protection and improved recruiting station quality of life. Security assessments will be conducted for all recruiting stations nation-wide. There will be increased emphasis on station upgrades to bring all stations up to quality standards, which will make stations more appealing to public as well as better working areas for recruiters. Execution of the Enhanced Facility Initiative started in FY 03.

POCs: Esther Cruz, CEMP-SWD, 202-761-8100, or Darwin Smith, CEMP-DD, 202-761-0065.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

LEASE PAYMENTS - DoD RECRUITING & USACE GSA OCCUPIED LEASES  
DIRECT FUNDING (\$000)

| MSC  | FY 05   | FY 06   | FY 07   |
|--|---------|---------|---------|
| LRD  | 18,185  | 19,094  | 20,049  |
| MVD  | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| NAD  | 36,228  | 38,039  | 39,941  |
| NWD  | 21,538  | 22,615  | 23,746  |
| POD  | 1,586   | 1,666   | 1,749   |
| SAD  | 22,207  | 23,317  | 24,483  |
| SPD  | 21,074  | 22,127  | 23,233  |
| SWD  | 18,355  | 19,272  | 20,236  |
| UFC <u>1</u> / Includes USACE & DoD GSA Leases                           | 45,733  | 44,145  | 46,352  |
| UNDIST/HQPRG   | 5,200   | 4,700   | 4,935   |
| <b>TOTAL DoD RECRUITING<br/>LEASES</b> (Includes USACE & DoD GSA Leases) | 190,105 | 194,976 | 204,725 |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 – FY 07

The DoD Recruiting Program PBG will be adjusted to provide funding for actions requested by the DoD Recruiting Commands in the year before execution. Enhanced quality recruiting facilities moved from the test phase in FY 04 and will ramp upward into full lease execution through FY 05/06. The spike in undistributed funds from FY 05 – FY 07 is due to some current uncertainties as to the exact locations and lease costs for the enhanced facilities. The HQ will not distribute full funding until these issues are worked.

Emphasis will be placed on force protection and recruiting station quality in FY 05 through FY 07. The program has experienced cost growth because of OSD policy changes that decreased influence of cost and increased influence of location as deciding factors in facility selection. POCs: Esther Cruz, CEMP-SWD, 202-761-8100, or Darwin Smith, CEMP-DD, 202-761-0065.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

#### LEASED GOVERNMENT HOUSING PROGRAM

#### FUNDING (\$000)

| MSC               | FY 05        |               | FY 06        |               | FY 07        |               |
|-------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
|                   | LABOR COST   | TOTAL FUNDS   | LABOR COST   | TOTAL FUNDS   | LABOR COST   | TOTAL FUNDS   |
| LRD               | 483          | 4,066         | 459          | 3,659         | 459          | 3,659         |
| MVD               | -            | -             | -            | -             | -            | -             |
| NAD               | 340          | 2,488         | 322          | 2,239         | 322          | 2,239         |
| NWD               | 611          | 4,798         | 581          | 4,318         | 581          | 4,318         |
| POD               | -            | -             | -            | -             | -            | -             |
| SAD               | 481          | 4,088         | 457          | 3,679         | 457          | 3,679         |
| SPD               | 302          | 2,500         | 286          | 2,250         | 286          | 2,250         |
| SWD               | 457          | 3,204         | 434          | 2,883         | 434          | 2,883         |
| UNDIST/<br>HQ PRG | 53           | 270           | 55           | 280           | 55           | 280           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>      | <b>2,727</b> | <b>21,415</b> | <b>2,594</b> | <b>19,300</b> | <b>2,594</b> | <b>19,300</b> |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 – FY 07

Congress is expected to increase service members' basic allowance for housing (BAH) during FY 05. Therefore, The Army is expecting the need for this program to diminish and plans to stop approving any new housing requests with FY 06. The Navy and various other customers however anticipate the program existing beyond FY 06. Due to this decrease from Army in new housing requests the program budget is decreased for FY 07. POCs: Esther Cruz, CEMP-SWD, 202-761-8100, or Darvin Smith, CEMP-DD, 202-761-0065.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (HAP)

DIRECT FUNDING (LABOR & WORKLOAD)

(\$000)

| MSC           | FY 05         |               | FY 06         |              | FY 07         |              |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
|               | LABOR & ADMIN | TOTAL FUNDS   | LABOR & ADMIN | TOTAL FUNDS  | LABOR & ADMIN | TOTAL FUNDS  |
| SAD           | 491           | 2,530         | 350           | 1,368        | 157           | 561          |
| SPD           | 1,578         | 5,076         | 1,678         | 2,575        | 1,417         | 1,417        |
| SWD           | 924           | 2,729         | 577           | 1,833        | 577           | 1,420        |
| UNDIST/HQ PRG | 787           | 1,207         | 836           | 1,252        | 869           | 1,281        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b>3,780</b>  | <b>11,542</b> | <b>3,441</b>  | <b>7,028</b> | <b>3,020</b>  | <b>4,679</b> |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

In spite of a new program in Panama, and the extension of the Fort Polk, Louisiana program to 30 Sep 04, as well as the anticipated emphasis on A-76 contracting throughout DoD, overall program requirements in some of the HAP Districts continue to diminish. Some additional programs are being projected for the future including Edwards AFB, (ready for program approval), Hill AFB, Ogden, Utah (Market Impact Study being accomplished), Beale AFB, California (request coming to HQ for approval to do a Preliminary Impact Report) (PIR), Mountain Home AFB, Idaho, (being monitored), and Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico. While the districts are working accurately to estimate the potential size of these possible programs, as well as the impacts of A-76 contracting nationwide, accurate estimates will not be forthcoming until more data becomes available. Upon completion of The Army, Navy and Air Force programs on Oahu, there will be a significant decline unless the above-mentioned areas are eligible for the HAP. Congress is discussing the need for another round of base closures. If new legislation is enacted to close or realign additional facilities, the dollar amounts for FY 05-06 and beyond may increase substantially. POCs: Frank Jones, CEMP-POD, 202-761-0291, or Imogene Newsome, CERM-BA\F\SPD, 202-761-0797.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

REAL ESTATE OPERATIONS, ARMY REIMBURSABLE  
REIMBURSABLE LABOR FUNDING  
(\$000)

| MSC                       | FY 05 | FY 06 | FY 07 |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| LRD                       | 487   | 477   | 464   |
| MVD                       | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| NAD                       | 871   | 853   | 830   |
| NWD                       | 471   | 462   | 449   |
| POD                       | 1,201 | 1,177 | 1,144 |
| SAD                       | 3,630 | 3,559 | 3,457 |
| SPD                       | 312   | 306   | 297   |
| SWD                       | 222   | 218   | 211   |
| UNDIST/HQPRG              | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| TOTAL REO,<br>ARMY, REIMB | 7,194 | 7,052 | 6,852 |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 – FY 07

The PBG estimate for FY 06 and FY 07 is the same as FY 05 with inflation. The Army reimbursable program will be adjusted to provide funding for new work requested by Army Installation Management Agency Regions, Army Reserve, and National Guard in the year before execution. The FY 05 -- 07 emphasis will be on output/outcome performance -based execution, and reporting progress to customers. This offers the opportunity to identify shortfalls in direct funding of critical oversight functions, to highlight our current effort and capabilities for support of Army customers, as well as identify improvements realized through implementation of best business practices. This program funding is directly tied to the field execution of new actions in support of Army initiatives such as restationing actions for both the Active and Reserve Components, Transformation initiatives, overseas activities, buffer acquisition, conservation conveyance, conveyance and disposal of real property, acquisition of realty interests, resolution of encroachments, and condemnations, etc. POC: Jeanne Herman, CEMP-D, 202-761-1082.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

REAL ESTATE OPERATIONS, AIR FORCE REIMBURSABLE

REIMBURSABLE LABOR FUNDING

(\$000)

| <b>MSC</b>                            | <b>FY 05</b> | <b>FY 06</b> | <b>FY 07</b> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| LRD                                   | 195          | 201          | 207          |
| MVD                                   | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| NAD                                   | 799          | 823          | 848          |
| NWD                                   | 1,585        | 1,623        | 1,672        |
| POD                                   | 561          | 578          | 595          |
| SAD                                   | 843          | 868          | 894          |
| SPD                                   | 1,015        | 1,046        | 1,077        |
| SWD                                   | 250          | 258          | 266          |
| UNDIST/HQPRG                          | 122          | 126          | 130          |
| <b>TOTAL REO, AIR<br/>FORCE REIMB</b> | <b>5,370</b> | <b>5,531</b> | <b>5,689</b> |

#### **Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 – FY 07**

Our ability to program the necessary manpower resources to execute the Air Force's real estate Work requires close coordination with the Air Force Real Estate team members at Base/District, MSC and MAJCOM/MACOM levels. We must identify the program year workload estimates in order for us to reserve the FTE for execution in those program years. The FY 05 targets represent a slight decrease in funding. USACE and the Air Force will coordinate enhancements to product delivery business processes. Enhancements could include streamlining business processes as well as the Automated Information System (AIS).

POCs: Judy Silver, CEMP-NAD, 202-761-0618, or Jeanne Herman, CEMP-D, 202-761-1082.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

REAL ESTATE OPERATIONS, ARMY ADMINISTRATION

DIRECT LABOR FUNDING

(\$000)

| MSC                       | FY 05   | FY 06   | FY 07   |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| LRD                       | 346.8   | 340.0   | 330.3   |
| MVD                       | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| NAD                       | 613.4   | 601.4   | 584.2   |
| NWD                       | 923.1   | 905.0   | 879.1   |
| POD                       | 415.1   | 407.0   | 395.3   |
| SAD                       | 708.2   | 694.3   | 674.5   |
| SPD                       | 424.9   | 416.6   | 404.7   |
| SWD                       | 270.6   | 265.3   | 257.7   |
| UNDIST/HQPRG              | 9.9     | 9.7     | 9.4     |
| TOTAL REO,<br>ARMY, REIMB | 3,711.8 | 3,639.3 | 3,535.2 |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 – FY 07

We continue to assist customers and HQDA in programming and budgeting for real estate requirements that exceed our current ability to direct fund. The need continues for close workload / program coordination between USACE and our customers at all levels. USACE will focus more on output/outcome performance-based execution metrics. This offers the opportunity to identify shortfalls in direct funding of critical functions, highlight current/future capabilities for support of Army customers, as well as identify improvements realized from best business practice implementation. The Army's real estate mission is an integral part of The Army initiatives for privatization of utilities, the family housing commercialization, outgranting and disposal of federal lands, transformation of The Army, and restructuring of the overseas force structure. Some of the challenges and opportunities facing real estate include: The Global War on Terrorism, Homeland Security, enhanced compliance inspections, buffer zones and encroachment identification and resolutions. POC: Jeanne Herman, CEMP-D, 202-761-1082.

### PROGRAM MANAGERS AND DOCUMENTATION

1. General Investigations:  
Program Manager: Wanda Cook, CECW-IP, 202-761-5857
2. Construction, General:  
Program Manager: Leonard Henry, CECW-IP, 202-761-5856
3. Operation & Maintenance, General:  
Program Manager: Joseph Bittner, CECW-IP, 202-761-4130
4. Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries:  
Program Manager: Anil Chaudhey, CECW-IP, 202-761-4133
5. General Expenses:  
Program Manager: Sue Bobby, CERM-B, 202-761-4728  
Appropriation Account Manager: Gary Campbell, CECW-IN, 202-761-4153
6. Regulatory Program:  
Program Manager: Mark Sudol, CECW-CO, 202-761-8560  
Appropriation Account Manager: Jeff Krull, CECW-IN, 202-761-4449
7. Flood Control & Coastal Emergencies:  
Program Manager: Bill Irwin, CECW-HS, 202-761-4667  
Appropriation Account Manager: Lizbeth Miller, CECW-HS, 202-761-0217
8. Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP):  
Program Manager: Sharon Wagner, CECW-IP, 202-761-1775
9. Coastal Wetlands Restoration Trust Fund:  
Program Manager: Bruce Heide, CECW-MVD, 202-761-4580  
Appropriation Account Manager: Mark Guest, CERM-BC, 202-761-4649
10. Support for Others - Reimbursable Funding:  
Program Manager: Al Bertini, CEMP-NE, 202-761-4271

**SECTION 2****CIVIL WORKS****CIVIL WORKS**

## GENERAL EXPENSES

(\$000)

| <b>MSC</b>               | <b>FY 05</b> | <b>FY 06</b> | <b>FY 07</b> |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| LRD                      | 9,306        | 9,123        | 8,863        |
| MVD                      | 9,689        | 9,499        | 9,228        |
| NAD                      | 8,520        | 8,353        | 8,115        |
| NWD                      | 9,727        | 9,536        | 9,263        |
| POD                      | 2,990        | 2,931        | 2,848        |
| SAD                      | 9,815        | 9,623        | 9,348        |
| SPD                      | 10,754       | 10,543       | 10,241       |
| SWD                      | 8,103        | 7,944        | 7,717        |
| HQs                      | 56,092       | 54,992       | 53,421       |
| OTHER CE<br>OFFICES      | 22,777       | 22,331       | 21,693       |
| <b>TOTAL GEN<br/>EXP</b> | 147,773      | 144,875      | 140,736      |

**Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07**

The PBG estimate for FY 06 and FY 07 is the same as FY 05 with inflation. The POC is Sue Bobby, CERM-B, 202-761-4728.

## SECTION 2

## CIVIL WORKS

### CIVIL WORKS

#### GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

(\$000)

| MSC                      | FY 05  | FY 06  | FY 07  |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| LRD                      | 6,319  | 6,500  | 6,600  |
| MVD                      | 14,521 | 14,900 | 15,300 |
| NAD                      | 5,601  | 5,700  | 5,900  |
| NWD                      | 5,043  | 5,200  | 5,300  |
| POD                      | 2,900  | 3,000  | 3,050  |
| SAD                      | 3,459  | 3,500  | 3,600  |
| SPD                      | 11,015 | 11,300 | 11,600 |
| SWD                      | 9,598  | 9,800  | 10,000 |
| <b>TOTAL GEN<br/>INV</b> | 58,456 | 59,900 | 61,350 |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

The General Investigations program is flat through the year 2005. The FY 05 Budget is a very constrained planning program level. Adjustments to this program level will be made dependent upon the successes of the individual activities underway and the annual Energy and Water Development Appropriation Acts. The MSC ceilings in the outyears reflected by the annual program EC reflect a growth of 2.5%.

**SECTION 2****CIVIL WORKS****CIVIL WORKS****CONSTRUCTION GENERAL**

(\$000)

| <b>MSC</b>                 | <b>FY 05</b>     | <b>FY 06</b>     | <b>FY 07</b>     |
|----------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| LRD                        | 283,000          | 296,000          | 296,000          |
| MVD                        | 147,000          | 154,000          | 154,000          |
| NAD                        | 156,000          | 163,000          | 164,000          |
| NWD                        | 219,000          | 230,000          | 230,000          |
| POD                        | 34,500           | 36,000           | 36,000           |
| SAD                        | 214,000          | 224,000          | 224,000          |
| SPD                        | 121,000          | 126,000          | 126,000          |
| SWD                        | 69,000           | 72,000           | 73,000           |
| HQ                         | 84,000           | 88,000           | 88,000           |
| <b>TOTAL CONST<br/>GEN</b> | <b>1,327,500</b> | <b>1,389,000</b> | <b>1,391,000</b> |

**Program Managers Assessment: FY 05**

The gross FY 05 Construction, General program request prior to the application of an adjustment for savings and slippage, is \$1,549 Billion. Under performance based budgeting there are no out year ceilings. Adjustments to the Construction, General program will be made each year after passage of the annual Energy and Water Development Appropriation Acts to reflect the funding level actually provided.

## SECTION 2

## CIVIL WORKS

### CIVIL WORKS

O&M GENERAL  
DIRECT FUNDING  
(\$000)

| MSC                      | FY 05            | FY 06            | FY 07            |
|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| LRD                      | 339,797          | 370,580          | 406,900          |
| MVD                      | 372,640          | 406,400          | 446,300          |
| NAD                      | 191,784          | 209,160          | 229,700          |
| NWD                      | 256,793          | 280,060          | 307,500          |
| POD                      | 12,926           | 14,100           | 15,500           |
| SAD                      | 290,530          | 316,850          | 347,900          |
| SPD                      | 108,274          | 118,080          | 129,700          |
| SWD                      | 274,866          | 299,770          | 329,200          |
| Remaining Items          | 90,715           | 93,000           | 95,300           |
| Savings and Slippages    | -12,325          | -8,000           | -8,000           |
| <b>Total O&amp;M GEN</b> | <b>1,926,000</b> | <b>2,100,000</b> | <b>2,300,000</b> |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

The President's Budget for FY 05 emphasizes essential maintenance and security activities at key Corps facilities and supports recreation modernization. The budget also proposes a new \$35 million reserve fund to meet unexpected, urgent maintenance and repair needs at key facilities. A separate estimate of \$12 million under Remaining Items for facility protection, is included primarily to protect administrative facilities and laboratories (projects are protected with project specific funds), complete implementation of facility protection standards at MR&T facilities and continue monitoring other Homeland Security (HLS) activities, continue Force Protection Standards for non-project specific Corps Offices, and continue to interface with other Federal, state and local government offices and private industry. The FY 05 Legislative Package includes and Administration proposal for three Power Marketing Agencies (PMAs) to directly fund hydropower O&M costs which, if enacted, would offset O&M appropriations by about \$150 million in FY 05.

The above table is based on the Corps recommendation to reduce the high priority backlog in the out-years within realistic parameters. Other FY 05 and out-years increases could result from unanticipated significant weather-related emergencies or major accidents to be covered by emergency supplemental appropriations.

## SECTION 2

## CIVIL WORKS

### CIVIL WORKS

#### MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

#### DIRECT FUNDING

(\$M)

| MSC | FY 05 | FY 06 | FY 07 |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|
| MVD | 270   | 281   | 292   |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

The Mississippi River and Tributaries program for FY 05, reflects a major reduction from FY 04 Appropriations that was \$322 million. Although the FY 05 program will allow the overall MR&T project to remain on schedule through providing a funding priority to the construction of the Mississippi River Levees project and other Main Stem components, specific delays will be encountered in completion of some of the tributaries basins. One new starts in the General Investigations portion of the appropriation is included for FY 05 and no new contracts except those necessary for the Channel Improvement revetment program. Morganza to the Gulf Hurricane Protection project is the only continuing preconstruction engineering and design funded. There should be no impacts to the operations and maintenance of the main stem projects. The maintenance backlog will continue to grow at current funding levels. The MR&T program will be adjusted each year after enactment of the annual Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts to reflect the funding level actually provided.

## SECTION 2

## CIVIL WORKS

### CIVIL WORKS

REGULATORY PROGRAM

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

| <b>MSC</b>   | <b>FY 05</b>   | <b>FY 06</b>   | <b>FY 07</b>   |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| LRD          | 21,600         | 22,600         | 23,800         |
| MVD          | 20,000         | 21,000         | 22,000         |
| NAD          | 25,000         | 26,200         | 27,500         |
| NWD          | 18,700         | 19,500         | 20,500         |
| POD          | 8,200          | 8,600          | 9,000          |
| SAD          | 28,400         | 29,700         | 31,300         |
| SPD          | 15,000         | 15,700         | 16,500         |
| SWD          | 11,000         | 11,500         | 12,100         |
| LABS         | 2,100          | 2,200          | 2,300          |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>150,000</b> | <b>157,000</b> | <b>165,000</b> |

#### **Program Manager's Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07**

Program funds will be utilized in accordance with new program performance targets to be announced. Estimates are not considered to be authoritative and all will change. Congress has not set the FY 05 total for the Regulatory program. Projections for 06 and 07 program numbers and division funding levels have low reliability as no total requested amounts have been developed and resource needs among division will be based on changes in future workload.

## SECTION 2

## CIVIL WORKS

### CIVIL WORKS

OTHER DIRECT (FUSRAP)

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

| MSC                 | FY 05          | FY 06          | FY 07          |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| LRD                 | 45,300         | 39,300         | 39,300         |
| MVD                 | 50,300         | 48,500         | 48,600         |
| NAD                 | 44,400         | 52,200         | 52,100         |
| NWD                 | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| POD                 | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| SAD                 | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| SPD                 | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| SWD                 | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| <b>TOTAL FUSRAP</b> | <b>140,000</b> | <b>140,000</b> | <b>140,000</b> |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

The FUSRAP account has been funded at \$140,000 million since FY 01 with the exception of \$145,000 in FY 03. This level of funding has allowed work to progress at a moderate pace. Outyear estimates are being developed in accordance with program priorities and adjustments in project schedules.

### CIVIL WORKS

OTHER DIRECT (FCCE)

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

#### **Program Manager's Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07**

The President's Budget for FY 05 request \$50 million for the FCCE account. This will be added to the carryover from FY 04 and used to meet the requirements of the preparedness program in FY 05. However, due to the event-driven nature of the FCCE account, total MSC programs cannot be estimated and additional funds will be requested when the balance in the account is expected to be insufficient to support the preparedness program and emergency response activities.

## SECTION 2

## CIVIL WORKS

---

### CIVIL WORKS

OTHER DIRECT (COASTAL WETLANDS)

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

| MSC | FY 05    | FY 06    | FY 07    |
|-----|----------|----------|----------|
| MVD | \$63,000 | \$64,000 | \$66,000 |

#### **Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07**

Breaux Act funding is provided by the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 and comes from excise taxes on fishing equipment and fuel taxes on motorboat and small engines. On October 20, 1999, Public Law 106-74 amended the Breaux Act to provide funding authority through FY 00. On November 1, 2000, Public Law 106-408 amended the Breaux Act to provide funding authority through FY 09.

## SECTION 2

## CIVIL WORKS

### CIVIL WORKS

EPA SUPERFUND

REIMBURSABLE FUNDING (\$000)

| MSC                        | FY 05          | FY 06          | FY 07          |
|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| LRD                        | 2,000          | 2,000          | 2,000          |
| MVD                        | 1,000          | 1,000          | 1,000          |
| NAD                        | 120,000        | 120,000        | 120,000        |
| NWD                        | 50,000         | 50,000         | 50,000         |
| POD                        | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| SAD                        | 25,000         | 25,000         | 20,000         |
| SPD                        | 10,000         | 10,000         | 10,000         |
| SWD                        | 15,000         | 10,000         | 10,000         |
| OTHER CE<br>OFFICES        | 6,000          | 6,000          | 6,000          |
| <b>TOTAL OTHER<br/>SFO</b> | <b>229,000</b> | <b>224,000</b> | <b>219,000</b> |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

“EPA Superfund” consists of hazardous, toxic and radioactive waste removal and remediation work the Corps performs for EPA in compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA). The above forecasts for future work are based upon funds we currently have on hand and project to receive during the coming year.

**SECTION 2****CIVIL WORKS****CIVIL WORKS**

OTHER ERS

REIMBURSABLE FUNDING (\$000)

| <b>MSC</b>               | <b>FY 05</b> | <b>FY 06</b> | <b>FY 07</b> |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| LRD                      | 8,000        | 6,000        | 6,000        |
| MVD                      | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| NAD                      | 2,000        | 2,000        | 2,000        |
| NWD                      | 8,000        | 7,000        | 7,000        |
| POD                      | 1,000        | 1,000        | 1,000        |
| SAD                      | 1,000        | 1,000        | 1,000        |
| SPD                      | 1,000        | 1,000        | 1,000        |
| SWD                      | 5,000        | 5,000        | 5,000        |
| OTHER CE<br>OFFICES      | 1,000        | 1,000        | 1,000        |
| <b>TOT OTHER<br/>ERS</b> | 27,000       | 24,000       | 24,000       |

**Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07**

“Other ERS” consists of hazardous, toxic, and radioactive waste management and remediation work the Corps performs for other agencies or entities (not including EPA Superfund). The above forecasts for future work are based upon work we have performed in the past, expected continuation of the ongoing work until completion and any new work that may result from the outreach efforts currently underway.

## SECTION 2

## CIVIL WORKS

### CIVIL WORKS

OTHER INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SERVICES (IIS) (FORMERLY  
SUPPORT FOR OTHERS)  
REIMBURSABLE FUNDING  
(\$000)

| MSC                    | FY 05          | FY 06          | FY 07            |
|------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| GRD                    | 21,000         | 7,000          |                  |
| LRD                    | 59,000         | 63,000         | 67,000           |
| MVD                    | 13,000         | 14,000         | 15,000           |
| NAD                    | 300,000        | 320,000        | 340,000          |
| NWD                    | 120,000        | 130,000        | 140,000          |
| POD                    | 60,000         | 63,000         | 66,000           |
| SAD                    | 100,000        | 115,000        | 120,000          |
| SPD                    | 70,000         | 75,000         | 80,000           |
| SWD                    | 100,000        | 115,000        | 120,000          |
| OTHER CE OFFICES       | 56,000         | 60,000         | 65,000           |
| <b>TOTAL OTHER IIS</b> | <b>899,000</b> | <b>962,000</b> | <b>1,013,000</b> |

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 - FY 07

Other Interagency and International Services (IIS) (formerly known as “Support for Others”) consists of work the Corps performs for other agencies or entities relating to vertical construction, facilities, infrastructure, and water resources. The above forecasts for future work are based on work we have performed in the past, expected continuation of ongoing work until completion, and any requests for new work.

## SECTION 2

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

---

### PROGRAM MANAGERS AND DOCUMENTATION

1. Direct Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E)

Program Managers: Ms. Debra Kabinier, ERDC, 703-428-6901; Ms. Theresa Salls, ERDC, 703-428-6255; Susan Slaton 601-634-3963

2. Direct OMA: Program Manager: Ms. Carol Lichtenfels, ERDC, 703-428-6654, EMAP Program Manager: Mr. Paul Harwig, ERDC 703-428-7134

3. Direct Civil: Program Managers: Ms. Terri Prickett Cox; ERDC, 703-428-6630, Ms. Rebecca Young, ERDC, 601-634-4277

### Program Managers Assessment: FY 05 – FY 07

The civil works R&D program continues to provide practical end products to enhance the efficiency of civil works planning, design, construction, operations and maintenance activities. Strategic R&D focus areas for FY 05-07 include Navigation, Flood and Coastal, Environmental, and System-Wide Water Modeling.

The RDT&E program within the Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC) continues to evolve to meet Army and Corps mission requirements in military engineering, battle space environment, environmental quality, and facility management. The ERDC maximizes its extensive and synergistic scientific and technical expertise to develop and execute well integrated programs that are responsive to customer requirements and to deliver quality products to the field. To that end, the ERDC has the following major objectives:

- . To deliver new technologies needed by USACE to achieve its strategic vision,
- . To increase the relevance of the Corps to its customers,
- . To increase the focus on priority future operational capabilities of the Nation and
- . To sustain world-class research capability in critical mission areas.

## SECTION 2

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Engineer Research & Development Center (ERDC) (\$000)

|  | FY 05   | FY 06   | FY 07   |
|--|---------|---------|---------|
| Civil Works Direct                     |         |         |         |
| GI                                     | 22,051  | 23,154  | 23,501  |
| CG                                     | 5,848   | 6,140   | 6,232   |
| O&M                                    | 23,281  | 24,445  | 24,812  |
| GE & Other                             | 8,205   | 8,615   | 8,744   |
| Total CW Direct                        | 59,385  | 62,354  | 63,289  |
| Civil Works Reimbursable               |         |         |         |
| USACE Reimb (Corps to Corps)           | 91,354  | 96,065  | 97,506  |
| Support for Others (Federal)           | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| Support for Others (Non-Fed)           | 17,654  | 18,537  | 18,815  |
| HQUSACE                                | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| Environ Restoration Spt                | 536     | 563     | 571     |
| Total CW Reimbursable                  | 109,544 | 115,165 | 116,892 |
| Direct Fund Cites                      | 7,138   | 7,352   | 7,462   |
| Total Civil Works                      | 176,067 | 184,871 | 187,644 |
| Military Direct                        |         |         |         |
| RDT&E Direct and Congressionals        | 93,032  | 84,007  | 88,713  |
| OMA Direct                             | 30,112  | 32,316  | 37,655  |
| Oth Mil Dir (MCA-Army, OPA, DOD, CTIS) | 79,741  | 81,952  | 83,181  |
| Total Direct                           | 202,885 | 198,275 | 209,549 |
| Military R&D Reimbursable              |         |         |         |
| HQUSACE                                | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| Corps to Corps                         | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| Army, R&D, OMA, ETC                    | 75,260  | 76,389  | 77,535  |
| Other DOD                              | 51,537  | 52,309  | 53,094  |
| Total Military Reimbursable            | 126,797 | 128,698 | 130,629 |
| Direct Fund Cites                      | 107,865 | 109,483 | 111,125 |
| Total Military                         | 437,547 | 436,456 | 451,303 |
| Total ERDC                             | 613,614 | 621,327 | 638,947 |

## SECTION 3

## HR REGIONALIZATION

**HR REGIONALIZATION.** HR Regionalization, begun in FY 96, requires budgeting for the costs of both regional Civilian Personnel Operations Centers (CPOC) and local Civilian Personnel Advisory Centers (CPAC). CPOC costs are billed by HQUSACE to Corps CONUS and OCONUS commands for their share of the HQDA-identified costs. Starting in FY05, costs will be billed to OCONUS commands.

The CPOC bill includes operating costs (primarily salary and benefits for a portion of the CPOC staff). The basis for the CPOC charges is the percent each command's population represents of the total regional CPOC's serviced population. The basis for establishing serviced employees is based on the Civilian Productivity Report, Serviced Employee Detail Report as of July 2004.

| <b>ALL CPOC REGIONS</b>               | (Per employee serviced) |               |               |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|
|                                       | Rate<br>FY 05           | Rate<br>FY 06 | Rate<br>FY 07 |
| All CE Divisions/Districts/Centers/HQ | \$483                   | \$503         | \$524         |

**CPAC REALIGNMENT.** Beginning in FY 04, all CPACs and CPOCs aligned under U.S. Army Civilian Human Resources Agency (CHRA) by authority of the Secretary of The Army and the Chief of Staff, Army, memorandum, 21 Feb 03. Reimbursable costs for CPACs include those costs directly supporting the provision of CPAC services for all Corps of Engineers civilian employees as outlined in the MOU between the Assistant G-1 for Civilian Personnel Policy, the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) and the Commander U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) except those who are funded with direct Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA). The annual bill will be jointly calculated by CHRA and MSCs and Districts having on-site CPACs. The CPAC bill will identify the annual USACE owed amount broken out by the amounts attributable to each CPAC servicing USACE civilian personnel. CPAC costs are billed by HQUSACE to Corps commands for their share of the identified costs.

Estimates for the FY 05 CPAC budget costs are not currently available. Use the CPAC operating budget for FY 04 in estimating FY 05 CPAC costs. It is anticipated costs for the FY 05 budget will increase at least 4.9%. **The POC is Linda Tompkins, 202-761-1536.**

## SECTION 3

## USACE FINANCE CTR RATES

### USACE FINANCE CENTER (UFC) RATES

The FY 05-07 estimated costs for UFC operating finance and accounting support is provided below for each USACE activity. To more accurately reflect the level of effort required, the UFC has changed the method used to prorate costs to each supported USACE activity. First, workload statistics were compiled for each activity to serve as a basis for distributing the UFC cost. Then, the projected operating cost of each of the UFC mission areas (travel, accounts payable, accounts receivable/debt management, disbursing, cash reports, and field reports) was determined. Each USACE activities share of a specific mission area cost was then calculated based on the workload statistics for that activity. Last, the activities total estimated cost was determined by summing the costs of each individual mission area for each specific USACE activity.

The UFC will bill only for actual costs incurred. Although the following estimates were calculated using budget projections, actual billings will be determined by applying an activity's workload percentage to the UFC actual monthly operating cost. The UFC will accept/record customer orders for support costs on its CEFMS database. **Therefore, each site must transmit government order(s) to the UFC for support costs in FY 05. The POC is Greg Porter, 901-874-8409.**

| <u>FOA</u>             | <u>FY 05</u> | <u>FY 06</u> | <u>FY 07 (Est \$'s)</u> |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| A0 HUNTSVILLE          | 560,000      | 588,000      | 617,000                 |
| B0 MISS. VALLEY DIV.   | 56,000       | 59,000       | 62,000                  |
| B1 MEMPHIS             | 174,000      | 182,000      | 191,000                 |
| B2 NEW ORLEANS         | 404,000      | 424,000      | 446,000                 |
| B3 ST. LOUIS           | 301,000      | 316,000      | 332,000                 |
| B4 VICKSBURG           | 385,000      | 404,000      | 424,000                 |
| B5 ROCK ISLAND         | 317,000      | 333,000      | 350,000                 |
| B6 ST. PAUL            | 253,000      | 265,000      | 279,000                 |
| E0 NORTH ATLANTIC DIV. | 59,000       | 62,000       | 65,000                  |
| E1 BALTIMORE           | 794,000      | 833,000      | 875,000                 |
| E2 WASH. AQUEDUCT      | 38,000       | 40,000       | 42,000                  |
| E3 NEW YORK            | 346,000      | 363,000      | 381,000                 |
| E4 NORFOLK             | 328,000      | 344,000      | 361,000                 |
| E5 PHILADELPHIA        | 179,000      | 188,000      | 197,000                 |
| E6 NEW ENGLAND         | 307,000      | 323,000      | 339,000                 |
| E7 EUROPE              | 362,000      | 380,000      | 399,000                 |
| G0 NORTHWESTERN DIV    | 88,000       | 92,000       | 97,000                  |

## SECTION 3

## USACE FINANCE CTR RATES

### UFC RATES (CONT'D)

| <u>FOA</u>                 | <u>FY 05</u> | <u>FY 06</u> | <u>FY 07</u> | (Est \$'s) |
|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| G2 PORTLAND                | 421,000      | 442,000      | 464,000      |            |
| G3 SEATTLE                 | 389,000      | 409,000      | 429,000      |            |
| G4 WALLA WALLA             | 266,000      | 279,000      | 293,000      |            |
| G5 KANSAS CITY             | 499,000      | 524,000      | 551,000      |            |
| G6 OMAHA                   | 859,000      | 902,000      | 947,000      |            |
| H0 GR. LKS./OHIO RVR. DIV. | 59,000       | 62,000       | 65,000       |            |
| H1 HUNTINGTON              | 321,000      | 337,000      | 354,000      |            |
| H2 LOUISVILLE              | 712,000      | 748,000      | 785,000      |            |
| H3 NASHVILLE               | 288,000      | 303,000      | 318,000      |            |
| H4 PITTSBURGH              | 199,000      | 209,000      | 220,000      |            |
| H5 BUFFALO                 | 119,000      | 125,000      | 131,000      |            |
| H6 CHICAGO                 | 56,000       | 59,000       | 62,000       |            |
| H7 DETROIT                 | 163,000      | 171,000      | 180,000      |            |
| J0 PACIFIC OCEAN DIV.      | 42,000       | 44,000       | 46,000       |            |
| J1 FAR EAST (KOREA)        | 236,000      | 248,000      | 260,000      |            |
| J2 JAPAN                   | 130,000      | 136,000      | 143,000      |            |
| J3 HONOLULU                | 225,000      | 236,000      | 248,000      |            |
| J4 ALASKA                  | 298,000      | 313,000      | 328,000      |            |
| K0 SOUTH ATLANTIC DIV.     | 66,000       | 70,000       | 73,000       |            |
| K2 CHARLESTON              | 65,000       | 68,000       | 71,000       |            |
| K3 JACKSONVILLE            | 413,000      | 433,000      | 455,000      |            |
| K5 MOBILE                  | 1,041,000    | 1,093,000    | 1,148,000    |            |
| K6 SAVANNAH                | 589,000      | 618,000      | 649,000      |            |
| K7 WILMINGTON              | 190,000      | 199,000      | 209,000      |            |
| L0 SOUTH PACIFIC DIV.      | 59,000       | 62,000       | 65,000       |            |
| L1 LOS ANGELES             | 419,000      | 440,000      | 462,000      |            |
| L2 SACRAMENTO              | 628,000      | 659,000      | 692,000      |            |
| L3 SAN FRANCISCO           | 107,000      | 112,000      | 118,000      |            |
| L4 ALBUQUERQUE             | 174,000      | 182,000      | 191,000      |            |
| M0 SOUTHWESTERN DIV.       | 102,000      | 107,000      | 113,000      |            |
| M2 FORT WORTH              | 815,000      | 856,000      | 899,000      |            |
| M3 GALVESTON               | 144,000      | 151,000      | 159,000      |            |
| M4 LITTLE ROCK             | 489,000      | 513,000      | 539,000      |            |
| M5 TULSA                   | 519,000      | 544,000      | 572,000      |            |

## SECTION 3

## USACE FINANCE CTR RATES

---

### UFC RATES (CONT'D)

| <u>FOA</u>              | <u>FY 05</u> | <u>FY 06</u> | <u>FY 07</u> (Est \$'s) |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| N0 TRANSATLANTIC PROG.  | 229,000      | 241,000      | 253,000                 |
| PO GULF REGION DIVISION | 33,000       | 35,000       | 36,000                  |
| Q0 WTR. RES. SPT. CTR.  | 69,000       | 72,000       | 76,000                  |
| S0 OFC. OF CH. OF ENG   | 406,000      | 426,000      | 448,000                 |
| U4 ERDC                 | 1,130,000    | 1,186,000    | 1,245,000               |
| W2 HECSA                | 54,000       | 57,000       | 60,000                  |
| W3 CTR PUBLIC WORKS     | 69,000       | 72,000       | 76,000                  |
| TOTAL                   | \$18,043,000 | \$18,939,000 | \$19,890,000            |

### INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT)

As part of the USACE 2012 reorganization, the Directorate of Corporate Information established eight sub Communities of Practice (CoPs) under the main Information Technology CoP. Guidance is presented by these eight sub CoPs: Architecture and Infrastructure, Capital Planning, E-Government, Information Assurance, IT Human Capital, Performance Management, Acquisition, and Software Engineering.

#### **Architecture and Infrastructure**

##### **Corps Enterprise Architecture (CeA)**

The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Corps Enterprise Architecture (**CeA**) is a management tool to enhance communications between business leaders and Information Technology (IT) experts to ensure IT is effectively used to achieve current and future business needs. Specifically, the **CeA** will serve as the key component for exchanging ideas, functional requirements, and technical solutions between business owners/managers, strategic planners, Automated Information System (AIS) developers and Chief of Information Officer (CIO) staff.

The **CeA** Community of Practice (CoP) has established a collaborative web site to share latest information and promote an exchange of ideas. The **CeA** Web site is located at <https://eko.usace.army.mil/usacecop/ci/ceaiti/index.cfm> . You will need your Army Knowledge Online (AKO) ID and Password to access the collaborative portion of this site.

As we continue on our path to USACE 2012, the **CeA** will grow from a repository of information to a benchmarking business and IT exchange for Regional Business Centers, Regional Integration Teams, and Communities of Practice.

The **CeA** establishes a high level framework for information exchange between business owners and IT specialists by identifying corporate cross-cutting business functions, data requirements, and opportunities for measuring and controlling costs and efficiencies. Examples of potential benefits that will come from developing the **CeA** are:

## SECTION 3

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

| Short Term Benefit  | Long Term Benefit   | Beneficiary   |
|---|---|---|
| Enable informed decisions to be made about selecting, ranking and resourcing IT investments   | Improvement to the Capital Planning and Investment Decision Process   | Business Owners, Customers, Stakeholders  |
| Identify potential opportunities for consolidation in business processes, applications, information or technology.                          | Reduce redundant IT initiatives   | Business Owners, District Commanders, Senior Leaders, Project Review Boards, Customers, Stakeholders        |
| Analyze sources for data and automated processes in the pre-development stage of AIS development  | Reduced time and cost to upgrade or deploy new AIS  | Customers, Stakeholders, Business Owners, System Developers, CIO Staff                                      |
| Standard vocabulary to articulate expectations between business owners and AIS developers   | Improve communication among the business organizations and IT organizations   | Business Owners, System Developers, CIO Staff   |
| Increased focus on the strategic use of emerging technologies to better manage the enterprise's information                                 | Improved ability to consistently insert new technologies into the enterprise  | Strategic Planners, Business Owners, System Developers, CIO Staff   |
| Effectively link information technology investments to USACE strategic goals, objectives and plans, as well as to USACE' business functions | Improve consistency, accuracy, timeliness, integrity, quality, availability, access and sharing of IT-managed information across the USACE enterprise   | Strategic Planners, Business Owners, System Developers, CIO Staff, Customers, Stakeholders                  |
| Effectively link USACE business functions to other Federal Government business functions  | Improve consistency, accuracy, timeliness, integrity, quality, availability, access and sharing of IT-managed information across the Federal Government | Strategic Planners, Business Owners, System Developers, CIO Staff, Federal Agencies Customers, Stakeholders |

Enterprise architecture planning and management can be a significant contributor to the corporate decision making process. Good business management practices ensure IT initiatives are derived from architecture-based parameters, filters and analysis. The outcome will be improvements in IT asset management decisions and quicker response time in solving technical problems associated with Automated Information Systems (AIS) development. The major components of the **CeA** framework are:

- The **Business Reference Model (BRM)**: Describes USACE business functions and sub-functions.
- The **Data and Information Reference Model (DRM)**: Describes the data and information that support program, support and internal lines operations.
- The **Performance Reference Model (PRM)**: Identifies a common set of general performance outcomes and metrics used to achieve USACE program goals and objectives.
- The **Service Component Reference Model (SRM)**: Identifies and classifies horizontal and vertical IT capabilities that support business functions and sub-functions.

- The **Technical Reference Model (TRM)**: Provides a hierarchical foundation to describe how technology is supporting the delivery of the application capability.

### Defense Communications Services (DCS)

Global long-haul communications and network services - See Section 3, IT Charges

### **Capital Planning and Investment Control**

The Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) community manages a decision-making process for ensuring that information technology (IT) investments integrate strategic planning, budgeting, procurement, and the management of IT in support of USACE missions and business needs. The CPIC process addresses the selection, control, and evaluation of IT investments over their lifecycles. The process makes good business sense and is good government. The CPIC team's web site is: <https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/cfat/>

The results of the process are a prioritized list of proposed IT investment requirements, and the authorized funding level for these requirements. This list is applied within the USACE budget process and externally to Army in the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) process and to OMB within the Civil Works budget process. The CPIC process also includes project management oversight of IT investments, and uses metrics to compare accomplishments against performance goals.

The CPIC process is described in Engineer Circular EC 25-1-303. (<http://www.usace.army.mil/usace-docs/eng-circulars/ec25-1-303/toc.htm>) This circular requires all USACE Commands to have a CPIC process in place to review, evaluate, and prioritize IT investments.

### **E-Government**

E-Government covers a broad spectrum of capabilities, with a common goal of efficiently and effectively conducting government business in today's web-based environment. The President's Management Agenda (PMA) sets goals for streamlining delivery of information services and products in several venues: Government-to-Citizen (G2C); Government-to-Business (G2B); Government-to-Government (G2G); as well as Internal Effectiveness and Efficiency (IEE). This FY 05 guidance highlights some key elements of the Corps web policies, as well as upcoming enterprise e-Government initiatives that support the PMA.

## SECTION 3

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

---

### Web Policy, Procedures and Guidelines

Aggregation of the Corps web presence reflects on the agency as a whole. Application of a common set of web policies, procedures and guidelines is essential in achieving the “One Door” concept and “castle name brand” recognition that we are a single agency with a common set of missions, products and services. As such, Commanders need to be aware –and ensure compliance, with the present and future DoD, Army and Corps of Engineers policies for management and use of the World Wide Web.

#### Present:

Corps of Engineers Regulation 25-1-99, Management and Use of CorpsWeb (Corps web presence) <http://www.usace.army.mil/publications/eng-regs/er25-1-99/toc.htm>

Other relevant Corps web related guidance has been aggregated at --  
<https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/webref>

Army Regulation 25-1, chapter 6-3 -- Telecommunications, paragraph r. -- Internet (World Wide Web), Intranet, and Extranets. [http://www.army.mil/usapa/epubs/xml\\_pubs/r25\\_1/head.xml](http://www.army.mil/usapa/epubs/xml_pubs/r25_1/head.xml)

Department of Defense, Web Site Administration, Policies & Procedures  
[http://www.defenselink.mil/webmasters/policy/dod\\_web\\_policy\\_12071998\\_with\\_amendments\\_and\\_corrections.html](http://www.defenselink.mil/webmasters/policy/dod_web_policy_12071998_with_amendments_and_corrections.html)

#### Future:

The final report of the Federal Web Content Policies done under the auspices of the Interagency Committee on Government Information (ICGI), Web Content Standards Working Group, has been issued. This policy covers a diverse range of subjects, from expected content for each agency to form and style issues. The Corps web presence will be expected to fully comply with this policy document. The report is available at: <https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/webref/>

**e-Corps**

The pilot enterprise portal project, eCorps, was successfully completed during FY 04, and, is anticipated to be placed into production early FY 05. eCorps will impact web presence across the Corps in several ways, as the replacement for the Corps present home page, as well as providing a “wrapper” over Regional Business Center, Laboratory, and Field Operating Activity ‘home pages.’ It will provide: common look & feel templates across the Corps web presence; a common set of portlet functionality to improve aggregation of information; content authoring & management capabilities; and, search engine capabilities. Organizations will be expected to provide and publish content to eCorps. Organizations, as well as business lines are also encouraged to streamline their web presence and content to improve citizen and customer access. This streamlining could include migration to eCorps portlet and authoring functionality down through their web presence, as well as the creation of new portlet capabilities within the eCorps environment from a Regional Business Center or business line perspective.. eCorps will provide enterprise level Internet, Intranet, and Extranet environments, an enterprise level search engine, and single sign on capability.

**Corps Knowledge Management Environment (KME)**

Success of USACE 2012 is dependent on technology to support virtual work teams and Communities of Practice working on local, regional, and a national scale. Based on FY 04 prototype efforts, an enterprise software licensing approach is being pursued to create a common, integrated Corps KME, with anticipated deployment early in FY 05. This KME will be available Corps-wide, with capabilities for teaming, collaboration, shared information repositories, content management, as well as lessons learned management. KME capabilities will be accessible and managed through the eCorps Intranet environment.

**Electronic Forms Content Management Program (FCMP)**

As a result of Adobe's announcement of discontinuance of FormFlow, the Army Publishing Directorate (APD) of Headquarters, Department of the Army, has informed the Corps of APD activities relating to items such as those carried in the Adobe product line and indicated that re-engineering and implementation of future business functions for forms and their usage/management will be performed through an Army enterprise solution for digital signature, forms software, workflow, and document management. The result could mean new enterprise form software. Expect a decision by 1st quarter, FY 05.

## **SECTION 3**

## **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

---

### **Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA)**

GPEA requires Federal agencies to provide the option of electronic maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information, when practicable, as a substitute for paper; and, use and acceptance of electronic signatures, when practicable. As a reminder, any Corps activity that transacts business with and/or collects information from the public is subject to GPEA, with its goal of simplifying and unifying business processes through electronic media, eliminating paperwork, and incorporating electronic signature capability.

### **Privacy Impact Assessments (PIA)**

The privacy provisions (Section 208) of the E-Gov Act require agencies to conduct Privacy Impact Assessments (PIA) on automated information systems (AIS) and on information collections subject to the Paper Reduction Act (PRA) and make the PIAs publicly available. Likewise, PIAs for all USACE IT investments must be integrated into the OMB 300 submittal process. By FY 05, AIS and PRA specific PIA templates for Corps-wide use will be available and policies and guidelines regarding the conduct of PIAs will be in place. This privacy objective complements the National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace, maximizing both privacy and security when Americans interact with their government.

### **Human Capital**

The IT Human Capital Community of Practice supports the USACE IT Strategic Human Capital Management Plan, defining the skills and competencies necessary for the ever changing enterprise, workforce planning and skills inventories, IT program/project management, knowledge management, organizational designs and dynamics, competitive recruiting techniques, innovative developments in training and career development, succession planning, virtual team building, workplace accessibility, teleworking, state-of-the-art personnel retention and incentives programs, competitive sourcing alternatives and downsizing and organizational climate issues.

### **Information Assurance**

#### **Security and Information Assurance Community of Practice (S&IA CoP)**

The S&IA CoP is comprised of IA personnel at all levels of the Corps. At the top is the CoP Champion, who is the Information Assurance Program Manager (IAPM), located in the Headquarters, Washington, DC; the CoP Practice Leader, who is the MACOM Network/Security Program Manager located in the Headquarters Forward; Members of the CoP are; Information Assurance Managers (IAM), one at each MSC; Information Assurance Network Managers

## SECTION 3

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

---

(IANM), one at each MSC, (IAM and the IANM can be the same person); Information Assurance Security Officers (IASO), as many as needed at each MSC; and the Systems Administrators, as many as needed. IA is one of the top priorities within the Department of Defense, the Army and USACE. We rely on our Information Systems and Data Communication Networks in the performance of our critical civil and military missions.

### DITSCAP

Comply with the DoD Information Technology Security Certification and Accreditation Process (DITSCAP). Specific information may be found at: <https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/ia/ditscap.html>

Divisions/Districts must have valid accreditation packages for their LAN, and the systems they maintain. Division/District DAAs will execute an MOA with the CEEIS PM as to the rules of engagement between the site or AIS and CEEIS. The Designated Approving Authority (DAA), is the Commander, and will approve accreditation requests. See the letter of delegation located at: <https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/ia/reports/docs/daadelegationletter.pdf>

Corps of Engineers Enterprise Infrastructure Services (CEEIS) must have valid accreditation packages on the WAN, the two processing centers, and the systems they maintain. The USACE CIO will approve the CEEIS accreditation.

Functional Proponents must submit accreditation packages for Corps-wide, standard automated information systems they develop/maintain, to the USACE CIO, for approval. AIS Program Managers will execute an MOA with the CEEIS PM as to the rules of engagement between the AIS and CEEIS.

**New guidance this year**, All systems that will not be accredited prior to 30 June must submit a Plan of Action and Management on 30 June. Guidance for the POA&M will be located at: <https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/ia/ditscap.html>

### Intrusion Detection Systems, IDS

Network Based Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS) are required at all entrances and gateways to the CEEIS wide area and between the CEEIS managed infrastructure and the site network.

Divisions and Districts will ensure all outside connections (non-Corps connections) at their site have a site funded, CEEIS managed IDS and are connected to the infrastructure in accordance with USACE security designs.

CEEIS will verify that all corporate gateways have an IDS. CEEIS will also maintain and monitor all enterprise firewalls and IDS devices. (Local sites may have the ability to read these mandatory devices where the software supports read only access).

## SECTION 3

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

---

Army Policy requires host-based Intrusion Detection Systems, IDS, on Information Assurance Servers that support dial-in systems (RADIUS compliant server) and on all mission critical systems. A server is critical if the loss of the server will severely impact the command's ability to perform its mission.

Divisions, Centers, Labs, Districts, and FOAs will add host-based IDS to mission critical servers including dial-in servers.

CEEIS will install IDS on all critical processing center servers. CEEIS will monitor all mandatory IDS devices.

Functional proponents who do not process their applications, including web-based or enabled, at the CEEIS processing centers will install IDS on all their critical servers.

The Internet Center of Expertise (ICE) will install IDS on all critical web servers.

### Training

Information Assurance Mandatory Security training requirements are located at:  
<https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/ia/training.html>

Divisions, Centers, Labs, Districts and FOAs will complete all mandatory training and document the training in the Army Compliance Reporting Database.

Located at: <https://newia.us.army.mil/>

All commanders must complete Designated Approving Authority (DAA) training and certification. This can be accomplished by completing the DAA CD located at:  
<https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/ia/cdtrain.html>

### Funding Requirements

MX5T COMSEC Requirements, to include secure phones, must be input into the ISSP database to be validated prior to purchase. Mr. Charles Wilson is the POC for all COMSEC.

MS4X Computer Security requirements will be submitted annually to the IAPM. Army is in the process of revising the POM process, further guidance will be made available at:  
<https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/ia/> as it becomes available.

### Publications

Policy and Guidance Publications can be found at:  
<https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/ia/publications.html>

### **Public Key Infrastructure (PKI)**

The Army and DoD are increasingly reliant on PKI as the cornerstone of "identity management" in the "net centric" environment. PKI, as presented on the Common Access Card (CAC), is an essential component of soldier/employee identity and security. PKI will be the cornerstone of single sign-on in the next 2-5 years, and is already essential for reaching many DA websites. In the Corps, all AIS doing authentication (separate userids and passwords) will either move to PKI, or show cause why not (business case for avoidance). CEFMS - currently the Corps sole electronic signature application - and the cornerstone of our "paperless" accounting system, is converting to PKI for electronic signatures, with conversion and full deployment anticipated in the next 2-3 years.

### **Performance Management**

#### **Performance CoP Purpose**

We are responsible for the establishment of processes and approaches or the conduct of organizational assessments and performance measurements related to customer satisfaction assessment, information assessment, and technology issues surrounding performance measurement.

#### **Mission**

Providing a comprehensive performance and results based management environment to facilitate the Corps in providing quality, responsive engineering services to the nation.

#### **Performance CoP Objectives**

- Provide a standard process/methodology for defining, developing, collecting and reporting performance measurement data
- Foster a growth and learning environment for our customers
- Provide an automated infrastructure to assist in the collection and processing of performance measurement data
- Link performance measures to measurable outcomes

### Acquisition

Information on Oracle Licenses is provided in the IT Charges section.

### Other Topics

#### **Federal Records Management (RM) Requirements.**

These requirements provide for cost-efficient and systematic life cycle management of all recorded information, regardless of media and format. Continuing RM programs capture, preserve, and make available evidence essential for USACE decisions and actions, preserve permanently valuable information, protect the rights and interests of USACE, soldiers, citizens, and the Government, and meet the needs of the American public. Commanders at all echelons are required to document USACE official business and ensure accessibility of information throughout its life cycle. Regional level and District CIOs should be implementing the new Army Records Information Management System (ARIMS) as prescribed under revised AR 25-400-2 and enforcing the standards set forth. Records management functions should be integrated into all automated information systems (AIS). Electronic recordkeeping systems compliance with ARIMS, USACE-wide Electronic Document Management System (EDMS) Guidelines and Standards, and DoD 5015.2-STD, Design Criteria for Records Management Applications should also be ensured. Information concerning these matters can be found at <http://www.usace.army.mil/ci/recmgmt>.

#### **Ensuring Quality of Information Disseminated to the Public**

In accordance with OMB, DoD, and Army Quality of Information (QIP) requirements, a basic standard of quality (objectivity, utility, and integrity) must be maintained and appropriate steps taken to incorporate information quality criteria into USACE public information dissemination practices. Particular emphasis is placed on scientific, environmental, financial, and statistical information produced by an agency. By FY 05, USACE-wide IQG program responsibilities will be assigned, a web-based administrative mechanism will be put in place for the public to seek and obtain correction of disseminated information, and annual reporting requirements will be issued.

**The POC is Sally Mahoney, 202-761-7135.**

## **SECTION 3**

## **MP STANDARD DEFINITIONS**

1. **PROGRAM CATEGORIES.** Design and construction programs are view in the broad categories identified below. These broad categories can be 'Direct' or 'Reimbursable' funded.

- Military Direct, Army
- Military Direct, Air Force
- Military Direct, DoD Agencies
- Military Environmental
- Military Reimbursable, O&MA
- Military Reimbursable, O&M, Air Force
- Military Reimbursable, DoD (Work for Others)
- Special Management Programs
- Military Reimbursable, Non-Federal
- Civil Reimbursable, Environmental Interagency and International Services
- Civil or Military Reimbursable, Interagency and International Services

2. **DIRECT FUNDING.** Military Construction (MILCON) funds are generally provided to USACE on a Funding Authorization Document (FAD) or a Treasury Warrant. The MILCON and other direct funds are allocated to USACE activities through the issuance of FADs.

3. **REIMBURSABLE FUNDING.** Funds that are provided by non-USACE activities are provided on a Military Interdepartmental Purchase Request (MIPR) or comparable document. Examples include MIPRs received from other Major Commands, Army Major Subordinate Commands (MSC), and installations as well as DoD elements. The funds are used primarily for operations and maintenance, repair, or environmental work and Interagency and International Services by Federal and non-Federal agencies for major construction, operations and maintenance, rehabilitation, repair projects and engineering services.

4. **CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUNDS TYPE FUNDS.** The Major Program Categories identified in paragraph 1 above are further refined into Type Funds (TF) codes used for the identification of specific programs and projects in P2 for management information purposes.

## SECTION 3

## MP STANDARD DEFINITIONS

Following is a list of all TFs used in the P2 system for Military Programs sorted by TF Description. The HQUSACE Proponent (CEMP-I) is responsible for coordinating the maintenance and issuance of the TFs listed. Requests for additional fund type designations should be addressed to CEMP-IR, ATTN: P2 Military Coordinator.

### TYPE FUNDS SORT BY DESCRIPTION

| <u>Description</u>                                   | <u>Abbreviation</u> | <u>TF Code</u> |
|--|---------------------|----------------|
| Advance Measures (FCCE)                              | FCCAM               | DE             |
| Air Force - Energy Conserv Investment Program        | ECIF                | 1B             |
| Air Force Furniture Design and Procurement           | AFF                 | 2F             |
| All Non-Government Entities                          | SONGV               | WY             |
| All Other Federal Departments and Agencies           | SOOTH               | WX             |
| Alternate Construction, Germany                      | FRGA                | 62             |
| American Battle Monuments Commission                 | SABMC               | XD             |
| Appalachian Regional Development Program             | SOARD               | WE             |
| Arlington National Cemetery                          | ANC                 | 16             |
| Army Furniture Design and Procurement                | ARMF                | 1F             |
| Army/Air Force Exchange HQ                           | AFES                | 64             |
| Army/Air Force Exchange, Local                       | AFEL                | 65             |
| Barracks Upgrade Program - O&M Army Funded           | BUP                 | 1V             |
| Base Closure Program Part III, Air Force             | BCF3                | 0B             |
| Base Closure Program Part III, Army (BRAC93)         | BCA3                | 0A             |
| Base Closure Program, Air Force (BRAC95)             | BCF4                | 0D             |
| Base Closure Program, Army (BRAC95)                  | BCA4                | 0C             |
| Base Closure Program, Part I, Air Force              | BCF1                | 03             |
| Base Closure Program, Part I, Army (BRAC I)          | BCA1                | 02             |
| Base Closure Program, Part I, Other                  | BCD1                | 04             |
| Base Closure Program, Part II, Air Force             | BCF2                | 08             |
| Base Closure Program, Part II, Army (BRAC91)         | BCA2                | 07             |
| Base Closure Program, Part II, Other                 | BCD2                | 09             |
| Beach Erosion control (CG)                           | CGBEC               | BD             |
| BRAC Envir, Part I, Army (BRAC I), Direct            | BA1E                | 5H             |
| BRAC Envir, Part II, Air Force, Direct               | BF2E                | 5Q             |
| BRAC Envir, Part III, Air Force, Direct              | BF3E                | 5R             |
| BRAC Envir, Part III, Army (BRAC 93), Direct         | BABE                | 5J             |
| BRAC Envir, Part IV, Air Force, Direct               | BF4E                | 5T             |
| BRAC Envir, Part IV, Army (BRAC 95), Direct          | BA4E                | 5K             |
| BRAC Operation and Maintenance, Air Force            | BOMAF               | 29             |
| Central Heat Plant Program                           | CHP                 | 1C             |
| Combined Defense Improvement Program                 | CDIP                | 6C             |
| Communica Electronic Evalu & Testing Agency          | CEETA               | 53             |
| Compli, Conserv and Pollution Prev, Reimb, Air Force | C2PF                | 5E             |
| Compli, Conserv and Pollution Prev, Reimb, Army      | C2PA                | 5C             |

## SECTION 3

## MP STANDARD DEFINITIONS

### TYPE FUNDS SORT BY DESCRIPTION

| <u>Description</u>                                      | <u>Abbreviation</u> | <u>TF Code</u> |
|---|---------------------|----------------|
| Construction (MR&T)                                     | MR&TC               | ER             |
| Cooperative Threat Reduction                            | CTR                 | 4T             |
| CW Managed Environmental Restoration Support            | CERS                | B2             |
| CW Other Direct Reimb Mitigation Protection, Compliance | MPC                 | B3             |
| DC Public Schools                                       | SDCPS               | W6             |
| Defense Agency (DOD), Unspecified Minor                 | MDOD                | 39             |
| Defense Business Operations Fund (Air Force)            | DBOF                | 3F             |
| Defense Business Operations Fund (Army)                 | DBOA                | 3A             |
| Defense Business Operations Fund (Defense)              | DBOD                | 3D             |
| Defense Business Operations Fund (Navy/MC)              | DBON                | 3N             |
| Defense Commissary Agency                               | DECA                | 98             |
| Defense Communications Agency                           | DCA                 | 58             |
| Defense Emergency Relief Fund                           | DERF                | 1U             |
| Defense Language Institute                              | DLI                 | 48             |
| Defense Logistics Agency                                | DLA                 | 54             |
| Defense Manpower Data Center                            | SDMDC               | 4D             |
| Defense Mapping Agency                                  | DMA                 | 56             |
| Defense Overseas Mil Fac, Invest Recov Account          | DFIRA               | 61             |
| Defense Threat Reduction Agency                         | DTRA                | 57             |
| Department of Defense Agencies                          | DODO                | Z2             |
| Department of Defense Dependent Schools                 | DODS                | 51             |
| Department of Defense Medical Facilities                | DODM                | 46             |
| Department of Energy                                    | DOE                 | 55             |
| Department of the Treasury                              | HTRE                | V3             |
| Department of Transportation (US Coast Guard)           | SODOT               | WZ             |
| Dept of Agriculture                                     | SDOA                | XA             |
| Dept of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corp              | HCCC                | VF             |
| Dept of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency                | HFSA                | VG             |
| Dept of Agriculture, Forest Service                     | HAFS                | VZ             |
| Dept of Commerce  | SDOC                | XB             |
| Dept of Commerce Economic Development Admin             | HEDA                | VA             |
| Dept of Energy ERS                                      | HDOE                | VL             |
| Dept of Energy SFO                                      | SODOE               | WL             |
| Dept of Health and Human Services                       | HHHS                | VK             |
| Dept of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs ERS          | HBIA                | VB             |
| Dept of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs SFO          | SBIA                | XF             |
| Dept of Interior, Bureau of Land Management             | HBLM                | VC             |
| Dept of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation                 | HIBR                | VX             |
| Dept of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service ERS         | HIFW                | VY             |
| Dept of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service SFO         | SFWL                | XE             |
| Dept of Interior, National Park Service ERS             | HNPS                | VD             |

## SECTION 3

## MP STANDARD DEFINITIONS

### TYPE FUNDS SORT BY DESCRIPTION

| <u>Description</u>                                      | <u>Abbreviation</u> | <u>TF Code</u> |
|---|---------------------|----------------|
| Dept of Interior, National Park Service SFO             | SODOI               | WJ             |
| Dept of Justice, Bureau of Prisons ERS                  | HJBP                | VT             |
| Dept of Justice, Bureau of Prisons SFO                  | SODOJ               | WK             |
| Dept of Justice, Drug Enforcement Agency                | SDEA                | XG             |
| Dept of Justice, Fed Bureau of Investigations ERS       | HJFBI               | VU             |
| Dept of Justice, Fed Bureau of Investigations SFO       | SFBE                | WQ             |
| Dept of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization         | HJINS               | VV             |
| Dept of State, Agency for International Development     | SDOS                | WI             |
| Dept of Transportation, Federal Aviation Admin ERS      | HFAA                | VH             |
| Dept of Transportation, Federal Aviation Admin SFO      | SFAA                | XH             |
| Dept of Transportation, Federal Railway Admin           | HFRA                | VJ             |
| Dept of Transportation, US Coast Guard                  | HCG                 | VI             |
| Dept of Treasury, Internal Revenue Service              | SDOTR               | WR             |
| DERP, Air Force Installation Restoration Prog, Reimb    | IRPF                | 5F             |
| DERP, Army Inst Restoration Prog (IRP), Direct          | IRPAD               | 5A             |
| DERP, Army IRP, Reimb                                   | IRPAR               | 5G             |
| DERP, Defense Logistics Agency IRP, Reimb               | IRPLR               | 5D             |
| DERP, Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS), Direct        | FUDS                | 5U             |
| DERP, Other, IRP, Reimbursable                          | IRPR                | 5B             |
| Disaster Preparedness (FCCE)                            | FCCDP               | DA             |
| DOD Ballistic Missile Defense Organization              | BMDO                | 4B             |
| DOD Defense Finance Accounting System                   | DFAS                | 41             |
| DOD Medical Facilities, Oper and Maint                  | DMOM                | 4M             |
| DOD Medical Facilities, Unspecified Minor               | DODU                | 43             |
| DOD Schools, Operations and Maintenance                 | OMS                 | 5M             |
| DOD Special Operations Force                            | SOF                 | 4S             |
| Emergency Drinking Water (FCCE)                         | FCCEW               | DD             |
| Emergency Operations (FCCE)                             | FCCEO               | DB             |
| Energy Conservation Investment Program                  | ECIP                | 1A             |
| Energy Engineering Analysis Program                     | EEAP                | 96             |
| Engineer Assistance Program, Saudi                      | EAPS                | 91             |
| Environmental Compliance Assessment System              | ECAS                | 5V             |
| Environmental for Gen Services Admin                    | HGSA                | V1             |
| Environmental Protection Agency, Other                  | EPAO                | WD             |
| Environmental Quality, Reimb                            | EQ                  | 5L             |
| EPA Construction Grants Programs                        | EPACG               | WH             |
| EPA Superfund   | SUPF                | WU             |
| EPA, except Construction Grants and Superfund           | HEPA                | WG             |
| Facilities Improvement Program                          | FIP                 | 6B             |
| Family Housing - Energy Conservation Investment Program | FHEC                | 44             |
| Family Housing - Line Item Improvement                  | FHLI                | 42             |

## SECTION 3

## MP STANDARD DEFINITIONS

### TYPE FUNDS SORT BY DESCRIPTION

| <u>Description</u>                           | <u>Abbreviation</u> | <u>TF Code</u> |
|--|---------------------|----------------|
| Family Housing - Maintenance and Repair      | FHMA                | 45             |
| Family Housing - Repair, Navy                | FHRN                | 3C             |
| Family Housing, Air Force                    | FHAF                | 26             |
| Family Housing, New Construction             | FHNC                | 40             |
| Family Housing, O&M, Air Force               | FHMF                | 2M             |
| Farm Services Agency                         | SOFHA               | W1             |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation        | HFDIC               | VP             |
| Federal Emergency Management Agency          | SOEMA               | WW             |
| Federal Emergency Management Agency ERS      | HFEMA               | VN             |
| Flood Control (CG)                           | CGFC                | BE             |
| Flood Control (O&M)                          | OMFC                | CB             |
| Food and Drug Administration ERS             | HFDA                | V5             |
| Food and Drug Administration SFO             | SOFDA               | W4             |
| Foreign Governments                          | SOFG                | WT             |
| Foreign Military Sales                       | FMS                 | 70             |
| Formerly Used Sites Remedial Action Program  | FUSRIP              | B1             |
| Funds From State and County Expense Sharing  | CF                  | FW             |
| General Accounting Office                    | SGAO                | W7             |
| General Services Administration              | SHGSA               | WA             |
| Government Accounting Office                 | HGAO                | V4             |
| Government of Japan (Burden share)           | GOJ                 | 76             |
| Government of Japan Funded Construction      | GOJC                | 3J             |
| Government of Korea (Burden share)           | GOK                 | 77             |
| Government of Kuwait Funded Construction     | GOCQ                | 3Q             |
| Hazardous Navigation, Team Activities (FCCE) | FCCHN               | DF             |
| Health and Medical                           | H+C                 | 4H             |
| Holocaust Museum                             | SHOLM               | W8             |
| Host Nation, Japan                           | HN                  | 6A             |
| Housing and Urban Development Assistance SFO | SHUD                | WF             |
| Housing and Urban Development ERS            | HHUD                | V2             |
| Immigration and Naturalization Service       | SOINS               | W3             |
| Indian Health Service                        | HIHS                | V6             |
| International Boundary Commission            | SOIBC               | WN             |
| International Communication Agency (VOA) SFO | SOVOA               | WP             |
| Kennedy Center                               | SKENC               | W9             |
| Korean War Memorial                          | KWM                 | 1K             |
| Magnetic Levitation                          | MGLV                | 1M             |
| Maintenance (MR&T)                           | MR&TM               | ES             |
| Master Plans                                 | MPLA                | 97             |
| MIL Constr Defense Account (Chem Demil)      | MCDA                | 4A             |
| Milcon, Section 6 Schools (CONUS)            | S6S                 | 5S             |

## SECTION 3

## MP STANDARD DEFINITIONS

### TYPE FUNDS SORT BY DESCRIPTION

| <u>Description</u>                               | <u>Abbreviation</u> | <u>TF Code</u> |
|--|---------------------|----------------|
| Milcon, Southern Command (Panama)                | SOCM                | 1S             |
| Military Assistance Program                      | MAP                 | 13             |
| Military Assistance Program, Air Force           | MAPF                | 22             |
| Military Construction, Air Force                 | MCAF                | 20             |
| Military Construction, Air Force Reserve         | MAFR                | 21             |
| Military Construction, Air National Guard        | MANG                | 25             |
| Military Construction, Army                      | MCA                 | 10             |
| Military Construction, Army - Minor Construction | MMCA                | 11             |
| Military Construction, Army National Guard       | ARNG                | 17             |
| Military Construction, Army Reserve              | MCAR                | 12             |
| Military Construction, Army Reserve Minor        | MMCR                | 06             |
| Military Construction, Navy                      | MCN                 | 30             |
| Minor Construction, Air Force                    | MMAF                | 23             |
| Miscellaneous (CG)                               | CGMIS               | BG             |
| Modernization of U.S. Facilities, Germany        | MOSF                | Z1             |
| Multipurpose (CG)                                | CGMP                | BF             |
| Multipurpose Power Project (O&M)                 | OMMP                | CC             |
| Nation Emergency Preparedness (O&M)              | OMNEP               | CE             |
| National Aeronautical and Space Admin            | SONAS               | W2             |
| National Aeronautics & Administration            | NASA                | 50             |
| National Oceanic and Atmospheric Admin           | HNOAA               | VS             |
| National Park Service                            | SONPS               | WM             |
| National Security Agency                         | NSA                 | 69             |
| National War Memorial                            | NWM                 | 1N             |
| Navigation (CG)                                  | CGNAV               | BB             |
| Navigation (O&M)                                 | OMNAV               | CA             |
| Navy and Marine Corps Reserve                    | NMCR                | 32             |
| Non-Appropriated Army, Local                     | NALF                | 82             |
| Non-Appropriated Funds, Air Force                | NAAF                | 27             |
| Non-Appropriated Funds, Army                     | NAFA                | 60             |
| Non-Appropriated Funds, Navy                     | NAFN                | 35             |
| North Atlantic Treaty Organization               | NATO                | 52             |
| North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Air Force    | AFN                 | 5N             |
| Operation & Maintenance, Navy/MC                 | OMN                 | 33             |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force             | OMAF                | 24             |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army                  | OMA                 | 14             |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve          | OMARD               | 18             |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve, Reimb   | OMARR               | 1R             |
| Operation and Maintenance, DOD                   | OMD                 | 49             |
| Other Air Force Funds                            | OTHF                | 28             |
| Other Army Funds                                 | OTHA                | 19             |

## SECTION 3

## MP STANDARD DEFINITIONS

### TYPE FUNDS SORT BY DESCRIPTION

| <u>Description</u>                            | <u>Abbreviation</u> | <u>TF Code</u> |
|---|---------------------|----------------|
| Other Navy Funds (Host Nation)                | OTHN                | 31             |
| Other Non-Defense Federal Funds               | ONDF                | 59             |
| Payment in Kind, Army                         | PIKA                | 63             |
| Pentagon Renovation Program (WHS)             | PRP                 | 1P             |
| Plant Replacement and Improvement             | PRIP                | 36             |
| Production Base Support                       | PBS                 | 15             |
| Protection of Navigation (O&M)                | OMCD                | CD             |
| Public Health Service                         | HPHS                | VM             |
| Quality of Life Enhancements, AF              | QOLEA               | Z3             |
| Quality of Life Enhancements, Air Force       | QOLEF               | 2A             |
| Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense         | QOLED               | 4C             |
| Real Property Maintenance, Defense (Air F)    | RPMF                | 3G             |
| Real Property Maintenance, Defense (Army)     | RPMA                | 3B             |
| Real Property Maintenance, Defense (Defense)  | RPMD                | 3E             |
| Real Property Maintenance, Defense (Navy/MC)  | RPMN                | 3P             |
| Rehabilitation (CG)                           | CGREH               | BH             |
| Rehabilitation (FCCE)                         | FCCRH               | DC             |
| Rehabilitation (MR&T)                         | MR&TR               | EU             |
| Republic of Korea Funded Construction         | ROKC                | 3K             |
| Research, Development, Test & Eval, Air Force | RDAF                | 84             |
| Research, Development, Test & Eval, Army      | RDTA                | 83             |
| Research, Development, Test & Eval, DOD       | RDTD                | 85             |
| Revolving Funds                               | REVOL               | WV             |
| Sale and Replacement Funds                    | SRF                 | 37             |
| Small Business Administration                 | HSBA                | VQ             |
| Small Missile Construction, Air Force         | AFSM                | 2S             |
| Smithsonian Institute                         | SSMTH               | XC             |
| Special Action Command on Okinawa             | SACO                | 6E             |
| State and Local Government                    | SOSLG               | WS             |
| State, Municipality and Private Funds         | SMPF                | 86             |
| Support Civil A-E Contracts for Multi TF      | AECV                | AA             |
| Support Military A-E Contracts For Multi TF   | AEM                 | 01             |
| Support to Directorates of Public Works       | SDPW                | 1T             |
| Troop Support Agency, LOC                     | TSAL                | 99             |
| United States Postal Service                  | HUSPS               | VR             |
| US Soldiers and Airmens Home                  | SAH                 | 66             |
| Voice of America                              | VOA                 | 47             |
| Washington Aqueduct (CONSTR)                  | SOWAC               | WB             |
| Washington Aqueduct (O&M)                     | SOWAO               | WC             |

## SECTION 3

## MP STANDARD DEFINITIONS

5. Interagency and International Services (IIS), formerly known as Support for Others (SFO)/Work for Others (WFO) is: Reimbursable assistance provided by USACE to non-Department of Defense (DoD) Federal agencies (EPA, FEMA, etc.), State and Local Governments, Native American Nations, U.S. Territorial Governments, U.S. Private Firms, International Organizations and Foreign Governments.

**By exclusion, any work that falls outside the Corps' Civil and Military core missions listed below will be classified as IIS.**

| <b>Civil Works Programs</b>                 | <b>Acronym</b> |
|---|----------------|
| Civil Works Construction General            | CWCG           |
| Civil Engineering and General Investigation | CEGI           |
| Civil Works Operations and Maintenance      | CW O&M         |

### **Interagency and International Services (IIS) Definition (Cont'd)**

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Formerly Used Sites, Remedial Action Program                 | FUSRAP    |
| Mississippi River and Tributaries                            | MR&T      |
| Regulatory and Emergency                                     | Reg/Emerg |
| Civil Works Research, Development, Technology and Evaluation | CW RDT&E  |

| <b>Military Programs</b>   | <b>Acronym</b> |
|--|----------------|
| Major Military Construction<br><i>(BRAC, Army, Air Force, DoD, Navy, NMD, Chemical Demilitarization, etc.)</i>     | MILCON         |
| Department of Defense Reimbursable<br><i>(O&amp;M, FH O&amp;M, NAF, DLA, AFES, PBS, MAP, NSA, CTR, etc., etc.)</i> | DoD Reimb      |
| Installation Support   | IS (Inst Spt)  |
| Formerly Utilized Defense Sites  | FUDS           |
| Installation Restoration   | IR             |
| Foreign Military Sales/Other Security Assistance   | FMS            |
| Host Nation Support<br><i>(Japan, Korea, Europe and NATO)</i>  | HNS            |
| Military Research, Development, Technology and Evaluation  | MIL RDT&E      |
| Defense Burden Sharing (Kuwait, etc.)  | ---            |
| Home Owners Assistance Program   | HAP            |

## **SECTION 3**

## **MP STANDARD DEFINITIONS**

---

Army and Civil Works Real Estate

RE Support

Department of Defense Recruitment

DoD Recruit

Detailed guidance on accepting and performing IIS work is provided in ER 1140-1-211.

**Questions on the classification of work as IIS may be addressed to Mr. Don Kisicki, CEMP, 202-761-8880 or the POC for the definitions, Ms. Susan Turek, CEMP, 202-761-7426.**

## **SECTION 3                      INSTALLATION SUPPORT PROGRAM**

---

### **MILITARY PROGRAMS INSTALLATION SUPPORT (IS) PROGRAM (SRM Support to Directorates of Public Works)**

1. The goal is to have a PM forward at each major Army installation. However, resources do not allow funding of this goal on the short term. Priority focus of the PM-Forward activities is to place PM-Forwards at those installations that are Power Projection Platforms, Power Support Platforms and those OMA-funded installations that will have a Stryker IBCT or Objective Force at the installation. Placement of PM Forwards will be coordinated with HQIMA and IMA regional offices. Other PM Forward positions are funded by a combination of district, other program funds, and customers. It is also a goal to have with a MSC liaison at each IMA Regional Office.
2. To the maximum extent possible, all checkbook funds should be allocated during the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters to allow adequate execution rates and development of an execution plan that meets Army customer needs.
3. Installation Support funds are regional assets. Work accomplished by districts, using MSC installation support funds will have appropriate district overhead applied to the work. Regional support and integration of installation support are MSC missions and will be treated as such in the application of overhead rates.
4. Use of Installation Support Funds:
  - Funds must be used in accordance with HQIMA priorities in coordination with the IMA regional offices.
  - .OMA funded customers and projects may receive services funded by the IS Checkbook funds or directly from IS personnel.
  - All non-OMA support or services must be reimbursable using the appropriate fund source.
  - Service or studies for OMA-funded initiatives, such as project development, scoping, DD1391 preparation, IDIQ-contract development, may be appropriate use for OMA IS funds. HQIMA will provide priorities for use of IS funds.
  - OMA funds may be used in support of 'Army Working Capital Fund' (AWCF) installations and installations with similar revolving funds, but, the purpose of AWCF or similar funds is to be self-supporting, and MSCs should seek reimbursement for services provided.
5. The MSCs provide regional support to installations. Using checkbook funds, MSCs can purchase individual, direct support services for installations from districts, labs, CXs or other sources. **The POC is Peter Almquist, 202-761-7495.**

### MANPOWER ALLOCATION

1. The FY05 Final Manpower Allocations are based on a review and analysis of several factors that include workload, funding levels, utilization trends, budget proposals, and full-time equivalent (FTE) ceiling limitations and targets. Based on our best projections, we feel that each command is receiving the manpower resources necessary to accomplish its respective missions. Each command reviewed the initial manpower allocation and provided comments.
2. Local Commanders have flexibility in the internal distribution of the manpower allocations and execution within their respective commands to ensure the most efficient and economic utilization of manpower resources. Therefore, if during the year a command determines that their allocation is insufficient to execute actual workload, they should first adjust within the command, and then, if necessary come forward to HQUSACE with a request for additional resources.

### UTILIZATION PLANS

1. The final manpower allocation for Fiscal Year 2005 was sent out for your information and use in developing your respective utilization plans for the year. The initial utilization plans for military funded and civil funded civilians are due 30 September 2004. Utilization Plans involve two distinct projections that in turn estimate execution of military-funded as well as civil-funded manpower resources. The Civilian Employment Plan (CEP) is a projected execution by activity and appropriation, detailing usage of your military funded manpower resources. Likewise, the Civil Works Utilization Plan (CWUP) is the planned execution by Core activity (CORE) and Support for Others (SFO). **Mid-year adjustments to the initial utilization plans will not be used for CMR purposes.** Quarterly updates will be used to monitor manpower execution and will influence future requirements of manpower to HQDA and OMB. Refer to RM Table 5 for further information on the CMR Utilization metric.
2. Headquarters is not retaining a reserve of FTE. We will therefore readjust from among the commands based on past, as well as projected utilization patterns. Each command is authorized to exceed their final allocation by up to two percent in the year of execution and is expected to manage its hire lag aggressively to obtain the optimum use of manpower resources.
3. We will continue to focus attention this fiscal year to maintaining our activities relative to several manpower programs receiving increased emphasis from DA and OMB. This includes initiatives mandated by the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act, the President's management agenda – competitive sourcing initiatives, and various actions supporting The Army Stationing Installation Plan (ASIP), the Total Army Analysis (TAA) and The Army Transformation.

### MILITARY FUNDED MANPOWER

1. The February 2003 Army Program Objective Memorandum (POM) submission (FY 05-09 POM) is the primary basis for the FY 05 allocation. The POM and program manager input, as well as your projection of outyear workload, impacted the FY 05-06 allocations.
2. As background, the Program Budget Guidance (PBG) is the document published by HQDA that gives USACE its military-funded manpower authorizations (end strengths rather than FTE). What we have attempted to do in the FY05 FTE Allocation is provide an overall execution year FTE target that approximates the authorizations in our PBG, and positions USACE to fully execute the manpower resources provided to us by HQDA. We internally reallocate FTE within the year of execution to accommodate changes in workload that you have reported to us.
3. The controlling factor within USACE in measuring manpower utilization will continue to be FTE. However, end strength numbers remain important, as they will continue to be monitored and reported to higher headquarters. HQDA will continue to “grade” USACE and the rest of the MACOMs on their manpower execution by measuring on-board strength (faces) against authorizations/end strengths in the PBG. To assist us in responding to HQDA civilian execution taskings, and in understanding more fully the relationship between your on-board strength (faces) and FTE execution, the CEP submission will include a column showing your on-board strength (faces) along with the planned FTE execution. Commands who are in a “ramp-up” or hiring mode, will likely show FY05 with a greater year-end on-board strength number, than FTE executed. Commands who are downsizing will likely show the reverse, with more FTE executed than the year-end on-board strength snapshot.
4. Accurate planning for the execution of manpower is critical to insure maximum utilization of available resources. Timely and accurate submission of the Civilian Employment Plan (CEP) are essential. Commands should monitor both their end strength and FTE execution on a monthly basis, and relate the two to ensure that both are being reported accurately.
5. Commands must ensure that all military funded work is accurately charged in CEFMS. This will allow for accurate capture of utilization in the Manpower Utilization Module. Reports **should be generated and uploaded into CEEMIS, by the 5<sup>th</sup> working day following the end of the reporting month.**

### CIVIL WORKS FUNDED MANPOWER

1. The final FY05 FTE allocation is based on workload representing historic funding levels with an allowance for three-percent inflation in the out years. Therefore, no FTE was withheld for congressional actions.
2. Field comments to the initial allocation and guidance from the Director of Civil Works, HQUSACE contributed to the final allocation.
3. Complete and timely submission of Civil Works Usage Plans (CWUP) is important. Reports **should be generated and uploaded into CEEMIS, by the 5<sup>th</sup> working day following the end of the reporting month.**

### ED&M MANPOWER MANAGEMENT

1. Due to the increased interest in execution of the Executive Direction and Management (ED&M) resources within USACE we are adding a new CMR metric. It is assumed that the results of the USACE 2012 effort will be the resizing of the ED&M workforce downward from FY 2003 levels, and that this adjusted workforce will be fully funded to perform the reengineered functions and tasks.
2. Each MSC, FOA and HQUSACE receiving ED&M manpower authorizations will report quarterly a) the authorized strength, b) the current on-board strength, and c) the FTE utilized, by GE and OMA. CERM-M will publish the format via the Manpower Bulletin. The ED&M reports are due 10 working days after the end of each quarter until CEEMIS provides the data automatically. **The POC is Peter Glycer, 202-761-1881.**

# SECTION 3

# MANPOWER

## UNIFORMED MANPOWER ALLOCATIONS AND GRADE CEILINGS FY 05

| ORG                | MILITARY FUNDED |           |           |           |           |          |           |            |            | CIVIL WORKS FUNDED |           |           |           |            |          |          |          |            |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
|                    | OFF             |           |           |           |           |          | WO        | EN         | TOTAL      | OFF                |           |           |           |            |          | WO       | ENL      | TOTAL      |
|                    | GO              | 06        | 05        | 04        | 03        | 02       |           |            |            | GO                 | 06        | 05        | 04        | 03         | 02       |          |          |            |
| HNC                | 0               | 1         | 1         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 3          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0          |
| LRD                | 0               | 1         | 1         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 2          | 1                  | 4         | 11        | 9         | 24         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 49         |
| MVD                | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 0          | 1                  | 7         | 7         | 10        | 17         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 42         |
| NAD                | 1               | 1         | 4         | 2         | 2         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 10         | 0                  | 5         | 4         | 5         | 18         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 32         |
| NWD                | 0               | 1         | 3         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 4          | 1                  | 4         | 3         | 5         | 14         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 27         |
| POD                | 0               | 3         | 4         | 1         | 3         | 0        | 0         | 5          | 16         | 1                  | 1         | 1         | 3         | 7          | 0        | 0        | 0        | 13         |
| SAD                | 0               | 1         | 3         | 3         | 2         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 9          | 1                  | 4         | 5         | 5         | 5          | 0        | 0        | 0        | 20         |
| SPD                | 0               | 1         | 2         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 4          | 1                  | 2         | 4         | 5         | 13         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 25         |
| SWD                | 0               | 1         | 1         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 3          | 1                  | 4         | 4         | 1         | 21         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 31         |
| TAC                | 1               | 2         | 0         | 0         | 2         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 5          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0          |
| <b>D/C Total</b>   | <b>2</b>        | <b>12</b> | <b>19</b> | <b>9</b>  | <b>9</b>  | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b>  | <b>5</b>   | <b>56</b>  | <b>7</b>           | <b>31</b> | <b>39</b> | <b>43</b> | <b>119</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>239</b> |
| ERDC               | 0               | 1         | 0         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 1         | 6          | 9          | 0                  | 1         | 1         | 3         | 12         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 17         |
| Lab Total          | 0               | 1         | 0         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 1         | 6          | 9          | 0                  | 1         | 1         | 3         | 12         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 17         |
| HECSA              | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 0          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0          |
| FOA Total          | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 0          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0          |
| 249th PPB          | 0               | 0         | 1         | 2         | 4         | 0        | 9         | 194        | 210        | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0          |
| PP School          | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 1         | 9          | 10         | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0          |
| <b>Total 249th</b> | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>  | <b>4</b>  | <b>0</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>203</b> | <b>220</b> | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>   | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b>   |
| TRG                | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 0          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0          |
| AMHA               | 1               | 0         | 0         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 1          | 3          | 2                  | 7         | 14        | 11        | 9          | 0        | 1        | 0        | 44         |
| HQ Total           | 1               | 0         | 0         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 1          | 3          | 2                  | 7         | 14        | 11        | 9          | 0        | 1        | 0        | 44         |
| <b>Cmd Total</b>   | <b>3</b>        | <b>13</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>215</b> | <b>288</b> | <b>9</b>           | <b>39</b> | <b>54</b> | <b>57</b> | <b>140</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>300</b> |

# SECTION 3

# MANPOWER

## UNIFORMED MANPOWER ALLOCATIONS AND GRADE CEILINGS FY 06

| ORG                | MILITARY FUNDED |           |           |           |           |          |           |            |            | CIVIL WORKS FUNDED |           |           |           |            |          |          |          |            |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
|                    | OFF             |           |           |           |           |          | WO        | EN         | TOTAL      | OFF                |           |           |           |            |          | WO       | ENL      | TOTAL      |
|                    | GO              | 06        | 05        | 04        | 03        | 02       |           |            |            | GO                 | 06        | 05        | 04        | 03         | 02       |          |          |            |
| HNC                | 0               | 1         | 1         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 3          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0          |
| LRD                | 0               | 1         | 1         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 2          | 1                  | 4         | 10        | 9         | 24         | 0        | 0        |          | 48         |
| MVD                | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 0          | 1                  | 7         | 7         | 10        | 17         | 0        | 0        |          | 42         |
| NAD                | 1               | 1         | 4         | 2         | 2         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 10         | 0                  | 5         | 3         | 5         | 18         | 0        | 0        |          | 31         |
| NWD                | 0               | 1         | 3         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 4          | 1                  | 4         | 3         | 5         | 14         | 0        | 0        |          | 27         |
| POD                | 0               | 3         | 4         | 1         | 3         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 16         | 1                  | 1         | 1         | 3         | 7          | 0        | 0        |          | 13         |
| SAD                | 0               | 1         | 3         | 3         | 2         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 9          | 1                  | 4         | 5         | 5         | 5          | 0        | 0        |          | 20         |
| SPD                | 0               | 1         | 2         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 4          | 1                  | 2         | 4         | 5         | 13         | 0        | 0        |          | 25         |
| SWD                | 0               | 1         | 1         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 3          | 1                  | 4         | 4         | 1         | 21         | 0        | 0        |          | 31         |
| TAC                | 1               | 2         | 0         | 0         | 2         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 5          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        |          | 0          |
| <b>D/C Total</b>   | <b>2</b>        | <b>12</b> | <b>19</b> | <b>9</b>  | <b>9</b>  | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b>  | <b>5</b>   | <b>56</b>  | <b>7</b>           | <b>31</b> | <b>37</b> | <b>43</b> | <b>119</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> |          | <b>237</b> |
| ERDC               | 0               | 1         | 0         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 1         | 6          | 9          | 0                  | 1         | 1         | 3         | 12         | 0        | 0        |          | 17         |
| Lab Total          | 0               | 1         | 0         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 1         | 6          | 9          | 0                  | 1         | 1         | 3         | 12         | 0        | 0        |          | 17         |
| HECSA              | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 0          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        |          | 0          |
| FOA Total          | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 0          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        |          | 0          |
| 249th PPB          | 0               | 0         | 1         | 2         | 4         | 0        | 9         | 194        | 210        | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        |          | 0          |
| PP School          | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 1         | 9          | 10         | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        |          | 0          |
| <b>Total 249th</b> | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>  | <b>4</b>  | <b>0</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>203</b> | <b>220</b> | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>   | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> |          | <b>0</b>   |
| TRG                | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 0          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        |          | 0          |
| AMHA               | 1               | 0         | 0         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 1          | 3          | 2                  | 7         | 14        | 11        | 9          | 0        | 1        |          | 44         |
| <b>HQ Total</b>    | <b>1</b>        | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b>   | <b>3</b>   | <b>2</b>           | <b>7</b>  | <b>14</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>9</b>   | <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>44</b>  |
| <b>Cmd Total</b>   | <b>3</b>        | <b>13</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>215</b> | <b>288</b> | <b>9</b>           | <b>39</b> | <b>52</b> | <b>57</b> | <b>140</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>298</b> |

# SECTION 3

# MANPOWER

## UNIFORMED MANPOWER ALLOCATIONS AND GRADE CEILINGS FY 07

| ORG                | MILITARY FUNDED |           |           |           |           |          |           |            |            | CIVIL WORKS FUNDED |           |           |           |            |          |          |          |            |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
|                    | OFF             |           |           |           |           |          | WO        | EN         | TOTAL      | OFF                |           |           |           |            |          | WO       | ENL      | TOTAL      |
|                    | GO              | 06        | 05        | 04        | 03        | 02       |           |            |            | GO                 | 06        | 05        | 04        | 03         | 02       |          |          |            |
| HNC                | 0               | 1         | 1         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 3          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0          |
| LRD                | 0               | 1         | 1         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 2          | 1                  | 4         | 10        | 9         | 24         | 0        | 0        |          | 48         |
| MVD                | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 0          | 1                  | 7         | 7         | 10        | 17         | 0        | 0        |          | 42         |
| NAD                | 1               | 1         | 4         | 2         | 2         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 10         | 0                  | 5         | 3         | 5         | 18         | 0        | 0        |          | 31         |
| NWD                | 0               | 1         | 3         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 4          | 1                  | 4         | 3         | 5         | 14         | 0        | 0        |          | 27         |
| POD                | 0               | 3         | 4         | 1         | 3         | 0        | 0         | 5          | 16         | 1                  | 1         | 1         | 3         | 7          | 0        | 0        |          | 13         |
| SAD                | 0               | 1         | 3         | 3         | 2         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 9          | 1                  | 4         | 5         | 5         | 5          | 0        | 0        |          | 20         |
| SPD                | 0               | 1         | 2         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 4          | 1                  | 2         | 4         | 5         | 13         | 0        | 0        |          | 25         |
| SWD                | 0               | 1         | 1         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 3          | 1                  | 4         | 4         | 1         | 21         | 0        | 0        |          | 31         |
| TAC                | 1               | 2         | 0         | 0         | 2         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 5          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        |          | 0          |
| <b>D/C Total</b>   | <b>2</b>        | <b>12</b> | <b>19</b> | <b>9</b>  | <b>9</b>  | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b>  | <b>5</b>   | <b>56</b>  | <b>7</b>           | <b>31</b> | <b>37</b> | <b>43</b> | <b>119</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> |          | <b>237</b> |
| ERDC               | 0               | 1         | 0         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 1         | 6          | 9          | 0                  | 1         | 1         | 3         | 12         | 0        | 0        |          | 17         |
| <b>Lab Total</b>   | <b>0</b>        | <b>1</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>6</b>   | <b>9</b>   | <b>0</b>           | <b>1</b>  | <b>1</b>  | <b>3</b>  | <b>12</b>  | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> |          | <b>17</b>  |
| HECSA              | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 0          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        |          | 0          |
| <b>FOA Total</b>   | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>   | <b>0</b>   | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>   | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> |          | <b>0</b>   |
| 249th PPB          | 0               | 0         | 1         | 2         | 4         | 0        | 9         | 194        | 210        | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        |          | 0          |
| PP School          | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 1         | 9          | 10         | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        |          | 0          |
| <b>Total 249th</b> | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>  | <b>4</b>  | <b>0</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>203</b> | <b>220</b> | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>   | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> |          | <b>0</b>   |
| TRG                | 0               | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0          | 0          | 0                  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0        |          | 0          |
| AMHA               | 1               | 0         | 0         | 1         | 0         | 0        | 0         | 1          | 3          | 2                  | 7         | 14        | 11        | 9          | 0        | 1        |          | 44         |
| <b>HQ Total</b>    | <b>1</b>        | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b>   | <b>3</b>   | <b>2</b>           | <b>7</b>  | <b>14</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>9</b>   | <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>44</b>  |
| <b>Cmd Total</b>   | <b>3</b>        | <b>13</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>215</b> | <b>288</b> | <b>9</b>           | <b>39</b> | <b>52</b> | <b>57</b> | <b>140</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>298</b> |

**SECTION 3****MANPOWER****FY 05 FINAL ALLOCATION**

|                        | <b>CIVIL WORKS</b> | <b>MILITARY</b> | <b>TOTAL</b>  |
|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| LRD                    | 3,943              | 415             | 4,358         |
| MVD                    | 5,160              | 158             | 5,318         |
| NAD                    | 2,216              | 1,389           | 3,605         |
| NWD                    | 3,868              | 1,061           | 4,929         |
| POD                    | 300                | 1,552           | 1,852         |
| SAD                    | 2,830              | 985             | 3,815         |
| SPD                    | 1,704              | 630             | 2,334         |
| SWD                    | 2,189              | 640             | 2,829         |
| <b>MSC Subtotal</b>    | <b>22,210</b>      | <b>6,830</b>    | <b>29,040</b> |
| <br>                   |                    |                 |               |
| GRD                    | 33                 | 367             | 400           |
| AED                    | 0                  | 60              | 60            |
| <b>G-3 Subtotal</b>    | <b>33</b>          | <b>427</b>      | <b>460</b>    |
| <br>                   |                    |                 |               |
| HNC                    | 62                 | 614             | 676           |
| TAC                    | 1                  | 308             | 309           |
| ERDC                   | 591                | 1,303           | 1,894         |
| UFC                    | 172                | 96              | 268           |
| MDC                    | 30                 | 0               | 30            |
| <b>Center Subtotal</b> | <b>856</b>         | <b>2,321</b>    | <b>3,177</b>  |
| <br>                   |                    |                 |               |
| IWR                    | 162                | 0               | 162           |
| HECSA                  | 90                 | 76              | 166           |
| Prime Power School     | 0                  | 29              | 29            |
| 249th AUG TDA          | 0                  | 7               | 7             |
| <b>Other Subtotal</b>  | <b>252</b>         | <b>112</b>      | <b>364</b>    |
| <br>                   |                    |                 |               |
| HQUSACE                | 426                | 270             | 696           |
| TRG                    | 0                  | 122             | 122           |
| <b>HQ Subtotal</b>     | <b>426</b>         | <b>392</b>      | <b>818</b>    |
| <br>                   |                    |                 |               |
| <b>TOTAL</b>           | <b>23,777</b>      | <b>10,082</b>   | <b>33,859</b> |

# SECTION 3

# EXECUTIVE DIRECTION & MGT FUNDING

| EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT (ED&M) |                               |                                |                   |                            |             |                            |  |                          |                   |                |                   |                |             |                |              |                |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| FY 03-05 CURRENT FISCAL GUIDANCE (CFG)    |                               |                                |                   |                            |             |                            |  |                          |                   |                |                   |                |             |                |              |                |
| \$000                                     |                               |                                |                   |                            |             |                            |  |                          |                   |                |                   |                |             |                |              |                |
| COMMAND                                   | GENERAL EXPENSES (GE) 96X3124 |                                |                   |                            |             |                            | OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE, ARMY (OMA) 21 Y 2020 |                          |                   |                |                   |                |             |                |              |                |
|   | FY 02 (ACT OBLIG)             |                                | FY 03 (ACT OBLIG) |                            | FY 04 (BGT) |                            | FY 05 (PROG)                                   |                          | FY 02 (ACT OBLIG) |                | FY 03 (ACT OBLIG) |                | FY 04 (BGT) |                | FY 05 (PROG) |                |
|   | FTE                           | FUNDS                          | FTE               | FUNDS                      | FTE         | CG Approved                | FTE  | FUNDS                    | FTE               | FUNDS          | FTE               | FUNDS          | FTE         | CG Approved    | FTE          | FUNDS          |
| LRD                                       | 81                            | 10919.5                        | 81                | 10576.9                    | 82          | 10357.2                    | 69   | 9305.9                   | 13                | 1515.8         | 13                | 1486.4         | 13          | 1545.4         | 12           | 1457.3         |
| MVD                                       | 83                            | 10374.9                        | 84                | 10605.6                    | 84          | 10045.0                    | 73   | 9689.1                   | 0                 | 0.0            | 0                 | 0.0            | 0           | 0.0            | 0            | 0.0            |
| NAD                                       | 71                            | 9846.0                         | 72                | 9788.7                     | 72          | 9465.0                     | 62   | 8520.3                   | 26                | 2856.6         | 26                | 2833.4         | 26          | 2834.9         | 21           | 2563.4         |
| NWD                                       | 73                            | 9919.3                         | 74                | 9740.5                     | 74          | 9368.6                     | 68   | 9726.6                   | 21                | 2494.3         | 21                | 2411.5         | 21          | 2429.9         | 20           | 2487.2         |
| POD                                       | 20                            | 3257.1                         | 20                | 3212.3                     | 20          | 3217.2                     | 19   | 2990.0                   | 54                | 7024.0         | 54                | 7119.3         | 54          | 6924.0         | 47           | 6666.0         |
| SAD                                       | 75                            | 10454.5                        | 76                | 10526.0                    | 76          | 10136.5                    | 63   | 9815.5                   | 20                | 2464.9         | 20                | 2414.3         | 20          | 2479.9         | 17           | 2427.2         |
| SPD                                       | 73                            | 10347.8                        | 74                | 10242.9                    | 74          | 10054.4                    | 62   | 10753.5                  | 18                | 2053.0         | 18                | 1999.4         | 18          | 2019.5         | 16           | 2375.3         |
| SWD                                       | 70                            | 8800.0                         | 71                | 8590.6                     | 71          | 9146.4                     | 60   | 8102.8                   | 21                | 2009.3         | 21                | 1931.4         | 21          | 1983.8         | 18           | 1753.8         |
| <b>TOTAL MSC</b>                          | <b>546</b>                    | <b>73919.1</b>                 | <b>552</b>        | <b>73283.5</b>             | <b>553</b>  | <b>71790.4</b>             | <b>476</b>                                     | <b>68903.7</b>           | <b>173</b>        | <b>20417.9</b> | <b>173</b>        | <b>20195.7</b> | <b>173</b>  | <b>20217.4</b> | <b>151</b>   | <b>19730.0</b> |
| <b>HQ OPERATING BGT</b>                   | <b>419</b>                    | <b>49291.8</b>                 | <b>420</b>        | <b>51822.7</b>             | <b>420</b>  | <b>53869.9</b>             | <b>402</b>                                     | <b>56091.8</b>           | <b>271</b>        | <b>29605.7</b> | <b>271</b>        | <b>29453.1</b> | <b>278</b>  | <b>32047.6</b> | <b>251</b>   | <b>32952.6</b> |
| HECSA: HEC PORTION                        | 85                            | 7859.5                         | 85                | 8016.1                     | 85          | 8396.5                     | 81   | 7990.6                   | 41                | 4958.9         | 41                | 3596.2         | 41          | 4852.4         | 41           | 4598.8         |
| HQ PORTION                                | 0                             | 9156.7                         | 0                 | 7966.8                     | 0           | 8723.5                     | 0  | 9366.0                   | 0                 | 1317.6         | 0                 | 955.5          | 0           | 3316.0         | 0            | 3465.8         |
| <b>SUBTOT HECSA</b>                       | <b>85</b>                     | <b>17016.2</b>                 | <b>85</b>         | <b>15982.9</b>             | <b>85</b>   | <b>17120.0</b>             | <b>81</b>                                      | <b>17356.6</b>           | <b>41</b>         | <b>6276.5</b>  | <b>41</b>         | <b>4551.7</b>  | <b>41</b>   | <b>8168.4</b>  | <b>41</b>    | <b>8064.6</b>  |
| ERDC                                      | 2                             | 283.0                          | 2                 | 274.4                      | 2           | 269.0                      | 2  | 212.2                    | 0                 | 0.0            | 0                 | 0.0            | 0           | 0.0            | 0            | 0.0            |
| IWR                                       | 25                            | 4964.8                         | 25                | 4735.5                     | 25          | 4068.0                     | 27   | 4443.4                   | 0                 | 0.0            | 0                 | 0.0            | 0           | 0.0            | 0            | 0.0            |
| UFC                                       | 10                            | 1004.7                         | 10                | 1217.7                     | 10          | 991.0                      | 9  | 765.2                    | 10                | 867.0          | 10                | 983.0          | 10          | 830.0          | 9            | 681.9          |
| <b>TOTAL OTHER FOA</b>                    | <b>122</b>                    | <b>23268.7</b>                 | <b>122</b>        | <b>22210.5</b>             | <b>122</b>  | <b>22448.0</b>             | <b>119</b>                                     | <b>22777.4</b>           | <b>51</b>         | <b>7143.5</b>  | <b>51</b>         | <b>5534.7</b>  | <b>51</b>   | <b>8998.4</b>  | <b>50</b>    | <b>8746.5</b>  |
| <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATING</b>                 | <b>1087</b>                   | <b>146479.6</b>                | <b>1094</b>       | <b>147316.7</b>            | <b>1095</b> | <b>148108.3</b>            | <b>997</b>                                     | <b>147772.9</b>          | <b>495</b>        | <b>57167.1</b> | <b>495</b>        | <b>55183.5</b> | <b>502</b>  | <b>61263.4</b> | <b>452</b>   | <b>61429.0</b> |
| <b>USACE PROG ACCOUNTS</b>                | <b>0</b>                      | <b>9635.2</b>                  | <b>0</b>          | <b>6749.7</b>              | <b>0</b>    | <b>15208.0</b>             | <b>0</b>                                       | <b>11727.0</b>           | <b>0</b>          | <b>0.0</b>     | <b>0</b>          | <b>0.0</b>     | <b>0</b>    | <b>991.6</b>   | <b>0</b>     | <b>3439.0</b>  |
| <b>(Plus: FY03 carry-over)</b>            |                               |                                |                   |                            |             | <b>4225.0</b>              |  |                          |                   |                |                   |                |             |                |              |                |
| UNDISTRIBUTED (see #5)                    | 0.0                           | 0.0                            | 0.0               | 0.0                        | 0.0         | 0.0                        | 0.0  | 7500.2                   | 0.0               | 0.0            | 0.0               | 0.0            | 0.0         | 0.0            | 0.0          | 1263.0         |
| <b>GRAND TOTAL</b><br>(ceiling+adj)       | <b>1087</b>                   | <b>156114.8</b><br>(\$153+3.9) | <b>1094</b>       | <b>154066.4</b><br>(154+3) | <b>1095</b> | <b>159056.0</b><br>(160-1) | <b>997</b>                                     | <b>167000.0</b><br>(167) | <b>495</b>        | <b>57167.1</b> | <b>495</b>        | <b>55183.5</b> | <b>502</b>  | <b>62255.0</b> | <b>452</b>   | <b>66131.0</b> |

**Notes:**

1. The "official" USACE CCG is published by CERM-P, 3 times a year. This CFG is solely an update of the ED&M portion as approved by the SPBAC of 27 Aug 03.
2. The FY04 GE "Grand Total" includes rescission of \$944K.
3. The FY05 GE "passback" resulted in a reduction to the program by directing a \$7M add-on (for a CFO audit of CW Fin Statements), to the USACE Prog Accts line; thus CECW (HQPG chair) revised the previous funds distribution.
4. The FY04 & FY05 OMA numbers are IAW the POM LOCK of 15 Jan 04.
5. The "Undistributed" line in FY04 & FY05 for GE and OMA reflects the reserve for "2012" Transition Costs as requested by the CG and CFO Audit (\$7M).
6. FY04 Undistributed line includes a withdraw of excess GE funds in both USACE Program Accounts and the HQ Operating Budget. This transaction was coordinated with CECW-BA.
7. The FY04 USACE Program Accounts is reduce by \$205K in P2/PMBP. Funds was erroneously applied to Resident Management System (RMS) instead of P2.
8. HQ Operating Account increased by \$8K for travel expenses on a EEOC Hearing.
9. The FY04 Undistributed (Cdr's Reserve) reduce to fund P2 UFR of \$1,782K GE and \$1,198K OMA. OMA mission funds transferred to Cdr's Reserve to cover the difference (\$206.4K). P2 Out-of-cycle was approved by DCG (3/22/04).
10. Received Congressional letter (dated 21 Jun 04) approval of ED&M reprogramming action from the ED&M Mid-Year Review. See WAD for distribution of funds.
11. Transfer of funds from MSCs to HQ Operating Account to Support Labor of Nationalized Positions. See WAD for transferred amounts.
12. SPD received \$300K from HQ Operating Account to pay an EEO Settlement.
13. SAD return excess FY02 USACE PCS Costs (Per e-mail message dated 27 Apr 04)

CERM-B/30 Aug 2004 (HSB Rev #26)

## **SECTION 3      SUPERVISION & ADMINISTRATION (S&A)**

The Board of Directors (BOD) approved the Supervision and Administration (S&A) Regionalization proposal on 16 August 1999 to improve the method of S&A management and to promote the regional business center concept. Implementation took place on 1 October 1999 and an S&A “checking account” was established for each MSC. MSCs took ownership of these funds and are responsible for managing on a break-even basis over the long term. S&A Regionalization works by crediting future gains and losses to each MSC S&A checking account.

S&A operates out of the Civil Works Revolving Fund and must meet the nominal balance requirement like other accounts in the Revolving Fund. Gains or losses in the MSC checkbooks can cause the Corps-wide S&A accounts (HQ MILCON and O&M reserves + MSC checking accounts) to be outside the nominal balance requirement (4 months S&A expense  $\pm$  1 months expense). **Therefore each MSC will have a nominal balance limit for their checkbook account. For FY 04 and beyond the year-end upper limit is 2.5 months expense (average actual for the year) and the lower limit is .5 months expenses. MSC Balances in excess of this amount will become a part of the HQ reserve. Plans that cause the balance to fall below the minimum will be adjusted or must obtain HQ approval.** MSC are still expected to recoup their losses.

S&A Regionalization provides an incentive for MSCs to wisely manage their regional S&A accounts. If their expenses stay below their income, they grow a balance for use during low-income phases of the construction. If their expenses exceed income, they must take action to reduce costs to stay within their finite account. The regional S&A management approach has a more “forward” focus; it promotes wise investments in the workforce, which produce long-term benefits, and gives MSCs greater flexibility in responding to customer needs.

The tables on the following page reflect MSC “target” S&A rates for the next three fiscal years. They were developed based on placement and expense projections submitted to HQUSACE. “Target” S&A rates are shown in the table below. Acceptable variation from the “target S&A rates are  $\pm$ . 3% for MILCON,  $\pm$ . 4% for O&M, and  $\pm$ . 6% for DERP. **The POC is Phil Blount, 202-761-8908.**

New S&A accounts (RF68xx) were set up for GRD and AED in FY 04 to segregate their cost from the National MILCON and O&M accounts. The rates charged to their customers will be adjusted to recover the actual cost of supervising construction in their Areas of Responsibility (AOR). Projects in their AOR will be assessed a security surcharge effective FY 05 for the actual cost of providing security.

**SECTION 3 SUPERVISION & ADMINISTRATION (S&A)**

| <b>Target S&amp;A Rates:</b>                     |                      |                       |                    |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <b><u>FY 05</u></b>                              | <b><u>MILCON</u></b> | <b><u>O&amp;M</u></b> | <b><u>DERP</u></b> |
| LRD  | 5.9%                 | 6.7%                  | 7.2%               |
| NAD*   | 5.9%                 | 7.1%                  | 7.3%               |
| NWD  | 5.7%                 | 6.5%                  | 7.0%               |
| POD  | 6.6%                 | 8.1%                  | 7.5%               |
| SAD  | 5.7%                 | 6.7%                  | 7.1%               |
| SPD  | 5.7%                 | 6.5%                  | 7.0%               |
| SWD  | 5.7%                 | 6.5%                  | 7.1%               |
| TAC  | 6.5%                 | 8.0%                  | N/A                |
| GRD  | 7.7%                 | 9.2%                  | N/A                |
| AED  | 7.7%                 | 9.2%                  | N/A                |
| *Est. Checkbook Adj. Europe Moratorium = \$2 Mil |                      |                       |                    |
| <b><u>FY 06</u></b>                              | <b><u>MILCON</u></b> | <b><u>O&amp;M</u></b> | <b><u>DERP</u></b> |
| LRD  | 6.0%                 | 6.6%                  | 7.4%               |
| NAD  | 5.9%                 | 7.3%                  | 7.3%               |
| NWD  | 5.7%                 | 6.5%                  | 7.0%               |
| POD  | 6.5%                 | 8.1%                  | 7.5%               |
| SAD  | 5.7%                 | 6.7%                  | 7.0%               |
| SPD  | 5.7%                 | 6.5%                  | 7.0%               |
| SWD  | 5.7%                 | 6.5%                  | 7.0%               |
| TAC  | 6.5%                 | 8.0%                  | N/A                |
| GRD  | 7.7%                 | 9.2%                  | N/A                |
| AED  | 7.7%                 | 9.2%                  | N/A                |
| <b><u>FY 07</u></b>                              | <b><u>MILCON</u></b> | <b><u>O&amp;M</u></b> | <b><u>DERP</u></b> |
| LRD  | 6.0%                 | 6.6%                  | 7.3%               |
| NAD  | 5.9%                 | 7.4%                  | 7.4%               |
| NWD  | 5.7%                 | 6.5%                  | 7.0%               |
| POD  | 6.5%                 | 8.1%                  | 7.5%               |
| SAD  | 5.7%                 | 6.7%                  | 7.0%               |
| SPD  | 5.7%                 | 6.5%                  | 7.0%               |
| SWD  | 5.7%                 | 6.5%                  | 7.0%               |
| TAC  | 6.5%                 | 8.0%                  | N/A                |
| GRD  | 7.7%                 | 9.2%                  | N/A                |
| AED  | 7.7%                 | 9.2%                  | N/A                |





# SECTION 3

# IT CHARGES

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT) CHARGES

1. Management costs, including development, testing and operations of HQUSACE-directed IT are paid by either direct funding (including PRIP) or by a fee-for-service (FFS). This section addresses FFS only, which pays for operations, maintenance and PRIP payback. FFS is a site license charged to user field offices.
2. The following site license fees are based on what we need to actually charge for FY 04 after any reductions from the authorized level by system proponents and funding not spent in previous years has been considered. For FY 05 the fees are based on current authorization ceilings and for FY 06 the fees are based on what has been submitted as requirements in ITIPS (no authorization levels have been established for FY 06). The FY 04 and FY 05 authorization ceilings have been established by the Cross Functional Assessment Team (CFAT) and Executive Functional Assessment Team (EFAT) process, with the exception of OMBIL, which is a mandatory charge for PRIP payback. ECS was identified as a requirement after the regular authorization process and was recently authorized based on a midyear EFAT vote. A more detailed breakout for FY 04, FY 05 and FY 06 can be found at the following link: <ftp://ftp.hq.usace.army.mil/CERM/>, which reflects charges to each activity/office down to the district level.
3. An attempt was made to include all known IT/AIS charges to the field, regardless of billing methodology or source. Therefore, included are systems in which the Headquarters manages the centralized billing as well as those that are managed by other USACE sites such as CEEIS which is billed by ERDC and CEALS which is billed by the HECSA Office of Counsel. Also included are SPS that is billed directly by the Army and DCS that would have been billed by CEIM. CASE and NUMMODS are voluntary systems in which activities will determine whether they get billed based on their decision to use them. Microsoft licenses are billed based on requirements submitted by each office.

| AIS            | Est # Licenses | Fee per Lic       | Fee per Lic           | Fee per Lic             | Fee per Lic             |
|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|                | FY 04          | (Actual)<br>FY 04 | (Authorized)<br>FY 05 | (Requirements)<br>FY 06 | (Requirements)<br>FY 07 |
| PCASE          | 20             | \$20,000          | \$20,020              | \$20,000                | 20,000                  |
| VIMS           | 43             | 2,872             | 2,872                 | 4,965                   | 4,965                   |
| APPMS          | 58             | 6,609             | 7,642                 | 7,642                   | 7,642                   |
| CACES/EP1110-1 | 284            | 4,366             | 4,366                 | 4,475                   | 4,587                   |
| RECIS          | 1,171          | 105               | 125                   | 624                     | 656                     |
| REMIS          | 1,114          | 901               | 905                   | 1,760                   | 2,255                   |
| RMS            | 291            | 4,811             | 5,842                 | 8,179                   | 8,471                   |
| SPS            | 45             | 3,681             | 5,800                 | 6,904                   | 7,049                   |
| PPDS           | 56             | 6,250             | 0                     | 0                       | 0                       |
| ACASS/CCASS    | 44             | Varies            | Varies                | Varies                  | Varies                  |
| CWMS           | 214            | 9,988             | 10,134                | 10,136                  | 10,136                  |
| DrChecks       | 44             | 9,153             | 9,336                 | 9,710                   | 10,764                  |
| SPECS INTACT   | 42             | 5,976             | 6,214                 | 6,214                   | 6,214                   |
| NUM MODS       | 38             | 25,789            | 29,342                | 30,789                  | 32,368                  |
| NRRS           | 25             | 11,790            | 8,000                 | 0                       | 0                       |
| CASE           | 49             | 12,282            | 13,883                | 13,883                  | 0                       |
| CEFMS/CEEMIS   | 30,173         | 349               | 454                   | 466                     | 481                     |
| DCS            | TBD            | TBD               | TBD                   | TBD                     | TBD                     |

## SECTION 3

## IT CHARGES

### IT CHARGES (CONT'D)

| Infrastructure     | Est # Licenses<br>FY 04 | Fee per Lic<br>FY 04 | Fee per Lic<br>FY 05 | Fee per Lic<br>FY 06 | Fee per Lic<br>FY 07 |
|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| CEALS              | 5,000                   | Varies               | Varies               | Varies               | Varies               |
| OMBIL              | 48                      | 26,992               | 26,992               | 26,992               | 0                    |
| CEEIS              | 38,686                  | 742                  | 774                  | 799                  | 858                  |
| Microsoft Licenses | 11,326                  | 275                  | TBD                  | TBD                  | TBD                  |
| Oracle             | TBD                     | TBD                  | TBD                  | TBD                  | TBD                  |
| P2                 | TBD                     | TBD                  | TBD                  | TBD                  | TBD                  |
| ECS                | 43                      | 7,326                | 6,977                | 6,977                | 6,977                |
| EGIS               | TBD                     | TBD                  | TBD                  | TBD                  | TBD                  |

1/ The criteria for determining the site license fees are as follows:

**PCASE (Pavement Computer Assisted Structural Engineering)** - Based on the total cost divided evenly between those districts utilizing the programs.

**VIMS (Vehicle Information System)** – Total cost equally divided among organizations which have vehicles.

**APPMS (Automated Personal Property Management System)** – Total cost equally divided among 58 for FY04 and 59 organizations required to have a property book for FY05-06. If GRD Districts are required to maintain a property book an out of cycle request will need to be submitted to add the cost of 3 more site licenses for FY05 and beyond.

**CACES (Computer Aided Cost Engineering System)/EP1110-1-8 (Equipment Manual)** – Total cost is allocated based on the number of authorized Cost Engineer manpower spaces at each district/FOA.

**RECIS (Real Estate Corporate Information System)** – Based on the number of projected FY04 RE positions at the district/FOA, HQ's and MSC's divided by the total number of projected RE positions which gives us a percent times the total cost.

**REMIS (Real Estate Management Information System)** – Based on the number of projected FY04 RE positions at the district/FOA divided by the total number of projected RE positions which gives us a percent times the total cost.

**RMS (Resident Management System)** – Total cost is allocated proportionately based on the number of Area / Resident offices plus one for the District. The cost increase for RMS this year was approved by the EFAT in 2003 to allow for the expediting of Operations and Sustainment changes to existing functions. Originally these changes were projected as Enhancements to be funded with PRIP funds, but a review of the work involved by CECW-E & CECI concluded that the changes should be classified as O&S. Outside of these increases and the additional staff to accomplish the work, all other costs (i.e., Software, hardware, contract support, travel, training, supplies, facility and PRIP repayment costs) are expected to remain the same.

## SECTION 3

## IT CHARGES

---

### IT CHARGES (CONT'D)

**SPS (Standard Procurement System)** - DoD Procurement/Contracting System and a key feeder to USACE financial management system. SPS is critical to the DoD Financial Management modernization effort, the future DoD end-to-end business process model and paperless initiatives. Annually, during the month of October, the Army Contracting Agency (ACA) notifies each MACOM of the annual Standard Procurement System (SPS) Software Maintenance Support cost for the new fiscal year. The ACA has made a conscious effort to keep the annual maintenance support cost at a very low rate for all customers. FY 05 program cost of \$5,800 per site (45 data bases) will remain the same as FY 04. Funding will provide technical support services throughout the fiscal year. The support dollars are crucial in providing support to all USACE districts/centers/labs to include OCONUS sites. The maintenance support package for FY 05 provides all USACE users, approximately 1800, with unlimited usage for help desk support, software engineering support (application and database), Army Response Team (ART) assistance, CEFMS/SPS interface maintenance support, and limited request for modifications/changes to database or application software.

**PPDS (Programs and Projects Delivery System)** – The FY 04 Fee for Service bill is based on the total number of MSCs, Districts, Centers and Labs (56), with ERDC counted as 4 labs. The total cost is divided by the number of sites for a cost per site. System will be subsumed by P2 in late FY 04. However, if P2 deployment is delayed, site license costs may have to be increased to continue operations.

**ACASS/CCASS (Architect-Engineering Contract Administration Support System/Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System)** – Total cost is allocated based on the total dollars of construction and A-E contracts placed by a district or center annually. Six charging brackets are established based on the FY03 Cost of Doing Business Report: \$0-\$50M, \$50M-\$100M, \$100M-\$200M, \$200M-\$300M, \$300M-\$400M, over \$400M.

**CWMS (Corps Water Management System)** – The cost allocation is in proportion to pre-determined subscription units allocated to offices based on an analysis of the water control management system and responsibilities in each Corps office. CWMS fees are assessed based on the number of subscriptions allocated to each individual District. Increases in fees which started in FY 03 are due to initiation of PRIP payback for CWMS development. Funding for support/enterprise management is also added to this fee after CWMS is deployed to your District.

**DrChecks (Design Review and Checking System)** – Two basic license fees are applied: large users (\$10,226) and small users (\$7,212) determined by the amount of PED funds received by districts and centers per the FY 02 Cost of Doing Business Report. There are two exceptions due to small PED allocations at LRE and SAC. For these two sites, a rate of \$3,786 is applied. The dividing line between large and small users is set at a PED allocation of \$12,250,000; the dividing line for “exceptions” is \$3,000,000. The amounts shown are the average per site.

## SECTION 3

## IT CHARGES

### IT CHARGES (CONT'D)

**SI (SPECSINTACT)** – License fees are determined by prorating total system cost against the amount of MP and CW PED funds received by districts and centers as identified on the current CERM Cost of Doing Business Report. By regulation, SPECSINTACT is not required for OCONUS work, so NAU is not included. However, a POD survey indicates POF, POH, and POJ use the system and agree to support it, so these districts are included in the charges.

**NUM MODS (Numerical Models)** - Funding for this program is *voluntarily* provided by Districts. The amount provided by a District depends on the number of models to be used, if any, in the Fiscal Year, and is sent directly to ERDC by MIPR. (Funds are not to be sent to Headquarters.) The amounts shown in this section are an average, based on the average number of Districts that have participated in the past, and the funding they provided in past years. They do not reflect a specific District funding level. A data call will go out from ERDC to Districts in September requesting their requirements for models in the program, and requesting a MIPR to fund those models needed to meet their requirements. Specific funding amounts cannot be provided until that time, or later in the year, after Districts determine their needs. A more accurate figure will be available during the first quarter, FY 04, after ERDC receives District requirements.

**NRRS (National Recreation Reservation Service)** – The amount shown (\$11,790) is an average cost per district. Districts are charged a variable rate based on the number of park office sites per district and the telecommunications options used by each site.

**CASE (Computer-Aided Structural Engineering)** - The CASE program develops, maintains, operates, and upgrades structural, geotechnical, and soil-structure interaction computer programs to comply with HQUSACE guidance. CASE software is tailored to meet Corps needs and does not compete with COTS. Funding for CASE is voluntary and is based on an office's projected civil works funding for the current fiscal year. Requested funding is grouped into four tiers (Divisions, Districts with Small, Medium, and Large civil works budgets). Dollar amounts are assigned to each of the four recommended funding levels in order to fund all CASE objectives for the FY.

**CEFMS (Corps of Engineers Financial Management System) /CEEMIS (Corps of Engineers Management Information System)** – The amounts for each site are based upon transactions processed in CEFMS. Transactions for the twelve month period ended April 2004 were compiled and percentages were calculated based on the number of each site's transactions as a proportion of total transactions. The respective percentages were then applied to the amounts approved by the EFAT for CEFMS and CEEMIS.

**Defense Communications Services (DCS)** – It translates DOD global long-haul communications and network requirements into effective voice/video/data network solutions and resolves technical support issues for the DOD long-haul networks to include services such as: GIG Bandwidth Expansion, Dedicated Data Services, NIPRNet, SIPRNet, DSN a worldwide private-line telephone network, Defense Red Switch Network (DRSN), JWICS, SATCOM, Enhanced

## SECTION 3

## IT CHARGES

---

### IT CHARGES (CONT'D)

Mobile Satellite Service (EMSS), INMARSAT, IRIDIUM, DISN Video Services, Teleport System; Transport Services, NS\EP, GETS, Wireless communications, Special communications. Commands are to use their current and past FY costs to estimate their FY 04-06 funding requirements for long-haul communications and network requirements they plan to acquire, maintain, and/or sustain from DCS.

[CEALS \(Corps of Engineers Automated Legal System\)](#) – Subscribers are segregated into Counsel Members and Non-Counsel Members. Counsel team groups/members are assessed a higher administrative fee to cover CEALS AIS costs. Non-Counsel Team Groups are assessed a lower administrative fee to cover costs associated with obtaining and maintaining the services. The administrative fee is calculated/computed using their monthly billing totals and the fee is added to the bottom total. CEALS AIS is collected by the government order for WESTLAW & LEXIS Services.

[OMBIL \(Operations and Maintenance Business Information Link\)](#) – This is the first year of a 3 year PRIP payback. The amount per site is derived by equally dividing the FY 04 amount of \$1.5M by 56 USACE users.

[CEEIS \(Corps of Engineers Enterprise Information Services\)](#) – In accordance with CECI policy and implementation guidance, registration of userids in the U-PASS system is used to compute the per user charge allocated to sites. At the time of developing this guidance, the monthly userid counts through May 2004 were available. These counts were averaged to obtain a userid count to develop the cost estimate shown. The final FY05 charge will likely vary slightly from this estimate once the final count from FY04 is averaged across all 12 months of the FY. It also should be noted that in FY04 the CEEIS per user charge began including enterprise e-mail services, which was formerly managed and billed as a separate AIS.

[Microsoft Licenses](#) - The Information Technology E-Commerce and Commercial Contracting Center (ITEC4), in conjunction with the Chief Information Office/G6 (CIO/G6) and the Army Small Computer Program (ASCP), awarded a six-year, Army-wide Enterprise License Agreement (ELA) for Microsoft (MS) products to Softmart Government Services, Inc. G6 has issued a moratorium requiring purchasing Microsoft Software only from this Army contract. The contract applies to all Army, Army Reserve, Army National Guard Bureau agencies, and Army authorized contractors. Systems operated in a joint organization (e.g. Central Command (CENTCOM)), those covered under an educational license (e.g. West Point), and those contractually obligated under existing contracts until contract expiration (e.g. MEDCOM) are not affected by these interim instructions. USACE has some activities obligated under existing contracts. USACE have to reimburse Army for all Desktop and all Windows Exchange Server licenses we would require. Decision was made to request reimbursement be accomplished by charging the field a fee service charge.

### IT CHARGES (CONT'D)

**Oracle** – Cost is determined by software licenses currently in use at each site. New licenses are billed at a one-time charge at the current negotiated rate. Support maintenance on licenses purchased during the year is pro-rated monthly from date of purchase through 30 September. Yearly maintenance renewal is invoiced for entire 12 months in October of each FY. Sites will receive a maintenance renewal cost notification during the third quarter of each year for upcoming FY budget planning. Billing is managed by ERDC. Each site should prepare a government order (GO), which will be issued directly to ERDC. FY 05 cost includes Oracle maintenance cost associated with the P2 Oracle software that was transferred to each site at the time of P2 deployment. This cost only concerns Oracle Software. It does not include Primavera, Primavision etc.

**P2 (PROMIS Phase II)** – This requirement will be “Direct” funded in FY 04. FY 05 and out spread to the field is based on the FY03 PROMIS bill.

**Electronic Contract Solicitation (ECS)** – Per ER 715-1-21, all USACE solicitations will be maintained on a central website at ERDC-WES-ITL, managed by the CADD/GIS Technology Center. ECS is an e-Gov initiative, which provides validation of all potential offerors through the FedTeDS system prior to allowing access to solicitation files and maintains a record of those who have viewed or received solicitations. The charge for each contracting office (district and center) is the same as the effort to maintain the site is largely independent of the number of solicitations posted.

**Enterprise GIS (EGIS)** - Enterprise GIS is the integrated geospatial technology infrastructure delivering spatial information products, services and standard datasets to all functional elements and business processes of the organization. The EGIS costs identified here specifically pay for 1) a Corps wide licenses for geospatial base data for USACE and 2) the coordination link to the Commercial Satellite Imagery Library (CSIL). The USACE wide licensing of geospatial base data is the most cost effective way of licensing the data from commercial industry and prohibits the practice of each and every District licensing their own base data sets. The link to CSIL is required by DoD and promotes the reuse of Satellite Imagery through DoD. USACE saved \$5.4M in FY 04 by reusing Satellite Imagery already purchased by DoD through the CSIL. The costs were calculated by evenly distributing the costs to those entities that use the data and the CSI. (150K for data license and 30K for CSIL).

**4. POCs are Ed Zammit, CERM-BA, (202) 761-4960, Belinda Chase, CERM-BA, (202) 761-0067 or the AIS POC identified in ITIPS database.**

### **CORPS OF ENGINEERS ENTERPRISE INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES (CEEIS) CHARGES**

1. The CEEIS Program was established 1 October 2000 to reflect a new phase in the life cycle of the Corps' corporate Information Technology (IT) infrastructure. The program management responsibility for CEEIS is located at ERDC/Vicksburg/ITL, where the network infrastructure, network security, and systems operations are centrally managed.

2. Among the major influences on the CEEIS program during FY 04 were the Army's AKM initiative and the assigned CEEIS role to represent the Corps as its' functional CIO (FCIO) that leads the Corps' Region within the Army's AKM-NETCOM framework; extensive support to Corps' missions in Iraq and Afghanistan and the associated increased risk from impacts to CEEIS maintenance and backup activities; gaining a three year approval by CIO/G6 for the USACE Virtual Private Network (VPN) solution to be used on Army installations; coordination and support of the USACE pilot for deployment of Active Directory; continuing to promote Continuity of Operations (COOP) capabilities; establishing Memorandums of Agreement with Corps sites and AIS proponents; establishment of a CEEIS web presence; managing the HQUSACE Oracle Enterprise contract; continued refinement of DITSCAP accreditation criteria; ordering, installation, and configuration of the Corps Network and Security Stack (CNSS) at all Corps sites; intense review and coordination with NETCOM on Army security mandates in order to mitigate effects on the Corps' non-military business; increasing USACE bandwidth to the NIPRNET; exploring innovative ways to reduce USACE costs for OCONUS communications circuits; continuing to respond to a variety of audits; gaining approval by DoD to operate the Corps' two Internet gateways; persistent enhancement of the information assurance (IA) program to maintain the Corps' recognized leadership position in the IA community; and cooperation with the P2 development team and P2 Project Manager as P2 continued deployment.

3. FY 05 will bring opportunities and challenges to CEEIS in a number of areas. Among these are continued support to GRD and AED; development of a formal Configuration Management program; completion of the Active Directory deployment; continuing cooperation and participation in the Army's AKM-NETCOM program; support to the USACE Virtual Design Team initiative; increasing communications requirements from sites that require CEEIS to expand existing Wide-Area-Network (WAN) capacities; utilization of VPN capability to provide secure and reliable connectivity to Corps field sites as well as remote individual team members and customers; advancing the ability of CEEIS network staff to perform "lights-out" monitoring and troubleshooting at Corps sites by utilizing components in the CNSS; assisting sites in establishment and testing of their local COOP capabilities; implementation of web access for customers to the Helpdesk trouble ticketing system; improving the ability of the CEEIS web presence to provide accurate and timely information to customers of CEEIS services; migration of P2 operational responsibilities into the CEEIS program; continued support to the President's Management Agenda and associated responses to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) directives that focus on electronic government and competitive sourcing; and the continuing

## SECTION 3

## CEEIS CHARGES

### CORPS OF ENGINEERS ENTERPRISE INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES (CEEIS) CHARGES (CONT'D)

forward movement of the USACE 2012 effort and its' emphasis on consolidation, regionalization, and centralization of functions and services.

4. Costs to provide CEEIS baseline services (enterprise network, security, and processing infrastructure) are recovered by fee-for-service billings using a flat fee for each Corps user of those services. HQUSACE policy mandates that consumers of CEEIS resources are to be counted via registration of those users in the U-PASS system. For FY 05 billing, an average of the 12 monthly FY 04 snapshots will be used to establish an annual user-id count and per-user fee. For CCG preparation, the user-id counts will be averaged through May 2004 with the final average and associated per-user fee being established at the end of FY 04. Each site's annual fee will be collected on a quarterly basis during FY 05.

5. Budgeted costs for FY 04 were kept at the FY 03 level of \$28,697,070. The estimated budget for FY 05 is \$29,900,000. This is 13% less than the EFAT approved authority for FY 05 and represents an actual cost increase of only 5.5% since FY 02 even though the scope of the CEEIS mission has expanded significantly since then. As of May 2004, there were an average of 38,686 billable users registered in U-PASS for FY 04 resulting in an estimated annual charge of \$773 per user for FY 05. The FY 05 per-user charge will be finalized once the FY 04 user counts are completed.

6. Note there are additional non-baseline efforts a site may request that can impact an individual site's total costs during FY 05:

(a) Non-Baseline Site – Non-baseline sites that connect into the CEEIS network will be charged a \$950 per month fee (baseline sites are HQ offices of Divisions, Districts, Labs, and Centers). This fee was directed by the CEEIS CCB in order to allow CEEIS to perform the additional site management workload and to reimburse maintenance costs for hardware and software. This will typically apply to a baseline site's COOP connectivity where the COOP site connects directly into the CEEIS network.

(b) Non-Baseline Circuits – Sites that request additional communications connectivity above the corporate baseline of dual circuits into the CEEIS network must reimburse CEEIS for costs of those circuits.

**7. POC is the CEEIS Program Manager, Dr. Peggy Wright, CEERD-IC, at 601-634-4630.**

**SECTION 3**

**PRIP**

**PLANT REPLACEMENT AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (PRIP)**

(\$000)

|              | Approved FY<br>04 | Requested FY<br>05 | Requested<br>FY 06                      |          |
|--------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|----------|
| CEHNC        | 1,815             | 0                  | Program<br>Amounts Are<br>Not Available |          |
| CELRD        | 2,121             | 0                  |   |          |
| CEMVD        | 6,086             | 2,967              |   |          |
| CENAD        | 3,512             | 19,090             |   |          |
| CENWD        | 3,766             | 2,174              |   |          |
| CEPOD        | 777               | 125                |   |          |
| CESAD        | 510               | 2,037              |   |          |
| CESPD        | 523               | 0                  |   |          |
| CESWD        | 1,624             | 1,371              |   |          |
| CEHQ         | 378               | 0                  |   |          |
| CEHEC        | 614               | 0                  |   |          |
| CEMDC        | 45,197            | 25,141             |   |          |
| CEFC         | 0                 | 0                  |   |          |
| CEERD (WES)  | 5,310             | 14,095             |   |          |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>72,232</b>     | <b>67,001</b>      |   | <b>0</b> |

Remarks: FY 04 reflects approved and FY 05 requested PRIP program amounts. FY 06 estimates are currently under development. The FY 05 PRIP program supports 13 Major Item New Starts:

| MSC   | FY 04 Major Item New Start                                  | Total Estimated<br>Cost (\$000) |
|-------|---|---------------------------------|
| CEMVD | Dredge JADWIN POONTOON Pipeline Replacement                 | 4,215                           |
|       | Dredge JADWIN Anchor Barge Replacement                      | 1,120                           |
|       | PEORIA Rock Barges (2)                                      | 2,270                           |
|       | M/V PEORIA Replacement                                      | 6,225                           |
|       | Dragline D-47 Replacement                                   | 750                             |
|       | Sardis -Arkabutla Project Management Office                 | 1,360                           |
|       | Ouachita-Greenson-DeGray Project Management Office          | 3,208                           |
|       | CENAD   | Dredge McFARLAND Overhaul       |
|       | Renovate Docks A&B – U.S. Moorings                          | 3,408                           |
| CENWD | Walla Walla District Headquarter Bldg Judgment Fund Payment | 1,541                           |
| CESAD | Dredge MERRITT Side Casting Propulsion – Replacement        | 1,800                           |
|       | Vessel BLAIR – Replacement                                  | 601                             |
| CESWD | Port Arthur Bulkhead Replacement                            | 1,131                           |

Program amounts will be revised based on actual FY 04 execution and approval of FY 05 PRIP program adjustments and FY 06 PRIP Budget request by the SPBAC. POC is **Marilynn VH White, 202-761-5620.**

## SECTION 3

## FACILITIES GUIDANCE

MACOM Engineer Office (CELD-ZE):

**Larry Robinson, MACOM Engineer, CELD-ZE, Telephone: 202-761-4499, Fax 202-761-1588,**  
[larry.m.robinson@usace.army.mil](mailto:larry.m.robinson@usace.army.mil)

### 1. Policy to clarify Antiterrorist Force Protection (AT/FP) requirements for administrative space.

1.1 In order to continue to provide first class engineering services to The Army and the Nation, the Corps of Engineers must protect its people from terrorist aggression in its administrative facilities worldwide, whether Corps owned, leased, or as a tenant on a military installation. This can be accomplished by applying antiterrorism standards to minimize the potential for mass casualties and/or the progressive collapse of its administrative facilities.

1.2 As a result of a collaborative effort of representatives from the Services and numerous defense agencies, the Department of Defense now has a new Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC), "DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings." The Unified Facilities Criteria system prescribed by MIL-STD 3007, provides planning, design, construction, operations, and maintenance criteria which applies to all DoD commands. The minimum antiterrorism standards for buildings occupied by DoD will have a major impact on our people and funding streams, regardless of the source for FY 05-07. DoD standards apply to new construction projects beginning in FY 04; new leases executed on or after 1 Oct 05; and renewals or extensions of any existing leases executed on or after 1 Oct 09.

### 2. Policy to expedite space requests

2.1. Provided administrative space does not exceed the USACE administrative space ceiling of 162 Net Square Feet (NSF) per person, Space Requests that increase local Command rental \$, but maintain Net Square Feet (NSF) to within 10,000 SF of the existing space (assuming that no controversy exists surrounding the acquisition) will no longer require HQUSACE approval, and in the future will be handled as follows:

- \$1 < \$50,000/Year: delegated to District Commander (DC) for requirements validation and acquisition; change will be reported to HQUSACE, CELD-ZE, with the submission of an Administrative Space Report, through MSC, within 30-days of acquisition.
- \$50,000 < \$200,000/Year: delegated to MSC Commander; DC submits to MSC for validation prior to acquisition; change will be reported to HQUSACE, CELD-ZE, by DC with the submission of an Admin Space Report, through MSC, within 30-days of acquisition.

> \$500,000/Year: Delegated to MACOM Engineer; DC submits to MSC for requirements validation and forwards to MACOM Engineer (CELD-ZE) for endorsement; change will be reported to HQUSACE, CELD-ZE, by DC with the submission of an Admin Space Report, through MSC, within 30-days of acquisition.

## SECTION 3

## FACILITIES GUIDANCE

Note: If there is controversy associated with the request, then HQUSACE approval is required. Submit package to the MSC for requirement validation endorsed by MACOM Engineer, CELD-ZE, and forwarded to Chief of Engineers for approval.

2.2 Space requests that may or may not increase rental \$, but will increase Net Square Feet (NSF) by more than 10,000 SF or will result in exceeding the USACE administrative space ceiling of 162 NSF per person, will require HQUSACE validation and the Chief of Engineers' approval. Such requests will be submitted to the MSC for requirement validation then endorsed by CELD-ZE and forwarded to the Chief of Engineers for approval. The MACOM Engineer will coordinate and clear such requests with CERE, key Headquarters staff and the OACSIM. CERE's liaison office will coordinate requests that require Title 10 Reports and seek approval from Congress.

3. **AR 405-70** prescribes The Army's policies, criteria, responsibilities and procedures for the use of real property. It identifies rules for the use and survey of real property under the control of the Department of The Army (DA), and establishes integration with The Army's real property master planning process. It does not include—

*a.* Real property of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) directly associated with a single, Civil Works projects, i.e., property that is not PRIP-owned or leased. (For such property, see ER 37-1-29, below, for guidance)

*b.* Non-federal real property at state-owned facilities

4. **ER 37-1-29**, 30 November 2002, Financial Administration—Financial Management of Capital Investments, defines the policies and procedures for the supervision and administration of capital assets obtained by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers used in providing goods or services. It includes procedures for programming, budgeting, allocating funds, utilization, calculation of costs and reporting requirements for the Revolving Fund, Plant Replacement Improvement Program (PRIP), project specific, and Operations and Maintenance, Other Procurement, Army (O&M, OPA). It applies to Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (HQUSACE), Major Subordinate Commands, and all Field Operating Activities having capital assets funded by the Revolving Fund, Civil Works projects, or Military appropriations.

5. Facilities master planning by all USACE individual commands is the key to sound capital investment for our internal facility needs. Facilities costs are a component of overhead that must be managed to control overhead rates and remain competitive

6. Subordinate commands whose office or admin space utilization rates (U.R.) remains above the DA/USACE targets, are required to maintain space reduction plans. Space utilization rates and reduction plan updates are shared with CECG at least annually (2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter CMR), and are covered in Command Staff Inspections. This supports requirement to comply with HQDA mandated space utilization goals and continuing audit of space reduction efforts.

7. Divisions, Labs, Centers, FOAs, and Districts will continue to monitor (and submit updates on an annual basis) the CMR facilities performance indicators, using the Utilization Rate targets established by HQDA and USACE policy. In keeping with our emphasis on providing world-class office environments for our world class work force, we emphasize the provisions of AR 405-70 that stipulate a minimum (as well as a maximum) U.R. These U.R.s are 115 NSF/P (minimum) and 130 NSF/P (maximum), respectively for office space. This translates to 144 NSF/P (minimum) and 162 NSF/P (maximum), for the USACE administrative space U.R. goals. The minimum should not be disregarded any more than the maximum while supporting a quality work environment. Whenever a new space request is forwarded to HQUSACE for validation, the project proponent will comply with AR 405-70 and the new CERM ER 37-1-29. See below for Guidance on “Typical Components” of a USACE Typical Decision Package.
8. We will continue to focus on the cost impacts of space utilization decisions. The need to be competitive, to support new ways of working, and to attract and maintain a skilled world class workforce is leading USACE to focus on alternative approaches to attaining world class office environments and teaming arrangements that involve the creation of flexible office space arrangements that will support interactive, collaborative work processes. This trend will accelerate as more and more employees telework from home and telework centers.
9. In this changing environment, a measure of space use in the traditional office building environment, such as “space per person,” is not complete. While the CMR submission will continue to provide a baseline for visibility and management, we will also be translating space utilization rates into rental cost estimates which will be compared with actual rent bills to identify potential opportunities for reducing our office lease costs.
10. As most of our facilities are controlled or leased through GSA, USACE facilities management strategy will continue to develop in line with GSA as we build on our partnering efforts. GSA relies primarily on the “guidance mode” focusing on “cost per square foot” and “cost per person,” along with “customer satisfaction” as indicators of facilities performance measurement. We will be working through a horizontal and vertical team approach (USACE-wide and with GSA) to identify meaningful metrics that will support obtaining a world class work environment, address the impact on overhead and maintaining competitive rates, and achieve best value for our world class workforce.
11. Presently, as in the past, the preferred USACE approach to meeting its facilities requirements is, in general, through leasing due to the flexibility leasing provides. CECG remains open to moves to military installations where practicable.
12. Should a USACE subordinate command determine that its needs cannot be met in the future in the current facilities, contact the MACOM Engineer Office to discuss the best course of action and appropriate documentation to address the facilities needs. A listing of typical components of a facility decision package for CECG approval is included in the Logistics MACOM Engineer website. The degree of documentation depends on the size and complexity of the request. Space requirements must be submitted through the Logistics functional channel to HQUSACE (MACOM Engineer Office) for validation early in the process to avoid delays and lost effort.

### GENERAL GUIDANCE FOR A USACE FACILITY DECISION PACKAGE

- Capital Investment Strategy, as part of an on-going master plan, affordability and flexibility are essential.
- Identify, consider, and report on all viable alternatives. Local military installations, lease options, and the “as is”/current facility are normally among the alternatives. If you are constrained to be in the Central Business District (CBD), reflect this in your alternatives or how you plan to work around this requirement (E.O. 12072). New construction is normally the least attractive option due to funding problems and decreased flexibility with a changing workforce. Use ECONPACK for your economic analysis and recommend one of the alternatives for CG approval. Make the business case to support the move.
- Prepare a space requirements analysis in accordance with GSA AR 405-70 and ER-37-1-29 30 Nov 02 criteria. Demonstrate that the local administrative space utilization rate will be within USACE administrative space target of 162 nsf/authorized person, given official manning allowances and manning forecasts. Use of SF 81/81a or 1450/1450a is recommended.
- Address employee/union impacts, and assess the need for an Environmental Impact Statement.
- Address mission accomplishment relative to the alternatives.
- Discuss local political support or resistance to the relocation.
- Address any coordination with GSA, and GSA’s position on the proposed relocation; e.g., supportive, resistant, will delegate leasing authority to Corps, etc. Clarify if the relocation is a GSA forced move.
- Address urgency. Provide timelines for needed actions including approvals and funding.
- Address impact if no relocation is approved.
- State whether systems furniture is being planned in conjunction with the relocation, and how it will be paid for.
- Clarify how you plan to pay for the relocation and associated construction and annual RPMA costs. Identify sources of funding and what funding, if any, is being requested from HQUSACE.

See Logistics' MACOM Engineer website <http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/celd/FAC/FAC.HTM>

## SECTION 3

## FACILITIES GUIDANCE

---

### MACOM Engineer Space Requirements Template

*A Quick and easy way to see if your space request is going to fly*

Here's a template that you can use to do your space analysis. If you apply the four "space requirement controls," discussed below, to your district's GSA SF-81 and Space Requirements Analysis, you will have no problem getting the approval/validation from our office. See, also, comments, above, on other issues pertinent to the MACOM Engineer.

1. Based on its most recent CMR data, the Headquarters District/Division Corps of Engineers currently has a total space requirement of \_\_\_\_\_, net square feet (NSF). This is comprised of:

- 1.1 \_\_\_\_\_, NSF of Office Space,
- 1.2 \_\_\_\_\_, NSF of Storage Space,
- 1.3 \_\_\_\_\_, NSF of Special Space, and
- 1.4 \_\_\_\_\_, NSF of Other Space
- 1.5 \_\_\_\_\_, Military Allocations
- 1.6 \_\_\_\_\_, Civil Allocations
- 1.7 \_\_\_\_\_, Total FTE Authorization
- 1.8 \_\_\_\_\_, FTE w/ Offices in ST/Special Space

2. The enclosed space accommodation request, dated \_\_\_\_\_, amends that requirement as follows:

- 2.1 \_\_\_\_\_, NSF of Office Space,
- 2.2 \_\_\_\_\_, NSF of Storage Space,
- 2.3 \_\_\_\_\_, NSF of Special Space,
- 3.4 \_\_\_\_\_, NSF of Other Space
- 2.5 \_\_\_\_\_, Military Allocations
- 2.6 \_\_\_\_\_, Civil Allocations
- 2.7 \_\_\_\_\_, Total FTE Authorization
- 2.8 \_\_\_\_\_, FTE w/ Offices in ST/Special Space

3. Office Space\*. This is within The Army's maximum allowable requirement for office space of \_\_\_\_\_ NSF, for this facility, and we request that it be approved.

[Note: \* Space Requirement, Control No.1: Based on The Army's utilization rate target of 130 NSF per person (NSF/P), in accordance with AR 405-70, the maximum allowable office space requirement for the total number of persons being accommodated is a total of \_\_\_\_\_ NSF (i.e., \_\_\_ P x 130 NSF/P). If your space request exceeds the maximum allowable office space requirement, by any amount, the excess space cannot be validated as necessary and must be reduced to within The Army target].

## SECTION 3

## FACILITIES GUIDANCE

4. Storage Space\*\*. We can justify the need for \_\_\_\_\_ NSF of Storage Space broken down as follows:

| <u>Space Description</u> | <u>Existing NSF</u> | <u>Required NSF Justification</u> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| •                        |                     |                                   |

5. Special Space\*\*. We can justify the need for \_\_\_\_\_ NSF of Special Space broken down as follows:

| <u>Space Description</u> | <u>Existing NSF</u> | <u>Required NSF Justification</u> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| •                        |                     |                                   |

[Note: \*\* Space Requirement, Control No.2: Based on the Chief's Letter, dated \_\_\_\_, applicable to USACE-controlled space, only: the maximum allowable combined total of Storage plus Special Space for a given building is 25-percent of the maximum allowable Office Space, i.e., for this facility, it is a total of \_\_\_\_ NSF (0.25 x 130 NSF/P x \_\_\_\_ P)].

6. Admin Space: This is within the Chief's maximum allowable space requirement for Office Space plus Storage Space plus Special Space, equal to \_\_\_\_\_ NSF for this facility, and we request that it be approved.

[Note: \*\*Space Requirement, Control No.3: Based on the Chief's Letter, dated \_\_\_\_, applicable to USACE-controlled space, only: the maximum allowable combined total of Office plus Storage plus Special Space for a given building is 1.25-percent of the maximum allowable Office Space, i.e., the "Admin Space" actual, total NSF must be less than the maximum target, or under 1.62 NSF/P x No. of Persons accommodated = (1.25 x 130 NSF/P x \_\_\_\_ P). Any amount over this target must be justified].

7. Other Space\*\*\*. We can justify the need for \_\_\_\_\_ NSF of Other Space broken down as follows:

| <u>Space Description</u> | <u>Existing NSF</u> | <u>Required NSF Justification</u> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| •                        |                     |                                   |

[Note: \*\*\* Space Requirement Control No. 4: Based on MACOM Engineer Letter of Instruction, dated \_\_\_\_\_, applicable to USACE-controlled space only. Published with Logistics CMR guidance, it identifies all Other Space by name/function. As a general rule, when the "actual" approaches the "targeted," maximum amounts of Army "office space" (130 NSF/P) and "admin space" (32+130 NSF/P), the maximum target for "other" space is 38 NSF/P. This balance must be maintained to get under the HQDA ("unwritten") threshold of 200 NSF/P].

### **FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE (FEM) SYSTEM**

Facilities and Equipment Maintenance (FEM) is a Department of Defense migratory Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS). The Joint Logistics Systems Center (JLSC) developed the system to meet the needs of DoD maintenance organizations. This system was designated as a DoD migratory system in 1995. FEM is the Corps customization of MAXIMO Enterprise Base Systems (MRO Software, Inc.), which is a Commercial-Off-The-Shelf-System (COTS) package. The customization is provided to each service (Army, Navy, Air Force) to fulfill unique mission requirements. FEM integrates several plant maintenance functions into a cost-effective asset management program. It supports and consolidates functions, such as capital depreciation, equipment preventative and corrective maintenance, equipment installation, facility modification, and equipment calibration into a single management environment. The functionality also envisions an integrated application that optimizes asset use through management of corrective and preventive equipment maintenance, asset calibration, inventory and property, and maintenance budget. It provides capability to track life cycle costs of all assets, thus providing real-time accountability. In terms of expected performance outcome, deployment of FEM will standardize the maintenance business process Corps-wide. In addition, implementing FEM should reduce spare parts consumption, material purchases, maintenance labor, contract costs, calibration labor, and capital equipment acquisition. It will replace local-unique applications at several field activities, as well as automate facility and equipment maintenance management at an estimated 80% of Corps facilities, which had not developed any automation in support of their maintenance management program. FEM will also replace the corporate Vehicle Information Management (VIM) system.

FEM was designated the USACE corporate standard automated maintenance management system by the USACE Milestone Decision Authority on 10 December 1998. The Corps received Congressional support to implement in December 1999. In April 2000 the Corps entered into Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with DoD Program Manager (Navy System Support Group) for the Facilities and Equipment Maintenance (FEM) System to implement the system. The DoD Program manager provides a Corps FEM project team to manage and coordinate the development, deployment, and sustainment of the corporate Corps FEM application. Corps Headquarters has established a Corps Project Manager to serve as the Service Point of Contact for the execution of this project. The Corps has also provided representatives from the Corps maintenance community to assist in the definition of the system functional requirements and to conduct final application acceptance testing. The DoD Program Manager utilizes appropriate GSA contract vehicles to enlist the services of experienced MAXIMO implementation contractor support for the most efficient development of the USACE FEM application. The Corps FEM application has customized screens and interfaces used to provide the solution to project/plant facility and capital equipment resource planning and maintenance management. The application is designed to support current and anticipated business requirements within Corps for the next four to five year period. FEM obtained Lifecycle Management of Information Systems (LCMIS) Milestone III on 8 Feb 02. We plan to re-start USACE-wide deployment in FY 04 with and complete the implementation by FY 06.

## SECTION 3

## CIVIL WORKS GUIDANCE

The Revised Benefit Cost Analysis (BCA) completed on 21 Dec 01 by DoD FEM PM validated business value benefits with a Net Present Value of \$3.578M with annual cost avoidance of \$2.812M in FY 03 and \$4.149M in FY 04. Total estimated capitalized cost provided by DoD FEM PM: \$18,767,454. Through FY 02: \$6,947,397 for development. FY 03: \$1,807,000 for systems interface and function testing. FY 04: \$3,719,368, to begin implementation. Future years: \$6,293,682 to complete. **The POC is Thomas Verna, CECW 202-761-0036.**

**This schema reflects the funding for development, implementation, and post deployment:**

|                    | FY 02        | FY 03        | FY 04        | Future       |                   |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|
|                    | (\$M)        | (\$M)        | (\$M)        | (\$M)        |                   |
| PRIP               | 6.947        | 1.807        | 3.719        | 6.293        |                   |
| Project (Training) |              |              |              |              |                   |
| Data Conversion    |              |              |              |              |                   |
| PRIP Payback       |              |              |              |              |                   |
| DoD Maintenance    |              |              |              |              |                   |
| <b>TOTALS</b>      | <b>6,947</b> | <b>1,807</b> | <b>3,719</b> | <b>6,293</b> | <b>18,767,454</b> |

PRIP will be used to cover the capitalized costs (payback over 8 years beginning in FY 05 from appropriate accounts).

The cost for training and data conversion will be billed to the divisions, centers, and field operating activities on the year of scheduled implementation. It will be the responsibility of these elements to collect funds from subordinate activities.

The PRIP payback schedule will begin in FY 05 after the system is deployed and end in eight years. Again the division, centers, and field operating activities will be billed. This same procedure will be used to collect funds for post deployment maintenance support.

FEM implementation schedule and estimated training and data conversion cost distribution is shown below. System cost is distributed to all divisions, centers, and field operating activities based on size – one size does not fit all. There are 5 categories of size: large, medium (2 categories), and small (2 categories).

## SECTION 3

## CIVIL WORKS GUIDANCE

### USACE FEM, 2 Year Implementation Order with Dates

| Costs TBD<br>AS OF<br>05/19/04 | District     | Name  | Start<br>Changes<br>req'd | Comp<br>Changes<br>req'd | Process<br>ing<br>Center |
|--------------------------------|--------------|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                                | <b>CENWD</b> | <b><i>Northwestern Division</i></b>           | 08/04/03                  | <b>11/20/03</b>          | <b>WPC</b>               |
|                                | CENWS        | Seattle District CENWS                        | 8/04/03                   | 11/07/03                 | WPC                      |
|                                | CENWK        | Kansas City District CENWK                    | 8/07/03                   | 11/20/03                 | WPC                      |
|                                | <b>CELRD</b> | <b><i>Great Lakes &amp; Ohio Division</i></b> | 10/06/03                  | <b>8/06/04</b>           | <b>WPC</b>               |
|                                | CELRE        | Detroit District CELRE                        | 10/06/03                  | 2/06/04                  | WPC                      |
|                                | CELRH        | Huntington District CELRH                     | 10/09/03                  | 2/20/04                  | WPC                      |
|                                | CELRP        | Pittsburgh District CELRP                     | 2/17/04                   | 7/26/04                  | WPC                      |
|                                | CELRL        | Louisville District CELRL                     | 3/02/04                   | 7/12/04                  | WPC                      |
|                                | CELRN        | Nashville District CELRN                      | 3/05/04                   | 8/06/04                  | WPC                      |
|                                | CELRB        | Buffalo District CELRB                        | 3/16/04                   | 6/25/04                  | WPC                      |
|                                | CELRC        | Chicago District CELRC                        | 3/20/04                   | 6/24/04                  | WPC                      |
|                                |              |   |                           |                          |                          |
|                                | <b>CESPD</b> | <b><i>South Pacific Division CESPD</i></b>    | <b>10/13/03</b>           | <b>8/20/04</b>           | <b>WPC</b>               |
|                                | CESPA        | Albuquerque District CESPA                    | 10/13/03                  | 7/02/04                  | WPC                      |
|                                | CESPK        | Sacramento District CESPK                     | 10/27/03                  | 7/01/04                  | WPC                      |
|                                | CESPL        | Los Angeles District CESPL                    | 4/22/04                   | 8/20/04                  | WPC                      |
|                                | CESPN        | San Francisco District CESPN                  | 5/06/04                   | 8/20/04                  | WPC                      |
|                                |              |   |                           |                          |                          |
|                                | <b>CENAD</b> | <b><i>North Atlantic Division CENAD</i></b>   | <b>1/22/04</b>            | <b>7/18/05</b>           | <b>WPC</b>               |
|                                | CENAD        | Baltimore District CENAB                      | <b>1/17/05</b>            | <b>5/20/05</b>           | WPC                      |
|                                | CENAP        | Philadelphia District CENAP                   | <b>1/20/05</b>            | <b>6/06/05</b>           | WPC                      |
|                                | CENAE        | New England District CENAE                    | <b>1/31/05</b>            | <b>6/20/05</b>           | WPC                      |
|                                | CENAN        | New York District CENAN                       | <b>2/03/05</b>            | <b>7/01/05</b>           | WPC                      |
|                                | CENAO        | Norfolk District CENAO                        | <b>1/22/04</b>            | <b>5/14/04</b>           | WPC                      |
|                                | CENAU        | Europe District CENAU                         | <b>2/28/05</b>            | <b>7/18/05</b>           | CPC                      |
|                                |              |   |                           |                          |                          |
|                                | <b>CEPOD</b> | <b><i>Pacific Ocean Division CEPOD</i></b>    | <b>3/14/05</b>            | <b>8/26/05</b>           | <b>WPC</b>               |
|                                | CEPOA        | Alaska District CEPOA                         | <b>3/14/05</b>            | <b>8/01/05</b>           | WPC                      |
|                                | CEPOH        | Honolulu District CEPOH                       | <b>3/28/05</b>            | <b>8/12/05</b>           | WPC                      |
|                                | CEPOJ        | Japan District CEPOJ                          | <b>4/11/05</b>            | <b>8/19/05</b>           | WPC                      |
|                                | CEPOF        | Far East District CEPOF                       | <b>4/14/05</b>            | <b>8/26/05</b>           | WPC                      |
|                                |              |   |                           |                          |                          |

## SECTION 3

## CIVIL WORKS GUIDANCE

|   |              |  |                 |                |            |
|---|--------------|--|-----------------|----------------|------------|
|   | <b>CESWD</b> | <b><i>Southwestern Division CESWD</i></b>                      | <b>1/19/04</b>  | <b>3/10/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CESWL        | Little Rock District CESWL                                     | <b>1/19/04</b>  | <b>4/30/04</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CESWG        | Galveston District CESWG                                       | <b>10/14/04</b> | <b>2/24/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CESWF        | Fort Worth District CESWF                                      | <b>10/11/04</b> | <b>2/10/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CESWT        | Tulsa District CESWT   | <b>102504</b>   | <b>3/10/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   |              |  |                 |                |            |
|   | <b>CEMVD</b> | <b><i>Mississippi Valley Division CEMVD</i></b>                | <b>11/3/03</b>  | <b>9/23/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CEMVN        | New Orleans District CEMVN                                     | <b>10/11/04</b> | <b>3/24/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CEMVR        | Rock Island District CEMVR                                     | <b>10/25/05</b> | <b>4/07/04</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CEMVS        | St. Louis District CEMVS                                       | <b>10/28/04</b> | <b>4/21/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CEMVK        | Vicksburg District CEMVK                                       | <b>10/14/04</b> | <b>4/29/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CEMVM        | Memphis District CEMVM   | <b>11/06/03</b> | <b>4/15/04</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   |              | USACE Finance Center   | 10/11/04        | 9/23/05        | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CEMVP        | St. Paul District CEMVP  | <b>11/03/03</b> | <b>4/02/04</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   |              |  |                 |                |            |
|   | <b>CESAD</b> | <b><i>South Atlantic Division CESAD</i></b>                    | <b>10/20/03</b> | <b>9/19/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CESAM        | Mobile District CESAM  | <b>10/27/03</b> | <b>3/22/04</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   |              |  |                 |                | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | <b>CEHNC</b> | <b><i>Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville CEHNC</i></b> | <b>10/18/04</b> | <b>9/19/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   |              |  |                 |                | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CESAS        | Savannah District CESAS  | <b>2/02/04</b>  | <b>5/31/04</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CESAW        | Wilmington District CESAW                                      | <b>10/20/03</b> | <b>3/08/04</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CESAC        | Charleston District CESAC                                      | <b>2/05/04</b>  | <b>6/14/04</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CESAJ        | Jacksonville District CESAJ                                    | <b>10/23/03</b> | <b>3/22/04</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   |              |  |                 |                |            |
| <b>U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center CEERD</b> |              |  | <b>10/25/04</b> | <b>9/13/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
| Vicksburg   |              |  | 11/01/04        | 8/26/05        | CPC        |
| Champaign   |              |  | 11/08/04        | 8/30/05        | CPC        |
| Ft Belvoir  |              |  | 10/25/04        | 8/11/05        | CPC        |
| Hanover   |              |  | 11/15/04        | 9/13/05        | CPC        |
|   |              |  |                 |                |            |
|   | CEHEC        | <b><i>Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity CEHEC</i></b> | <b>10/25/04</b> | <b>8/04/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CEPPB        | <b><i>Prime Power School</i></b>                               | <b>10/25/04</b> | <b>8/08/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CETAC        | <b><i>Transatlantic Programs Center CETAC</i></b>              | <b>10/25/04</b> | <b>8/08/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |

## SECTION 3

## CIVIL WORKS GUIDANCE

FEM estimated PRIP payback and post deployment maintenance support cost:

### PRIP PAYBACK AND POST DEPLOYMENT SUPPORT COSTS

| Costs TBD | District     | Name                                   | Start           | Comp            | Processing Center |
|-----------|--------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
|           | <b>CENWD</b> | <b>Northwestern Division</b>           | <b>8/04/03</b>  | <b>11/20/03</b> | <b>WPC</b>        |
|           | CENWS        | Seattle District CENWS                 | 8/04/03         | 11/07/03        | WPC               |
|           | CENWK        | Kansas City District CENWK             | 8/07/03         | 11/20/03        | WPC               |
|           | <b>CELRD</b> | <b>Great Lakes &amp; Ohio Division</b> | <b>10/06/03</b> | <b>8/06/04</b>  | <b>WPC</b>        |
|           | CELRE        | Detroit District CELRE                 | 10/06/03        | 2/06/04         | WPC               |
|           | CELRH        | Huntington District CELRH              | 10/09/03        | 2/20/04         | WPC               |
|           | CELRP        | Pittsburgh District CELRP              | 2/17/04         | 7/26/04         | WPC               |
|           | CELRL        | Louisville District CELRL              | 3/02/04         | 7/12/04         | WPC               |
|           | CELRN        | Nashville District CELRN               | 3/05/04         | 8/06/04         | WPC               |
|           | CELRB        | Buffalo District CELRB                 | 3/16/04         | 6/25/04         | WPC               |
|           | CELRC        | Chicago District CELRC                 | 3/20/04         | 6/24/04         | WPC               |
|           |              |  |                 |                 |                   |
|           | <b>CESPD</b> | <b>South Pacific Division CESPD</b>    | <b>10/13/03</b> | <b>8/20/04</b>  | <b>WPC</b>        |
|           | CESPA        | Albuquerque District CESPA             | 10/13/03        | 7/02/04         | WPC               |
|           | CESPK        | Sacramento District CESPK              | 10/27/03        | 7/01/04         | WPC               |
|           | CESPL        | Los Angeles District CESPL             | 4/22/04         | 8/20/04         | WPC               |
|           | CESPN        | San Francisco District CESPN           | 5/06/04         | 8/20/04         | WPC               |
|           |              |  |                 |                 |                   |
|           | <b>CENAD</b> | <b>North Atlantic Division CENAD</b>   | <b>1/22/04</b>  | <b>7/18/05</b>  | <b>WPC</b>        |
|           | CENAD        | Baltimore District CENAB               | 1/17/05         | 5/20/05         | WPC               |
|           | CENAP        | Philadelphia District CENAP            | 1/20/05         | 6/06/05         | WPC               |
|           | CENAE        | New England District CENAE             | 1/31/05         | 6/20/05         | WPC               |
|           | CENAN        | New York District CENAN                | 2/03/05         | 7/01/05         | WPC               |
|           | CENAO        | Norfolk District CENAO                 | 1/22/04         | 5/14/04         | WPC               |
|           | CENAU        | Europe District CENAU                  | 2/28/05         | 7/18/05         | CPC               |
|           |              |  |                 |                 |                   |
|           | <b>CEPOD</b> | <b>Pacific Ocean Division CEPOD</b>    | <b>3/14/05</b>  | <b>8/26/05</b>  | <b>WPC</b>        |
|           | CEPOA        | Alaska District CEPOA                  | 3/14/05         | 8/01/05         | WPC               |
|           | CEPOH        | Honolulu District CEPOH                | 3/28/05         | 8/12/05         | WPC               |
|           | CEPOJ        | Japan District CEPOJ                   | 4/11/05         | 8/19/05         | WPC               |
|           | CEPOF        | Far East District CEPOF                | 4/14/05         | 8/26/05         | WPC               |

## SECTION 3

## CIVIL WORKS GUIDANCE

|   |              |  |                 |                |            |
|---|--------------|--|-----------------|----------------|------------|
|   | <b>CESWD</b> | <b><i>Southwestern Division CESWD</i></b>                      | <b>1/19/04</b>  | <b>3/10/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CESWL        | Little Rock District CESWL                                     | 1/19/04         | 4/30/04        | CPC        |
|   | CESWG        | Galveston District CESWG                                       | 10/14/04        | 2/24/05        | CPC        |
|   | CESWF        | Fort Worth District CESWF                                      | 10/11/04        | 2/10/05        | CPC        |
|   | CESWT        | Tulsa District CESWT   | 102504          | 3/10/05        | CPC        |
|   |              |  |                 |                |            |
|   | <b>CEMVD</b> | <b><i>Mississippi Valley Division CEMVD</i></b>                | <b>11/3/03</b>  | <b>9/23/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CEMVN        | New Orleans District CEMVN                                     | 10/11/04        | 3/24/05        | CPC        |
|   | CEMVR        | Rock Island District CEMVR                                     | 10/25/05        | 4/07/04        | CPC        |
|   | CEMVS        | St. Louis District CEMVS                                       | 10/28/04        | 4/21/05        | CPC        |
|   | CEMVK        | Vicksburg District CEMVK                                       | 10/14/04        | 4/29/05        | CPC        |
|   | CEMVM        | Memphis District CEMVM   | 11/06/03        | 4/15/04        | CPC        |
|   |              | USACE Finance Center   | 10/11/04        | 9/23/05        | CPC        |
|   | CEMVP        | St. Paul District CEMVP  | 11/03/03        | 4/02/04        | CPC        |
|   |              |  |                 |                |            |
|   | <b>CESAD</b> | <b><i>South Atlantic Division CESAD</i></b>                    | <b>10/20/03</b> | <b>9/19/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CESAM        | Mobile District CESAM  | 10/27/03        | 3/22/04        | CPC        |
|   |              |  |                 |                | CPC        |
|   | <b>CEHNC</b> | <b><i>Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville CEHNC</i></b> | <b>10/18/04</b> | <b>9/19/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   |              |  |                 |                | CPC        |
|   | CESAS        | Savannah District CESAS  | 2/02/04         | 5/31/04        | CPC        |
|   | CESAW        | Wilmington District CESAW                                      | 10/20/03        | 3/08/04        | CPC        |
|   | CESAC        | Charleston District CESAC                                      | 2/05/04         | 6/14/04        | CPC        |
|   | CESAJ        | Jacksonville District CESAJ                                    | 10/23/03        | 3/22/04        | CPC        |
|   |              |  |                 |                |            |
| <b>U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center CEERD</b> |              |  | <b>10/25/04</b> | <b>9/13/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
| Vicksburg   |              |  | 11/01/04        | 8/26/05        | CPC        |
| Champaign   |              |  | 11/08/04        | 8/30/05        | CPC        |
| Ft Belvoir  |              |  | 10/25/04        | 8/11/05        | CPC        |
| Hanover   |              |  | 11/15/04        | 9/13/05        | CPC        |
|   |              |  |                 |                |            |
|   | CEHEC        | <b><i>Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity CEHEC</i></b> | <b>10/25/04</b> | <b>8/04/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | CEPPB        | <b><i>Prime Power School</i></b>                               | <b>10/25/04</b> | <b>8/08/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |
|   | <b>CETAC</b> | <b><i>Transatlantic Programs Center CETAC</i></b>              | <b>10/25/04</b> | <b>8/08/05</b> | <b>CPC</b> |

## **SECTION 3**

## **CONTRACTING OUT GUIDANCE**

It is the policy of the Corps of Engineers to maintain a balanced program of in-house and contract work on all phases of the Civil Works and Military programs. The percentage of work contracted out will vary with the different programs and phases of the projects.

### **CIVIL WORKS CONTRACTING OUT GUIDANCE**

In the Planning, Engineering, and Design phases, sufficient work must be accomplished in-house to maintain the technical expertise required to properly define, manage, and review the work of architect-engineer contractors. Based on the projected size of the FY 05 Civil Works program, the programmatic level of contracting for Planning, Engineering, and Design products, that will maintain technical expertise is 40%, as measured by the Cost of Doing Business (CDB) report. While Civil Works contracting for planning, engineering, and construction phase service is no longer a Command Management Review indicator, Civil Works Engineering and Construction Division will monitor quarterly CDB summaries from the various MSC's and report those incidents where MSC's fall below 30% on the CDB.

The CDB measures contracting of products, which are produced by a team consisting of many elements of the command. While for many items, planning and engineering provide a large portion of the product, the team efforts also involve Project-Program Management, Real Estate, and other elements of the district. As such, the responsibility of maintaining an appropriate level of contracting is a corporate responsibility. The distribution of in-house and contracting work at the District level must be viewed as a command-wide action. The RBC is responsible for balancing the contracting effort across districts. While it is desirable for the various districts to maintain a uniform level of contracting, the MSC RMB may adjust the contracting level for any District to meet the current and future needs and goals of the MSC. **The POC is Don Evick, 202-761-4736.**

### **MILITARY PROGRAMS CONTRACTING OUT GUIDANCE**

Operating RBCs should perform sufficient engineering and design work in-house to maintain a high order of competence in all management, design, cost estimating, and engineering disciplines required to accomplish the design programs in a timely manner and develop and maintain a readily available work force having the capability and flexibility to quickly respond during mobilization and in natural disaster situations. Objectives of sustaining this in-house capability include: the attraction, development, and retention of capable architects, engineers, and other design professionals; the development and maintenance of a high level of expertise to advance the design professions and to provide adequate definition, direction and review of the work

## **SECTION 3**

## **CONTRACTING OUT GUIDANCE**

---

accomplished by A-E contracts; and the development and maintenance of expertise required for successful execution of design and construction programs.

For military projects, these objectives generally can be met by in-house design of 20 to 30 percent of the total military design program over an average of five program years (e.g. current Program Year  $\pm$  two years). Preparation of RFPs for design-build contracts should be included in the 5 year average. Districts and RBCs should consider this percentage range when developing manpower and operating plans. Staffing needs will vary for special situations and as annual programs change in character and project mix. In-house design of Superfund HTRW projects executed for the Environmental Protection Agency is limited to a maximum of 10 percent.

The in-house design percentage is a CCG indicator, MP - 12. RBCs may adjust the contracting level for its districts to meet the execution needs and goals of the RBC. **The POC is Ms. Susan Turek, 202-761-7426**

## SECTION 3

## COMMAND STAFF REVIEWS

### USACE ORGANIZATIONAL INSPECTION PROGRAM

1. The HQUSACE OIP will consist of Command Staff Reviews and IG Inspections.

**HQUSACE Command Strategic Reviews (CSR)** consist of a two-day visit to USACE Divisions by the DCG and selected staff principals once in every 24-month cycle. The proponent will make specific implementation guidance available. A CSI schedule is provided below to cover the next three fiscal years.

**IG Inspections** will be conducted by the Office of the Engineer Inspector General in accordance with the provisions of AR 20-1 and AR 1-201. The Commander will direct inspection focus and scheduling.

2. The OIP for USACE Divisions and the 249<sup>th</sup> Engineer Battalion (Prime Power) will consist of Command Reviews and Staff Assistance Visits.

Division commanders and the 249<sup>th</sup> Engineer Battalion Commander will conduct **Command Reviews** of their respective organizations. The frequency and scope of these inspections will be tailored to meet the needs of each commander.

Division staffs and the 249<sup>th</sup> Engineer Battalion staff, as directed by the respective commander or staff principal, will conduct **Staff Assistance Visits**.

3. The POC is **Toni Trombecky, 202-761-7528**.

#### FY 05-07 Command Review Dates:

| <u>FY 05</u>  | <u>FY 06</u>      | <u>FY 07</u> |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Nov 2004 SPD  | Nov 2005 MVD/ERDC | Nov 2006 SPD |
| Jan 2005 TAC* | Jan 2006 SAD      | Jan 2007 SWD |
| Mar 2005 SWD  | Mar 2006 LRD      | Mar 2007 POD |
| May 2005 POD  | May 2006 NAD      | May 2007 NWD |
| Jul 2005 NWD  | Jul 2006 HNC*     |              |

\*TAC and HNC as support commands are reviewed once every 36 months.

## SECTION 3

## CONFERENCES

ER 37-1-18 provides guidance and instructions for conducting all USACE sponsored meetings and conferences. (This ER is being updated but the update will not change basic content herein). The CG has approved the following *Standard Recurring Approved Conferences* that support our strategic vision. Other meetings that involve 25 or more Department of The Army (DA) personnel in a TDY status are *Special Meetings* that are approved on an 'as needed' basis. MSC Commanders, HQUSACE Management Staff will follow ER 37-1-18 in gaining these approvals. **The POC is Mark Guest, 202-761-4649.**

### HQUSACE STANDARD RECURRING APPROVED CONFERENCES

Senior Leaders' Conference (with the associated Emerging Leaders Conference)  
Spring USACE Leaders Workshop (with ENFORCE)      Security and Law Enforcement Conference  
Fall District Commanders Conference (in DC)      CP-55 Career Program Managers Workshop  
\* Worldwide DPW Training Workshop      National Regulatory Conference  
\* Project Delivery Team Conference<sup>1</sup>      Public Affairs Conference  
\* USACE Technical Transfer Conference<sup>2</sup>      PARC Roundtable Conference  
\* Navigation Conference (*PL95-269 & WRDA*)      Hispanic Engineer National Achievement  
Small Business Conference (in DC)      Awards Corporation Conference (HENAAC)  
CP-18 Career Program Managers Seminar  
Worldwide USACE Legal Services Conference  
Real Estate Conference  
Finance and Accounting Conference  
Resource Management Conference  
Information Managers Symposium

These HQUSACE sponsored Conferences will have specific mission purposes, clearly written objectives, and After Action Reviews (AAR) to assess if objectives were met. HQUSACE Management Staff will include success in meeting conference/workshop objectives in appropriate senior leaders' performance evaluations.

The intent of the Commander is also that MSC and Center Commanders plan for and conduct staff rides at least annually as a means of communicating and facilitating teamwork among our people.

\* The MP and CW managed Conferences will have a total not to exceed 3200 mandays per year.

---

1 The focus audience for this conference will be division chiefs at district, division and HQs, representing the disciplines that comprise the project team concept for cradle to grave project management. Intent is to facilitate the maturation of this project management concept, eliminate stovepipe mentality, and to engrain this concept into our organization culture. The focus of each year's conference would vary based on different phases of a project. While each conference would include representation from all the disciplines comprising the project team, attendance would be weighted towards those disciplines supporting that conference's focus area. This strategy supports the "train the trainer" concept as only a fraction of the leadership involved with project management across districts and divisions will be able to attend each year. Annual scheduling provides the ability to establish continuity between conferences and over time to reach a greater percentage of Corps employees associated with the project management process.

2 The conferences conducted within this framework will consist of a series of workshops that will have written objectives and specific mission purposes approved by the Deputy Commanding General(s) of MP & CW. The number, size and type of workshops will vary each year, but the total number of mandays involved would remain relatively constant. The focus audience of the workshops would generally be below the branch chief level. Each workshop will focus on a particular discipline, with the purpose of disseminating information, receiving feedback, sharing lessons learned and best practices, and clarifying guidance to assure that critical policies, methods and resolutions of major issues are understood.

## SECTION 3

## USACE MGT CONTROL PLAN

1. Army Regulation 11-2, Management Control (1 August 1994), directs that organizations develop a Management Control Plan (MCP) describing how their required management control evaluations will be conducted over a five-year period. Our five-year plan covers FY 04–08, and is located on the HQ, USACE website under Resource Management, Business Practices, Management Directed Programs, Management Control Program. Updates to our MCP will be published in conjunction with Army updates. (RM website URL: <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/rm/business/programs.htm>)
2. The USACE MCP is a compilation of appropriate Army functions requiring Management Control Evaluations and other areas identified by HQUSACE functional staff. You should tailor this plan to your specific workload and environment. As in the past, the mandatory evaluation areas on this plan plus any others you consider appropriate will constitute the MCP for MSCs, ERDC, TAC, HNC, districts, and FOAs.
3. Management control evaluations may be conducted in one of two ways—management control checklists or existing management review processes. Checklists and key management controls for FY 04–08 are in the USACE MCP which can be found on the RM website. Existing review processes acceptable for use by USACE organizations to evaluate key management controls include reports of Command Staff Inspections, Command Management Reviews, Command and Staff Assistance Visits, and scheduled audits/inspections by other internal or external agencies. Another source of Army’s mandatory control areas is the Assistant Secretary of The Army, Financial Management and Comptroller (ASA (FM&C)), website. Upon opening the website, click on the first entry “Army Management Control Evaluations” and follow the directions given thereafter. (ASA(FM&C) website URL: <http://www.asafm.army.mil/fo/fod/mc/mc.asp>)
4. Management controls monitoring and evaluation is a year-round activity. The formal process generally begins each year in April or May with the publication by ASA (FM&C) of the requirements for reporting on Management Controls within the Department of The Army. The process culminates in September or October with the Secretary of The Army’s Annual Statement of Assurance on Management Controls to the Secretary of Defense. These requirements are then incorporated into the data call published by HQUSACE forwarded to subordinate USACE organizations. The data collected is then analyzed and incorporated into the annual statement from the Chief of Engineers/Commanding General, USACE, to the Secretary of The Army.
5. **Proponent for this process is CERM-P (Pamla Washington, 202-761-4886).**

## SECTION 3

## USACE SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM

The USACE Small Business Office provides command-wide management oversight to the USACE Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization (SADBU) Program and sustains the U. S. Army USACE (USACE) as a premier organization in developing small businesses and assuring them the opportunity to participate in our procurements. Public Law 95-507 established the OSADBU to focus on developing our economic base through a strong program supporting small business. The organizational mission is to maximize contract awards to Small Businesses (including various socio-economic program subcategories). Functionally, the office promulgates policy, establishes procedures, publishes direction and guidance for USACE MSCs/Regional Business Centers and Districts; acts as principal advisor to the USACE Command Group at Headquarters in Washington, DC as well as Division Headquarters via National Office staff located forward at one of two paired Division Commands on all matters pertaining to the Small Business Program. The office also provides functional oversight and guidance to Commanders and their Deputies for Small Business at the Districts. The Chief of Small Business (GS-15) is appointed by the Commander pursuant to DoD Directive 4205.1. Via the Small Business Community of Practice, the office helps to strengthen economic development and maximize small business participation in our programs.

The Small Business office staff develop and assign command-wide performance goals designed to meet Army-assigned goals for all socioeconomic elements of the Program, and establishes and maintains continuing liaison with industry via outreach counseling. Develops/implements innovative methods for doing business with all businesses that qualify under the various socioeconomic programs. Supports members of Congress through participation in Business Opportunity and Federal Procurement Conferences. Acts as initial POC and focal point for industry inquiries. Specific performance targets for FY 05 through FY 08 projected to be assigned by the Secretary of the Army are listed in table. Not all statutory goals are identified in the table below as they are not included in Secretary of The Army's performance targets for USACE. All statutory goals can be found in Public Laws. The POC is Judith Blake, 202-761-8789.

| Scorecard Elements                            | FY 05 Target | FY 06 Target | FY 07 Target | FY 08 Target |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>PRIME Contracting</b>                      |              |              |              |              |
| Small Business                                | 42.4%        | 43.2%        | 43.4%        | 43.6%        |
| Small Disadvantaged Business                  | 16.7%        | 16.9%        | 16.9%        | 17.1%        |
| HUBZone Small Business                        | 3.2%         | 3.3%         | 3.4%         | 3.5%         |
| Women-Owned Small Business                    | 5.6%         | 5.7%         | 5.8%         | 5.9%         |
| HBCU/MI                                       | 18.6%        | 18.6%        | 18.8%        | 18.6%        |
| Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business | 3.0%         | 3.0%         | 3.0%         | 3.0%         |
| <b>Subcontracting</b>                         |              |              |              |              |
| Small Business                                | 73.5%        | 74.5%        | 74.5%        | 74.5%        |
| Small Disadvantaged Business                  | 10.6%        | 10.7%        | 10.7%        | 10.7%        |
| HUBZone Small Business                        | 3.2%         | 3.2%         | 3.2%         | 3.2%         |
| Women-Owned Small Business                    | 11.0%        | 11.2%        | 11.2%        | 11.2%        |
| Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business | 3.0%         | 3.0%         | 3.0%         | 3.0%         |

## **SECTION 3            SPT TO NATIONALIZED EMPLOYEES**

---

Support to Headquarters (HQ) Nationalized Function Personnel Duty Stationed at Regional Business Centers (RBCs)

1. As a result of the USACE 2012 realignment plan, certain support office functions including Counsel, Human Resources, Internal Review, Equal Employment Opportunity, Safety, and Small and Disadvantaged Business, have become “nationalized” under the Headquarters (HQ) - Washington Level. Although personnel in these functional areas are assigned to the HQ Manpower Management Document (MMD), some are duty-stationed at the Regional Business Center (RBC) geographical locations.
  
2. Because it is impractical to provide most operational support to these personnel from the Washington, DC area, the HQ - Washington Level has negotiated an agreement to define the terms and conditions for the RBC to provide the support. A standard, simplified cost model has been developed to accommodate reimbursement for services to be rendered including rent and utilities, and seat management. Seat management is defined as a standard, flat rate method of charging for support provided to each workstation/office in the RBC occupied by nationalized function personnel. Reimbursement for cost associated with as-requested services will be negotiated separately. Nationalized offices will coordinate with each RBC to identify unique support requirements (ex. administrative support or additional equipment) that may require transfer of funds between RBCs or HQ funding through a government order or labor charge code for cross charged labor.
  
3. Reimbursable support costs are quantified below for rent and utilities, and seat management. Funds will be transferred from HQUSACE to the RBCs in the amounts identified below for FY05:

| <b>RBC</b> | <b>Standard<br/>Workstation<br/>@ \$11.0K per<br/>FTE</b> | <b>Enhanced<br/>Workstation<br/>@ \$11.5K per<br/>FTE</b> | <b>Rent<br/>and/or<br/>Maint per<br/>FTE</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------|---|---|--|--------------|
| LRD        | 6   | 2   | 5,948  | 136,584      |
| MVD        | 7   | 1   | 8,155  | 153,740      |
| NAD        | 7   | 1   | 4,190  | 122,020      |
| NWD        | 7   | 2   | 6,074  | 146,129      |
| POD        | 6   | 1   | 2,592  | 95,644       |
| SAD        | 7   | 2   | 7,081  | 163,729      |
| SPD        | 7   | 1   | 9,243  | 162,444      |
| SWD        | 8   | 2   | 5,225  | 163,250      |
|            |   |   |  | 1,143,540    |