



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers**

**USACE  
Fiscal Year 2002  
Consolidated  
Command  
Guidance**

---

---

**HQUSACE  
May/July 2001**

---

## FOREWORD

---

The Fiscal Year 2002 (FY 02) Consolidated Command Guidance (CCG) is the Command's near-term blueprint for fulfilling our vision. This year our near-term guidance continues to emphasize longer-term matters, in addition to the current year 2002 focus. We again address projections three years out to provide a backdrop that will assist our Regional Management Boards (RMBs) in developing their three-year operating budgets.

My guidance to you is to review both your near-term and longer-term initiatives in the context of our refreshed Vision and the USACE Campaign Plan. To assist you in this effort, this year's CCG again presents an updated roadmap and narrative describing our evolving Strategic Management Process. The revised Command Management Review (CMR) discussed in this document will provide us a tool to help improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our daily operations. The Strategic Management Review (SMR) process and indicators described herein will also evolve to better reflect the refreshed Vision and Campaign Plan. Our goal is to make these SMR metrics a valuable mechanism for shaping and measuring strategic change, and for keeping us on the strategic path outlined in the Vision document.

Please ensure your own strategic focus helps our command accomplish the three strategic goals contained in the USACE Vision: People, Process, and Communication and implement their supporting strategies described in the USACE Campaign Plan. We will be concentrating on these three goals during the years I am privileged to serve as your Commander.

By pursuing these goals, living the Army Values, and implementing my four imperatives for individual behavior, we can dramatically enhance our support to the Army and the Nation.

### ESSAYONS!



ROBERT B. FLOWERS  
Lieutenant General, USA  
Commanding

**FY 02 CONSOLIDATED COMMAND GUIDANCE**

---

**CONTENTS**

---

**INTRODUCTION ..... i**

**CHAPTER 1 USACE STRATEGIC PLANNING ..... 1-1**

**CHAPTER 2 RESOURCES ..... 2-1**

**CHAPTER 3 MEASURES OF SUCCESS ..... 3-1**

**ANNEX A - RELATIONSHIP OF THE CCG TO PUBLIC LAW ..... A-1**

---

# INTRODUCTION

---

## GENERAL

The CCG is a single document which for the past several years has presented a summary of USACE's strategic direction, resource guidance, and performance requirements for the upcoming fiscal year and outyears. The Strategic Management Review (SMR), CMR and other types of performance review sessions have and will provide mission execution feedback to USACE Commanders.

## USES AND ORGANIZATION OF THE CCG:

1. FY 02 Consolidated Command Guidance is a major command-level document that outlines USACE resources and procedures to monitor mission execution. This document:
  - a. Links the Corps Strategic Vision and the command-wide corporate strategic focus areas to mission resourcing and execution: Chapter 1.
  - b. Provides a road map for the resources available to the Corps: Chapter 2.
  - c. Establishes the FY 02 Performance Execution targets and the SMR/CMR indicators: Chapter 3.
  - d. Documents as guidance the SMR strategic indicators and goals by which we have chosen to specify our strategic change goals.
2. Consolidated Guidance will be used by HQUSACE to:
  - a. Transmit changes in Manpower and Budget Guidance as required.
  - b. Establish mission execution visibility and accountability at operational levels: Major Subordinate Commands (MSCs), Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC), Field Operating Activities (FOAs) and Districts.
3. Major Subordinate Commanders, District Commanders, ERDC Commander, and FOA Directors are expected to use the CCG to help them establish:
  - a. Organizational goals, objectives, plans, schedules and milestones to support the Corps' Vision.
  - b. A performance monitoring system (SMR) prescribes performance changes required to achieve the USACE strategic goals.

---

## INTRODUCTION

---

c. The systems to provide a free-flow of data and information throughout the Command and HQUSACE.

### Changes for FY 02:

1. One valid criticism of previous years' Consolidated Command Guidance documents was that the entire document was never coordinated or integrated thoroughly at HQUSACE. This FY 02 CCG has been fully coordinated and integrated at HQUSACE.
2. Workload figures, previously provided in past years, will no longer be published in the CCG. Workload data was only updated once a year and published in the CCG. MSC workload figures became obsolete too quickly. The workload figures previously published in the CCG can still be found in the Integrated Command Resource Information (ICRI) data tables at the following web site: <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/rm/tools/icri.html>

# FY 02 CONSOLIDATED COMMAND GUIDANCE

---

## CHAPTER 1

---

### USACE STRATEGIC PLANNING

The day after LTG Flowers assumed command as the 50th Chief of Engineers, in October 2000, he and 70 of the top military and civilian leaders from throughout USACE gathered in Norfolk, Virginia, at the annual Senior Leaders Conference to begin strategic planning efforts for his tenure. These leaders addressed 4 sequential strategic questions in their workshops and general sessions:

**“What is it that the Army and the Nation need from the Corps of Engineers?”**

**“Which of our current initiatives for improving the Corps are relevant to those needs?”**

**“In what ways should the USACE Vision be refreshed to adapt to current requirements?”**

**“What specific steps should be taken to better support the Army and the Nation?”**

In November, the Chief convened a workshop with interested stakeholders from inside and outside the Federal government to provide him with their various views on issues to address during his tenure. The following month he initiated efforts at refreshing the USACE Vision and producing a USACE Campaign Plan.

The drafting of the refreshed USACE Vision document and Campaign Plan was done by a group of senior leaders at HQUSACE. These leaders received significant input from the MSC Commanders and District Commanders during two separate conferences in January 2001. Others throughout USACE provided additional input, in response to the draft versions of those two documents available through the internet. The two documents were approved by LTG Flowers and published simultaneously 30 March 2001.

The direction setting USACE Vision document and the more detailed USACE Campaign Plan jointly provide guidance on how USACE will further improve its service to the Army and the Nation. This will be through emphasis on three specific strategic goal areas: People, Process, and Communication. People are the foundation of the Corps, Process enables our effectiveness, and Communication is fundamental in our role as public servants.

The creation of a refreshed Vision document and Campaign Plan represent the prudent measures undertaken by any new Chief of Engineers, especially one assuming command at almost the same time as a new presidential administration is chosen. This effort affirmed many of the ongoing initiatives, such as the institution of Regional Business Centers and the widespread use of the Project Management Business Process, and identified additional ones fitting within the areas of the three strategic goals. Status updates from last year's CCG and key elements of the strategic objectives detailed in the USACE Campaign Plan are shown below.

### **Status Update on Selected New USACE Initiatives**

LTG Flowers, as the 50<sup>th</sup> Chief of Engineers and Commander, USACE, is committed to increasing our service to the Army and the Nation. Our missions--Field Force Engineering/ENGLINK and contingency support; domestic and international response, recovery and redevelopment; life cycle engineering supporting our soldiers, their families and the public; management and stewardship of water resources; and regulatory actions and environmental stewardship--are diverse and critical to the well-being of the Nation

We have major initiatives underway to support Army Transformation and our installations; to implement several critical knowledge/technology management programs; and to execute our assigned missions and executive agency roles. We have identified to the Army leadership key unresourced requirements including Field Force Engineering/ENGLINK, installation support, establishment of the Support Command, and the enhancement of our Executive Agent missions (DOD Recruiting Facilities Program, Engineers and Scientist and Real Estate career program management, topographic support, and disposal of three deactivated nuclear-power plants). We will continue to work closely with HQDA as unresourced requirements evolve—especially in areas driven by Transformation (e.g. real estate services, environmental services, installation support).

We are also working with the Army leadership on several issues that affect us across the command. Training of **all USACE personnel** is critical and we are working to ensure that our training requirements are identified and resourced. We are also continuing to address a critical shortfall in our officer allocations. Additionally, we have re-stated to the Chief of Staff of the Army, the adverse impact of the loss of our MILCON contingency funding.

The Army Transformation Campaign Plan requires that support to Transformation be conducted within existing processes, systems and budgets. This means that USACE must simultaneously provide engineering support for recapitalizing and sustaining our Legacy Forces, upgrading Fort Lewis' infrastructure to support the first two (initial) Brigade Combat Teams, while assisting the Army in defining, designing, constructing and maintaining "Fort Future". I have established a USACE Transformation Task Force to match requirements with appropriate/necessary USACE capabilities and to assist proponents in integrating engineer support across all lines of operations. Our unresourced requirement for this initiative is approximately \$15 million annually.

Our research and development programs have been closely aligned with the projected capabilities of the Objective Force. Our focus is on providing a common “digital and dynamic” operating environment that provides a more effective platform for the exploitation of modeling and simulation in the acquisition process for the Future Combat Systems. We are also developing more effective means to support deployment of forces through rapid airfield construction, increasing port and over the shore logistics capabilities, and enhancing force protection in contingency operations. Finally we are creating a new suite of tools that will employ modeling and simulation to support the transformation of installations to meet the deployment, readiness and wellness needs of the objective forces.

We are organizing our USACE command structure to better support the CINCs. We are establishing a single organization—the Support Command—which will provide command and control for the Europe District, Transatlantic Programs Center, the Huntsville Engineering and Support Center, the Engineering Research and Development Command, the 249<sup>th</sup> Engineer Battalion (Prime Power) and the Prime Power School (52E MOS school). Our unresourced requirement for the Support Command is \$10 million annually.

Enhancing our Executive Agent missions will require additional funding. I have requested the following resource amounts in our last Program Objective Memorandum (POM) to enhance these missions:

DOD Recruiting Facilities Program	(\$16 million annually)
Engineers and Scientists and Real Estate Career Programs	(\$365K annually)
Topographic Support	(\$10 million annually)
Disposal of Deactivated Nuclear Power Plants	(\$13 million annually)

### **Status Updates from Selected Initiatives Described in the FY 01 CCG**

#### **a. Capable Workforce Development.**

NWD was the designated “test division” for the Capable Workforce pilot project – a Corps-wide initiative. At the February 2001 Board of Directors meeting, NWD presented their conclusions and offered their recommendations for Command-wide consideration. LTG Flowers directed his MSC Commanders to capitalize on the lesson learned by NWD and adapt the NWD concepts to their own commands, as appropriate.

#### **b. Corporate Information.**

Critical success for USACE in this domain can be defined as creating an environment that fully leverages Information Technology (IT) products and services throughout the Corps. The Corporate Information professional community must partner with business process owners to effectively provide the Corps

team, as well as their customers & stakeholders, the right information - the right knowledge any time and any place. Elements essential to achieving this environment include wide/local area networks and their associated hardware and software, supercomputers, desktop computers, commercial-off-the-shelf office automation software, and the radio infrastructure. The most indispensable assets however, are the corporate business information systems operating on this infrastructure, providing direct support to customers in the accomplishment of their missions.

Effectively operating within this environment will require developing sound processes that ensure the design, deployment, operations and maintenance (O&M) of our suite of corporate automated business systems - as well as our network infrastructure. Establishing these processes will lead to automated tools and services that provide full functionality, reliability, responsiveness, and accessibility to Corps customers. The USACE Chief Information Officer (CIO) staff, along with the Regional CIOs, must continue to forge effective partnerships with USACE functional areas and stakeholders to ensure that IT is strategically aligned to meet business processes. This alignment is essential to accomplish interoperability; IT innovation, systems modernization (integration & reliability), information security, and capture of explicit and tacit organizational knowledge (Knowledge Management). We must pursue innovative and expeditious approaches to insert new IT while mitigating risk, and distancing ourselves from lengthy contracting and development efforts. Economies of scale in building the USACE networked, multi-tier architecture must be a continuing goal, as well as reducing duplications and inefficiencies. We must also develop strategies to enhance the core competencies of our existing USACE IT workforce and provide them a roadmap to become professionals in this field.

There are four areas of emphasis for the FY 02 in the Command guidance. They are:

1. Implementation and maintenance of an aggressive information assurance (IA) program;
2. Modernization and enhancement of command's Corps of Engineers Enterprise Infrastructure Services (CEEIS), in particular the communications network and its administration;
3. Proactive partnerships with Headquarters proponents to institutionalize best software engineering practices and IT project Life Cycle Management Processes.
4. Improvement in IT Capital Planning, Investment and Decision process.

The enterprise-wide initiatives associated with the above four areas, and their impact upon Regional Business Center and District planning, will be covered in Chapter 2; Section 3, Procedural Guidance for Information Technology.

**c. Regional Management Boards (RMBs), and the overall Regional Business Center (RBC) Initiative.**

All MSC headquarters offices have been restructured to better accommodate their new roles as managers of the Regional Business Centers, with new Business Management Offices, updated position descriptions and duties for many personnel, and increased emphasis on regional management activities. Based on experience from the first two years of RBC operations, a HQUSACE RBC Steering Group has been established to provide overall USACE direction.

## **Summary of Strategic Objectives in the USACE Campaign Plan**

### **People**

**Strategic Objective 1:** Attract and retain a world-class workforce.

**Strategic Objective 2:** Create a learning organization.

**Strategic Objective 3:** Develop leaders at all levels.

### **Process**

**Strategic Objective 1:** Practice Project Management across all levels.

**Strategic Objective 2:** One Corps, operating regionally and globally.

**Strategic Objective 3:** Enhance capabilities to create synergy between economic objectives and environmental values.

### **Communication**

**Strategic Objective 1:** Develop key strategic messages that foster understanding of service to the nation.

**Strategic Objective 2:** Develop a work climate that is open, informed, and actively engaged in listening and being responsive.

**Strategic Objective 3:** Build effective relationships with external partners, stakeholders, and customers.

**Strategic Objective 4:** Integrate strategic communications into our business processes.

## THE USACE STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT PROCESS

The USACE Strategic Management Process (SMP) continues to evolve toward being a permanent part of USACE operations. USACE leaders try to balance the principles of sound internal strategic management, as applied in the private sector, with the requirements of a public sector agency influenced by several key governing cycles: those of federal appropriations on an annual basis, congressional elections every two years, and presidential elections every four years. In addition, USACE responds to several different external centers of authority, in the Administration, in the Pentagon, and in the Congress.

In order to dovetail with the four-year command cycle for the Chief of Engineers, USACE strategic planning and management needs to combine long-term planning with shorter-term strategies and actions, and to link our budgeting decisions to the planning effort. The optimal long-term planning effort for USACE would commence at some point in the middle of each Chief's tenure, to lay the groundwork for strategic decisions by the next Chief. This effort would culminate shortly after the change of command, when the new Chief would review strategic recommendations for applicability to his new responsibility. Then, during his first six months, the new Chief would incorporate the results of this long-range planning effort with his current imperatives to refresh the USACE Vision and adopt the major initiatives to be emphasized during his tenure. This approach is designed to make the SMP an established routine recognized by Corps leaders as an effective, fair and efficient forward-based management planning tool.

From the standpoint of strategic management, the remainder of each Chief's term would involve the implementation, measurement, and fine-tuning of his strategic initiatives. This process would then partially overlap with the initiation of the next long-range planning effort.

To complement formal USACE strategic planning it is imperative for all USACE leaders to "manage strategically" in their day to day activities. The designated structural components of the SMP are described and discussed below.

- Strategic Management Board (SMB). This body consists of the assembled HQUSACE General Officer and Senior Executive Service members who are stationed at HQUSACE. The purpose of the SMB is to discuss, and/or make recommendations on, strategic issues of significance to HQUSACE. The SMB was chartered to establish a structure and process for our HQ SES and GO members to jointly engage in strategic dialogue. Recommendations of the SMB typically have been discussed, reviewed, and decided on at the quarterly Board of Directors meetings.

- The Command Council (CC) (formerly Board of Directors). To date this group has consisted of all HQ GOs, all MSC and Center Commanders, plus six SESs (currently three from HQUSACE and three from the MSCs). Their purpose is to address strategic issues and make recommendations to the Commanding General (as CC chair). Each member has selected an Emerging Leader Program graduate to serve as a staff assistant to their CC member. The Emerging Leaders Conference (ELC) CC Liaison Team serves as support staff as well as participating as shadows to this strategic process, thereby observing how leaders lead, how issues progress from concepts to decisions. Each quarter, the ELC support team has received a team assignment topic on which the CC elicits their perspectives and advice. The BOD/CC presentations and fact sheets are posted on the USACE (corpsinfo) intranet.
- Command Management Review (CMR). The CMR is a quarterly two-hour meeting in which all HQUSACE Staff principals meet jointly with all MSC Commanders to address measures of operational efficiency and effectiveness. These measures are portrayed and compared across all MSCs to depict a Corps-wide status report that identifies areas for improvement and promotes sharing of best practices. The CMR is always scheduled in conjunction with Command Council sessions, in order to minimize travel requirements and provide a standard sequence of events. CMR charts are posted on the USACE INET web site: <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/rm/rmpg/cmr/cmr.html>. Although we strive for stability in CMR measures, there is generally some change in measures through the year (see Chapter 3 of this document for guidance on recurring CMR measures). Additionally, we have adopted a more balanced and less quantitative set of strategic measures that we have titled the Strategic Management Review (SMR). The SMR is modeled on the Balanced Scorecard concept that addresses how well the organization is changing toward its stated strategic goals through a balanced approach to measurement (more strategic qualitative and quantitative measures, with both short-term and long-term financial and non-financial components, and from internal and external perspectives). As the metrics of the Campaign Plan are refined, the SMR measures will likewise evolve. One key is to ensure that USACE's standardized information systems are capable of populating metrics used to measure both tactical and strategic progress and problems.
- Senior Leaders Conference (SLC). The SLC is an annual conference held in the late summer/early fall that brings together all USACE SESs, MSC and Center Commanders, HQUSACE Staff Principals, and FOA Directors. This conference constitutes an annual senior level working session at which strategic issues are briefed, discussed, and worked. It is through this milieu that the Commander is able to ensure focus and clarity of senior leadership with regard to his key strategic initiatives. See the INET SLC home page for details of last year's and this year's SLC dates, location, agenda, briefings, and photographic record: <http://www.usace.army.mil/essc/slc>.

- Emerging Leaders Conference (ELC). Conducted concurrently with the SLC, the ELC is an annual conference held for a group of competitively selected mid-level USACE personnel. This is a combined educational and networking opportunity for this select group. The ELC agenda consists of both individual assessment modules as well as attendance at joint SLC-ELC sessions where major strategic issues are briefed and discussed. From a strategic perspective, the ELC is a major investment in developing USACE's future leaders in the strategic dialogue.
- District Engineers Conferences. Twice annually the USACE District Engineers meet to address strategic issues, exchange lessons learned, make recommendations to the Commander, and receive his guidance. First, typically in the fall, the District Engineers assemble in Washington, D.C., for a two-day session of corporate updates, strategic dialogue, and face-to-face idea exchanges with the Commander. In the spring, they travel to Ft. Leonard Wood to join with MSC Commanders, SESs, HQUSACE senior staff, and the other members of the Engineer Regiment to focus primarily on project and policy updates and team building events. Although this spring session at Ft. Leonard Wood is not a USACE-only event, it is a recurring opportunity to coalesce the energy of the USACE headquarters and field leadership.
- Command Inspections. An annual series of Command inspection visits which the Deputy Commanding General and the HQUSACE staff principals conduct to ensure regional level implementation of the Strategic Vision. The agenda for these visits is structured around the three strategic goals of People, Process, and Communication. All read aheads and after-action reports methodically enumerate (function-by-function) how the MSC's are addressing those goals. The format and schedule for the next two years of Command Inspections is provided at Chapter 2 of this document.
- Consolidated Command Guidance (CCG). This annual guidance document strives to issue both the strategic and tactical guidance required for major and recurring matters of significance Command-wide. This document is provided in hard copy as well as on the INET home page: <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/rm/rmpg/rmpg.htm>.

Strategic planning always carries a degree of risk associated with change. The current environment in which we are operating includes a new Administration, a statutory quadrennial Defense review and the Transformation of the Army. Because of the volume and significance of these changes, we are faced with changing resource levels/expectations. The FY 02 President's Budget, which normally would have been submitted to Congress in February of this year, has not yet been finalized. The Service FY 03-07 Program Objective Memorandums which were originally due to OSD in May of this year are still on hold pending OSD guidance. We will provide information as soon as we receive it—in the meantime, we will have to work with the latest.

## **RELATIONSHIP OF THE CCG TO PUBLIC LAW**

The CCG is built on a clear and modern foundation of public laws. The four pillars of management in the U.S. Government noted below are dynamic, fully implemented by most Government organizations and directive in nature for all U.S. Executive Agencies. Our CCG and, indeed, our entire existing—and future—USACE management organization must answer to these Federal mandates. It follows then that our CCG must be fashioned so as to carefully reflect each of the following four overarching Public Laws for management.

- Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, (CFO)  
(Public Law 101-576)
- Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, (GPRA or Results Act)  
(Public Law 103-62)
- Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, (PRA)  
(Public Law 104-13)
- Clinger-Cohen Act, (formerly referred to as the Information  
Technology Management Reform Act [ITMRA])  
(Public Law 104-106), 1996

The relationship of our USACE CCG to each of these preeminent public laws is briefly summarized in Annex A.

**FY 02 CONSOLIDATED COMMAND GUIDANCE**

---

**CHAPTER 2**

---

**RESOURCES**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. GENERAL REMARKS .....</b>	<b>2-3</b>
<b>2. PROGRAMMATIC OVERVIEW</b>	
<b>SELECTIVE DISCRETIONARY DOD PROGRAM FUNDS .....</b>	<b>2-4</b>
<b>USACE PROGRAM SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>2-5</b>
<b>CUSTOMER MSC/LAB OVERVIEW</b>	
<b>MILITARY PROGRAM MANAGERS .....</b>	<b>2-6</b>
<b>MP CONSTRUCTION, ARMY .....</b>	<b>2-7</b>
<b>MP CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE .....</b>	<b>2-8</b>
<b>MP CONSTRUCTION, DOD AND OTHER .....</b>	<b>2-9</b>
<b>MP INSTALLATION SUPPORT OFFICES .....</b>	<b>2-10</b>
<b>MP OMA DERP - IRP .....</b>	<b>2-11</b>
<b>MP OMA DERP - FUDS .....</b>	<b>2-12</b>
<b>MP BRAC - ER .....</b>	<b>2-13</b>
<b>MP EQ PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>2-14</b>
<b>MP OMA DERP - OTHER DOD .....</b>	<b>2-15</b>
<b>CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM MANAGERS .....</b>	<b>2-16</b>
<b>CW GENERAL EXPENSES .....</b>	<b>2-17</b>
<b>CW GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS .....</b>	<b>2-18</b>
<b>CW CONSTRUCTION GENERAL .....</b>	<b>2-19</b>
<b>CW O&amp;M GENERAL .....</b>	<b>2-20</b>
<b>CW MR&amp;T .....</b>	<b>2-21</b>
<b>CW REGULATORY PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>2-22</b>
<b>CW OTHER DIRECT (FUSRAP) .....</b>	<b>2-23</b>
<b>CW OTHER DIRECT (FCCE) .....</b>	<b>2-24</b>
<b>CW OTHER DIRECT (COASTAL WETLANDS) .....</b>	<b>2-25</b>
<b>CW EPA SUPERFUND .....</b>	<b>2-26</b>
<b>CW OTHER ERS .....</b>	<b>2-27</b>
<b>CW OTHER INTERAGENCY &amp; INTERNATIONAL SERVICE (IIS).....</b>	<b>2-28</b>

**RESOURCES (CONT'D)**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
REAL ESTATE PROGRAM MANAGERS .....	2-29
RE DOD RECRUITING, LEASE ADMINISTRATION .....	2-30
RE DOD RECRUITING & USACE GSA OCCUPIED LEASES .....	2-31
RE CIVIL DIRECT.....	2-32
RE CIVIL REIMBURSABLE .....	2-33
RE HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROG (LABOR & WKLD) .....	2-34
RE OPERATIONS, ARMY REIMBURSABLE .....	2-35
RE OPERATIONS, AIR FORCE REIMBURSABLE .....	2-36
RE SUPPORT TO ARMY .....	2-37
RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM MANAGERS .....	2-38
R&D ERDC .....	2-39
<b>3. OTHER - PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE</b>	
HR REGIONALIZATION .....	2-40
USACE FINANCE CENTER RATES .....	2-42
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT) .....	2-44
MILITARY PROGRAMS STANDARD DEFINITIONS .....	2-51
MILITARY PROGRAMS INSTALLATION SUPPORT PROGRAM .....	2-52
MANPOWER .....	2-53
HIGH GRADE ALLOCATIONS .....	2-54
EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT FUNDING .....	2-55
SUPERVISION & ADMINISTRATION (S&A) .....	2-56
COST OF DOING BUSINESS .....	2-58
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT .....	2-60
PLANT REPLACEMENT AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (PRIP) .....	2-62
FACILITIES GUIDANCE .....	2-63
LOGISTICS GUIDANCE .....	2-65
CONTRACTING OUT GUIDANCE .....	2-68
COMMAND INSPECTIONS .....	2-69
CONFERENCES .....	2-70
USACE MANAGEMENT CONTROL PLAN .....	2-71

## 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 that OMB Circular A-76, as augmented by higher authority implementing guidance, must be used for determining the performance of commercial activities using government facilities and personnel or by contract. This includes decisions regarding new starts, expansions, and existing services. Conversions to contract solely to avoid personnel ceilings or salary limitations are prohibited by the Circular.
3. The **USACE Program Summary** represents a three-year macro update of program for the Command. It is provided to assist Regional Management Boards (RMBs) in developing their three-year Command Operating Budgets (COB). The Program Summary is based on the FY 02 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 02 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.

**SECTION 2**

**DISCRETIONARY DOD PROGRAM**

---

**WILL BE UPDATED IN THE FUTURE**

## SECTION 2

## USACE PROGRAM SUMMARY

### FY 02 CONSOLIDATED COMMAND GUIDANCE

### USACE PROGRAM SUMMARY (DIRECT + REIMB)

### FY 02-04 ESTIMATED PROGRAM (\$ MILLIONS)

SOURCE: APRIL 2001 ICRI TABLES

USACE	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
Military Programs	8,809	7,260	7,350
Civil Works	5,553	5,597	5,694
Total	14,362	12,857	13,044

Military Programs	FY 02*	FY 03	FY 04
Army, Construction	2,515	1,747	1,883
Air Force, Construction	1,149	558	715
DOD	1,661	1,467	1,425
Environmental (DERP/BRAC)	890	870	703
Engineering & Design	691	696	668
Real Estate	213	202	196
RDT&E	326	327	327
Host Nation/FMS	1,153	1,184	1,224
Other (e.g., ED&M)	211	209	209

Civil Works	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
General Investigations	130	133	137
Construction General	1,324	1,368	1,413
Operations & Maintenance	1,745	1,803	1,862
Flood Control, MR&T	280	287	295
General Expense	153	157	161
Other Direct (Regulatory Prgm, FUSRAP, Non-Fed)	782	710	687
SFO Environmental	400	400	400
SFO All Other	739	739	739

\*FY 02 Military Program increased by \$1.0B from the FY 02 MILCON plus-up.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

---

### PROGRAM MANAGERS AND DOCUMENTATION

#### PROGRAMS MANAGEMENT DIVISION - CEMP-M

TYLER, J. JOSEPH. - Chief, 761-1145

#### ARMY & AIR FORCE BRANCH - CEMP-MA

STICKLEY, HOWARD - Chief, 761-1995

#### DEFENSE/SUPPORT FOR OTHERS BRANCH - CEMP-MD

VACANT- Chief,

#### POLICY BRANCH - CEMP-MP

VACANT- Chief,

#### ENVIRONMENTAL DIVISION - CEMP-R

RIVERS, PATRICIA - Chief, 761-0858

#### POLICY AND REQUIREMENTS BRANCH - CEMP-RA

ECKERSLEY, WILLIAM - Chief, 761-4704

#### FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES BRANCH - CEMP-RF

LUBBERT, BOB - Chief, 761-4950

#### ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT BRANCH - CEMP-RI

BALLIF, JAMES - Chief, 761-8880

#### INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND SUPERFUND SUPPORT BRANCH - CEMP-RS

BILL BRASSE - Chief, 761-8879

#### INSTALLATION SUPPORT DIVISION - CEMP-I

ALLAMAN, KRISTINE L. - Chief, 761-1014

#### PLANNING BRANCH - CEMP-IP

REYNOLDS, STEPHEN- Chief, 761-5786

#### BUSINESS SYSTEMS BRANCH - CEMP-IB

VACANT- Chief,

#### INSTALLATION SUPPORT POLICY BRANCH - CEMP-IO

KISHIYAMA, MICHAEL, Chief, 761-5777

#### INTERAGENCY & INTERNATIONAL SERVICES DIVISION – CEMP-N

SANFORD, DAVID, Chief, 761-5642

#### EXTERNAL AFFAIRS BRANCH – CEMP-NE

KISICKI, DONALD - Chief, 761-4273

#### STRATEGY & ANALYSIS BRANCH – CEMP-NI

VACANT- Chief,

#### STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION BRANCH – CEMP-NS

LOVO, JAMES - Chief, 761-4804

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

CONSTRUCTION, ARMY (CEMP-MA)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

<b>MSC</b>	<b>FY 02</b>	<b>FY 03</b>	<b>FY 04</b>
HNC	178,000	85,600	79,230
LRD	108,915	104,581	76,993
NAD	255,050	196,490	228,650
NWD	184,150	156,720	167,300
POD	239,400	303,300	307,300
SAD	189,100	160,350	217,100
SPD	15,400	14,700	41,900
SWD	94,600	40,400	55,200
TAC	0	0	10,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,264,615</b>	<b>1,062,141</b>	<b>1,183,673</b>

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04

**MCA** - Program remains constant at \$1B. Chem Demil is included under Type Fund "10-MCA" for Program Years 02-04. Type Fund "4A-MCDA" displayed Chem Demil for Program Years 95-01. **AFHC** - Program averages \$140M per year. **MCAR** - Program averages \$50 -\$60M per year.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE (CEMP-MA)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

<b>MSC</b>	<b>FY 02</b>	<b>FY 03</b>	<b>FY 04</b>
HNC	0	0	0
LRD	3,450	0	20,00
NAD	101,950	50,250	50,205
NWD	76,500	25,700	63,951
POD	66,017	41,900	46,767
SAD	76,300	29,000	63,140
SPD	52,150	26,200	52,683
SWD	48,400	33,000	66,021
TAC	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>424,767</b>	<b>206,050</b>	<b>362,767</b>

#### **Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04**

The Corps of Engineers is responsible for design and construction of approximately 80 percent of the Air Force's annual military construction program (MCAF). The Corps is responsible for a portion of the Air Force Reserve MILCON Program (MAFR). We are experiencing a MAFR decrease in the historical average of approximately \$33 million annually. FHAF is not included in the above projections.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

CONSTRUCTION, DOD AND OTHER (CEMP-MD)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

MSC	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
HNC	0	0	0
LRD	0	4,000	22,000
NAD	361,000	215,000	199,000
NWD	22,000	19,000	21,000
POD	505,000	401,000	301,000
SAD	71,000	38,000	28,000
SPD	6,000	29,000	6,000
SWD	48,000	67,000	45,000
TAC	96,000	96,000	96,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,109,000</b>	<b>869,000</b>	<b>718,000</b>

### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04

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

Program	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
DOD Medical	\$94,000	\$81,000	\$115,000
DLA	\$ 86,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 75,000
DC Schools	\$210,000	\$140,000	\$90,000
USSOCOM	\$59,000	\$38,000	\$40,000

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

INSTALLATION SUPPORT PROGRAM (DIRECT)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

RPMA SUPPORT TO DIRECTORATES OF PUBLIC WORKS

(\$000)

MSC	FTEs	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
LRD	4	650	680	700
MVD	1	100	0	0
NAD	12	1,560	1,620	1,690
NWD	6	1,090	1,135	1,180
POD	8	1,180	1,225	1,275
SAD	10	1,205	1,255	1,305
SPD	5	695	725	755
SWD	7	985	1,025	1,070
TAC	2	235	350	365
HQ IS	0	450	450	450
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>8,150</b>	<b>8,465</b>	<b>8,790</b>

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04

1. Funding for labor increases 3.7% in FY 02, 4.0% in FY 03, and 4.0% in FY 04.
2. 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.
3. MVD is expected to phase out the PM-Forward at Rock Island Arsenal by the end of FY 02.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

OMA DERP - IRP (DIRECT / REIMB) (CEMP-RI)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

<b>MSC</b>	<b>FY 02 DIR / REIMB</b>	<b>FY 03 DIR / REIMB</b>	<b>FY 04 DIR / REIMB</b>
HNC	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
LRD	2,400 / 5,500	2,400 / 5,500	2,400 / 5,500
NAD	5,700 / 11,000	5,700 / 11,000	5,700 / 11,000
NWD	3,200 / 23,000	3,200 / 23,000	3,200 / 23,000
POD	0 / 16,000	0 / 16,000	0 / 16,000
SAD	19,500 / 16,000	19,500 / 16,000	19,500 / 16,000
SPD	15,500 / 12,000	15,500 / 12,000	15,500 / 12,000
SWD	3,500 / 11,500	3,500 / 11,500	3,500 / 11,500
DSMOA-STATES	5,300 / 0	5,300 / 0	5,300 / 0
HQ	1,800 / 0	1,900 / 0	1,900 / 0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>56,900 / 95,000</b>	<b>56,900 / 95,000</b>	<b>57,000 / 95,000</b>

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04

Funding for the Installation Restoration Program should remain stable over the next few years.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

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

<b>MSC</b>	<b>FY 02</b>	<b>FY 03</b>	<b>FY 04</b>
HNC	10,700	11,700	5,700
LRD	21,752	18,557	21,274
NAD	28,360	33,518	36,006
NWD	43,671	30,889	34,111
POD	24,584	27,532	29,043
SAD	11,768	11,624	12,814
SPD	14,012	16,052	17,027
SWD	13,687	12,921	12,634
DSMOA-STATES	4,000	5,000	5,000
HQ	8,520	13,320	13,320
HQDA	9,200	12,000	12,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>190,255</b>	<b>193,104</b>	<b>198,929</b>

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04

Funding for the military environmental programs should remain stable over the next few years. Note that the HQ line for FY 02, FY 03 and FY 04 include contingency funding totaling \$3.8M. These funds will be issued to districts for project execution as requirements are identified.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

BRAC – ER (DIRECT) (CEMP-RI)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

MSC	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
HNC	0	0	0
LRD	24,000	18,000	18,000
NAD	37,000	23,000	23,000
NWD	6,000	3,000	3,000
POD	0	0	0
SAD	33,000	26,000	26,000
SPD	31,000	24,000	24,000
SWD	3,000	2,000	2,000
DSMOA-STATES	3,400	3,100	3,100
HQ	3,000	3,000	3,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>140,400</b>	<b>102,100</b>	<b>102,100</b>

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04

Only direct BRAC-ER is shown in the above chart since reimbursable funding to specific divisions can not be predicted accurately.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

EQ PROGRAM (REIMB) (CEMP-RI)

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

MSC	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
HNC	724	782	759
LRD	12,588	13,603	13,197
NAD	12,747	13,775	13,363
NWD	26,831	28,995	28,130
POD	32,033	34,616	33,583
SAD	41,767	45,135	43,788
SPD	20,031	21,646	21,000
SWD	39,163	42,321	41,058
TAW	0	0	0
HQ	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>185,884</b>	<b>200,873</b>	<b>194,878</b>

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04

Funding for the Environmental Quality Program rises gradually to FY 03, then declines slightly for FY 04. Projections are based on the fluctuation in the Army Environmental Program budget.

## SECTION 2

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

### MILITARY PROGRAMS

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

TOTAL PROGRAM (FUNDS AVAILABLE)

(\$000)

MSC	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
HNC	8,400	8,400	8,400
LRD	0	0	0
NAD	0	0	0
NWD	45,000	41,000	39,000
POD	4,500	4,000	4,000
SAD	2,500	2,500	2,500
SPD	5,000	5,000	5,000
SWD	9,500	9,900	9,000
DSMOA	16,800	15,800	15,800
HQ	130	105	80
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>91,830</b>	<b>86,705</b>	<b>83,780</b>

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04

Funding for the OMA DERP – Other DOD (reimb) shows a decline over the next few years.

### PROGRAM MANAGERS AND DOCUMENTATION

1. General Investigations:  
Program Manager: Ken Hall, CECW-BW, 202-761-1992
2. Construction, General:  
Program Manager: Leonard Henry, CECW-BE, 202-761-5856
3. Operation & Maintenance, General:  
Program Manager: Joseph Bittner, CECW-BC, 202-761-4130  
Alternate: Dennis Kern, CECW-BC, 202-761-4133
4. Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries:  
Program Manager: Kyle Jones, CECW-BC, 202-761-4105
5. General Expenses:  
Program Manager: Judy Champion, CERM-B, 202-761-1820  
Appropriation Account Manager: John Micik, CECW-BA, 202-761-4114
6. Regulatory Program:  
Program Manager: John Studt, CECW-OR, 202-761-4750  
Appropriation Account Manager: John Micik, CECW-BA, 202-761-4114
7. Flood Control & Coastal Emergencies:  
Program Manager: Ed Hecker, CECW-OE, 202-761-4601  
Appropriation Account Manager: John Micik, CECW-BA, 202-761-4114
8. Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP):  
Program Manager: Hans Moening, CECW-BA, 202-761-4113
9. Coastal Wetlands Restoration Trust Fund:  
Program Manager: Bruce Heide, CECW-BC, 202-761-4155  
Appropriation Account Manager: Mark Guest, CERM-BE, 202-761-0067
10. Support for Others - Reimbursable Funding:  
Program Manager: Al Bertini, CEMP-NE, 202-761-4271
11. Project Cooperation Agreements (PCAs):  
Program Manager: James Scott, CECW-PC, 202-761-4235

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

## GENERAL EXPENSES

(\$000)

<b>MSC</b>	<b>FY 02</b>	<b>FY 03</b>	<b>FY 04</b>
LRD	11,117	11,993	11,997
MVD	10,475	11,385	11,592
NAD	11,477	12,298	11,937
NWD	11,199	12,168	11,947
POD	9,388	10,135	8,725
SAD	11,822	12,640	12,471
SPD	11,147	11,957	11,819
SWD	11,175	12,002	11,780
OTHER CE OFFICES	123,327	132,922	125,132
TOTAL GEN EXP	211,127	227,500	217,400

**Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04**

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

## GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

(\$000)

<b>MSC</b>	<b>FY 02</b>	<b>FY 03</b>	<b>FY 04</b>
LRD	14,000	14,400	14,700
MVD	16,000	16,400	16,800
NAD	14,500	14,900	15,200
NWD	8,500	8,700	8,900
POD	3,500	3,600	3,700
SAD	8,000	8,200	8,400
SPD	25,000	25,600	26,300
SWD	11,000	11,300	11,600
TOTAL GEN INV	100,500	103,100	105,600

**Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04**

The General Investigations program is flat through the year 2004. The FY 02 Budget is a constrained planning program level. Adjustments to this program level will be made dependent upon the successes of the individual studies 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 02</b>	<b>FY 03</b>	<b>FY 04</b>
LRD	218,950	280,000	329,000
MVD	190,400	167,000	166,000
NAD	228,800	202,000	217,000
NWD	183,200	200,000	184,000
POD	8,200	13,000	20,000
SAD	297,700	233,000	238,000
SPD	130,200	170,000	161,000
SWD	97,900	108,000	92,000
HQ	125,230	131,000	138,000
TOTAL CONST GEN	1,480,580	1,504,000	1,545,000

**Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04**

The gross FY 02 Construction, General program request prior to the application of an adjustment for savings and slippage, is \$1.481 Billion. After anticipated savings and slippages programmed amounts are \$1,324,000 for FY 02, \$1,368,000 for FY 03, and \$1,413,000 for FY 04. The gross Construction, General program ceiling, which contains the follow-on funding required for these navigation projects, remains flat at \$1.504 billion and \$1.545 billion in FY 03 and FY 04, respectively, and thereafter. 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 02	FY 03	FY 04
LRD	330,409	335,711	343,285
MVD	334,561	339,929	347,598
NAD	193,727	196,836	201,276
NWD	214,880	218,328	223,254
POD	9,955	10,115	10,343
SAD	289,958	294,611	301,257
SPD	96,008	97,549	99,749
SWD	252,024	256,068	261,845
Remaining Items	39,930	40,571	41,486
Savings and Slippages	-16,452	-16,716	-9,093
Total O&M GEN	1,745,000	1,773,000	1,821,000

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 -- FY 04

In addition to the amounts reflected in the President's Budget for FY 02 and the two out years, direct funding by the Bonneville Power Administration would increase these amounts for NWD by \$114, and \$118 million respectively for FY 02 and FY 03. A New MOA is anticipated to increase the direct funding for FY 04 to about \$122 million. O&M funds are also augmented, slightly, in most MSCs by a distribution of funds under the Maintenance and Operation of Dams account in a total amount of about \$8 million. The FY 03 and FY 04 amounts are essentially the same as FY 02 with a small allowance for inflation in accordance with OMB passback guidance to implement aggressive cost cutting measures. Other FY 02 and out-year increases could result from significant national weather-related emergencies.

## SECTION 2

## CIVIL WORKS

---

### CIVIL WORKS

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

MSC	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
MVD	280	287	295

#### **Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04**

The Mississippi River and Tributaries program is flat for Fiscal Years 2002, experiences a major reduction from Fiscal Year 2001. Although there is an upward trend from FY 02 to FY 03 and FY 04, the funding level does not reach the FY 01 level. However, the FY 02 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. However, specific delays will be encountered in completion of some of the tributaries basins. There should be no impacts to the operations and maintenance of the main stem projects. Although there should be no impacts to the operation of the tributaries projects, the maintenance backlog will continue to grow. 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)

MSC	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
LRD	18,423	19,862	20,438
MVD	17,600	18,975	19,525
NAD	22,063	23,787	24,476
NWD	15,722	16,950	17,422
POD	7,521	8,109	8,344
SAD	24,525	26,441	27,207
SPD	12,018	12,957	13,332
SWD	9,275	10,000	10,289
LABS	853	920	946
TOTAL	128,000	138,000	142,000

#### Program Manager's Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04

The FY 02 budget does not support the increasing permit workload in the districts, particularly the workload increases expected from the revisions to Nationwide permits, which took effect in FY 00. Recommended program amounts for FY 03-04 would help restore performance to at least FY 00 levels. However, these amounts are subject to the annual budgetary process and actual funding levels may be less.

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

OTHER DIRECT (FUSRAP)

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

<b>MSC</b>	<b>FY 02</b>	<b>FY 03</b>	<b>FY 04</b>
LRD	32,940	44,550	45,500
MVD	52,470	51,425	55,950
NAD	54,590	46,025	43,550
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>142,000</b>	<b>145,000</b>

**Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04**

## **SECTION 2**

## **CIVIL WORKS**

---

### **CIVIL WORKS**

OTHER DIRECT (FCCE)

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

#### **Program Manager's Assessment: FY 02- FY 04**

The President's Budget for FY 02 does not request funds for the FCCE account. Funds carried over from FY 01 will be used to meet the requirements of the program in FY 02. Funds will be requested when the balance of funds in the FCCE 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 02	FY 03	FY 04
MVD	59,976	63,756	65,016

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04

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 02	FY 03	FY 04
LRD	6,000	4,000	3,000
MVD	2,000	2,000	2,000
NAD	169,000	160,000	150,000
NWD	67,000	60,000	50,000
POD	0	0	0
SAD	10,000	8,000	5,000
SPD	20,000	15,000	12,000
SWD	8,000	5,000	3,000
OTHER CE OFFICES	0	0	0
TOTAL OTHER SFO	282,000	254,000	225,000

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04

“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)

MSC	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
LRD	4,000	3,000	3,000
MVD	0	0	0
NAD	4,000	3,000	3,000
NWD	10,000	9,000	8,000
POD	12,000	10,000	8,000
SAD	3,000	2,000	2,000
SPD	1,000	1,000	1,000
SWD	1,000	1,000	1,000
OTHER CE OFFICES	1,000	1,000	1,000
TOT OTHER ERS	36,000	30,000	27,000

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04

“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 02	FY 03	FY 04
LRD	23,000	25,000	25,000
MVD	4,800	5,000	5,000
NAD	180,000	190,000	190,000
NWD	44,000	48,000	48,000
POD	56,000	35,000	35,000
SAD	65,000	70,000	70,000
SPD	96,000	100,000	100,000
SWD	71,000	75,000	75,000
OTHER CE OFFICES	15,000	15,000	15,000
TOTAL OTHER SFO	554,800	563,000	563,000

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 - FY 04

“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 and infrastructure. 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 requests for new work.

### PROGRAM MANAGERS AND DOCUMENTATION

1. The allocation targets for direct funded Real Estate Army work are based on the FY 02-04 Program Budget Guidance (PBG) as provided by CERM-B. No specific document allocates resources for Reimbursable real estate work estimates. These projections are based on customers and districts projections. The Program Manager is Bret Griffin, CERE-R, 202-761-7573.
2. No specific document allocates resources for reimbursable civil real estate functions. This is because of the various agreements under which reimbursable work is undertaken. Program Manager, Robert Vining, CECW-B, 202-761-4100 and Real Estate POC is Bret Griffin, CERE-R, 202-761-7573.
3. Homeowners Assistance Program (HAP) funding authorizations are based on approved HAPs. Funding targets depicted below are contingent upon realization of projected workload. Program Manager: Don Chapman, CERE-M-D, 202-761-7575. Real Estate Manpower POC is Bret Griffin, CERE-P, 202-761-7573.
4. DOD Recruiting Lease Program (DOD-R) funding is based upon approved workload estimates expressed in terms of cost of leases, service contracts, utilities, maintenance, and administration. Requirements identified outside of the POM cycle are considered by Army, the DOD Executive Agent, and may or may not be funded, as recommended by ACSIM and ABO. Program Manager: Don Chapman, CERE-M-D, 202-761-7575. Real Estate Manpower POC is Bret Griffin, CERE-P, 202-761-7573

## SECTION 2

## REAL ESTATE

### REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

DOD RECRUITING, LEASE ADMINISTRATION

DIRECT FUNDING

(\$000)

MSC	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
LRD	1,820	1,856	1,610
MVD	0	0	0
NAD	3,920	3,998	3,467
NWD	2,529	2,579	2,237
POD	202	206	178
SAD	3,692	3,766	3,266
SPD	2,776	2,831	2,455
SWD	1,593	1,624	1,408
UNDIST/HQPRG	3,090	3,183	3,278
TOTAL DOD REC LEASE ADMIN	19,619	20,043	17,900

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 – FY 04

USACE will experience a surge in workload in FY 02 and FY 03 to complete actions for the increases in Air Force and Navy recruiters and to clear the backlog of Army re-stationing effort. The workload should decrease in FY 04 to a steady level that will continue through the outyears after efforts to expand and relocate recruiting facilities are completed.

## SECTION 2

## REAL ESTATE

### REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

DIRECT FUNDING (\$000)

DOD RECRUITING & USACE GSA OCCUPIED LEASES

MSC	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
LRD	17,527	17,878	16,125
MVD	0	0	0
NAD	31,101	31,723	28,613
NWD	20,373	20,780	18,743
POD	1,355	1,382	1,246
SAD	22,424	22,873	20,631
SPD	18,827	19,204	17,321
SWD	17,262	17,607	15,881
UFC <u>1</u> / Includes USACE & DOD GSA Leases	42,107	43,371	44,672
UNDIST/HQPRG	5,489	5,654	5,824
TOTAL DOD RECRUITING LEASES (Includes USACE & DOD GSA Leases)	176,465	180,472	169,056
	<u>1</u> / 42,107	<u>1</u> / 43,371	<u>1</u> / 44,672

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02– FY 04

USACE support to the DOD Recruiting Facilities Program will experience a spike in growth in FY 02 and FY 03 to cover unfunded FY 01 work that must be executed. This spike is a result of the Air force and Navy increasing the number of recruiters to meet accession goals and the backlog of mission support actions that have been deferred because of funding constraints. Also the program has experienced cost growth because of OSD policy change which decreased influence of cost and increased influence of location as deciding factors in facility selection. Additionally the strong national economy enables landlords to find many quality businesses to occupy their space that will pay a percentage of their gross income.

**SECTION 2****REAL ESTATE****REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS**

CIVIL, DIRECT PROGRAM (\$000)

MSC	FY 02		FY 03		FY 04	
	LABOR COST	TOTAL FUNDS	LABOR COST	TOTAL FUNDS	LABOR COST	TOTAL FUNDS
LRD	14,045.5	28,857.5	11,389.4	39,075.4	14,122.3	51,558.3
MVD	17,020.8	28,453.8	12,512.7	17,952.7	13,637	19,503
NAD	4,782.6	5,951.6	4,428.3	5,743.3	4,487.2	5,634.2
NWD	9,603.9	16,398.9	7,835.9	8,744.9	9,535.9	10,834.9
POD	604.2	657.2	628.4	633.4	534.3	552.3
SAD	9,167.5	11,106.5	9,261.9	11,149.9	9,084	11,025.4
SPD	5,701.8	8,629.8	5,241.1	5,556.1	5,311	5,644
SWD	7,553.1	8,776.1	7,565.8	8,532.8	7,422.9	8,434.9
UNDIST/HQ RG	2,074.7	2,326.7	2,066.8	2,317.8	2,148.8	2,408.8
TOTAL CIVIL, DIRECT	70,554.1	111,158.1	60,930.3	99,706.3	66,283.8	115,595.8

**Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 – FY 04**

When compared to FY 01, the overall income/workload projection through FY 04 is down slightly (3.5%). This takes into consideration a nine percent (9%) slow down possibly between FY 02 and FY 03. Based on these data, the program gains some momentum in FY 04 with a workload increase of approximately four percent (4%) over FY 02. Managers should review their project data in coordination with the PM and RM to ensure that it is captured and reflected in the appropriate execution years.

**SECTION 2****REAL ESTATE****REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS**

CIVIL, REIMBURSABLE PROGRAM (\$000)

MSC	FY 02		FY 03		FY 04	
	LABOR	TOTAL FUNDS	LABOR	TOTAL FUNDS	LABOR	TOTAL FUNDS
LRD	6,134.2	9,262.2	4,910.8	5,686.8	5,371.7	6,301.7
MVD	3,450	6,423	3,613.1	7,870.1	3,842.9	8,152.9
NAD	1,114.8	1,898.8	1,072.1	1,885.1	926.9	1,699.9
NWD	3,558.9	3,790.9	4,062.6	4,404.6	4,112	4,850
POD	261.4	263.4	177.5	180.5	126	128
SAD	5,065.2	6,749.2	4,624.4	6,378.4	4,350.1	6,102.1
SPD	3,633.5	6,503.5	3,026.4	3,185.4	3,162.3	3,377.3
SWD	3,366.2	3,963.2	3,490.7	3,788.7	3,412.9	3,613.9
UNDIST/H QPRG	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL CIVIL, REIMB	26,584	38,854.2	24,977.6	33,379.6	25,304.8	34,225.8

**Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 – FY 04.**

When compared to FY 01, the overall income/workload projection through FY 04 is down significantly, approximately forty-five percent (45%). Based on these data, we encourage managers to review their project data in coordination with the PM and RM to ensure that it is captured and reflected in the appropriate execution years.

## SECTION 2

## REAL ESTATE

### REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (HAP)

DIRECT FUNDING (LABOR & WORKLOAD)

(\$000)

MSC	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
LRD			
MVD			
NAD	0	0	0
NWD			
POD			
SAD	3,052	836	182
SPD	21,662	9,455	4,542
SWD	5,110	2,333	711
UNDIST/HQPRG	1,791	7,143	1,620
TOTAL HAP	31,615	14,367	7,055

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 – FY 04

Overall program requirements continue to diminish. Some additional programs are being projected for the future including Fort McClellan, AL; Kelley AFB, TX; Edwards AFB, CA and Fort Greely, AK. Congress is discussing the need for two additional rounds of Base closures. If new legislation is enacted to close or realign additional facilities, the dollar amounts for FY 02-03 and beyond may increase substantially. There are indications that Navy installation commanders/staffs provide little program information to prospective applicants and discourage program participation to hold costs down. This chart will be updated in the Phase Two CCG Update and publication. POCs: Don Chapman, CERE-M-D, 202-761-7575, or Imogene Newsome, CERM-B 202-761-0531.

## SECTION 2

## REAL ESTATE

### REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

REAL ESTATE OPERATIONS, ARMY REIMBURSABLE

REIMBURSABLE LABOR FUNDING

(\$000)

MSC	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
LRD	576	594	611
MVD	0	0	0
NAD	1,946	2,005	2,065
NWD	937	965	994
POD	432	445	458
SAD	2,163	2,227	2,294
SPD	1,225	1,262	1,300
SWD	576	594	611
UNDIST/HQPRG	0	0	0
TOTAL REO, ARMY, REIMB	7,855	8,092	8,333

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 – FY 04

We must continue to work with our Army customers by assisting them in programming and budgeting for the above real estate requirements that exceed our ability to directly fund. We realize that our customers have also experienced decreases in available funding. The need for close workload coordination is essential from district to installation, MSC and MACOM levels. For example the Army's initiatives for privatization of utilities, the family housing commercialization push and greater emphasis on outgranting federal lands and other enhanced leasing options represents a slight increase in workload. Communication is essential in order for us to adequately identify and program the Army's total workload, workload value and the necessary resources to execute the program. This chart will be updated in the Phase 2 of the CCG Update and publication.

## SECTION 2

## REAL ESTATE

### REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

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

MSC	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
LRD	220	236	243
MVD	0	0	0
NAD	1,000	1,030	1,060
NWD	1,443	1,486	1,530
POD	688	708	729
SAD	1,243	1,280	1,318
SPD	583	600	618
SWD	258	265	272
UNDIST/HQPRG	5	5	5
TOTAL REO, AIR FORCE REIMB	5,440	5,610	5,778

#### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 – FY 04

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 02 target represents a slightly constrained estimate. This estimate will be updated during Phase 2 of the CCG update.

## SECTION 2

## REAL ESTATE

### REAL ESTATE PROGRAMS

#### REAL ESTATE SUPPORT TO ARMY

#### DIRECT LABOR FUNDING

(\$000)

<b>MSC</b>	<b>FY 02</b>	<b>FY 03</b>	<b>FY 04</b>
LRD	400	400	400
MVD	0	0	0
NAD	705	705	705
NWD	855	855	855
POD	310	310	310
SAD	730	730	730
SPD	550	550	550
SWD	220	220	220
UNDIST/HQPRG	31	31	31
<b>TOTAL REAL ESTATE SUPPORT</b>	<b>3,880</b>	<b>3,880</b>	<b>3,880</b>

#### **Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 – FY 04**

The funding for this program is projected to remain at the current level through FY 04. This level of funding is not adequate to support the current estimate for the Army's installation support real estate base workload. Real Estate Program Managers at all levels (installation/district, etc) should coordinate their efforts to ensure that the unfunded real estate requirements for the program years are submitted for inclusion into the respective MACOM's program budgets. Additionally, each District should identify their unfunded requirements during the HQUSACE Midyear Review. Efforts are underway to revise policy and to secure additional funding for FY 02 and out. This chart will be updated during Phase 2 of the CCG update.

## SECTION 2

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

---

### PROGRAM MANAGERS AND DOCUMENTATION

1. Direct Research and Development Testing and Evaluation  
Program Managers: Dr. Clemens Meyer, CERD, (202)761-1850, Ms. Eloisa Brown, CERD, 202-761-1834, Thomas Hart, CERD, 703-428-6867.
2. Direct OMA: Program Manager: Ms. Eloisa E. Brown, CERD-L, 202-761-1834, EMAP  
Program Managers: Mr. Regis Orsinger, CEERD-TO, 703-428-6804 , Richard Herrmann, CEERD-TD, 703-428-6800.
3. Direct Civil: Program Manager: Ms. Isabel Sayers, CERD, 202-761-1837, Dr. Tony Liu, CERD, 202-761-0222, Mr. David Mathis, CERD, 202-761-1846

### Program Managers Assessment: FY 02 – FY 04

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 02-04 include innovations for navigation projects, high performance material and systems, regional sediment management, geospatial technology, and regional ecosystem analysis, management and restoration.

The RDT&E Program continues to evolve to meet Army mission requirements in the areas of military engineering, environmental quality and installation management. With the incorporation of the Corps laboratories into the Engineering, Research and Development Center (ERDC), the research community is aligned with the concept of Divisions as Regional Business Centers and in position to meet the critical technology needs of the Corps. To that end, the USAERDC has the following major end objectives:

- . To deliver new technologies needed by the USACE to achieve its strategic vision
- . To aggressively support army transformation goals
- . To sustain world-class research capability in critical mission areas
- . To provide special expertise and technical support to Corps, Army and Defense entities in the execution of their missions.

## SECTION 2

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

### ENGINEERING RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CENTER (ERDC) (\$000)

	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
<b>CW DIRECT</b>			
GI	24,000	24,600	25,200
CG	3,000	3,100	3,180
O&M	16,100	16,500	17,000
GE & OTHER	8,800	9,000	9,300
<b>TOT DIR</b>	<b>51,900</b>	<b>53,200</b>	<b>54,680</b>
<b>CW REIMB</b>			
USACE REIMB (CORPS TO CORPS)	77,955	80,293	82,302
SPT FOR OTHERS (FEDERAL)	10,336	10,646	10,965
SPT FOR OTHES (NON-FED)	3,034	3,125	3,219
HQUSACE	2,902	2,989	3,079
ENVIRON RESTORATION SPT	592	610	628
<b>TOTAL REIMB</b>	<b>94,819</b>	<b>97,663</b>	<b>100,193</b>
DIRECT FUND CITES	836	861	887
<b>TOT CIVIL WORKS</b>	<b>147,555</b>	<b>151,724</b>	<b>155,760</b>
<b>INCLUDES R&amp;D &amp; CIVIL WORKS</b>			
<b>MILITARY DIRECT</b>			
RDT&E DIRECT AND CONGRESSIONALS	116,764	120,267	123,875
OMA DIRECT	33,686	34,697	35,738
OTHER MILITARY DIRECT (MCA-ARMY OPA, DOD, CTIS, ETC.)	66,395	68,387	70,439
<b>TOTAL DIRECT</b>	<b>216,845</b>	<b>223,351</b>	<b>230,052</b>
<b>MILITARY REIMBURSABLE</b>			
HQUSACE	1,737	1,789	1,843
CORPS TO CORPS	7,595	7,823	8,058
ARMY, R&D, OMA, ETC.	51,107	52,640	54,219
OTHER DOD	62,012	63,872	65,788
<b>TOTAL MILITARY REIMBURSABLE</b>	<b>122,451</b>	<b>126,124</b>	<b>129,908</b>
DIRECT FUND CITES	32,640	33,619	34,628
<b>TOTAL MILITARY</b>	<b>371,936</b>	<b>383,094</b>	<b>394,588</b>
<b>TOTAL ERDC</b>	<b>519,491</b>	<b>534,818</b>	<b>550,348</b>

## SECTION 3

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

**HR REGIONALIZATION.** HR Regionalization, began 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 commands for their share of the HQDA-identified costs. Under the signed Memorandum of Agreement, HQDA is committed to providing a draft bill for planning purposes, followed by the actual bill in October. Payments can be made quarterly.

CPOC bills include both start-up costs (during the early years) and 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 table attached does not display CPAC costs that cover required services that have not been assumed by the regional CPOC. Determination and payment of the CPAC costs is a local command operating budget process (whether the CPAC is Corps or another Army Commands).

Based on latest information from HQDA and estimates of the percentage of population serviced by Regional CPOCs, the following rates (per employee serviced, excluding direct OMA Funded) can be used for planning purposes.

(Per employee serviced)

<b>CPOC REGIONS</b> DIVISIONS & DISTRICTS	RATE FY 02	RATE FY 03	RATE FY 04
<b>ANCR</b>	<b>\$578</b>	<b>\$590</b>	<b>\$602</b>
HQUSACE			
HEC			
CPW			
WRC			
TAC			
NAE			
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	<b>\$542</b>	<b>\$553</b>	<b>\$564</b>
SAD			
SAC			
SAJ			
SAM			
SAS			
SAW			
<b>NORTHEAST</b>	<b>\$542</b>	<b>\$553</b>	<b>\$564</b>
LRB			
LRE			
MDC			
NAD			
NAB			
NAN			
NAO			
NAP			
NAD			
<b>NORTHCENTRAL</b>	<b>\$611</b>	<b>\$623</b>	<b>\$635</b>
LRH			
LRP			
MVR			
MVP			

# SECTION 3

# PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

(Per employee serviced)

<b>CPOC REGIONS</b> DIVISIONS & DISTRICTS	RATE FY 02	RATE FY 03	RATE FY 04
<b>SOUTHCENTRAL</b>	<b>\$580</b>	<b>\$592</b>	<b>\$604</b>
CERL			
CRREL			
TEC			
WES			
UFC			
LRC			
NWK			
MVD			
MVM			
MVN			
MVS			
MVK			
HNC			
LRD			
LRL			
LRN			
<b>SOUTHWEST</b>	<b>\$572</b>	<b>\$583</b>	<b>\$594</b>
NWO			
SWD			
SWF			
SWG			
SWL			
SWT			
<b>WEST</b>	<b>\$541</b>	<b>\$552</b>	<b>\$563</b>
SPD			
SPL			
SPK			
SPN			
SPA			
NWD			
NWP			
NWS			
NWW			

## SECTION 3

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

### USACE FINANCE CENTER (UFC) RATES

Furnished below are the estimated amounts that will be distributed to each site for operating finance and accounting support provided by the UFC during FY 02-04. In calculating these amounts, the UFC has utilized an algorithm developed to distribute the support cost in correlation with the volume of work performed in six categories (or functions). These categories are travel, accounts payable, accounts receivable/debt management, disbursing, cash reports, and field reports. Workload statistics have been compiled for each site to serve as a basis for distributing the support costs.

Unlike previous years, it must be noted that the amounts provided below **include** CEEIS/AIS costs which the UFC expects to incur in FY 02-04. These CEEIS/AIS costs will no longer be billed separately to supported sites. Therefore, any comparisons between the costs indicated below and prior year amounts must take into consideration this change in billing methodology.

In addition, amounts are provided for the two sites which are scheduled to consolidate to the UFC during FY 02, i.e. Transatlantic Programs Center and Europe District. For FY 02 the support costs for these sites have been prorated based on the projected consolidation date of 1 April 2002.

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>FY 02</u>	<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u> (Est \$'s)
HUNTSVILLE	697,000	721,000	746,000
MISS. VALLEY DIV	71,000	73,000	76,000
MEMPHIS	194,000	201,000	208,000
NEW ORLEANS	424,000	439,000	454,000
ST. LOUIS	261,000	270,000	279,000
VICKSBURG	315,000	326,000	337,000
ROCK ISLAND	363,000	376,000	389,000
ST PAUL	271,000	280,000	290,000
NORTH ATLANTIC DIV	61,000	63,000	65,000
NEW YORK	476,000	493,000	510,000
NEW ENGLAND	374,000	387,000	401,000
BALTIMORE	1,054,000	1,091,000	1,129,000
NORFOLK	505,000	523,000	541,000
PHILADELPHIA	192,000	199,000	206,000
NORTHWESTERN DIV	101,000	105,000	109,000
PORTLAND	402,000	416,000	431,000
SEATTLE	539,000	558,000	578,000
WALLA WALLA	202,000	209,000	216,000

## SECTION 3

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

### UFC RATES (CONT'D)

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>FY 02</u>	<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u>	(Est \$'s)
KANSAS CITY	607,000	628,000	650,000	
OMAHA	1,054,000	1,091,000	1,129,000	
GR LKS OH RIV DIV	61,000	63,000	65,000	
HUNTINGTON	347,000	359,000	372,000	
LOUISVILLE	949,000	982,000	1,016,000	
NASHVILLE	292,000	302,000	313,000	
PITTSBURGH	208,000	215,000	223,000	
BUFFALO	93,000	96,000	99,000	
CHICAGO	59,000	61,000	63,000	
DETROIT	145,000	150,000	155,000	
ALASKA	391,000	405,000	419,000	
SOUTH ATLANTIC DIV	83,000	86,000	89,000	
CHARLESTON	66,000	68,000	70,000	
JACKSONVILLE	369,000	382,000	395,000	
MOBILE	1,207,000	1,249,000	1,293,000	
SAVANNAH	843,000	873,000	904,000	
WILMINGTON	210,000	217,000	225,000	
SOUTH PACIFIC DIV	82,000	85,000	88,000	
LOS ANGELES	457,000	473,000	490,000	
SACRAMENTO	864,000	894,000	925,000	
SAN FRANCISCO	95,000	98,000	101,000	
ALBUQUERQUE	219,000	227,000	235,000	
SOUTHWESTERN DIV	59,000	61,000	63,000	
FORT WORTH	954,000	987,000	1,022,000	
GALVESTON	112,000	116,000	120,000	
LITTLE ROCK	482,000	499,000	516,000	
TULSA	677,000	701,000	726,000	
ERDC	1,530,000	1,584,000	1,639,000	
WRSC	49,000	51,000	53,000	
HQUSACE	560,000	580,000	601,000	
HECSA	80,000	83,000	86,000	
CPW	76,000	79,000	82,000	
TRANSATLANTIC PROGRAMS CTR	115,000	238,000	246,000	
EUROPE	225,000	466,000	482,000	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>20,122,000</b>	<b>21,179,000</b>	<b>21,920,000</b>	

## SECTION 3

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

### INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT)

Information Technology (IT) is a key enabler to our ability to successfully implement “One Corps” Project Management Business Processes (PMBP) throughout the organization. The four focus areas provide opportunities at each command level to make contributions toward growing a partnership between the IT technical/professional staff and business owners/stakeholders in a way that best leverages IT products and services. Protecting our information and data, providing adequate computing power and communications to support business needs, adopting best software engineering practices and making the right choices for our IT investments are the critical success factors we must consider.

Emphasis Level	Four IT Focus Areas			
	Information Assurance	Modernization of IT Infrastructure	Software Engineering	IT Investment Decision Process
District	●		●	●
Regional	●		●	●
Enterprise	●	●	●	●
Critical Success Factors =	Protect Data, Information and IT Assets	Provide Adequate Computing Power and Communications to support Business Needs	Adopt Best Software Engineering Practices	Make the best choices for IT Investments

**1. Information Assurance (IA).** IA is one of the top priorities within the Department of the Army and USACE. We rely on our Information Systems and Data Communication Networks in the performance of our critical civil and military missions. In the current information technical environment, there is no easy secret to total information systems security. We must implement security on multiple tiers inside our organization with the cooperation of the whole team. The tasks below identify ways to protect and maximize computer resources.

a. Comply with the DOD Information Technology Security Certification and Accreditation Process (DITSCAP). Specific information may be found at <https://iase.disa.mil/ditscap/DitscapFrame.html>.

## SECTION 3

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

---

- (1) Divisions/Districts must have valid accreditation packages on their LAN, local site, and the systems they maintain. The Designated Approving Authority (DAA), normally the Commander, will approve accreditation requests.
- (2) Corps of Engineers Enterprise Infrastructure Services (CEEIS) must have valid accreditation packages on the WAN, the two processing centers, and the systems they maintain (i.e., UPASS). The USACE CIO will approve the CEEIS accreditation.
- (3) Corps-wide, standard automated information system Functional Proponents must submit accreditation packages for the systems, i.e., CEFMS, they develop/maintain to the USACE DAA, the USACE CIO, for approval.

b. Network Based Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS) are required at all entrances and gateways to the CEEIS wide area and local area communications networks.

- (1) Divisions will ensure all outside connections (non-Corps connections) at their site have IDS.
- (2) Districts will ensure all outside connections (non-Corps connections) have IDS.
- (3) CEEIS will verify that all corporate gateways have an IDS. CEEIS will also maintain and monitor all corporate firewalls and IDS devices. (Local sites may have the ability to read these mandatory devices where the software supports read only access).

c. 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.

- (1) Divisions, Centers, Labs, Districts, and FOAs will add host-based IDS to mission critical servers including dial-in servers.
- (2) CEEIS will install IDS on all critical processing center servers. CEEIS will monitor all mandatory IDS devices.
- (3) The E-mail Center of Expertise will install IDS on all critical mail servers.

## SECTION 3

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

---

(4) 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.

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

d. Mandatory DOD and DA security training is documented at:  
<http://pso24.pso.usace.army.mil:1700/docs/Army%20IA%20Training%20Requirements>

(1) Divisions, Centers, Labs, Districts and FOA's will complete all mandatory training.

(2) CEEIS, the E-Mail Center, ICE and the functional proponents will complete all mandatory training.

**2. Modernization and Enhancement of Corps of Engineers Enterprise Infrastructure Services (CEEIS).** The CEEIS program encompasses the USACE-wide communications network and two processing centers located at Vicksburg, MS and Portland, OR. The FY 01 CEEIS priorities were Information Assurance and providing adequate communications bandwidth to accommodate business needs. These challenges, plus unplanned command systems integration, impacted the CEEIS budget in FY 01. In FY 02, each USACE command should note that the administration of billing individual locations for CEEIS service is also changing. FY 02 CEEIS focus will be on modernizing the communications network and improving administration of the CEEIS program.

a. Division and District Commanders, and their IT representatives, should give consideration to installing "Caching Servers" to enhance computing performance and reduce impact on the communications network. Caching Servers can save up to 40% of circuit bandwidth, as seen in the circuit from Korea to Portland. The cost for a caching server is \$13,500 (includes one year of maintenance). The Standard Procurement System (SPS) could be a likely candidate to realize the benefits of applying a caching server. Director/Chiefs of Corporate Information should provide advice, benefits and disadvantages of this investment, to their command staffs and Contracting Officer.

b. An additional step that can be taken to improve local and regional performance is to obtain redundant firewalls and routers to reduce the possibility of downtime. CEEIS would be responsible for configuration and will provide specifications and facilitate the acquisition process. Firewalls cost \$4,500.00 or less. Routers cost \$6,000.00 or less.

c. There are sites in the Corps where information traffic needs have increased to a point where the currently installed CEEIS infrastructure is being stressed. The current infrastructure typically connects a Corps site into the CEEIS network at 1.5Mbps. Sites are encouraged to evaluate their current and future traffic needs and where possible, fund and install additional bandwidth to their site. In addition to providing additional connectivity for sites, this would also have the advantage of providing site redundancy so that a single link failure would not prevent continued access to remote systems. This additional site capability costs approximately \$1,300/month when ordered off of the FTS2001 contract. A separate document is being provided to sites that outlines additional technical issues along with additional information that can be used to better make a corporate site or regional decision whether to locally fund and install this capability.

d. The CEEIS Configuration Control Board (19 January 2001) made the following decisions regarding CEEIS resource support to corporate Automated Information Systems:

(1) CEEIS will fund for production hardware/software for corporate AIS. It will be the role of the CIO Liaison Division to facilitate collection of information for determining AIS hardware/software funding requirements.

(2) Use of CEEIS development hardware will be considered on a case by case basis, to determine if resources available for development. In general, development costs should be funded by the AIS if a dedicated system is required.

(3) CEEIS will provide facilities and staff for both integration and security testing.

**3. Software Engineering and IT Project Life Cycle Management.** The USACE Chief Information Officer (CIO) has laid a good foundation for an effective corporate information architecture. There is, however, a lot of work to be done in this area. Progress in growing the architecture, will be paced with available resources. Two of the most important benefits to future software engineering efforts will be a Common Operating Environment (COE) and a Technical Reference Guide (TRG).

a. The primary goal of migrating to a COE and TRG approach is to provide responsive and timely IT guidance that will facilitate information sharing in support of validated business needs. The final information architecture product, with its COE and TRG, will be a management tool that ensures interoperability, portability, scalability, reusability, security, reduced cost, and robustness to all USACE information users. This effort will take time and resources to bring it to full fruition. In the interim, we must continue to stretch toward reducing software engineering

costs and improving interoperability where and when possible. Institutionalizing best software engineering project management practices will continue to be the primary target area for improvement opportunities, as the information architecture matures.

b. At each command level, a fundamental understanding of why and how organizations use an enterprise architecture (EA) to assist in making IT investment selections and improving their IT infrastructures is critical to the ultimate success of the organization. To begin to develop this understanding, Directors/Chiefs of Corporate Information and their staffs are strongly encouraged to read Federal CIO Council publication, *Architecture Alignment and Assessment Guide*, dated October 2000. (This publication is accessible at <http://www.itpolicy.gsa.gov/mke/archplus/aaag.pdf>)

**4. Information Technology (IT) Capital Planning and Life Cycle Management of Automated Information Systems (AIS).** IT Capital Planning and Investment Process is how we select, control, and evaluate IT as part of our IT investment portfolios. In the selection phase specific criteria is applied representing how we conduct our business. These criteria are comprised of values and risks that are important to us as an organization in helping to achieve our business goals and objectives. In the control phase, the bulk of the oversight activity consist of the Life Cycle Management of Automated Information Systems, which is the application of project management principles to the AIS, throughout its life cycle. In the evaluation phase a variety of factors are considered, such as: strategic alignment of the IT initiative, importance to the mission of the organization and how effectively it supports the organization. This evaluation can lead to a determination as to the continuation or termination of an IT investment.

a. Improve the IT Capital Planning Process

(1) District level: Manage IT Investments (review & selection of IT investments) Establish IT committees - approve initiatives; enter & maintain data using ITIPS (produce portfolio); track IT cost - use ITIPS number on all IT expenditures.

(2) Regional level: Regional oversight & management of IT investments.

(3) Enterprise Level: Distribute IT Capital Planning Guidance, oversight and management of enterprise-wide IT investments.

b. Compliance with ER 25-1-2, Life Cycle Management of Information Systems.

(1) District level: Designate MDA; establish oversight committees and IPTs; exercise LCMIS oversight.

## SECTION 3

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

---

(2) Regional level: Regional Oversight of LCMIS; management of Regional-wide IT investment initiatives.

(3) Enterprise Level: Distribute LCMIS guidance; oversight and management of enterprise-wide IT investment initiatives; exercise LCMIS oversight.

**5. Other.** Additional initiatives important to leveraging IT products and services include:

**a. Corps-wide Lessons Learned Approach (CLL).** The Deputy Commanding General has approved and endorsed the CLL modular concept as the standard lessons learned approach to be followed throughout the Corps, and designated the CLL information system (IS) as the USACE corporate lessons learned IS. Accordingly, any Corps IS for which a lessons learned function is desired will act to include a CLL module in its development or next modification. Field trials of the CLL module embedded in the new design review information system, DrChecks were successfully completed in the Fall of 1999. The responsible CIO POC is CECI-H, in conjunction with ERDC-CERL-IL.

**b. Portal Technology.** The CIO has responsibility during FY 02 for leading prototyping efforts related to enterprise portal technology. A part of this responsibility is ensuring that “vertical” community-specific portal initiatives and shared functionality are appropriately integrated within the overall enterprise portal framework. Portal technology enhances the Command’s ability to share its structured and unstructured information resources, as well as promoting expertise and knowledge sharing among the Corps workforce. The responsible CIO POC is CECI-H, in conjunction with ERDC-ITL-N.

**c. Sustaining a Capable IT Workforce.** IT professionals face increasing challenges in managing IT and information systems. USACE now operates in an age where information and the technological capabilities to deliver information, work collaboratively, and leverage the “intellectual capital; i.e., tacit knowledge” of its people are essential to its core business strategies.

(1) All too often IT was consider “a cost” and this lead to budget and workforce reduces to achieve management directed reductions. This downsizing has forced DIMs and CIMs to use diminishing budgets and staff as effectively and efficiently as possible. Today, IT is consider “an investment.” USACE’s IT investments must be managed effectively and efficiently and this requires that commanders, at all levels, make an education, training, and experience investment in their IT professional workforce staff.

(2) Directors/Chiefs of Corporate Information are encouraged to actively participate in their organization's Capable Workforce initiatives and advise their commanders, command staffs, and Capable Workforce teams on/about what leadership, management, supervisory and technical education and training is required to execute the missions and functions assigned the IT organization. As a minimum, all commands should have their Directors/Chiefs of Information Management complete either the Advanced Management Program or CIO Certificate Program at the National Defense University's IRM College. This is a mandatory DOD requirement for GS-13 and above IT professionals serving in CIO (i.e., IM/IT) organizations. (Reference Deputy Secretary of Defense memorandum dated July 14, 2000, subject: Implementation of the Recommendations of the Information Assurance and Information Technology Integrated Process Team on Training, Certification and Personnel Management in the Department of Defense.) All other IT professionals should complete appropriate education/training leading to specific certification, such as a Microsoft Certified Systems Engineer. In particular, individuals appointed to information assurance (IA) positions (IA Program Manager, IA Manager, IA Officer, IA Security Officer, IA Network Security Officers, and System Administrators) **must** complete required certification training appropriate to their appointment. Also, **all** information system users and operators **must** complete DISA's Infosec Awareness training (available on CD). (Reference USACE IA website: <http://pso24.pso.usace.army.mil:1700/security/home.html>)

**d. Corporate Information Conference.** Headquarters, Directorate of Corporate Information will host a USACE-wide Information Technology (IT) Symposium in the late spring/early summer of FY02. Topics for discussion will include corporate/regional IT-related issues and concerns. Location and details will be established and provided under separate memo to the Corporate Information community. Attendance of all USACE Information Managers is encouraged.

**e. OPM Issues IT Job Family Position Classification Standard 2200.** Several years of hard work by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), the Federal CIO Council, and Federal agencies culminated with the issuance of a new classification standard for IT professionals at the end of May 2001. With the issuance of the standard, Federal agencies will be given a reasonable period of time (90-120 days) to reclassify the positions affected by the new standard. The new series covered by the standard is Information Technology Management (ITM), GS-2210. This series covers all GS-0334 Computer Specialist (GS-0334 series cancelled), and is used to classify GS-0301-I (Information Management) and GS-0391 (Telecommunications) when the knowledge, duties and responsibilities of IT management are paramount in the position.

## SECTION 3

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

---

The ITM GS-2210 series has eleven parenthetical titles to help ensure the position title more closely matches the work performed by the IT professional. The titles are as follows:

Applications Software	Customer Support	Data Management
Internet	Network Services	Operating Systems
Policy and Planning	Security	Systems Administration
Systems Analysis	General	

OPM issued special IT salary rates effective 14 January 2001 that covered the GS-0334, 0854, and 1550 series. These special IT salary rates will transfer to the new GS-2210 series.

Consequently, there may, and probably will, be a budget impact. The extent of the impact will vary by command, and is entirely dependent on how many GS-0301-I and GS-0391 positions get reclassified using the new standard. The total dollar impact to each command's budget will be driven by the number of positions reclassified and the grades of those position. The percentage increase by grade ranges from 33% for a GS-5 to 7% for a GS-12.

Each command's Director or Chief of Information Management will need to review their GS-0301-I and GS-0391 positions to determine which positions will need to be reclassified and then calculate the dollar impact on/to the budget and advise their Resource Management Officer accordingly. Depending on when the reclassification would get done the budget impact could occur in FY 01, and most definitely in FY 02.

**MILITARY PROGRAMS STANDARD DEFINITIONS**

1. **PROGRAM CATEGORIES.** Military Programs views construction and construction related programs in the categories identified below.

**FUNDS TYPE GROUPS**

<b><u>Direct (D) or Reimbursable (R)</u></b>	<b><u>Military (M) or Civil (C) Appropriation</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>
D	M	Military Direct, Army
D	M	Military Direct, Air Force
D	M	Military Direct, DoD Agencies
D & R	M	Military Environmental
R	M	Military Reimbursable, O&MA
R	M	Military Reimbursable, O&M, Air Force
R	M	Military Reimbursable, DoD (Work for Others)
D & R	M & C	Special Management Programs
R	M	Military Reimbursable, Non-Federal
R	C	Civil Reimbursable, Environmental Interagency and International Services
R	C & M	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 GROUPS AND TYPE FUNDS.** The Major Program Categories identified in paragraph 1.a. are further divided into Type Funds (TF) as published in the Corps' standard Project Management Information System (PROMIS).

## SECTION 4

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

Following is a list of all TFs. The HQUSACE Proponent (CEMP-MP) is responsible for coordinating the issuance of TFs listed. Requests for additional fund type designations should be addressed to the CEMP-MP, ATTN: PROMIS PM.

### TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

<b>TF</b>	<b>ABBR</b>	<b>HQ PROPONENT</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
72	SCGNT	CEMP-N	CONSTRUCTION GRANTS
73	SHUD	CEMP-N	HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
<b>1T*</b>	<b>SDPW</b>	<b>CEMP-IS</b>	<b>RPMA SUPPORT TO DIRECTORATES OF PUBLIC WORKS (NEW)</b>
04	BCD1	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE PROGRAM, PART I, OTHER
09	BCD2	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE PROGRAM, PART II, OTHER
96	EEAP	CEMP-MA	ENERGY ENGINEERING ANALYSIS PROGRAM
5V	ECAS	CEMP-MA	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM
10	MCA	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY
11	MMCA	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY, MINOR
32	NMCR	CEMP-MA	NAVY AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE
1R	OMARR	CEMP-MA	OP & MAINT, ARMY RESERVE REIMBURSABLE
18	OMAR	CEMP-MA	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE
Z3	QOLEA	CEMP-MA	QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS, AF
2S	AFSM	CEMP-MA	SMALL MISSILE CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE
63	PIK	CEMP-MA	PAYMENT IN KIND
84	RDAF	CEMP-MA	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALU, AIR FORCE
83	RDTA	CEMP-MA	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALU, ARMY
0B	BCF3	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE PART III, AIR FORCE
0A	BCA3	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE PART III, ARMY (BRAC93)
0C	BCA4	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE, ARMY (BRAC95)
03	BCF1	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE, PART I, AIR FORCE
02	BCA1	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE, PART I, ARMY (BRAC I)
08	BCF2	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE, PART II, AIR FORCE
07	BCA2	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE, PART II, ARMY(BRAC91)
0D	BCF4	CEMP-MA	BASE CLOSURE, PART IV, AIR FORCE
1B	ECIF	CEMP-MA	ENERGY CONSERV INVESTMT PROG, AIR FORCE
1A	ECIP	CEMP-MA	ENERGY CONSERV INVESTMT PROG, ARMY
44	FHEC	CEMP-MA	FAMILY HOUSING - ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM
26	FHAF	CEMP-MA	FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE
42	FHLI	CEMP-MA	FAMILY HOUSING, LINE ITEM IMPROVEMENT

## SECTION 4

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

### TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

<b>TF</b>	<b>ABBR</b>	<b>HQ PROPONENT</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
40	FHNC	CEMP-MA	FAMILY HOUSING, NEW CONSTRUCTION
4A	MCDA	CEMP-MA	MIL CONSTR DEFENSE ACCOUNT (CHEM DEMIL)
6	MMCR	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTR, ARMY RESERVES, MINOR
20	MCAF	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE
21	MAFR	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVES
23	MMAF	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE, MINOR
25	MANG	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL
12	MCAR	CEMP-MA	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVES
27	NAAF	CEMP-MA	NON-APPROPRIATED FUNDS, AIR FORCE
60	NAFA	CEMP-MA	NON-APPROPRIATED FUNDS, ARMY
15	PBS	CEMP-MA	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT
4C	QOLED	CEMP-MA	QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS, DEFENSE
2A	QOLEA	CEMP-MA	QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENT, AIR FORCE
4T	CTR	CEMP-MD	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION
W6	SDCPS	CEMP-MD	DC PUBLIC SCHOOLS
54	DLA	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
W5	SDMDC	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE MANPOWER DATA CTR
57	DNA	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY(MILCON)*
Z2	DODO	CEMP-MD	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AGENCIES
51	DODS	CEMP-MD	DOD DEPENDENT SCHOOLS (MILCON)
91	EAPS	CEMP-MD	ENGINEER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, SAUDI
W7	SGAO	CEMP-MD	GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
W8	SHOLM	CEMP-MD	HOLOCAUST MUSEUM
W9	SKENC	CEMP-MD	KENNEDY CENTER
1M	MGLV	CEMP-MD	MAGNETIC LEVITATION
22	MAPF	CEMP-MD	MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, AIR FORCE
5S	S6S	CEMP-MD	MILITARY CONSTR, SECTION 6 SCHOOLS-CONUS
30	MCN	CEMP-MD	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY
4B	BMDO	CEMP-MD	NAT'L MISSILE DEFENSE (BALLISTIC MISSILE)
56	DMA	CEMP-MD	NATIONAL IMAGING & MAPPING AGENCY(MILCON)*
69	NSA	CEMP-MD	NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY (MILCON)
1P	PRP	CEMP-MD	PENTAGON RENOVATION PROGRAM
66	SAH	CEMP-MD	US SOLDIERS' AND AIRMEN'S HOME
58	DCA	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY

## SECTION 4

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

### TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

<b>TF</b>	<b>ABBR</b>	<b>HQ PROPONENT</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
4D	SDMDC	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE MANPOWER DATA CENTER
1S	SOCM	CEMP-MD	MILCON, SOUTHERN COMMAND (PANAMA)
85	RDTD	CEMP-MD	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALU, DOD
WY	SONGV	CEMP-MD	ALL NON-GOVERNMENT ENTITIES
WX	SOOTH	CEMP-MD	ALL OTHER FED DEPARTMENTS & AGENCIES
16	ANC	CEMP-MD	ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY
53	CEETA	CEMP-MD	COMMUN ELECTRONIC EVAL & TESTING AGENCY
39	MDOD	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE AGENCY (DOD), UNSPECIFIED MINOR
98	DECA	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE COMMISSARY AGENCY (MILCON)
48	DLI	CEMP-MD	DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE
WL	SODOE	CEMP-MD	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
WJ	SODOI	CEMP-MD	DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR
WK	SODOJ	CEMP-MD	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, BUREAU OF PRISONS
WI	SODOS	CEMP-MD	DEPARTMENT OF STATE
W4	SOFDA	CEMP-MD	DEPT OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND DRUG ADMIN
WM	SONPS	CEMP-MD	DEPT OF INTERIOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
W3	SOINS	CEMP-MD	DEPT OF JUSTICE, IMMIG & NATURALIZATION
WZ	SODOT	CEMP-MD	DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION, U.S. COAST GUARD
41	DFAS	CEMP-MD	DOD DEFENSE FINANCE ACCOUNTING SYSTEM
46	DODM	CEMP-MD	DOD MEDICAL FACILITIES
43	DODU	CEMP-MD	DOD MEDICAL FACILITIES, UNSPECIFIED MINOR
4S	SOF	CEMP-MD	DOD SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCE
WW	SOEMA	CEMP-MD	FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
WT	SOFG	CEMP-MD	FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS
70	FMS	CEMP-MD	FOREIGN MILITARY SALES
WA	SHGSA	CEMP-MD	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
3Q	GOCQ	CEMP-MD	GOVERNMENT OF KUWAIT FUNDED CONSTR
WP	SOVOA	CEMP-MD	INTERNAT'L COMMUNICATION AGENCY (VOA)
1K	KWM	CEMP-MD	KOREAN WAR MEMORIAL
13	MAP	CEMP-MD	MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
W2	SONAS	CEMP-MD	NATIONAL AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE ADMIN
WS	SOSLG	CEMP-MD	STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
55	DOE	CEMP-NE	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
W1	SOFHA	CEMP-NE	FARM SERVICES AGENCY

## SECTION 4

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

### TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

<b>TF</b>	<b>ABBR</b>	<b>HQ PROPONENT</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
76	GOJ	CEMP-NE	GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN
77	GOK	CEMP-NE	GOVERNMENT OF KOREA
3J	GOJC	CEMP-NE	GOVT OF JAPAN FUNDED CONSTRUCTION
6A	HN	CEMP-NE	HOST NATION, JAPAN
17	ARNG	CEMP-NE	MILITARY CONSTR, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD
50	NASA	CEMP-NE	NATIONAL AERONAUTICS & ADMINISTRATION
1N	NWM	CEMP-NE	NATIONAL WAR MEMORIAL
52	NATO	CEMP-NE	NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION
59	ONDF	CEMP-NE	OTHER NON-DEFENSE FEDERAL FUNDS
1C	USCG	CEMP-NE	US COAST GUARD
47	VOA	CEMP-NE	VOICE OF AMERICA
XD	SABMC	CEMP-NE	AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION
WE	SOARD	CEMP-NE	APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
WZ	SODOT	CEMP-NE	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORATION (US COAST GUARD)
XA	SDOA	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF AGRICULTURE
XB	SDOC	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF COMMERCE
XF	SBIA	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS SFO
XE	SFWL	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE SFO
XG	SDEA	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF JUSTICE, DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENCY
WQ	SFBE	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF JUSTICE, FED BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS SFO
XH	SFAA	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMIN SFO
WR	SDOTR	CEMP-NE	DEPT OF TREASURY, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE
B1	FUSR	CEMP-NE	FORMERLY USED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM
WF	SHUD	CEMP-NE	HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE SFO
WN	SOIBC	CEMP-NE	INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION
XC	SSMTH	CEMP-NE	SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTE
86	SMPF	CEMP-NE	STATE, MUNICIPALITY AND PRIVATE FUNDS
5U	FUDS	CEMP-RF	DERP, FORMERLY USED DEF SITES (FUDS) DIRECT
5H	BA1E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART I, ARMY (BRAC I) DIRECT
5A	IRPAD	CEMP-RI	DERP, ARMY INST RESTORATN PROG (IRP), DIRECT
5G	IRPAR	CEMP-RI	DERP, ARMY IRP, REIMB
5L	EQ	CEMP-RI	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REIMBURSIBLE
5P	BF1E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART I, AIR FORCE, DIRECT
5Q	BF2E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART II, AIR FORCE, DIRECT

## SECTION 4

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

### TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

<b>TF</b>	<b>ABBR</b>	<b>HQ PROPONENT</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
5I	BA2E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART II, ARMY (BRAC91) DIRECT
5R	BF3E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART III, AIR FORCE, DIRECT
5J	BA3E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART III, ARMY(BRAC93) DIRECT
5T	BF4E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART IV, AIR FORCE, DIRECT
5K	BA4E	CEMP-RI	BRAC ENVIR, PART IV, ARMY(BRAC95) DIRECT
5E	C2PF	CEMP-RI	COMPLI, CONSERV & POL PREV, AF, REIMB
5C	C2PA	CEMP-RI	COMPLI, CONSERV AND POLLUTION PREV, REIMB
5F	IRPFR	CEMP-RI	DERP, AIR FORCE IRP, REIMB
5D	IRPLR	CEMP-RI	DERP, DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY IRP, REIMB
5B	IRPOR	CEMP-RI	DERP, OTHER IRP, REIMB
V1	HGSA	CEMP-RS	ENVIRONMENTAL FOR GEN SERVICES ADMIN
WD	EPAO	CEMP-RS & NE	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, OTHER
V3	HTRE	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
VF	HCCC	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORP
VG	HFSA	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF AGRICULTURE, FARM SERVICE AGENCY
VZ	HAFS	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF AGRICULTURE, FOREST SERVICE
VA	HEDA	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF COMMERCE, ECON. DEVPMNT ADMIN
VL	HDOE	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF ENERGY
VK	HHHS	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
VB	HBIA	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
VC	HBLM	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MGMT
VX	HIBR	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
VY	HIFW	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
VD	HNPS	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF INTERIOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
VT	HJBP	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF JUSTICE, BUREAU OF PRISONS
VU	HJFBI	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF JUSTICE, FED BUREAU INVESTIGATION
VV	HJINS	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION & NATURALIZATION
VH	HFAA	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF TRANSPORT, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMIN
VJ	HFRA	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF TRANSPORT, FEDERAL RAILWAY ADMIN
VI	HCG	CEMP-RS & NE	DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION, U.S. COAST GUARD
WH	EPACG	CEMP-RS & NE	EPA CONSTRUCTION GRANTS PROGRAMS
WU	SUPF	CEMP-RS & NE	EPA SUPERFUND
WG	HEPA	CEMP-RS & NE	EPA, EXCEPT CONSTR GRANTS & SUPERFUND
VP	HFDIC	CEMP-RS & NE	FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

## SECTION 4

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

### TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

<b>TF</b>	<b>ABBR</b>	<b>HQ PROPONENT</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
VN	HFEMA	CEMP-RS & NE	FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
V5	HFDA	CEMP-RS & NE	FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION
V4	HGAO	CEMP-RS & NE	GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING OFFICE
V2	HHUD	CEMP-RS & NE	HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
V6	HIHS	CEMP-RS & NE	INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE
VS	HNOAA	CEMP-RS & NE	NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMIN
VM	HPHS	CEMP-RS & NE	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
VQ	HSBA	CEMP-RS & NE	SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
VR	HUSPS	CEMP-RS & NE	UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
2F	AFF	NONE	AIR FORCE FURNITURE DESIGN AND PROCUREMENT
62	FRGA	NONE	ALTERNATE CONSTRUCTION, GERMANY
1F	ARMF	NONE	ARMY FURNITURE DESIGN AND PROCUREMENT
64	AFES	NONE	ARMY/AIR FORCE EXCHANGE HQ
65	AFEL	NONE	ARMY/AIR FORCE EXCHANGE, LOCAL
29	BOMAF	NONE	BRAC O&M, AIR FORCE
6C	CDIP	NONE	COMBINED DEFENSE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
3N	DBON	NONE	DEFENSE BUSINESS O FUND (NAVY/MC)
3F	DBOF	NONE	DEFENSE BUSINESS OP FUND (AIR FORCE)
3A	DBOA	NONE	DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND(ARMY)
3D	DBOD	NONE	DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND(DEFENSE)
61	DFIRA	NONE	DEFENSE OVERSEAS MIL FAC, INVEST RECOV ACCOUNT
4M	DMOM	NONE	DOD MEDICAL FACILITIES, OPER AND MAINT
5M	OMS	NONE	DOD SCHOOLS, OPERATIONS AND MAINT
6B	FIP	NONE	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
45	FHMA	NONE	FAMILY HOUSING - MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR
3C	FHRN	NONE	FAMILY HOUSING - O&M REPAIR, NAVY
2M	FHMF	NONE	FAMILY HOUSING, O+M, AIR FORCE
Z1	MOSF	NONE	MODERNIZATION OF U.S. FACILITIES, GERMANY
5N	AFN	NONE	NATO, AIR FORCE
35	NAFN	NONE	NON APPROPRIATED FUNDS (NAVY)
82	NALF	NONE	NON-APPROPRIATED ARMY, LOCAL
24	OMAF	NONE	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE
14	OMA	NONE	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY
49	OMD	NONE	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DOD

## SECTION 4

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

### TF LISTING BY MILITARY PROGRAMS PROPONENT OFFICE

TF	ABBR	HQ PROPONENT	DESCRIPTION
33	OMN	NONE	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY/MC
28	OTHF	NONE	OTHER AIR FORCE FUNDS
19	OTHA	NONE	OTHER ARMY FUNDS
31	OTHN	NONE	OTHER NAVY FUNDS (HOST NATION)
3G	RPMF	NONE	REAL PROPERTY MAINT, DEFENSE(AIR F)
3E	RPMD	NONE	REAL PROPERTY MAINT, DEFENSE(DEFENSE)
3P	RPMN	NONE	REAL PROPERTY MAINT, DEFENSE(NAVY/MC)
3K	ROKC	NONE	REPUBLIC OF KOREA FUNDED CONSTRUCTION
6E	SACO	NONE	SPECIAL ACTION COMMAND ON OKINAWA
99	TSAL	NONE	TROOP SUPPORT AGENCY, LOCAL
3B	RPMA	NONE	REAL PROPERTY MAINT, DEFENSE(ARMY)

5. The following is the current definition for Interagency and International Services (IIS) (formerly known as Support for Others (SFO)/Work for Others (WFO)) for use in Classifying Work and PROMIS Data Input and Reporting:

Interagency and International Services (IIS) Program (formerly known as Support for Others (SFO)/Work for Others (WFO)): Reimbursable assistance provided by USACE to non-Department of Defense (DOD) Federal agencies (EPA, FEMA, etc. and associated Real Estate support.), 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, Military or Real Estate 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
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

**Interagency and International Services (IIS) Definition (Cont.)**

<b><u>Military Programs</u></b>	<b><u>Acronym</u></b>
Major Military Construction <i>(BRAC, Army, Air Force, DoD, Navy, NMD, Chemical Demilitarization, etc.)</i>	MILCON
Department of Defense Reimbursable <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 <i>(Japan, Korea, Europe and NATO)</i>	HNS
Military Research, Development, Technology and Evaluation	MIL RDT&E
Defense Burden Sharing (Kuwait, etc.)	---
<b><u>Real Estate</u></b>	<b><u>Acronym</u></b>
Home Owners Assistance Program	HAP
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. James Lovo, CEMP-NI, 202-761-0052 or the POC for the definition, Mr. Phil Pinol, CEMP-MP, 202-761-1321.

## SECTION 3

## PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

---

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

1. Funding for labor increases 3.7% in FY 02, 4.0% in FY 03, and 4.0% in FY 04.
2. 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
3. MVD is expected to phase out the PM-Forward at Rock Island Arsenal by the end of FY 02. The intent of giving \$ 100,000 to MVD was to assist in the RI District/RIA DPW test. This test was concluded at the end of FY 99. RIA has a small active duty military population, 168 persons. With limited IS funds available support to one installation that is not actively involved in 'Training the Force' or 'Force Readiness' and is not a Power Projection Platform or a Power Support Platform is not practical.
4. The focus of the PM-Forward program should be to place PM-Forwards at those installations that are Power Projection Platforms and Power Support Platforms.
5. To the maximum extent possible, all checkbook funds should be allocated during the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters to provide adequate execution rates and development of an execution plan that meets Army customer needs. Manpower funds will be allocated quarterly. All installation support funds will be allocated at the appropriate AMSCO level.
6. Installation Support direct funds are regional assets. Work accomplished by districts, using MSC installation support funds should have appropriate district overhead applied to the work. Regional support and integration of installation support are MSC missions and should be treated as such in the application of overhead rates.
7. Use of IS Funds:
  - It is appropriate for all IS personnel to provide "baseline support" to any customer.
  - Any OMA funded customer may receive services funded by the IS Checkbook or directly from IS personnel.
  - All non-OMA customers may only receive baseline support free; all other support or services must be reimbursable.
  - Direct IS funds should not be used to provide overhead for specific M&R or New Work projects, nor used to provide funding for design, maintenance, repair or new work projects.
  - Any service or study, such as project development, scoping, DD1391 preparation, IDIQ type contract development, is an appropriate use.
  - OMA funds may be used in support of 'Army Working Capital Fund' (AWCF) installations and installations with similar non-appropriated funds, but, the purpose of AWCF or similar funds is to be self supporting, and MSCs should seek reimbursement for services provided.
8. 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 initial FY 02 FTE Allocations are based on the review and analysis of several factors, to include workload, funding levels, utilization trends, Budget proposals, and FTE ceiling limitations and targets. Based on our best projections, we feel that each command is receiving resources necessary to accomplish their respective missions. However, each command has until 13 August to review their FTE allocation and provide Headquarters consolidated comments. Reference EC 11-2-4, Calendar of Events.

The allocation includes changes to division offices staffing published in the Division Office Analysis Task Force report dated 27 November 2000. It also incorporates a shift in military MCA FTE that responds to PBD 809 program increases and similar funding increases that were not available in March-April when the field submitted FTE data for this cycle.

Commanders have flexibility in the internal distribution of the FTE allocations and utilization 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. Unlike past years, Headquarters is not retaining a reserve of FTE. HQ will readjust from among the commands based on projected utilization and past utilization patterns. Each command is authorized to exceed their final allocation by up to one percent in the year of execution and is expected to manage their hire lag aggressively to obtain the optimum use of manpower resources.

Manpower management continues to receive emphasis at Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA) due in part to the increased emphasis the Administration and OMB are placing on the Federal Activities Initiatives Reform (FAIR) Act and A-76, along with Army Stationing Installation Plan (ASIP), the Total Army Analysis (TAA) and Army Transition.

As part of a DA-wide initiative, USACE will undergo certification of its manpower requirement process by the U.S. Army Manpower Analysis Agency (USAMAA) in FY 02. This will include a 100 percent review of Headquarters, MSC offices and all Separate FOA, and two percent of the remaining subordinate organizations/work centers beginning later this FY. Certification will entail three distinct phases: preparation, on-site analysis, and post-study actions. A lot of time, effort, attention to detail, and command emphasis is required during all phases, especially the preparation phase. Central to this phase and overall process is the 12-Step Method of Analysis that minimizes the creation of additional written documentation. It describes and supports workload and manpower positions by capitalizing on information that already exists within the organization. It also provides the foundation for the baseline submission packages that will be developed by each organization element and provided to the

USAMAA Study Teams. You will be required, among other things, to account for organization tasks, individuals' hours vice those tasks, vacant positions, contractor workload, mission and functions, and organizations' comments (e.g., major changes, concerns, visions or new missions affecting the organization). Information regarding USAMAA and the 12-Step Method Analysis is available at the following web site address: <http://usamaa.army.pentagon.mil>.

We continue to coordinate with USAMAA to determine timeframes and the specific sites to be visited by their review teams. We will advise you of the field-level organizations/work centers identified for study as well as milestones, required actions, designation of POCs, and training.

### **MILITARY FUNDED MANPOWER**

1. The military allocation is subject to change based on MSC review of the initial allocation, conference report for military appropriations and revised command guidance.
2. The controlling factor 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.
3. Accurate planning for the execution of manpower is critical to insure maximum utilization of available resources. Timely and accurate submission of the Civilian Employment Plans (CEPs) is essential.
4. 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.
5. Detailed guidance by MDEP and AMSCO will be provided separately at a later date.

### **CIVIL WORKS FUNDED MANPOWER**

1. The initial FY 02 FTE allocation is based on workload representing historic funding levels with an allowance for three-percent inflation in the outyears. Therefore, no FTE were withheld for congressional actions. Adjustments to the initial allocation will be based on field comments, congressional action and guidance from the Director of Civil Works.
2. Timely and accurate submission of Civil Works Usage Plans (CWUPs) is important. Emphasis should be placed on timely and accurate submission of 113G reports.

### **UNIFORMED MILITARY AUTHORIZATIONS**

As part of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) of the Officer Reduction Inventory (ORI), uniformed military authorizations will now be allocated by grade.

**SECTION 3**

**MANPOWER**

<b>FINAL FY 02 FTE ALLOCATION</b>					
		<b>FY01</b>	<b>FY02</b>	<b>FY03</b>	<b>FY04</b>
<b>MVD</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	5,530	5,475	5,437	5,195
	<b>MILITARY</b>	146	167	158	158
	<b>TOTAL</b>	5,676	5,642	5,595	5,353
<b>NAD</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	2,480	2,428	2,398	2,179
	<b>MILITARY</b>	1,416	1,402	1,406	1,412
	<b>TOTAL</b>	3,896	3,830	3,804	3,591
<b>NWD</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	3,854	3,897	3,950	3,939
	<b>MILITARY</b>	1,024	1,060	1,060	1,060
	<b>TOTAL</b>	4,878	4,957	5,010	4,999
<b>LRD</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	4,444	4,322	4,344	4,162
	<b>MILITARY</b>	425	477	477	477
	<b>TOTAL</b>	4,869	4,799	4,821	4,639
<b>POD</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	291	289	321	268
	<b>MILITARY</b>	1,370	1,479	1,530	1,550
	<b>TOTAL</b>	1,661	1,768	1,851	1,818
<b>SAD</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	2,910	3,015	3,080	2,967
	<b>MILITARY</b>	1,020	1,004	1,000	1,000
	<b>TOTAL</b>	3,930	4,019	4,080	3,967
<b>SPD</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	1,911	1,783	1,634	1,564
	<b>MILITARY</b>	601	620	620	620
	<b>TOTAL</b>	2,512	2,403	2,254	2,184
<b>SWD</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	2,379	2,388	2,348	2,334
	<b>MILITARY</b>	676	670	670	670
	<b>TOTAL</b>	3,055	3,058	3,018	3,004
<b>MSC TOTAL</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	23,799	23,597	23,512	22,608
	<b>MILITARY</b>	6,678	6,879	6,921	6,947
	<b>TOTAL</b>	30,477	30,476	30,433	29,555

**SECTION 3**

**MANPOWER**

<b>FINAL FY 02 FTE ALLOCATION</b>					
		<b>FY01</b>	<b>FY02</b>	<b>FY03</b>	<b>FY04</b>
<b>HNC</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	24	49	51	53
	<b>MILITARY</b>	708	674	625	596
	<b>TOTAL</b>	732	723	676	649
<b>TAC</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	4	4	3	2
	<b>MILITARY</b>	300	307	297	297
	<b>TOTAL</b>	304	311	300	299
<b>CTR TOTAL</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	28	53	54	55
	<b>MILITARY</b>	1,008	981	922	893
	<b>TOTAL</b>	1,036	1,034	976	948
<b>WRSC</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	157	161	163	164
	<b>MILITARY</b>	0	0	0	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	157	161	163	164
<b>ERDC</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	705	688	669	591
	<b>MILITARY</b>	1,275	1,277	1,276	1,276
	<b>TOTAL</b>	1,980	1,965	1,945	1,867
<b>HECSA</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	92	92	92	92
	<b>MILITARY</b>	83	82	82	82
	<b>TOTAL</b>	175	174	174	174
<b>MDC</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	30	31	29	40
	<b>MILITARY</b>	0	0	0	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	30	31	29	40
<b>UFC</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	210	213	213	213
	<b>MILITARY</b>	112	111	121	121
	<b>TOTAL</b>	322	324	334	334
<b>249th BN &amp; PRIMEPOWER</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	0	0	0	0
	<b>MILITARY</b>	32	32	32	32
	<b>TOTAL</b>	32	32	32	32
<b>HQ</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	456	446	446	446
	<b>MILITARY</b>	438	391	396	396
	<b>TOTAL</b>	894	837	842	842
<b>FOA TOTAL</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	1,650	1,631	1,612	1,546
	<b>MILITARY</b>	1,940	1,893	1,907	1,907
	<b>TOTAL</b>	3,558	3,492	3,487	3,421
<b>CORPS TOTAL</b>	<b>CIVIL</b>	<b>25,477</b>	<b>25,281</b>	<b>25,178</b>	<b>24,209</b>
	<b>MILITARY</b>	<b>9,626</b>	<b>9,753</b>	<b>9,750</b>	<b>9,747</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35,103</b>	<b>35,034</b>	<b>34,928</b>	<b>33,956</b>

**SECTION 3****MANPOWER****INITIAL FY 02 MILITARY FTE ALLOCATION**

	<b>MCA</b>	<b>BRAC</b>	<b>DERP</b>	<b>RE</b>	<b>FMS</b>	<b>RDT&amp;E</b>	<b>OMA</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PGB FY 02</b>	<b>DIFF</b>
<b>MVD</b>	42	4	82	0	0	0	31	<b>159</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>NAD</b>	1,031	68	65	136	27	0	54	<b>1,381</b>	<b>1,520</b>	<b>-139</b>
<b>NWD</b>	767	25	196	87	0	0	44	<b>1,119</b>	<b>1,029</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>LRD</b>	291	27	76	49	0	0	21	<b>464</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>POD</b>	1,173	11	101	40	4	0	75	<b>1,404</b>	<b>1,371</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>SAD</b>	763	18	83	102	10	0	73	<b>1,049</b>	<b>1,019</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>SPD</b>	297	56	115	94	0	0	37	<b>599</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>SWD</b>	469	35	76	50	0	0	28	<b>658</b>	<b>672</b>	<b>-14</b>
<b>HNC</b>	542	0	78	0	0	0	54	<b>674</b>	<b>702</b>	<b>-28</b>
<b>TAC</b>	186	0	0	0	146	0	6	<b>338</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>-69</b>
<b>ERDC</b>	3	0	28	0	0	883	362	<b>1,276</b>	<b>1,276</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>HECSA</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	<b>83</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>UFC</b>	100	0	0	0	1	0	10	<b>111</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>HQ</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	264	<b>264</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>HQ-TRG</b>	1	26	45	9	5	0	56	<b>142</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>249TH</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>PRIME POWER</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,665</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>945</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>883</b>	<b>1,230</b>	<b>9,753</b>	<b>9,753</b>	<b>0</b>

**SECTION 3****MANPOWER****INITIAL FY 03 MILITARY FTE ALLOCATION**

	<b>MCA</b>	<b>BRAC</b>	<b>DERP</b>	<b>RE</b>	<b>FMS</b>	<b>RDT&amp;E</b>	<b>OMA</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PGB FY 03</b>	<b>DIFF</b>
<b>MVD</b>	41	4	75	0	0	0	33	<b>153</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>NAD</b>	1,056	63	62	136	23	0	54	<b>1,394</b>	<b>1,529</b>	<b>-135</b>
<b>NWD</b>	812	21	206	88	0	0	40	<b>1,167</b>	<b>1,030</b>	<b>137</b>
<b>LRD</b>	315	34	86	49	0	0	21	<b>505</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>POD</b>	1,094	10	119	32	6	0	66	<b>1,327</b>	<b>1,366</b>	<b>-39</b>
<b>SAD</b>	791	21	83	132	10	0	72	<b>1,109</b>	<b>1,017</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>SPD</b>	306	37	115	91	0	0	37	<b>586</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>SWD</b>	492	32	78	49	0	0	27	<b>678</b>	<b>669</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>HNC</b>	496	0	78	0	0	0	0	<b>574</b>	<b>705</b>	<b>-131</b>
<b>TAC</b>	175	0	0	0	146	0	13	<b>334</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>-81</b>
<b>ERDC</b>	3	0	28	0	0	883	362	<b>1,276</b>	<b>1,278</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>HECSA</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	<b>83</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>UFC</b>	117	0	0	0	1	0	10	<b>128</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>HQ</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	264	<b>264</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>HQ-TRG</b>	1	26	45	9	5	0	55	<b>141</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>249TH</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>PRIME POWER</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,699</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>975</b>	<b>586</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>883</b>	<b>1,169</b>	<b>9,751</b>	<b>9,750</b>	<b>1</b>

**\*\*NOTE: THE PGB FY 03 NUMBER IS -3 LESS, BECAUSE OF A MINUS WEDGE IN THE WEDGE UIC.  
PBG FOR FY 03 REFLECTS A TOTAL OF 9747.**

# SECTION 3

# MANPOWER

## INITIAL FY 04 MILITARY FTE ALLOCATION

	MCA	BRAC	DERP	RE	FMS	RDT&E	OMA	TOTAL	PBG FY 04	DIFF
MVD	40	4	71	0	0	0	33	148	134	14
NAD	951	62	72	136	15	0	54	1,290	1,523	-233
NWD	798	21	211	86	0	0	40	1,156	1,030	126
LRD	329	34	80	49	0	0	21	513	414	99
POD	1,220	15	129	32	11	0	75	1,482	1,366	116
SAD	818	21	83	132	10	0	72	1,136	1,017	119
SPD	355	37	115	91	0	0	37	635	568	67
SWD	495	32	78	49	0	0	27	681	669	12
HNC	433	0	36	0	0	0	30	499	705	-206
TAC	127	0	0	0	146	0	13	286	415	-129
ERDC	3	0	28	0	0	883	362	1,276	1,277	-1
HECSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	83	83	0
UFC	117	0	0	0	1	0	10	128	107	21
HQ	0	0	0	0	0	0	264	264	264	0
HQ-TRG	1	26	45	9	5	0	50	136	143	-7
249TH	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	7	0
PRIME POWER	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	25	25	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,687</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>948</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>883</b>	<b>1,203</b>	<b>9,745</b>	<b>9,747</b>	<b>-2</b>

**\*\*NOTE: THE PBG FY 04, BOTTOMLINE NUMBER IS 3 LESS, BECAUSE THERE IS A REDUCTION IN THE WEDGE UIC FOR A -3 FTE.**

## SECTION 3

## HIGH GRADE ALLOCATIONS



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20314-1000

REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF:

CERM-M (540-4g)

16 Jan 01

MEMORNDUM FOR Commanders/Directors, Major Subordinate Commands and Field Operating Activities

SUBJECT: USACE High Grade Management

1. References:

- a. Department of Defense memo, dated 21 November 2000, subject: Civilian High-Grade Control Program.
- b. Department of Army memo, dated 5 December 2000, subject: Civilian High-Grade Control Program.

2. The Department of Defense and the Department of Army have discontinued Department-wide high grade controls. Both they and I expect all managers and supervisors to continue to exercise appropriate prudence in addressing your human resource and budgetary needs. This additional flexibility should provide an opportunity to meet the recruitment, development, and retention goals that will make our civilian workforce fully effective and efficient.

3. This policy covers both civil and military funded civilian positions. Effective immediately, USACE High Grade ceilings are eliminated. From this point forward grades are tied to position classification and funding. Your baseline position will be the FY2001 High Grade and FTE allocations. We will use this baseline to monitor any changes. The GE and OMA labor funding and the FY2000 Cost of Doing Business actual will be used to monitor cost and funding changes. Also random reviews of classification of High Grades, and Regional Business Center oversight will be used.

4. My point of contact for any questions about this policy is Ms. Judith Clarke, Chief, Manpower Division, Directorate of Resource Management, who may be reached at (202) 761-1869.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

5 Encls

1. FY2001 High Grade Allocation
2. FY2001 FTE Allocation
3. GE & OMA Labor Funding
4. FY2000 Cost of Doing Business Actuals
5. Position Management Guideline

  
MILTON HUNTER  
Major General, USA  
Deputy Commander

# SECTION 3

# EXECUTIVE DIRECTION & MGT FUNDING

## D-R-A-F-T EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT CONSOLIDATED COMMAND GUIDANCE

FY 02 - FY 04

(\$000)

GENERAL EXPENSES, 96x3124							OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY					
96X3124							21 2020					
Division Offices*:	FTE Target	FY 02 Funding	FTE Target	FY 03 Funding	FTE Target	FY 04 Funding	FTE Target	FY 02 Funding	FTE Target	FY 03 Funding	FTE Target	FY 04 Funding
LRD	81	10,225	81	11,055	81	11,256	13	892	13	938	13	741
MVD	83	10,475	83	11,385	83	11,592	0	0	0	0	0	0
NAD	71	9,080	71	9,735	71	9,912	26	2,397	26	2,563	26	2,025
NWD	73	9,419	73	10,230	73	10,416	21	1,780	21	1,938	21	1,531
POD	20	2,874	20	3,135	20	3,192	54	6,514	54	7,000	54	5,533
SAD	75	10,175	75	10,890	75	11,088	20	1,647	20	1,750	20	1,383
SPD	73	9,705	73	10,395	73	10,584	18	1,442	18	1,562	18	1,235
SWD	70	9,347	70	10,065	70	10,248	21	1,828	21	1,937	21	1,532
Total Div.:	546	71,300	546	76,890	546	78,288	173	16,500	173	17,688	173	13,980
HQ**	420	57,009	425	61,545	425	62,664	285	29,191	285	31,313	285	24,750
HECSA	85	20,306	85	21,945	85	22,344	56	11,697	56	12,562	56	9,929
UFC	10	975	10	990	10	1,008	10	839	10	937	10	741
ERDC	2	195	2	165	2	168	0	0	0	0	0	0
IWR	25	3,115	25	3,465	25	3,528	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total SFOA:	122	24,591	122	26,565	122	27,048	66	12,536	66	13,499	66	10,670
Reserve		2,000		2,000		2,000		0				
<b>GRAND TOTAL:</b>	<b>1,088</b>	<b>154,900</b>	<b>1,093</b>	<b>167,000</b>	<b>1,093</b>	<b>170,000</b>	<b>524</b>	<b>58,227</b>	<b>524</b>	<b>62,500</b>	<b>524</b>	<b>49,400</b>

### Executive Direction & Management Funding Guidance

Executive Direction & Management Funding Guidance represents initial guidance for planning purposes.

Divisions and Major Subordinate Commands (MSCs) should make every effort to hire to 100 percent of authorized levels. However, authorized labor will be temporarily funded at 90 percent of the authorized levels. This action is based upon the historical under-execution of labor based upon hire lag. The non-labor funding guidance has been increased with the funds harvested from the under-funding labor. The chart as depicted above reflects the labor adjustment. Labor execution will be monitored monthly and labor funds will be increased or decreased based upon actual utilization. We anticipate this process will be temporary and should only last a few months--until the ED&M funding model can be evaluated. Headquarters U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Director of Resource Management, will convene a panel of Resource Managers from the field, and selected USACE Directorates to review and evaluate the ED&M funding model and its future use. The panel will also evaluate a requirements based approach to the budget formulation process. Final guidance will be provided by 1 September 2001.

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

---

The Supervision and Administration (S&A) Regionalization proposal was approved by the Board of Directors (BOD) 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 by opening an S&A “checking account” for each MSC.

MSC beginning balances were established by prorating a portion of one-quarter of the S&A reserve based on the MSCs FY 99 workload, plus gains or losses incurred during FY 99. This initial starting balance totaled \$24 million. MSCs took ownership of these funds and are responsible for managing on a break-even basis on 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 in September 2000 caused the S&A accounts (HQ MILCON and O&M reserves + MSC checking accounts) to slightly exceed the nominal balance requirement (4 months S&A expense  $\pm$  1 months expense). **Therefore MSC will have a nominal balance limit they can retain for future use. For FY 02 the limit is 3 months expense (average projected for the year) and for FY 03 and beyond the limit is 2.5 months expenses. MSC Balances in excess of this amount will become a part of the HQ reserve.** MSC are still expected to recoup their losses unless they are due to factors beyond their control.

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 consistently, 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. **An adjustment was made to expense to reflect the estimated impact of implementing the consolidated departmental overhead (CDO) accounting policy change. Expenses were increased 2.5% for FY 02 and 1% for FY 03-04. Customers should be provided the same level of staffing and S&A services as before the implementation of CDO.** “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.

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

---

### FY 02 – 04 S&A Rates:

<b>FY 02</b>	<u>MILCON</u>	<u>O&amp;M</u>	<u>DERP</u>
LRD	5.8%	6.7%	8.2%
NAD	6.2%	8.0%	8.1%
NWD	5.8%	6.7%	8.2%
POD	6.7%	9.1%	8.7%
SAD	5.9%	7.2%	8.2%
SPD	5.9%	6.7%	9.2%
SWD	5.9%	6.6%	8.2%
TAC	7.4%	N/A	N/A

<b>FY 03</b>	<u>MILCON</u>	<u>O&amp;M</u>	<u>DERP</u>
LRD	5.8%	6.6%	8.1%
NAD	6.0%	7.8%	8.2%
NWD	5.8%	6.6%	8.1%
POD	6.4%	7.9%	8.6%
SAD	5.9%	7.0%	8.1%
SPD	6.3%	6.8%	7.8%
SWD	5.8%	6.6%	8.1%
TAC	6.6%	N/A	N/A

<b>FY 04</b>	<u>MILCON</u>	<u>O&amp;M</u>	<u>DERP</u>
LRD	5.8%	6.6%	8.1%
NAD	6.2%	7.9%	8.3%
NWD	5.8%	6.6%	8.1%
POD	6.4%	7.9%	8.6%
SAD	5.8%	7.0%	8.1%
SPD	5.6%	6.6%	7.3%
SWD	5.8%	6.6%	8.1%
TAC	6.6%	N/A	N/A

## SECTION 3

## COST OF DOING BUSINESS

---

The FY 02-04 costs of doing business performance goals are provided as guidance to enable development of a three-year Command Operating Budget (COB). The Regional Management Boards (RMBs) are charged with the responsibility to provide Division oversight to the three-year COB process. As such, the RMBs must ensure that the District COBs are developed to attain these goals.

The objective is to provide a financial basis for day-to-day as well as long-term decision making. This process will help Regional Business Centers (RBCs) to better manage resources, ensure affordability and improve financial analysis capabilities.

The various General and Administrative (G&A) overhead and Consolidated Departmental overhead (CDO) Total Labor Multiplier (TLM) rates have been adjusted to reflect implementation of the CDO concept for FY 02. TLM target rates for Military Real Estate and Civil Operations and Maintenance (O&M) are based upon Corps-wide averages along with historical data. Development of the O&M TLM target rates are absent of departmental overhead being applied to plant and facility operations.

In establishing the cost of doing business performance targets, consideration was given to the higher operating costs in OCONUS locations. Additionally, we analyzed and incorporated the economies of scale phenomenon where appropriate. Separate targets are published for Civil and Military G&A, Civil O&M and Civil CDO TLM rates on the basis of the size of a district's direct labor base. The total direct labor base (regular labor plus fringe benefits) is used for forecasting G&A and CDO TLM target rates and the O&M direct labor base is used exclusively for forecasting the O&M TLM target rates.

G&A overhead, TLM rates, and chargeability factors will continue to be monitored and evaluated in FY 02 Command Management Reviews (CMRs). However, no formal ratings will be tabulated for G&A and CDO TLM rates due to CDO implementation. FY 02 will be used as the dust-settling period. TLM rates will be formally rated for district Military Real Estate and Civil O&M programs in the FY 02 CMRs and the CDO chargeability factors for both civil and military operations will be evaluated on a regional basis. Specific definitions, calculations and rating criteria are provided in CCG Chapter 3 – Resource Management.

The FY 02-04 cost of doing business performance goals for those **participating** in the Consolidated Departmental Overhead (CDO) test in FY 02 are as follows:

	<u>FY 02</u>	<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u>
CONUS Civil G&A (S)	.32	.32	.32
(M)	.27	.27	.27
(L)	.23	.23	.23
OCONUS Civil G&A (S)	.33	.32	.32

## SECTION 3

## COST OF DOING BUSINESS

	<u>FY 02</u>	<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u>
Civil O&M TLM (S)	2.48	2.46	2.46
(M)	2.35	2.33	2.33
(L)	2.25	2.23	2.23
Civil Consolidated TLM (S)	2.55	2.55	2.55
(M)	2.50	2.50	2.50
(L)	2.47	2.47	2.47
CONUS Military G&A (S)	.26	.26	.26
(L)	.24	.24	.24
OCONUS Military G&A (S)	.30	.30	.30
(L)	.29	.28	.28
Military Real Estate	2.36	2.35	2.35
Military Consolidated TLM	2.43	2.43	2.43
Military and Civil Consolidated Chargeability	.60	.60	.60

The FY 02-04 cost of doing business performance goals for those **not participating** in the Consolidated Departmental Overhead (CDO) test in FY 02 are as follows:

	<u>FY 02</u>	<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u>
CONUS Civil G&A (S)	.33	.32	.32
(M)	.28	.27	.27
(L)	.24	.23	.23
OCONUS Civil G&A (S)	.33	.32	.32
Civil Planning TLM	2.55	2.54	2.54
Civil Construction TLM	2.48	2.47	2.47
Civil O&M TLM (S)	2.48	2.46	2.46
(M)	2.35	2.33	2.33
(L)	2.25	2.23	2.23
Civil Design TLM (S)	2.55	2.53	2.53
(M)	2.53	2.51	2.51
(L)	2.50	2.49	2.49
CONUS Military G&A (S)	.27	.27	.27
(L)	.25	.25	.25

**SECTION 3****COST OF DOING BUSINESS**

---

	<u>FY 02</u>	<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u>
OCONUS Military G&A (S)	.31	.31	.31
(L)	.29	.29	.29
Military Design TLM (Non-DERP)	2.44	2.43	2.43
Military Design DERP TLM	2.46	2.45	2.45
Military Construction TLM	2.38	2.37	2.37
Military Real Estate TLM	2.36	2.35	2.35

NOTE: (S) = Smaller Districts (M) = Middle Districts (L) = Larger District

## SECTION 3

## INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

### 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. Fee-for-service can take the form of either a Site License (a one-time annual fee), or metered usage on a central platform such as CEEIS. Metered usage is measured in CPU/second. Fee-for-service pays for operations, maintenance, and PRIP payback.

2. The following are the site license fees for FY 02 and estimated for 03 and 04. These fees are based on the amounts submitted in the Information Technology Investment Portfolio System (ITIPS). These fees are dependent upon the results of final Headquarters approval of funding levels and any significant change in the number of sites. Three new systems will be deployed in FY 02, the Design Review and Checking System (DrChecks), the Corps Water Management System (CWMS) and the Facilities and Equipment Management System (FEMS). Another system that is not really new is the National Recreation Reservation System (NRRS). This system has been funded in the CEEIS budget in the past but is now shown as a separate AIS.

AIS	Est #	Fee per Site <u>1/</u>	Fee per Site <u>1/</u>	Fee per Site <u>1/</u>
	Sites	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04
PCASE	20	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00
VIMS	48	4,448.00	4,448.00	0
APPMS	58	8,810.00	8,207.00	0
CACES	269	4610.00	4610.00	4610.00
RECIS	1,332	236.00	244.00	244.00
RMS	278	4,039.00	<b>4500.00</b>	<b>5500.00</b>
E-MCX	38,568	48.80	50.79	50.79
PPDS	56	7,412.00	7,903.00	0
ACASS/CCASS	13,606	62.41	58.00	58.00
PROMIS	45	81,288.00	81,288.00	11,111.00
CWMS	215	2,276.00	9,341.00	9,942.00
DrChecks	42	7,886.00	8,690.00	7,678.00
SPECS INTACT	42	5,976.00	5,976.00	5,976.00
SPS	41	4,180	0	0
FEMS	29	110,345.00	78,000.00	74,000.00
NRRS	26	14,461.00	14,461.00	14,461.00

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

PCASE - Based on the total cost divided evenly between those districts utilizing the programs.

## SECTION 3

## INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

---

VIMS – Total cost equally divided among organizations which have vehicles. System will be subsumed by FEMS in FY 04.

APPMS – Total cost equally divided among organizations required to have a property book. The system will be subsumed by FEMS in FY 04.

CACES – Total cost is allocated based on the number of authorized Cost Engineer manpower spaces at each district/FOA.

RECIS – Based on the number of authorized RE positions at the district/FOA divided by the total number of authorized RE positions (includes RE HQ, Division, and Districts) which gives us a percent times the total cost.

RMS – Total cost is allocated proportionately based on the number of Area / Resident offices plus one for the District.

E-MCX – Total cost is allocated based on number of e-mail mailboxes that each site places in the Corps-wide X.500 Directory.

PPDS – Based on the total number of sites (56). ERDC is 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 FY 04.

ACASS/CCASS – Total cost is allocated based on the number of evaluations per site.

PROMIS – The number of sites is the total number of districts/FOA that plan and execute projects. The amount shown (\$83,066) is an average per site. This figure is a weighted formula combining District workload, as reflected in the Integrated Command Resource Information Tables, numbers of projects in the PROMIS database and allocated FTE. The increase from FY 01 is due to PRIP payback which has to be paid back in FY 02 and 03.

CWMS – 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.

DrChecks – Two license rates are applied: large users (\$10,500) and small users (\$8,500). Large and small users are again determined by the amount of PED funds received by districts and centers per the FY 00 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 \$4,100 is applied. Since limited use is anticipated at these sites, an option for on-site training will not be offered. Hence, the reduced license fee of \$4,100. Cost to all sites will be reduced in the future as on-site training will not be required after FY 04. The amounts shown are the average per site for each FY.

## SECTION 3

## INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

SPECSINTACT – License fees determined by prorating the total system cost against the amount of MP and CW PED funds received by districts and centers as identified on RM’s Cost of Doing Business Report for FY 00 (the latest data we have that reflects an entire FY and apples-to-apples MP/CW costs). By regulation, SPECSINTACT is not required for OCONUS work, so I do not include NAU; however, POD polled their districts and found that they use the system and want to help support it. Accordingly, POF, POH, and POJ are included in the charges.

SPS – The amount shown (\$4,180) is an average cost per site. Sites are charged a variable rate based on proportionate \$ amount of civil contracts. The final year of its 3 year PRIP payback will occur in FY 02.

FEMS – There are three levels of site license charges according to the classification of a district as large, medium or small.

NRRS – The amount shown is (\$14,461) is an average cost per district. Districts are charged a variable rate based on the number of park office sites per district.

3. All AIS FY 02 budget figures have been reviewed by the Cross Functional Assessment Team (CFAT) and presented to the Junior Program Budget Advisory Committee (JPBAC) and the Senior Program Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC). The budget figures shown represent the best information available at this time and may change prior to FY 02.

4. For those AIS (CEFMS, CEEMIS and REMIS) which are metered on the CEEIS platform the estimated rates are shown below. The rates are based on actual usage during the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of FY 01 and the current amounts reported in ITIPS. They are subject to change based on the results of final Headquarters approval of funding levels.

	<b>FY 02</b>	<b>FY 03</b>	<b>FY 04</b>
<i>Funding and Requirements</i>	\$14,027,000	\$17,511,000	\$18,247,000
CEFMS	(12,131,000)	(15,547,000)	(16,214,000)
CEEMIS	(509,000)	(535,000)	(561,000)
REMIS	(1,387,000)	(1,429,000)	(1,472,000)
<i>Rate Per CPU Second</i>	\$0.0433	\$0.0540	\$0.0563

5. POCs are Belinda Chase, CERM-BA, (202) 761-8970, Brenda Gooden, CECI-C, (202) 761-7115 or the AIS POC identified in ITIPS database.

## SECTION 3

## INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

---

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

1. The CEAP-IA program came to the end of the CDC/Syntegra contract effective 30 September 2000. Effective FY 01, the Processing Centers, located at Vicksburg, MS and Portland, OR, are operating under new vendor contracts to procure required hardware, software, maintenance, and services to support the processing centers and the network infrastructure. The program management responsibility for the new CEEIS Services program is located at ERDC/Vicksburg, where the network infrastructure, network security, and systems operations for both sites will be managed. The network experienced a technical refresh and increased required capability in FY 00 and has continued this trend in FY 01. The requirement for CEEIS network bandwidth for internet and business processing across USACE has significantly increased in the last year, as well as the demand and expectation for increased reliance and up time. The increase in communications costs, infrastructure costs, additional information assurance requirements, command systems integration (to prevent drive-by deployments) and increased user demands has significantly impacted the CEEIS budget.

2. In early FY 01, CECI chartered a Process Action Team (PAT) by request of the Division Information Managers (DIM) to formulate a fair and equitable methodology for billing CEEIS costs (corporate network and infrastructure only--NOT the AIS's costs). The PAT's recommendation was to bill CEEIS costs based on a flat fee by user ID. Because of concerns raised by field Resource Managers regarding the formulation and change of CEEIS costs associated with this new procedure, a decision was jointly made by CECI and CERM that CEEIS and the AIS's will be handled as they were in FY 01. The PAT will reconvene to further address this issue.

3. The estimated operational costs for FY 02 will increase from FY 01, \$22,395,900 to \$26,378,729. This increase represents additional funds needed for PRIP payback, information assurance, maintenance, and additional bandwidth/circuits for processing centers. Due to this increase, the CEEIS CCB and HQ are investigating alternate means of funding some of the CEEIS AIS requirements. All sites should realize there is a possibility of a revised FY 02 budget before the end of FY 01 based on recommendations of the CCB and HQ. It should also be noted that in order to fulfill the Internal Audit requirements; there will be no CAP in FY 02.

4. POC is Dr. Peggy Wright, CEERD-IV-Z, at 601-634-4630.

Estimated Fixed monthly cost per site:

FY00	\$19,935.30
FY01	\$19,935.30
FY02	\$24,587.29

## SECTION 3

## INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

---

Estimated Variable Costs: Systems were upgraded in FY 01

Sun 3000/5500 (336MHz). Sun 6800's (750MHz)

FY 00 \$.038

FY 01 \$.038

FY 02 \$.038 per CPU second (estimated)

### Input/Output

FY 00 \$.03 per thousand pages

FY 01 \$.03 per thousand pages

FY 02 \$.03 per thousand pages

### Connect Time

FY 00 \$.44 per hour

FY 01 \$.44 per hour

FY 02 \$.44 per hour

### 1-800 indail

FY 00 \$.09 per minute with minimum charge of \$1.00

FY 01 \$.09 per minute with minimum charge of \$1.00

FY 02 \$.09 per minute with minimum charge of \$1.00

POC is Dr. Peggy Wright, at 601-634-4630

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

(\$000)

	<b>FY 02</b>	<b>FY 03</b>	<b>FY 04</b>
<b>CEHNC</b>	10,727	3,350	0
<b>CELRD</b>	3,671	4,741	8,725
<b>CEMVD</b>	8,611	3,655	1,245
<b>CENAD</b>	2,540	1,670	175
<b>CENWD</b>	5,000	983	440
<b>CEPOD</b>	250	0	0
<b>CESAD</b>	2,260	14,905	21,544
<b>CESPD</b>	47	347	47
<b>CESWD</b>	227	60	1,260
<b>CEHQ</b>	12,861	37,782	0
<b>CEHEC</b>	1,698	1,381	976
<b>CEMDC</b>	33,618	31,507	2,206
<b>CEFC</b>	0	0	0
<b>CEERD (WES)</b>	9,190	8,620	3,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>90,700</b>	<b>109,001</b>	<b>39,618</b>

Remarks: All PRIP amounts are estimates. FY 02 and Outyear amounts include estimates for P2, CEEDMS, FEMS and the Jacksonville District Building, all of which require Congressional notification and concurrence. The amounts will be revised based on FY 02/03 PRIP submittals. FY 04 program amounts will be revised based on Eng. Form 1978s submittals. The POC is Marilyn H. White.

## SECTION 3

## FACILITIES GUIDANCE

---

MACOM Engineer Office (CELD-ZE):  
Larry Robinson, CELD-ZE, 202-761-8774, fax 202-761-0611,  
larry.m.robinson@usace.army.mil

Facilities master planning by all USACE individual commands is the key to sound capital investment strategies for our internal facility needs, and subsequent build-buy-lease recommendations for CECG approval. Facilities costs are a component of overhead that can be managed. Better correlation between space utilization rates and overhead costs is under study, and will be reflected in the CMR process in the near future. Subordinate commands above the DA/USACE target utilization rates are required to maintain space reduction plans. Space utilization rates and reduction plan updates are shared with CECG at least annually (normally 2nd Quarter CMR), and are covered in Command Staff Inspections.

Presently, in general, the preferred USACE approach to meeting its facilities requirements is through leasing due to the flexibility leasing provides. CECG is open to moves to military installations where practicable.

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 follows. 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.

### TYPICAL COMPONENTS OF 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 and AR 405-70 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 timeliness 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.

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

The Office of Logistics will be deploying the Facilities and Equipment Maintenance (FEM) System, FEM has been designated the corporate standard automated maintenance management system. We expect to begin deployment on or about May/June 2001 using a phased deployment schedule and be completed in mid 2003. The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Navy Systems Support Group (NSSG) and the USACE for implementation of the FEM System was signed on 11 April 2000 by the Deputy Commander.

The Deputy Commander by memorandum, CELO-MS, dated 15 February 2000, delayed the application of the CMR maintenance management indicators contained in the Consolidated Command Guidance (CCG) until the FEM System is deployed. CMR data collection will commence for each MSC as FEM is deployed.

**Project funds required for training (train the trainer) are estimated as shown below:**

	FY00 (\$M)	FY01 (\$M)	FY02 (\$M)	FY03 (\$M)	FY04 (\$M)	FY05 (\$M)	FY06 (\$M)	FY07 (\$M)	FY08 (\$M)	FY09 (\$M)	FY10 (\$M)
PRIP	5.075	2.38	4.77	4.77							
Project (Training)			1.1	1.1							
PRIP Payback					3.98	3.98	3.98	3.98	3.98		
DOD PM Support & Maintenance Fee for Maximo Licenses		0.314	0.314	0.314	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Total (PRIP & O&M)	5.075	2.694	6.184	6.184	5.18	5.18	5.18	5.18	5.18	1.2	1.2

Estimated Annual PRIP Payback for each USACE element: \$80K

Estimated Training Cost for each USACE element: Range from \$19K to \$105K (See implementation schedule).

Estimated Annual DOD PM Support and MAXIMO site licenses fee for each USACE element: \$24K

Note: The estimates are based on 50 implementation sites and five year payback period.

FEM implementation schedule and estimated training cost for each activity is attached.

## SECTION 3

## LOGISTICS GUIDANCE

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

Est Training Costs	District	Name	Start	Comp	Processing Center
\$105,000.00	CENWP	<b>IOC Site - Portland District CENWP</b>		7/14/01	WPC
\$0.00	<b>CENWD</b>	<b>Northwestern Division CENWD</b>	<b>9/10/01</b>	<b>3/15/02</b>	<b>WPC</b>
\$54,000.00	CENWW	Walla Walla District CENWW	9/27/01	2/1/02	WPC
\$54,000.00	CENWO	Omaha District CENWO	9/10/01	2/15/02	WPC
\$105,000.00	CENWS	Seattle District CENWS	9/24/01	3/4/02	WPC
\$28,000.00	CENWK	Kansas City District CENWK	9/13/01	3/15/02	WPC
\$0.00	<b>CESWD</b>	<b>Southwestern Division CESWD</b>	<b>10/8/01</b>	<b>4/12/02</b>	<b>CPC</b>
\$54,000.00	CESWL	Little Rock District CESWL	10/8/01	3/4/02	CPC
\$28,000.00	CESWG	Galveston District CESWG	10/25/01	3/18/02	CPC
\$54,000.00	CESWF	Fort Worth District CESWF	10/22/01	3/29/02	CPC
\$80,000.00	CESWT	Tulsa District CESWT	10/11/01	4/12/02	CPC
\$0.00	<b>CELRD-GL</b>	<b>Great Lakes and Ohio River Division CELRD</b>	<b>11/5/01</b>	<b>6/21/02</b>	<b>WPC</b>
\$28,000.00	CELRE	Detroit District CELRE	11/5/01	3/29/02	WPC
\$105,000.00	CELRH	Huntington District CELRH	11/8/01	4/12/02	WPC
\$54,000.00	CELRP	Pittsburgh District CELRP	11/12/01	4/26/02	WPC
\$105,000.00	CELRL	Louisville District CELRL	12/3/01	5/10/02	WPC
\$28,000.00	CELRN	Nashville District CELRN	12/6/01	5/24/02	WPC
\$28,000.00	CELRB	Buffalo District CELRB	12/6/01	6/10/02	WPC
\$19,000.00	CELRC	Chicago District CELRC	11/15/01	6/21/02	WPC
\$0.00	<b>CEMVD</b>	<b>Mississippi Valley Division CEMVD</b>	<b>1/7/02</b>	<b>7/23/02</b>	<b>CPC</b>
\$54,000.00	CEMVN	New Orleans District CEMVN	1/7/02	4/26/02	CPC
\$54,000.00	CEMVR	Rock Island District CEMVR	1/14/02	5/10/02	CPC
\$54,000.00	CEMVS	St. Louis District CEMVS	1/17/02	5/24/02	CPC
\$105,000.00	CEMVK	Vicksburg District CEMVK	1/10/02	6/4/02	CPC
\$105,000.00	CEMVM	Memphis District CEMVM	2/11/02	6/21/02	CPC
\$19,000.00	<b>CEFC</b>	<b>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Finance Center CEFC</b>	<b>2/14/02</b>	<b>7/9/02</b>	<b>CPC</b>
\$28,000.00	CEMVP	St. Paul District CEMVP	2/19/02	7/23/02	CPC
\$0.00	<b>CESAD</b>	<b>South Atlantic Division CESAD</b>	<b>3/4/02</b>	<b>2/24/03</b>	<b>CPC</b>
\$105,000.00	CESAM	Mobile District CESAM	3/4/02	8/2/02	CPC
\$28,000.00	<b>CEHNC</b>	<b>Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville CEHNC</b>	<b>3/7/02</b>	<b>8/16/02</b>	<b>CPC</b>
\$54,000.00	CESAS	Savannah District CESAS	6/3/02	11/8/02	CPC
\$54,000.00	CESAW	Wilmington District CESAW	6/6/02	11/22/02	CPC
\$28,000.00	CESAC	Charleston District CESAC	8/26/02	2/7/03	CPC
\$54,000.00	CESAJ	Jacksonville District CESAJ	8/29/02	2/24/03	CPC
\$0.00	<b>CESPD</b>	<b>South Pacific Division CSPD</b>	<b>1/14/02</b>	<b>8/16/02</b>	<b>WPC</b>
\$28,000.00	CESPA	Albuquerque District CESPA	1/14/02	7/9/02	WPC

## SECTION 3

## LOGISTICS GUIDANCE

\$54,000.00	CESPK	Sacramento District CESPK	1/28/02	7/23/02	WPC
\$28,000.00	CESPL	Los Angeles District CESPL	1/17/02	8/2/02	WPC
\$28,000.00	CESPN	San Francisco District CESPN	1/31/02	8/16/02	WPC
\$0.00	<b>CEERD</b>	<b>U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center CEERD</b>	<b>9/9/02</b>	<b>4/18/03</b>	<b>CPC</b>
\$105,000.00	CEERD	Vicksburg	9/9/02	3/10/03	
\$28,000.00	CEERD	Champaign	9/12/02	3/21/03	
\$28,000.00	CEERD	Ft Belvior	9/23/02	4/4/03	
\$54,000.00	CEERD	Hanover	9/26/02	4/18/03	
\$0.00	<b>CENAD</b>	<b>North Atlantic Division CENAD</b>	<b>9/9/02</b>	<b>4/18/03</b>	<b>WPC</b>
\$105,000.00	CENAD	Baltimore District CENAB	9/9/02	2/7/03	WPC
\$54,000.00	<b>CEHEC</b>	<b>Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity CEHEC</b>	<b>11/4/02</b>	<b>5/9/03</b>	<b>CPC</b>
\$28,000.00	<b>CEPPB</b>	<b>Prime Power School</b>	<b>11/7/02</b>	<b>5/16/03</b>	<b>CPC</b>
\$28,000.00	CENAP	Philadelphia District CENAP	9/12/02	2/24/03	WPC
\$54,000.00	CENAE	New England District CENAE	9/23/02	3/10/03	WPC
\$54,000.00	CENAN	New York District CENAN	9/26/02	3/21/03	WPC
\$54,000.00	CENAO	Norfolk District CENAO	10/7/02	4/4/03	WPC
\$28,000.00	CENAU	Europe District CENAU	10/10/02	4/18/03	WPC
\$0.00	<b>CEPOD</b>	<b>Pacific Ocean Division CEPOD</b>	<b>1/13/03</b>	<b>6/16/03</b>	<b>WPC</b>
\$28,000.00	CEPOA	Alaska District CEPOA	1/13/03	5/2/03	WPC
\$19,000.00	CEPOH	Honolulu District CEPOH	1/20/03	5/16/03	WPC
\$28,000.00	CEPOJ	Japan District CEPOJ	1/27/03	6/2/03	WPC
\$19,000.00	CEPOF	Far East District CEPOF	2/3/03	6/16/03	WPC
\$19,000.00	<b>CETAC</b>	<b>Transatlantic Programs Center CETAC</b>	<b>11/11/02</b>	<b>6/2/03</b>	<b>CPC</b>

## **SECTION 3**

## **CONTRACTING OUT GUIDANCE**

---

### **CIVIL WORKS 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 program. The percentage of work contracted out varies with the different phases of the projects.

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 02 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 MSC Regional Management Board (RMB) is responsible for balancing the contracting effort across district. While it is desirable for the various districts to maintain of 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.

## SECTION 3

## COMMAND INSPECTIONS

---

### USACE ORGANIZATIONAL INSPECTION PROGRAM

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

**HQUSACE Command Staff Inspections (CSI)** consist of three-day visits to USACE Divisions by the DCG and selected staff principals once in every 18-month cycle. Specific implementation guidance will be made available by the proponent. 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 Inspections and Staff Assistance Visits.

Division commanders and the 249<sup>th</sup> Engineer Battalion Commander will conduct **Command Inspections** 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**.

#### **FY 02-04 Command Inspection Dates:**

Feb 2002	LRD	Feb 2003	NWD	Feb 2004	POD
Apr 2002	NAD	Apr 2003	MVD/ERDC	Apr 2004	NAD
Jul 2002	SPD/POD	Jul 2003	SAD	Jul 2004	SPD
Oct 2002	SWD	Oct 2003	LRD	Oct 2004	SWD

## 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* which 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.

### HQUSACE STANDARD RECURRING APPROVED CONFERENCES

Senior Leaders’ Conference (with the associated Emerging Leaders Conference)

Spring USACE Leaders Workshop (with ENFORCE)

Fall District Commanders Conference (in DC)

\* Worldwide DPW Training Workshop

\* Project Delivery Team Conference<sup>1</sup>

\* USACE Technical Transfer Conference<sup>2</sup>

\* Navigation Conference (*PL95-269 & WRDA*)

Small Business Conference (in DC)

CP-18 Career Program Managers Seminar

Worldwide USACE Legal Services Conference

Real Estate Conference

Finance and Accounting Conference

Resource Management Conference

Information Managers Symposium

Security and Law Enforcement Conference

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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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. AR 11-2 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 02-06, and updates will be published in conjunction with Army updates.
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, or FOAs.
3. Management control evaluations may be conducted in one of two ways—management control checklists or existing management review processes. Most checklists and key management controls for the evaluation areas can be linked to from our 02-06 plan. Another source that contains Army’s mandatory control areas is their website at <http://www.asafm.army.mil/fo/fod/mc/amcec/inventory.htm>. Management review processes used by the Corps to evaluate key management controls include Command Inspections, Command Management Reviews, Command and Staff Assistance Visits, and scheduled audits/inspections.
4. Proponent for this process is CERM-P.

# SECTION 3

# USACE MANAGEMENT CONTROL PLAN

USACE Org	Army/USACE Function	Evaluation Areas	Related Reg	Checklists / Key Controls Published In:	Alternative Method	Evaluation Level		Evaluation Required						
						HQ	MSC/Dist	F Y 0 2	F Y 0 3	F Y 0 4	F Y 0 5	F Y 0 6		
CI	Info Mgmt	Army Info Resources Management Program	AR 25-1	<a href="#">AR 25-1</a>	CMR & CMD Inspections*	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X		
CI	Info Assurance (99 MW)	Info Systems Security (Mgmt Weakness)	AR 380-19	<a href="#">AR 25-1</a>	CMD Inspections*	X	MD	X	X	X	X	X		
CW	Civil Works	Regulatory Programs	<a href="#">33 CFR 320-331</a>	<a href="#">15 Oct 99 CFCW memo</a>	CMR and Div Visits	X	M D		X		X			
CW	Civil Works	Direct Program Development--Annual Prog / Budget Req	EC 11-2-179	<a href="#">EC (pgs 12 &amp; 24)</a>		X	M D	X	X	X	X	X		
CW	Civil Works	Engineering and Design	ER 1110-2-1150	<a href="#">ER (App H)</a>		X	M D				X			
CW	Civil Works	Emergency Management Activities	ER 11-1-320	<a href="#">ER (Apps F,G,H)</a>		X	M D		X					
CS	USACE Business Process	Program and Project Management	<a href="#">ER 5-1-11</a>	<a href="#">CECSMemo2Jul01</a>	CMR/CMD Inspections	X	M	X						
CC	Legal	Claims Services	AR 27-20	<a href="#">Appendix B</a>	CMD Inspections	X	M D		X					
EO	EEO	EEO and Affirmative Action	<a href="#">AR 690-12</a>	Cmd Insp Checklist	CMD Inspections	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X		
EO	EEO	EEO Discrimination Complaints	<a href="#">AR 690-600</a>	Cmd Insp Checklist	CMD Inspections	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X		
EO	EEO	Nondiscrimination in Progs/Actvts Asst'd	<a href="#">AR 690-600</a>	Cmd Insp Checklist	CMD Inspections	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X		
HR	Personnel (Military)	Personnel Accounting & Strength Reporting	<a href="#">AR 600-8-6</a>	<a href="#">MILPER Memo 97-002</a>		X	M D							
HR	Personnel (Military)	Leaves and Passes	<a href="#">AR 600-8-10</a>	<a href="#">MILPER Memo 97-001</a>		X	M D	X	X	X				
HR	Personnel (Military)	Monitoring Active Duty Service Obligations	AR 350-100	<a href="#">AR</a>		X	M D							
HR	Personnel (Military)	Special Duty Pay	AR 614-200	<a href="#">AR</a>		X	M D	X						
HR	Personnel (Military)	Personnel Info -- Indebtedness Remission	AR 600-4	<a href="#">AR</a>		X	M D		X					
HR	Personnel	Employee Benefits - Unemployment Compensation Prog	AR 690-800-850	<a href="#">AR</a>										
HR	Personnel	ACTEDS - Funding Control	AR 690-950	<a href="#">AR</a>										
IG	Inspector General	Training	AR 20-1	<a href="#">Appendix B</a>	N/A	X				X				
IG	Inspector General	Inspections	AR 20-1	<a href="#">Appendix B</a>	N/A	X				X				
IG	Inspector General	Investigations	AR 20-1	<a href="#">Appendix B</a>	N/A	X				X				
IG	Inspector General	Assistance	AR 20-1	<a href="#">Appendix B</a>	N/A	X				X				
IG	Inspector General	Information Resources	AR 20-1	<a href="#">Appendix B</a>	N/A	X				X				
IG	Inspector General	Intelligence Oversight	AR 20-1	<a href="#">Appendix B</a>	N/A	X				X				
IG	Inspector General	Legal	AR 20-1	<a href="#">Appendix B</a>	N/A	X				X				
IR	Internal Review	Audits / Internal Controls	AR 11 - 7	<a href="#">AR</a>	CMD Inspections *	x	MD	X	X	X	X	X		
LD	Supply	Supply Activities	<a href="#">AR 710-2</a>	<a href="#">CELD Checklist</a>		X	M D				X			
LD	Transportation	Transportation Services	<a href="#">DOD4500.9R</a>	EP 700-7-1 (App E)			M D	X		X			X	
LD	Facilities	Facilities Support	<a href="#">AR 420-10</a>	EP 700-7-1 (App D)		X	M D				X			
LD	Maintenance	Maintenance Activities	<a href="#">AR 750-1</a>	<a href="#">ER 750-1-1 (App E)</a>		X	M D				X			
LD	Logistics	Aviation Management	OMB Cir A-126	EP 700-7-1		X	M D		X					

# SECTION 3

# USACE MANAGEMENT CONTROL PLAN

USACE Org	Army/USACE Function	Evaluation Areas	Related Reg	Checklists / Key Controls Published In:	Alternative Method	Evaluation Level		Evaluation Required				
						HQ	MSC/Dist	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06
CW/MP	Construction	Engineering and Design Quality Management	ER 1110-1-12	<a href="#">ER (Apps G,H,I,J)</a>	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	*	*	*	*	*
CW/MP	Construction	Design and Construction Evaluation	ER 415-1-13	<a href="#">ER (Apps B,C)</a>	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	*	*	*	*	*
CW/MP	Construction	Construction Quality Management	ER 1180-1-6	ER 1180-1-6	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	*	*	*	*	*
PR	Procurement	Contracting	AFARS	AFARS (App DD)		X	M D				X	
RE	Real Estate	Real Property Acquisition-Leasing	<a href="#">AR 405-10</a>	<a href="#">interim checklist</a>	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X				X
RE	Real Estate	Homeowners Assistance Program	<a href="#">AR 405-16</a>	4 Apr 95 memo	CMD Inspections *	X	D		X			
RE	Real Estate	Outgranting	<a href="#">AR 405-80</a>	AR (App C)	CMD Inspections *	X	M D			X		
RE	Real Estate	Disposal	<a href="#">AR 405-90</a>	<a href="#">interim checklist</a>	CMD Inspections *	X	M D				X	
RM	Construction	Construction Fiscal Management	ER 415-1-16	<a href="#">Appendix C</a>	CMR / CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X		
RM	USAAA CFO Audit	CFO Issues	ER 37-2-10	CERM-F (15 Nov 99)	DCG Mthly Assessments	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X
RM	Accounting	Revolving Fund Operation	ER 37-2-10	ER (Ch 19, App A)	CMR / CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X
RM UFC	FM	Accounting Operations Activities	ER 37-2-10	<a href="#">DFAS-IN 37-1 (App H)</a>	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X
RM	FM	Management Controls	AR 11-2	<a href="#">AR</a>	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X
RM	FM	Budget Execution	AR37-49/ER37-1-24	<a href="#">SAFM-BUC (19 Jul 96); ER</a>	RMBs / Cmd Inspections *	X	M D		X			
RM	Personnel	Manpower Management Activities	<a href="#">AR 570-4</a>	<a href="#">SAMR-FMMR (13 Nov 98)</a>		X	M D	X				
RM	FM	Purchase Card Program	SAFM	<a href="#">APC Inst Manual (May 97)</a>	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X
RM	FM	USACE Indirect Costing Policy	<a href="#">EC 37-1-261</a>	<a href="#">CERM-P Checklist</a>	CMR / CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X			
RM	FM	Army Travel Charge Card Program		<a href="#">SAFM Checklist</a>	CMR	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X
RM UFC	FM	Travel Pay Activities		<a href="#">DFAS-IN 37-1 (App H)</a>		X	TAC/POD		X			X
RM UFC	FM	Disbursing Activities		<a href="#">DFAS-IN 37-1 (App L)</a>		X	TAC/POD		X			X
RM UFC	FM	Commerical Accounts Activities		<a href="#">DFAS-IN 37-1 (App G)</a>		X	TAC/POD		X			X
RM	ACSIM	Army Civilian Inmate Labor Program	AR 210-35	<a href="#">AR (App D)</a>	HQDA Annual Review	X	D	X	X	X	X	X
SO	Mgmt & Cmd	Management of Explosives Safety Program	AR 385-64	<a href="#">AR</a>	Army Safety Prog Eval.	X	M D		X			
SO	Mgmt & Cmd	Chemical Agents	AR 385-61	<a href="#">AR</a>	Army Safety Prog Eval.	X	M D					X
SO	Personnel	Mgmt of Civilian Injury/Illness Program	AR 690-800-810	<a href="#">SAMR 13 Nov 96 Mem</a>	CMR/CMD Inspections *		M D	X	X	X	X	X
SPO	Security	Physical Security Inspection Program	<a href="#">AR 190-13</a>	<a href="#">CECS-OS Memo 29 Ju</a>	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X
SPO	Intelligence/Security	Counterintelligence Program	<a href="#">AR 381-20</a>	<a href="#">CECS-OS Memo 29 Ju</a>	CMD Inspections *	X		X	X	X	X	X
SPO	Security	Anti-terrorism & Force Protect	<a href="#">AR 525-13</a>	<a href="#">CECS-OS Memo 29 Ju</a>	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X
SPO	Intelligence	Information Security	<a href="#">AR 380-5</a>	<a href="#">CECS-OS Memo 29 Ju</a>	CMD Inspections *	X	M D	X	X	X	X	X

\* FY evaluation requirements are dependent on the command inspection schedules for MSCs/Dists--conduct evaluation in preparation for command visit  
 Scheduled Command Inspections are as follows: FY02: POD,SPD,NWD,SWD; FY03: MVD,ERDC,SAD,LRD,NAD

Various regulation links take you to the ASA F&M Homepage, you must then navigate to your evaluation area through the toolbar on the left.  
[Army Management Control Plan Web Page](#)

**FY 02 CONSOLIDATED COMMAND GUIDANCE**

---

**CHAPTER 3**

---

**MEASURES OF SUCCESS**

**STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT REVIEW (SMR).....Page 3-2**

**USACE COMMAND MANAGEMENT REVIEW .....Page 3-6**

**COMMAND MANAGEMENT REVIEW INDICATOR TABLES:**

**Military Programs ..... Table 1**  
**Civil Works..... Table 2**  
**Real Estate..... Table 3**  
**Research and Development..... Table 4**  
**Resource Management..... Table 5**  
**Human Resources..... Table 6**  
**Equal Employment Opportunity ..... Table 7**  
**Corporate Information ..... Table 8**  
**Logistics..... Table 9**  
**Safety and Occupational Health..... Table 10**  
**Small Business Office ..... Table 11**  
**Principal Assistant Responsible for Contracting ..... Table 12**

## **STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT REVIEW: A USACE CORPORATE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

### **WHAT IS THE SMR?**

The Strategic Management Review (SMR) is a management system being used by the senior leaders of USACE to influence future direction and measure its performance toward that direction. The SMR highlights those processes that are most critical for achieving the goals of the USACE Vision. It translates the USACE Campaign Plan into a set of performance measures that provides the framework for a strategic measurement and management system.

### **WHAT ARE THE OBJECTIVES OF SMR?**

In order to implement the USACE Vision and Campaign Plan, USACE developed a multidimensional performance measurement system to ensure a balance between financial and non-financial measures, short- and long-term objectives, lagging and leading indicators, and external and internal perspectives. The objectives of the SMR are to accomplish the following:

- Clarify and translate vision and strategy
- Gain consensus about strategy
- Communicate strategy throughout USACE
- Align Division and District goals to the strategy
- Link strategic objectives to long-term targets and annual budgets
- Identify and align strategic initiatives
- Perform periodic and systematic strategic reviews
- Enhance strategic feedback and learning to improve strategy

### **HOW IS THE SMR DIFFERENT FROM CMR?**

The CMR is structured around current year performance execution indicators, which measure past performance, are termed “lagging” indicators; the SMR is built around goals to drive future performance (i.e., leading indicators which are strategic rather than operational). About 100 indicators are captured in the CMR; the SMR developed in 1999 attempts to summarize many smaller developments through capturing and monitoring nine vital indicators of future performance. The SMR is intended to evolve over time, dropping, adding, and modifying individual indicators, but its focus will always remain on assessing strategic outcomes rather than operational outputs.

The main part of the new SMR is its focus on leading measures of corporate or mission health and direction, and strategic measures aimed at keeping the Corps successfully headed in the right direction. The right direction is established in the USACE campaign plan and strategic goals. None of the SMR measures are specific to a particular division or program; rather they focus on answering strategic questions associated with achieving strategic goals. While in many instances the SMR measure can be peeled back to evaluate specific division or program influence on the corporate measure, the ultimate focus of each SMR measure is to evaluate corporate performance above the program level.

#### WHERE DID THE SMR COME FROM?

The USACE SMR is based on the balanced scorecard (BSC) concept developed in the 1990s by Robert Kaplan and David Norton. The BSC retains traditional financial measures, but balances them with three other perspectives – Customer, Business Process, and Learning and Growth.

- Financial Perspective. In the private sector, this perspective focuses on bottom lines based on financial information (e.g., return on investment, profit, loss, growth, etc.).
- Customer Perspective. This perspective recognizes the increased realization and importance of customer focus and satisfaction. This is a leading indicator. Poor performance is an indicator of future decline.
- Business Process Perspective. This perspective refers to internal business processes. Metrics based on this perspective allow managers to know how well their business is running, and whether its products and services support customer requirements (the mission). Two types of processes may be identified: mission-oriented processes and support processes.
- Learning and Growth Perspective. This perspective includes employee training and corporate cultural attitudes related to both individual and corporate self-improvement. In a knowledge-worker organization, people are the main resource.

#### HOW IS THE BALANCED SCORECARD CONCEPT APPLIED IN THE SMR?

USACE has applied the BSC approach by modifying the financial perspective to a mission perspective. Our motivation as a government organization is not like that in private industry. Our focus is on successful mission accomplishment. Thus, we have adjusted our focus to be public service. The measures of success we have selected include financial dimensions more appropriate to a public sector organization. The customer perspective is called Customer/Client; business process perspective is called Business Practices; and the innovation and learning perspective is called Capability and Innovation.

## WHAT STRATEGIC QUESTIONS AND MEASURES ARE ADDRESSED IN THE SMR?

The initial deployment of the SMR in FY 00 contained nine measures. The measures address specific strategic questions described below:

### **SMR Balanced Scorecard** **9 Strategic Measures**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Mission</u></b></p> <p>M-1: Corporate Program M-2: Strategic Client Relationship</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Client/Customer</u></b></p> <p>CC-1: Strategic Client Positioning CC-2: Client/Customer Satisfaction</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Business Practices</u></b></p> <p>B-1: Business Efficiency Indicator</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Capability &amp; Innovation</u></b></p> <p>CI-1: Leadership Capabilities and Effectiveness CI-2: Workforce Capabilities CI-3: Command Climate CI-4: Strategic Research and Technology Support</p>

#### Mission.

- M-1: What are we doing to strengthen our missions and programs to meet the needs of the Army and the Nation?
- M-2: How well are we fulfilling our role in providing engineering, environmental, real estate, and policy services to Army, DoD and Nation?

#### Customer/Client

- CC-1. Who are our strategic clients and what have we done to strengthen our position with these clients?
- CC-2. How well are we satisfying our clients, customers, and stakeholders?

#### Business Processes.

- B-1. What are we doing to improve the delivery of our products and services to our customers and clients?

#### Capability and Innovation.

- CI-1. What are we doing to ensure we have the leadership capability needed to execute current and future missions?
- CI-2. Do we have the critical capabilities needed to perform our missions?
- CI-3. What are we doing to strengthen our work environment?
- CI-4. How effectively are we using R&D to meet USACE strategic objectives?

Specific corporate goals, metrics, and supporting data and sources are being developed for each of these nine measures. More specific details can be found at the USACE SMR web page at: <http://www.usace.army.mil/sbsp/cmr/>.

#### WHAT IS THE STATUS OF SMR?

The USACE SMR was first developed in 1999 under the auspices of the Strategic Management Board (SMB) at HQUSACE. The SMR process is to be managed by the new Office of Strategic Affairs, scheduled to be formally established 1 October 2001.

As of June 2001, five SMR sessions have been conducted. Each SMR session has begun with the corporate program measure (Corporate Program, M-1) and then focused on a subset of the nine indicators. At different sessions, we have rotated these measures focused on different sets of customers (Strategic Client Relationship, M-2, and Strategic Client Positioning, CC-1), such as our Military or Civil Works customers. Other SMR measures are brought into the discussion as appropriate.

#### WHAT IS THE FUTURE FOR SMR?

The SMR is being deployed as a management system, not just as a new set of measures. The distinction between a measurement and management system is subtle but crucial. The measurement system is only a means to achieve an even more important goal – a strategic management system that helps senior leaders implement and gain feedback about their strategy. Senior leaders can mobilize the power of the measurement framework of the SMR to create long-term organizational change.

The implementation of the SMR is a dynamic, living process. As anticipated in 1999, we are in the process of adjusting some of the first measures. As results continue to come in from the SMR system, they may influence USACE strategy, and as senior management revises the strategy, they may need a revised set of measures. This iterative process is intentional and is one of the strengths of the SMR system.

An underlying concept of the SMR is that the Corps will corporately conduct a multi-tiered management review process. The tiers would consist of district, division, program and corporate levels. Structured correctly, each of these tiers would support the one above it, and all would be complementary and assist in directing us toward corporate objectives. It is envisioned that MSCs will conduct their own SMR based on the same perspectives, but using regional measures and goals they have determined appropriate for their program and region. The command visits have been redesigned to incorporate an SMR component as well.

## USACE COMMAND MANAGEMENT REVIEW

### GENERAL

The Command Management Review (CMR) is a quarterly review and analysis used by senior leaders of USACE to assess the operational condition of the Corps. In FY 02, there are 93 CMR performance indicators, versus 95 in FY 01. The following 12 tables contain each HQUSACE directorate performance measurements for FY 02, to include the functional area, proponent, indicator and evaluation visibility level, source of data, definition, calculation, rating criteria, and governing regulation or law. Each quarter, approximately 10-15 performance measurements are selected for presentation at the CMR. These charts are placed on the DRM homepage at least a week prior to the scheduled CMR.

### CHANGES IN FY 02

#### Table 1 Military Programs:

Dropped two indicators (Project Definition and Congressional Adds Project Execution) and added three new indicators (Financial Closeouts, Design to Cost Performance, and Military Reimbursable Orders Received)

#### Table 2 Civil Works:

Dropped one indicator on Continuing Authorities

#### Table 3 Real Estate:

Dropped two indicators (Outgrants and Encroachments Resolution) and added one indicator (Lease Family Housing)

#### Table 5 Resource Management:

Added Civil and Military CFO MSC Self-Assessments

Indicator name changed: Military Consolidated TLM, Civil Consolidated TLM, Consolidated Chargeability for Military, and Consolidated Chargeability for Civil

#### Table 6 Human Resources:

Dropped one indicator on staffing

#### Table 8 Corporate Information:

Dropped one indicator Common Operating Environment and added three new indicators (Modernization and Enhancement of CEEIS Communications Network, Compliance with Life Cycle Management Systems, and Improve the IT Capital Planning Process)

#### Table 9 Logistics:

Dropped one indicator on equipment maintenance costs

#### Table 12 PARC:

Same number of indicators—but changed emphasis on measurement on three indicators

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

INDICATOR FUNDS TYPE GROUPS PROPONENT	INDICATOR AND EVALUATION  VISIBILITY LEVEL SOURCE OF DATA (SOD)	DEFINITION	CALCULATION(S)	RATING CRITERIA GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW
<b>DEVELOPMENT, MANAGEMENT, AND EXECUTION OF PROGRAMS</b>				
<p><b>MP-01</b> <b>READY-TO-ADVERTISE (RTA)</b> TYPE FUNDS</p> <p>ARMY (10, 40, 42,12)</p> <p>AIR FORCE (20,21,26)</p> <p>DOD (53, 39, 41, 48, 43, 46, 4S, 4B, 16, 1K, 54, 56, 57, 58, 69, 51, 5S, 30, 32, 66, &amp; 3Q)</p> <p>CEMP-M</p>	<p>DATA AGGREGATED BY MSC. SOD: PROMIS</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSC; REPORTED QUARTERLY</p>	<p>RTA IS DEFINED AS COMPLETING ALL NECESSARY STEPS TO ADVERTISE A PROJECT FOR AWARD OF THE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT. IT IS A MEASURE OF HOW THE CORPS IS BEING POSITIONED FOR PROGRAM YEAR (PY) EXECUTION. THE GOAL IS TO HAVE 100% OF THE PRES BUD PROGRAM RTA BY 30 SEP. RTA GOAL SET BY SERVICE LEVEL CUSTOMER. ALL PRES BUD PROJECTS RELEASED BY 1 JAN OF DESIGN YEAR.</p>	<p>NUMERATOR: THE NUMBER OF PY PROJECTS WITH AN ACTUAL OR SCHEDULED RTA THROUGH 30 SEP.</p> <p>DENOMINATOR: THE NUMBER OF PY PROJECTS IN THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET PROGRAM RELEASED BY 1 JAN THAT ARE NOT DEFERRED, CANCELLED OR PLACED ON HOLD BY THE PROGRAMMING COMMAND</p> <p>ACTUAL SHOULD BE DISPLAYED AND RATED IN 4Q AND 1Q.</p>	<p>RATING CRITERIA:</p> <p>GREEN: ACTUAL <math>\geq</math> 90% OF GOAL AMBER: ACTUAL 80-89% OF GOAL RED: ACTUAL &lt; 80% OF GOAL</p> <p>GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW: NONE</p>

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

INDICATOR FUNDS TYPE GROUPS PROPONENT	INDICATOR AND EVALUATION VISIBILITY LEVEL SOURCE OF DATA (SOD)	DEFINITION	CALCULATION(S)	RATING CRITERIA GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW
<p><b>MP-02</b> <b>PROJECT EXECUTION:</b> TYPE FUNDS ARMY (10, 40, 42, , 12, 4A) AIR FORCE ( , 20,21, ,26, ) DOD (53, 39, 41, 48, 43, 46, 4S, 4B, 16, 1K, 54, 56, 57, 58, 69, 51, 5S, 30, 32, 66, 70, 3Q &amp; , AND TYPE FUNDS BEGINNING WITH "W")  CEMP-M</p>	<p>DATA AGGREGATED BY MSC.  SOD: PROMIS  VISIBILITY: MSC; REPORTED QUARTERLY</p>	<p>A MEASURE OF THE MSC AWARDING ITS CUMULATIVE CURRENT AND PRIOR YEAR UNAWARDED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS  USACE GOAL IS TO FORECAST AWARD OF ALL AVAILABLE PRES BUD PROJECTS BY 30 JUN. AWARD 100% OF TOTAL AVAILABLE PROGRAM (TO INCLUDE CONGRESSIONAL ADDS) BY 30 SEP. AF GOAL IS TO AWARD ALL AVAILABLE PRES BUD PROJECTS BY 31 MAR.</p>	<p>NUMERATOR: THE NUMBER OF PY AND PRIOR YEAR UNAWARDED PROJECTS ACTUALLY AWARDED THROUGH THE END OF THE RATING QUARTER.  DENOMINATOR: THE NUMBER OF PROJECTS FORECAST FOR AWARD THROUGH THE END OF THE RATING QUARTER THAT ARE NOT DEFERRED, CANCELED OR PLACED ON HOLD BY THE PROGRAMMING COMMAND. THE FORECAST IS BASED ON THE APPROVED HQUSACE LOCK-IN ESTABLISHED PRIOR TO THE END OF THE 1<sup>ST</sup> QUARTER.  AWARD OF MORE THAN 50% OF THE PROJECT WILL CONSTITUTE 100% PROJECT CREDIT.</p>	<p>RATING CRITERIA:  GREEN: ACTUAL ≥ 90% OF GOAL AMBER: ACTUAL 80-89% OF GOAL RED: ACTUAL &lt;80%OF GOAL  GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW: NONE</p>
<p><b>MP-03</b> <b>DESIGN COST MANAGEMENT</b>  FUND TYPE GROUPS: 1A, 1B, 1D, 1E, 1F, 1H, 2A, 2B, 2D, 2E, 2F, 3A, 5C, 6C, 7A, 7B, 7C, &amp; 7E  CECW-E</p>	<p>DESIGN COST MANAGEMENT IS EVALUATED BY COMPARING ACTUAL DESIGN COSTS MINUS LOST EFFORT TO TARGET DESIGN COSTS  SOD: PROMIS  VISIBILITY: MSC; REPORTED QUARTERLY</p>	<p>MEASURES ACTUAL DESIGN COST (LESS LOST DESIGN) OF PROJECTS AWARDED TO CONSTRUCTION AGAINST TARGET DESIGN COSTS. THE TARGET COSTS ARE DERIVED FROM A DESIGN COST TARGET CURVE WHICH IS BASED ON AN ANALYSIS OF HISTORICAL DESIGN COSTS. ONLY INCLUDES PROJECTS DESIGNED BY AE OR IN-HOUSE. PROGRAMMATIC GOAL OF 6%</p>	<p><math display="block">\text{ACTUAL COST} = \frac{\text{TOTAL DESIGN COST} - \text{LOST DESIGN}}{\text{TOTAL PROGRAM AMOUNT}} \times 100</math>  <math display="block">\text{TARGET COST} = \frac{\text{TOTAL TARGET COSTS}}{\text{TOTAL PROGRAM AMOUNT}} \times 100</math></p>	<p>RATING CRITERIA:  GREEN: ACTUAL COST ≤ TARGET COST AMBER: ACTUAL COST NO MORE THAN 5% OVER TARGET COST. RED: ACTUAL COST MORE THAN 5% OVER TARGET COST.  GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW: DESIGN COST TARGET CURVE ESTABLISHED BY CEMP-ES MEMORANDUM. "PLANNING &amp; DESIGN RATE TARGETS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS," DATED 1 DEC 94.</p>

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

INDICATOR FUNDS TYPE GROUPS PROPONENT	INDICATOR AND EVALUATION  VISIBILITY LEVEL  SOURCE OF DATA (SOD)	DEFINITION	CALCULATION(S)	RATING CRITERIA  GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW
<p><b>MP-04</b></p> <p><b>IN-HOUSE DESIGN PERCENTAGE</b></p> <p>FUND TYPE GROUPS: ALL MILITARY FUND TYPE GROUPS EXCEPT GROUPS 8A, 8B, 8C, 9C &amp; 9D</p> <p><i>CECW-E</i></p>	<p>MEASURES THE AMOUNT OF THE MILITARY WORKLOAD BEING DONE BY IN-HOUSE RESOURCES</p> <p>SOD: PROMIS</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSC; REPORTED QUARTERLY</p>	<p>IN-HOUSE DESIGN WORKLOAD IS MEASURED OVER A FIVE YEAR PERIOD (CURRENT FY ± 2 YEARS) TO ACCOUNT FOR FLUCTUATIONS IN PROGRAM SIZE AND PROJECT MIX. NOTE THAT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS WILL NOW BE INCLUDED SINCE THE INFORMATION WILL BE AVAILABLE IN PROMIS. INCLUDES ALL PROJECTS EXCEPT THOSE WITH AN AUTHORIZED PHASE CODE OF '0'-NO DESIGN AUTHORITY, '5'-DEFERRED FROM PROGRAM, AND '8'- PROJECT CANCELLED. THE GOAL IS TO DESIGN 25% OF THE MILITARY WORKLOAD IN-HOUSE.</p>	<p>NUMERATOR: THE TOTAL PROGRAM AMOUNT (PA) OF PROJECTS REPORTED AS BEING DESIGNED IN-HOUSE (DESIGN BY CODE IS 'HL').</p> <p>DENOMINATOR: THE TOTAL PA OF ALL PROJECTS UNDER DESIGN.</p>	<p>RATING CRITERIA:</p> <p>GREEN: IN-HOUSE DESIGN PERCENTAGE ≤ 25% AMBER: 25% &lt; IN-HOUSE PERCENTAGE ≤ 30% RED: IN-HOUSE PERCENTAGE &gt; 30%</p> <p>GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW: ER 1110-345-100, "DESIGN POLICY FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION"</p>
<p><b>MP-05</b></p> <p><b>BENEFICIAL OCCUPANCY DATE (BOD) TIME GROWTH</b></p> <p>TYPE FUNDS ARMY (10, 40, 42, , 12, 4A) AIR FORCE ( , 20,21, ,26, .) DOD (53, 39, 41, 48, 43, 46, 4S, 4B, 16, 1K, 54, 56, 57, 58, 69, 51, 5S, 30, 32, 66, 70, 3Q &amp; , AND TYPE FUNDS BEGINNING WITH "W")</p> <p><i>CECW-E</i></p>	<p>CONSTRUCTION TIME GROWTH EVALUATED AS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE BASELINE BOD AND ACTUAL BOD</p> <p>SOD: RESIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (RMS) &amp; PROMIS</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSC; REPORTED QUARTERLY</p>	<p>THE BASELINE BOD ESTABLISHED BY PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN.</p>	<p>NUMERATOR: CUMULATIVE TIME (IN DAYS) BETWEEN THE BASELINE BOD AND ACTUAL BOD</p> <p>DENOMINATOR: CUMULATIVE DAYS BETWEEN NTP AND BOD ACTUAL.</p> <p>NEGATIVE TIME GROWTH IS CALCULATED AS 0%.</p>	<p>RATING CRITERIA:</p> <p>GREEN: BOD GROWTH ≤ 10% AMBER: BOD GROWTH &gt; 11% BUT &lt; 20% RED: BOD GROWTH &gt; 21%</p> <p>GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW: NONE</p>

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

INDICATOR FUNDS TYPE GROUPS PROPONENT	INDICATOR AND EVALUATION  VISIBILITY LEVEL  SOURCE OF DATA (SOD)	DEFINITION	CALCULATION(S)	RATING CRITERIA  GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW
<p><b>MP-06</b></p> <p><b>CONSTRUCTION COST GROWTH</b></p> <p>TYPE FUNDS ARMY (10, 40, 42, , 12, 4A) AIR FORCE (, 20,21, ,26, ,) DOD (53, 39, 41, 48, 43, 46, 4S, 4B, 16, 1K, 54, 56, 57, 58, 69, 51, 5S, 30, 32, 66, 70, 3Q &amp; , AND TYPE FUNDS BEGINNING WITH "W")</p> <p><i>CECW-E</i></p>	<p>CONSTRUCTION COST GROWTH EVALUATED BY CONTROLLABLE AND UNCONTROLLABLE COSTS OF MODIFICATIONS.</p> <p>SOD: RMS &amp; PROMIS</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSC; REPORTED QUARTERLY</p>	<p>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST GROWTH FOR A PROJECT IS MADE UP OF TWO ELEMENTS: CONTROLLABLE COST GROWTH (ENGINEERING CHANGES, DIFFERING SITE CONDITIONS, VARIATIONS IN ESTIMATED QUANTITIES, VE CHANGES, AND GOVT. FURNISHED EQUIPMENT CHANGES) AND UNCONTROLLABLE COST GROWTH (USER CHANGES, INACCURATE PRICING/TAXES/USE &amp; POSSESSION/DEFECTIVE WORK, WEATHER, ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES, AND WORK SUSPENSION). . INCLUDES PROJECTS WITH A CONTRACT VALUE GREATER THAN \$200K WITH A DURATION GREATER THAN 183 DAYS, AND WITH A BOD ACTUAL FALLING WITHIN THE MEASUREMENT PERIOD.</p>	<p>NUMERATOR: THE SUMMATION OF THE ESTIMATED DOLLAR COST INCREASE/DECREASE OF ALL MODIFICATIONS</p> <p>DENOMINATOR: THE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AWARD AMOUNT PLUS MODIFICATIONS WITH REASON CODE 5 (PRE-NEGOTIATED CONTRACT OPTIONS).</p> <p>NUMERATOR FOR CONTROLLABLE COST GROWTH: SUMMATION OF THE ESTIMATED DOLLAR COST INCREASE/DECREASE OF ALL MODIFICATIONS WITH REASON CODE 1, 7, 8, G, &amp; Q.</p>	<p>RATING CRITERIA: GREEN: TOTAL COST GROWTH <math>\leq</math> 2% AMBER: TOTAL COST GROWTH = 2.1 – 2.5% RED: TOTAL COST GROWTH &gt; 2.5%</p> <p>GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW: NONE</p>

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

<b>INDICATOR FUNDS TYPE GROUPS PROPONENT</b>	<b>INDICATOR AND EVALUATION VISIBILITY LEVEL SOURCE OF DATA (SOD)</b>	<b>DEFINITION</b>	<b>CALCULATION(S)</b>	<b>RATING CRITERIA GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW</b>
<p><b>MP-07 FINANCIAL CLOSEOUT</b></p> <p>TYPE FUNDS ARMY (10, 40, 42, , 12, 4A) AIR FORCE ( , 20,21, ,26,) DOD (53, 39, 41, 48, 43, 46, 4S, 4B, 16, 1K, 54, 56, 57, 58, 69, 51, 5S, 30, 32, 66, 70, 3Q &amp; , AND TYPE FUNDS BEGINNING WITH "W")</p> <p>CEMP-M</p>	<p>DATA AGGREGATED BY MSC.</p> <p>SOD: PROMIS</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSC; REPORTED QUARTERLY</p>	<p>A MEASURE OF THE MSC TO FINANCIALLY CLOSEOUT THE NUMBER OF ASSIGNED PROJECTS (E.G. FOR FY01=FY97-01) AFTER BENEFICIAL OCCUPANCY DATE (BOD).</p>	<p>PROJECTS CLOSED ON TIME: NUMERATOR: THE NUMBER OF ASSIGNED PROJECTS WITH AN ACTUAL FINANCIAL COMPLETION DATE &lt;= 6 MONTHS FROM BOD FOR CONUS AND 12 MONTHS FROM BOD FOR OCONUS.</p> <p>DENOMINATOR: THE NUMBER OF ASSIGNED PROJECTS WITH AN ACTUAL BOD.</p> <p>PROJECTS NOT CLOSED ON TIME: NUMERATOR: THE NUMBER OF ASIGNED PROJECTS WITHOUT AN ACTUAL FINANCIAL COMPLETION DATE.</p> <p>DENOMINATOR: THE NUMBER OF ASSIGNED PROJECTS WITH AN ACTUAL BOD.</p>	<p>RATING CRITERIA: GREEN: ACTUAL &gt;=100% OF GOAL AMBER:ACTUAL 90-99% OF GOAL RED: ACTUAL&lt;90% OF GOAL</p> <p>ER 415-345-13 15 AUG 89</p>

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

<b>INDICATOR FUNDS TYPE GROUPS PROPONENT</b>	<b>INDICATOR AND EVALUATION VISIBILITY LEVEL SOURCE OF DATA (SOD)</b>	<b>DEFINITION</b>	<b>CALCULATION(S)</b>	<b>RATING CRITERIA GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW</b>
<p><b>MP-08</b> <b>“DESIGN TO COST” PERFORMANCE</b></p> <p>TYPE FUNDS ARMY (10, 40, 42, , 12, 4A) AIR FORCE ( , 20,21, ,26, ,) DOD (53, 39, 41, 48, 43, 46, 4S, 4B, 16, 1K, 54, 56, 57, 58, 69, 51, 5S, 30, 32, 66, 70, 3Q &amp; , AND TYPE FUNDS BEGINNING WITH “W”)</p> <p><i>CECW-E</i></p>	<p>DATA AGGREGATED BY MSC</p> <p>SOD: PROMIS</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSC; REPORTED QUARTERLY</p>	<p>A MEASURE OF MSC TO AWARD FULL SCOPE PROJECTS WITH TOTAL CWE AT OR WITHIN THE AUTHORIZED PROGRAMED AMOUNT (PA).</p>	<p>DENOMINATOR: PROJECT PA</p> <p>NUMERATOR: FULL SCOPE AWARD CWE</p>	<p>RATING CRITERIA:</p> <p>GREEN: PA OR LESS AMBER: 101 TO 105% OF PA RED: &gt; 105% OF PA</p>

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

INDICATOR FUNDS TYPE GROUPS PROPONENT	INDICATOR AND EVALUATION VISIBILITY LEVEL SOURCE OF DATA (SOD)	DEFINITION	CALCULATION(S)	RATING CRITERIA GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW
<p><b>MP-09</b> <b>MILITARY</b> <b>REIMBURSABLE</b> <b>ORDERS RECEIVED</b></p> <p><b>TYPE FUNDS:</b> <b>ARMY: 14, 16,45,1R</b> <b>AIR FORCE: 24, 28,</b> <b>2M, 2R</b> <b>DOD: 56,57,58,69,</b> <b>98, 4B, 66, 4T, 51,</b> <b>49, 4M, 5M</b></p> <p><b>CEMP-M</b></p>	<p>DATA AGGREGATED BY MSC</p> <p>SOD: CEFMS</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSC REPORTED QUARTERLY; MEASURED ANNUALLY.</p>	<p>A MEASURE OF INSTALLATION SUPPORT AND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES (NON-MILCON WORK). A MEASURE OF THE MSC ABILITY TO FINANCIALLY OBLIGATED ONE YEAR MONEY.</p> <p>GOAL IS 100% BY 4Q.</p>	<p>FUNDS OBLIGATED:</p> <p>NUMERATOR: THE AMOUNT OF CURRENT FY ONE-YEAR REIMBURSABLE FUNDS OBLIGATED.</p> <p>DENOMINATOR: THE AMOUNT OF CURRENT FY ONE YEAR REIMBURSABLE FUNDS RECEIVED</p> <p>THE FUNDS OBLIGATED FOR EACH CURRENT YEAR QUARTER WILL BE COMPARED TO THE SAME QUARTER OF THE PREVIOUS FY.</p>	<p>RATING CRITERIA:</p> <p>GREEN: ACTUAL <math>\geq</math>110% OF PREVIOUS FY ORDERS RECEIVED AMBER: ACTUAL 101-109% OF PREVIOUS FY ORDERS RECEIVED RED: ACTUAL <math>\leq</math> PREVIOUS FY ORDERS RECEIVED</p> <p>DFAS 37-100-2002</p>
<p><b>MP-10</b> <b>ENVIRONMENTAL</b> <b>OBLIGATIONS</b> <b>FUND TYPE</b> <b>GROUPS 4 &amp; H</b></p> <p><i>CEMP-R</i></p>	<p>QUARTERLY GOAL FOR PROGRAMS IDENTIFIED IN CHAPTER 3, SECTION 1, GPS 4 &amp; H.</p> <p>SOD: ICAR/CEFMS</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSC; REPORTED QUARTERLY.</p>	<p>MSCS' OBLIGATION OF CURRENT FY ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDS</p>	<p>OBLIGATION (EXECUTION), EXCEPT HQUSACE, MEASURED AGAINST THE ESTABLISHED QUARTERLY GOAL.</p>	<p>RATING CRITERIA:</p> <p>GREEN: <math>\leq</math> 90% OF GOAL AMBER: ACTUAL 80-89% OF GOAL RED: ACTUAL LESS THAN 80% OF GOAL</p>

## MILITARY PROGRAMS

INDICATOR FUNDS TYPE GROUPS PROPONENT	INDICATOR AND EVALUATION VISIBILITY LEVEL SOURCE OF DATA (SOD)	DEFINITION	CALCULATION(S)	RATING CRITERIA GOVERNING REGULATION OR LAW
<p><b>MP-11</b></p> <p><b>CUSTOMER SATISFACTION</b></p> <p><b>ALL MILITARY FUND TYPE GROUPS</b></p> <p>FUND TYPE GROUPS: ALL MILITARY FUND TYPE GROUPS</p> <p><i>CEMP-M</i></p>	<p>INDICATOR: NOT APPLICABLE</p> <p>SOD – CUSTOMER RESPONSES TO CEMP CUSTOMER SURVEY AND MSC ACTIONS</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSC; REPORTED AT END OF 4<sup>TH</sup> QUARTER ONLY AT BOD/SMR</p>	<p><i>PART I.</i> THE CORPORATE VIEW OF MILITARY CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS. THE CMR PRESENTATION WILL CONSIST OF A SERIES OF SLIDES DEPICTING A SUMMARY REPORT OF SURVEY RESULTS AND ISSUES WHICH THE DIRECTOR DEEMS APPROPRIATE FOR DISCUSSION. FOCUS WILL BE ON KEY STRATEGIC ISSUES AS PRESENTED IN THE VISION AND STRATEGIES.</p> <p><i>PART II.</i> THE MSC SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO SURVEY RESULTS. THE BRIEFING FORMAT WILL BE LEFT TO THE DISCRETION OF THE MSC COMMANDER BUT WILL INCLUDE OPPORTUNITIES AND ACTIONS UNDERWAY AND/OR COMPLETED TO ENHANCE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION. FOCUS WILL BE ON KEY ISSUES AND SPECIFIC ACTIONS BEING TAKEN AS A RESULT OF THE CUSTOMER RESPONSES.</p>		<p>GREEN = EXCEEDS CORPS 6-YR AVERAGE FOR Q1-11</p> <p><u>6-YR AVG:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) 3.96</li> <li>2) 3.82</li> <li>3) 4.14</li> <li>4) 3.86</li> <li>5) 3.62</li> <li>6) 3.84</li> <li>7) 3.30</li> <li>8) 3.89</li> <li>9) 3.86</li> <li>10) 3.77</li> <li>11) 3.83</li> </ol>

**CIVIL WORKS**

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Source of Data Visibility Level	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria
<b>PROGRAMS</b>				
<p align="center"><b>CW-01</b> PROGRAMMING, BUDGETING AND EXECUTING CIVIL WORKS <b>TOTAL DIRECT PROGRAM</b> CECW-BD FARRINGTON/761-1944</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS EVALUATED AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE SCHEDULED EXPENDITURES REFLECTED IN THE 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE AND COMPARED TO AN EXPENDITURE GOAL OF 100% WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%.</p> <p>SOD: CECW-BD SCHEDULES OF OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES 2101 REPORT (RCS CECW-B-8)</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSCs</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS EVALUATED AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE SCHEDULED EXPENDITURES REFLECTED IN THE 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE AND COMPARED TO AN EXPENDITURE GOAL OF 100% WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURES DIVIDED BY 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE</p> <p>AND COMPARED TO EXPENDITURE <b>GOAL OF 100%</b> WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%</p>	<p><u>GREEN</u>: ≥ 98%</p> <p><u>AMBER</u>: ≥ 95% - 98%</p> <p><u>RED</u>: &lt; 95%</p>
<p align="center"><b>CW-02</b> PROGRAMMING, BUDGETING AND EXECUTING <b>GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS</b> TOTAL PROGRAM CECW-BW HALL/761-1992</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS EVALUATED AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE SCHEDULED EXPENDITURES REFLECTED IN THE 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE AND COMPARED TO AN EXPENDITURE GOAL OF 100% WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%.</p> <p>SOD: CECW-BD SCHEDULES OF OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES 2101 REPORT (RCS CECW-B-8)</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSCs</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS EVALUATED AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE SCHEDULED EXPENDITURES REFLECTED IN THE 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE AND COMPARED TO AN EXPENDITURE GOAL OF 100% WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURES DIVIDED BY 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE</p> <p>AND COMPARED TO EXPENDITURE <b>GOAL OF 100%</b> WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%</p>	<p><u>GREEN</u>: ≥ 98%</p> <p><u>AMBER</u>: ≥ 95% - 98%</p> <p><u>RED</u>: &lt; 95%</p>
<p align="center"><b>CW-03</b> PROGRAMMING, BUDGETING AND EXECUTING <b>CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL</b> TOTAL PROGRAM CECW-BE HENRY/761-5856</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS EVALUATED AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE SCHEDULED EXPENDITURES REFLECTED IN THE 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE AND COMPARED TO AN EXPENDITURE GOAL OF 100% WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%.</p> <p>SOD: CECW-BD SCHEDULES OF OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES 2101 REPORT (RCS CECW-B-8)</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSCs</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS EVALUATED AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE SCHEDULED EXPENDITURES REFLECTED IN THE 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE AND COMPARED TO AN EXPENDITURE GOAL OF 100% WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURES DIVIDED BY 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE</p> <p>AND COMPARED TO EXPENDITURE <b>GOAL OF 100%</b> WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%</p>	<p><u>GREEN</u>: ≥ 98%</p> <p><u>AMBER</u>: ≥ 95% - 98%</p> <p><u>RED</u>: &lt; 95%</p>

## CIVIL WORKS

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Source of Data Visibility Level	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CW-04</b> PROGRAMMING, BUDGETING AND EXECUTING <b>CONSTRUCTION,</b> <b>GENERAL -</b> <b>CONTINUING</b> <b>AUTHORITIES</b> <b>PROGRAM</b> TOTAL PROGRAM CECW-BE HENRY/761-5856</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE OF CAP FUNDS EVALUATED AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE SCHEDULED EXPENDITURES REFLECTED IN THE 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE AND COMPARED TO AN EXPENDITURE GOAL OF 100% WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%.</p> <p>SOD: CECW-BD SCHEDULES OF OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES 2101 REPORT (RCS CECW-B-8) VISIBILITY: MSCs</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE OF CAP FUNDS EVALUATED AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE SCHEDULED EXPENDITURES REFLECTED IN THE 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE AND COMPARED TO AN EXPENDITURE GOAL OF 100% WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ACTUAL EXPENDITURES DIVIDED BY 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE</p> <p>AND COMPARED TO EXPENDITURE <b>GOAL OF 100%</b> WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%</p>	<p><u>GREEN</u>: ≥ 98%</p> <p><u>AMBER</u>: ≥ 95% - 98%</p> <p><u>RED</u>: &lt; 95%</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CW-05</b> PROGRAMMING, BUDGETING AND EXECUTING <b>OPERATIONS AND</b> <b>MAINTENANCE,</b> <b>GENERAL</b> TOTAL PROGRAM CECW-BC KERN/761-4133</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS EVALUATED AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE SCHEDULED EXPENDITURES REFLECTED IN THE 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE AND COMPARED TO AN EXPENDITURE GOAL OF 100% WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%.</p> <p>(R SOD: CECW-BD SCHEDULES OF OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES 2101 REPORT CS CECW-B-8) VISIBILITY: MSCs</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS EVALUATED AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE SCHEDULED EXPENDITURES REFLECTED IN THE 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE AND COMPARED TO AN EXPENDITURE GOAL OF 100% WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ACTUAL EXPENDITURES DIVIDED BY 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE</p> <p>AND COMPARED TO EXPENDITURE <b>GOAL OF 100%</b> WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%</p>	<p><u>GREEN</u>: ≥ 98%</p> <p><u>AMBER</u>: ≥ 95% - 98%</p> <p><u>RED</u>: &lt; 95%</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CW-06</b> PROGRAMMING, BUDGETING AND EXECUTING <b>MR&amp;T</b> <b>TOTAL PROGRAM</b> CECW-BC JONES/761-4105</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS EVALUATED AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE SCHEDULED EXPENDITURES REFLECTED IN THE 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE AND COMPARED TO AN EXPENDITURE GOAL OF 100% WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%.</p> <p>SOD: CECW-BD SCHEDULES OF OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES 2101 REPORT (RCS CECW-B-8) VISIBILITY: MSCs</p>	<p>ACTUAL EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS EVALUATED AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE SCHEDULED EXPENDITURES REFLECTED IN THE 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE AND COMPARED TO AN EXPENDITURE GOAL OF 100% WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ACTUAL EXPENDITURES DIVIDED BY 2101 BASIC SCHEDULE</p> <p>AND COMPARED TO EXPENDITURE <b>GOAL OF 100%</b> WITH A DEVIATION OF -2%</p>	<p><u>GREEN</u>: ≥ 98%</p> <p><u>AMBER</u>: ≥ 95% - 98%</p> <p><u>RED</u>: &lt; 95%</p>

## CIVIL WORKS

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Source of Data Visibility Level	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CW-07 CONGRESSIONAL INTENT</b> CECW-BD FARRINGTON-LYNCH/761-1944</p>	<p>EXECUTION OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDS EVALUATED BY PROJECT STARTS WITHIN THE SAME APPROPRIATION YEAR <b>INCLUDED ARE STUDIES AND PROJECTS IN GI, CG, INCLUDING CAP, O&amp;M, AND MR&amp;T APPROPRIATIONS</b></p> <p>SOD: CECW-BA SCHEDULES OF OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES 2101 REPORT (RCS CECW-B-8)</p>	<p>CONGRESSIONAL ADDS ARE THOSE NEW UNBUDGETED PROJECTS ADDED IN THE LEGISLATION &amp; APPROVED FOR EXECUTION. DO NOT INCLUDE CONTINUING PROJECTS OR THOSE ADDED IN PRIOR YEARS UNDER SAME APPROPRIATION.</p> <p><b>STARTED EQUALS THOSE STUDIES OR PROJECTS WHICH HAVE INCURRED AN EXPENDITURE.</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">% STARTED =</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>ADDS (STARTED) DIVIDED BY SCHEDULED NEW START CONGRESSIONAL ADDS</b></p>	<p><u>GREEN</u>: 100% SCHEDULED AND STARTED WITHIN THE YEAR ADDED.</p> <p><u>AMBER</u>: ≥ 90% - 99%</p> <p><u>RED</u>: &lt; 90%</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CW-08 CUSTOMER COMMITMENTS</b> CECW-BD HILTZ/761-1817</p>	<p>ACTUAL ACCOMPLISHMENT OF COMMITMENTS MADE WITH PROJECT SPONSOR EVALUATED AS A PERCENTAGE OF SCHEDULED COMMITMENTS MADE WITH PROJECT SPONSOR.</p> <p>SOD: PROJECT SPONSOR COMMITMENT MILESTONE DATES ENTERED IN PROMIS AND QUERIED BY PPDS.</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSCs</p>	<p>COMMITMENTS MADE WITH PROJECT SPONSOR WHICH HAVE SCHEDULED DATES NEGOTIATED WITH PROJECT SPONSOR FOR ACHIEVEMENT IN CURRENT FY. MEASUREMENT IS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF ACTUAL PROJECT SPONSOR COMMITMENTS MET ON TIME AS A FUNCTION OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PROJECT SPONSOR COMMITMENTS SCHEDULED.</p>	<p>NUMBER OF PROJECT SPONSOR COMMITMENTS MET FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD DIVIDED BY THE NUMBER OF PROJECT SPONSOR COMMITMENTS SCHEDULED FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD.</p>	<p><u>GREEN</u>: ≥ 90%</p> <p><u>AMBER</u>: ≥ 80% &lt;90%</p> <p><u>RED</u>: &lt; 80%</p>

## CIVIL WORKS

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Source of Data Visibility Level	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria
<b>PLANNING</b>				
<p><b>CW-09</b> GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (GI) STUDIES <b>(RECONS)</b> CECW-PM SMITH/761-4560</p>	<p>RECONNAISSANCE REPORTS EVALUATED BY COMPLETIONS ON SCHEDULE AND WITHIN TIME LIMITS (12-18 MONTHS FOR REGULAR AND 6-9 MONTHS FOR EXPEDITED REPORTS)</p> <p>SOD: REPORTED COMPLETIONS IN GI DATABASE AND STUDY SCHEDULES CONTAINED IN CURRENT YEAR PLUS 1 JUSTIFICATIONS</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSCs</p>	<p>A RECON REPORT IS COMPLETE WHEN THE DISTRICT SIGNS THE REPORT OR 905B ANALYSIS TO THE DIVISION FOR REVIEW OR WHEN THE STUDY IS TERMINATED</p>	<p>% COMPLETE =  RECONNAISSANCE STUDY REPORTS COMPLETED DIVIDED BY REPORTS SCHEDULED</p>	<p><u>GREEN</u>: &gt; or = 90% SCHEDULED REPORTS ARE COMPLETED.</p> <p><u>AMBER</u>: 80-89% SCHEDULED REPORTS ARE COMPLETED.</p> <p><u>RED</u>: &lt; 80% OF SCHEDULED REPORTS ARE COMPLETED.</p>
<p><b>CW-10</b> GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (GI) STUDIES <b>(FEASIBILITIES)</b> CECW-PM SMITH/761-4560</p>	<p>FEASIBILITY STUDY COMPLETIONS EVALUATED BY COMPLETIONS ON SCHEDULE; AVG TIME TO COMPLETE TRACKED VS. REGULATORY GUIDANCE (48 MONTHS)</p> <p>SOD: REPORTED COMPLETIONS IN GI DATABASE AND STUDY SCHEDULES IN CURRENT YEAR PLUS 1 JUSTIFICATIONS</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSCs</p>	<p>A STUDY IS CONSIDERED COMPLETE WHEN THE DIVISION ENGINEER'S REPORT IS ISSUED OR WHEN THE STUDY IS TERMINATED</p>	<p>% COMPLETE =  FEASIBILITY REPORTS COMPLETED DIVIDED BY REPORTS SCHEDULED</p>	<p><u>GREEN</u>: &gt; or = 90% SCHEDULED REPORTS ARE COMPLETED.</p> <p><u>AMBER</u>: 80-89% SCHEDULED REPORTS ARE COMPLETED.</p> <p><u>RED</u>: &lt; 80% OF SCHEDULED REPORTS ARE COMPLETED.</p>

## CIVIL WORKS

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Source of Data Visibility Level	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria
<b>ENGINEERING</b>				
<b>CW-11 AWARD OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS</b> CECW-EI STEELE/(703) 428-7338	CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AWARDS WITH ECC OVER \$1M (CG & MRT) EVALUATED BY ACTUAL AWARDS VS. SCHEDULED  SOD: PPDS/PROMIS VISIBILITY: MSCs	AWARD OF CONSTRUCTION GENERAL (CG) AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES (MR&T) CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS OVER \$1MILLION.	% OF CONTRACTS AWARDED =  $\frac{\# \text{ CONTRACTS AWARDED}}{\# \text{ AWARDS SCHEDULED}} \times 100$	<u>GREEN</u> : $\geq 90\%$  <u>AMBER</u> : $\geq 80\%$ AND $\leq 89\%$  <u>RED</u> : $< 80\%$
<b>CW-12 DESIGN COMPLETIONS</b> CECW-EI STEELE/ (703) 428-7338	DESIGN COMPLETIONS WITH ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COSTS (ECC) OVER \$1M (CG & MR&T) EVALUATED BY ACTUAL COMPLETIONS VS. SCHEDULED.  SOD: PPDS/PROMIS VISIBILITY: MSCs	DESIGN COMPLETION FOR CONSTRUCTION GENERAL (CG) AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MR&T) CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS OVER \$1 MILLION.	% OF DESIGNS COMPLETED =  $\frac{\# \text{ DESIGNS COMPLETED}}{\# \text{ DESIGNS SCHEDULED}} \times 100$	<u>GREEN</u> : $\geq 90\%$  <u>AMBER</u> : $\geq 80\%$ AND $\leq 89\%$  <u>RED</u> : $< 80\%$

## CIVIL WORKS

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Source of Data Visibility Level	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria
<b>POLICY</b>				
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CW-13 PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENTS</b> CECW-PC SMITH/ 202-761-4236</p>	<p>PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENTS (PCAs) EVALUATED BY ACTUAL VS SCHEDULED</p> <p>SOD: MSC SCHEDULES AND EXECUTED PCA DATA FROM CECW-PC</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSCs</p>	<p>PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENTS EXECUTED AS A PERCENTAGE OF PCAs SCHEDULED FOR EXECUTION BY THE MSCs</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">% EXECUTED</p> <p style="text-align: center;"># PCAs EXECUTED DIVIDED BY # PCAs SCHEDULED</p>	<p><u>GREEN</u>: <math>\geq 90\%</math></p> <p><u>AMBER</u>: <math>\geq 80\%</math> AND <math>\leq 89\%</math></p> <p><u>RED</u>: <math>&lt; 80\%</math></p>

## REAL ESTATE

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Source of Data Visibility Level	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria & Governing Regulation or Law
<i>Acquisition</i>				
<p>RE01 Reserves= Leasing Program CERE-AM Baker 202-761-7496</p>	<p>Reserve facilities leasing actions evaluated as a percentage of actual lease renewals compared to scheduled leasing actions.</p> <p>SOD: RFMIS.</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSCs</p>	<p>Renewals of existing leases for Army Reserve facilities.</p>	<p>Reserve Facilities Leases = <math>\frac{\text{Actual Renewals}}{\text{Planned Renewals}} \times 100\%</math></p>	<p>Rating Criteria:  <u>GREEN</u>: &gt; 95% completion  <u>AMBER</u>: ≥ 89% and &lt; 95% completion.  <u>RED</u>: &lt; 89% completion.</p>
<p>RE02 Recruiting Facilities Program CERE-AM Chapman 202-761-7575</p>	<p>High priority recruiting facilities leasing action delivery dates compared against the service recruiting commands' requested Beneficial Occupancy Dates.</p> <p>SOD: RFMIS</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSCs</p>	<p>Providing all Recruiting Facility High Priority Actions on the date requested by the Service Recruiting Command.</p>	<p>Each high priority recruiting facility lease possible score:            BOD -30 to +2 days = 4,            BOD +3 to +9 days = 3 BOD            +10 to +19 days = 2 BOD            &gt; 20 days = 1            Rating: total score / possible score</p>	<p>Rating Criteria:  <u>GREEN</u>: ≥ 75 (-30 to +9 days variance)  <u>AMBER</u>: ≥ 50% to 74.99% (+10 to +19 days)  <u>RED</u>: &lt; 49.99% (≥ 20 days variance)</p>
<p>RE03 Lease Family Housing Program CERE-M-D Price 202-761-7490</p>	<p>Family housing leasing action delivery dates compared against requesting commands' initial request dates.</p> <p>SOD: RFMIS</p> <p>VISIBILITY: MSCs</p>	<p>Providing service members with leased family housing within time period based upon request dates and family arrival dates.</p>	<p>BOD is later of initial request date + 30 days, or family arrival date. Each high priority recruiting facility lease possible score: BOD -9 to -1 days = 4, BOD 0 to +1 day = 3, BOD +2 to +7 days = 2, BOD ≥ 8 days = 1            Rating: total score / possible score</p>	<p>Rating Criteria:  <u>GREEN</u>: ≥ 75 (-9 to +1 days variance)  <u>AMBER</u>: ≥ 50% to 74.99% (+2 to +7 days)  <u>RED</u>: &lt; 49.99% (≥ +8 days variance)</p>

**REAL ESTATE**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Source of Data Visibility Level</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria &amp; Governing Regulation or Law</b>
<i>Homeowners Assistance</i>				
RE04 Private Sale Benefits Payment CERE-R Bevins 202-761-7570	Private sale benefits evaluated by the percentage of homes on which benefits have been paid within 85 days compared to the total number of homes on which private sale benefits have been paid.  SOD: HAPMIS  VISIBILITY: MSCs with HAP.	Benefits are paid to individuals who sell their homes to another individual at a loss. Then they apply to the government to recoup some of their loss.	Private Sale Benefits Paid = $\frac{\# \text{Apps Pd in 85 Days}}{\# \text{Of All Apps Paid}}$	Rating Criteria: <u>GREEN</u> : > 89% Paid in 85 days. <u>AMBER</u> : > 75 to 89%. <u>RED</u> : < 75% paid in 85 days.
RE05 Government Acquisition Benefits Payment CERE-R Bevins 202-761-7570	Government acquisition benefits evaluated by the percentage of applicants whose homes were purchased by the government.  SOD: HAPMIS  VISIBILITY: MSCs With HAP.	Government acquisition occurs when the government purchases a home from an applicant who was unable to effect a private sale.	Government Acquisition Benefits = $\frac{\# \text{Homes Acq in 125 Days}}{\# \text{Of All Acq. Homes}}$	Rating Criteria: <u>GREEN</u> : > 89% paid in 125 days. <u>AMBER</u> : > 75 to 89%. Paid in 125 days <u>RED</u> : < 75% paid in 125 days.

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
RD01 Military Direct R&D Projects	Quarterly status of obligations by major mission area and STO products executed by USACE	<p>STO Milestones scheduled in STO Reports or Management Plans.</p> <p>Military Direct obligations are scheduled annually in an obligation plan required by ASAPLT.</p>	<p>Assess monthly and quarterly progress against major STO Milestones.</p> <p>Assess monthly and quarterly percent of obligations against scheduled.</p>	<p><u>Milestones</u>  <u>GREEN:</u> All milestones met  <u>AMBER:</u> Critical milestone delayed but will be met in next quarter  <u>RED:</u> Milestone cannot be completed within STO period of performance  <u>Obligations</u>  Green = &gt; 95%  Amber = 90-95%  Red = &lt; 90%</p>
RD02 Military Reimbursable R&D Projects	Quarterly status of obligations by major mission area and status of major customer products.	Project scheduled products are defined in formal proposals approved by customers.	Assess progress towards on-time completion of products.	<p><u>Product Completion</u>  <u>GREEN:</u> Will deliver on time  <u>AMBER:</u> Potential delay but will deliver IAW sponsored-generated deadline  <u>RED:</u> Will not deliver or long delay</p>
RD03 Civil Works Direct R&D Projects	Quarterly status by major program area of expenditures versus scheduled and progress toward achieving major FY Milestones	<p>Milestones are updated once annually by program managers in conjunction with program monitors, upon receipt of funds.</p> <p>CW expenditures are reported monthly and compared against scheduled plan required by</p>	<p>Monitor milestone completion against scheduled dates.</p> <p>Percent funds expended by quarter versus scheduled.</p>	<p><u>Milestones</u>  <u>GREEN:</u> will complete on time  <u>AMBER:</u> Will complete/Short delay  <u>RED:</u> Long delay or will not be completed  <u>Expenditure</u>  Green &gt; 98%  Amber &gt; 95%  Red &lt; 95%</p>

**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visability Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
RD04 Civil Works Reimbursable Projects	Quarterly Status by major customer of expenditures versus scheduled and status of product delivery.	HQUFACE  Products/schedule defined proposals to customers.	Assess progress towards on-time completion of products.	<u>Milestones</u> <u>GREEN</u> : will complete on time <u>AMBER</u> : Will complete/Short delay <u>RED</u> : Long delay or will not completed

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<i>Finance and Accounting</i>				
<p>RM01 Revolving Fund Results of Operation</p> <p>CERM-F</p>	<p>Overall ending balance of major accounts (Overhead and Shop &amp; Facility) are targeted against an expensed based nominal balance.</p> <p>SOD: Statement of Results of Operations 3021</p> <p>Visibility: HQ, MSCs, and Separate FOAs</p>	<p>NOMINAL BALANCE is a year-end account balance which falls within a plus or minus of 1% of current year expenses.</p>	<p>X = percentage the EOP balance is over or under the total expenses at the end of the reporting period.</p> <p>X = Expense x 1% EOP balance cannot exceed X</p>	<p>Goal: To achieve a zero balance in all Revolving Fund Accounts. An unacceptable balance at end of period (EOP Balance) is one that is greater than:</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> Qtr 2% 4<sup>th</sup> Qtr 1%</p>
<p>RM02 Military Accounting: Unliquidated Obligations in Canceling Appropriations</p> <p>CERM-F</p>	<p>Army/USACE's Goal is a 100% Unliquidated Obligation (ULO) reduction for military appropriations canceling this FY and a 50% ULO reduction for those canceling next FY by 30 June.</p> <p>SOD: Monthly ICAR 218 report</p> <p>Visibility Level: OSD, HQDA and HQUSACE</p>	<p>ULO is the difference between the obligation and disbursement amounts.</p> <p>ULO balances can be positive or negative and are reviewed at the FY, appropriation and source of funding (direct and automatic) levels.</p> <p>Military appropriations cancel after being expired (not available for new obligations) for 5 years.</p>	<p>Calculate MSC ULO balance by summing District ULO balances.</p> <p>Compare MSC ULO balance to rating criteria to determine status.</p>	<p><u>GREEN</u>: No MSC ULOs in appropriations canceling this FY and at least a 50% ULO reduction for appropriations canceling next FY</p> <p><u>RED</u>: MSC ULOs in appropriations canceling this FY or less than 50% ULO reduction for appropriations canceling next FY</p> <p>Reporting Period: 3<sup>rd</sup> &amp; 4<sup>th</sup> Qtr</p> <p>Governing Laws/Regulations: 31 USC 1551-1557 DOD FMR, Vol. 3, Ch.8 DFAS-IN 37-1, Ch. 27 HQDA annual memo to MACOMs</p>

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<i>Finance and Accounting</i>				
RM03 Civil and Military CFO MSC Self Assessments CERM-F	1. Asset Cost Table Reconciliation 2. CIP-Proper Identification of Costs 3. Abnormal General Ledger Balances 4. Relocation Cost 5. Management of Accounts Receivable 6. Project Cost Transfers 7. Systems Security Issues 8. Accumulated Depreciation  SOD: MSC/District rating  Visibility Level: HQ, MSCs, and Separate FOAs	CFO issue has been resolved in accordance with guidance in information paper. Ultimate goal is to receive an Unqualified audit opinion on USACE financial statements.	Assess response from Districts to determine if they have completed required action per information papers.	<u>Green:</u> Action required in Information paper completed and verified by RM.  <u>Red:</u> Action required in Information paper not completed or verified.  Governing Regulations: - CFO Act 1990 - ER 37-2-10 - CFO Information Papers available on HQ RM homepage.

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<i>Manpower &amp; Force Analysis</i>		MANPOWER MANAGEMENT: Constructing utilization plans projecting civilian work years by month throughout the fiscal year and managing civilian actuals on a monthly basis within established tolerances of that plan. Plans, for CMR purposes, are due NLT 16 Oct 01 and updated plans are due NLT 16 Apr 02. The updated plans will take effect the first day of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter.		
RM04 Military and Civil  CERM-M	<p>Total actual cumulative civilian manpower FTE utilization evaluated as a % variance from the combined/latest approved Civilian Employment Plan (CEP) and Civil Workyear Utilization Plan (CWUP).</p> <p>SOD: CEP &amp; CWUP – latest HQUSACE approved plans;</p> <p>ACTUAL FTE – Military and Civil FTE report submissions from field activities;</p> <p>AUTHORIZED FTE – latest published manpower portion of the CCG. Division Headquarters, Districts, ERDC, and Separate FOAs.</p>	<p>CEPs and CWUPs for a particular month/quarter show projected military and civil-funded FTE utilization.</p> <p>CEFMS Military Funded FTE and OPM 113G reports show FTE actuals.</p>	$\% \text{ Variance} = \frac{\text{YTD FTE ACTUALS} - \text{FTE PROJECTIONS}}{\text{FTE PROJECTIONS}}$	<p>Rating Criteria %s:</p> <p><b>GREEN:</b> 1<sup>st</sup> QTR -1.0 thru +2.0  2<sup>nd</sup> QTR -1.0 thru +2.0  3<sup>rd</sup> QTR -1.0 thru +2.0  4<sup>th</sup> QTR -1.0 thru +2.0</p> <p><b>AMBER:</b>  1<sup>st</sup>QTR -1.1 thru &lt;-1.5 or &gt;+2.1 thru +2.5  2<sup>nd</sup>QTR -1.1 thru &lt;-1.5 or &gt;+2.1 thru +2.5  3<sup>rd</sup>QTR -1.1 thru &lt;-1.5 or &gt;+2.1 thru +2.5  4<sup>th</sup>QTR -1.1 thru &lt;-1.5 or &gt;+2.1 thru +2.5</p> <p><b>RED:</b> 1<sup>st</sup> QTR &lt;-1.5 or &gt;+2.5  2<sup>nd</sup> QTR &lt;-1.5 or &gt;+2.5  3<sup>rd</sup> QTR &lt;-1.5 or &gt;+2.5  4<sup>th</sup> QTR &lt;-1.5 or &gt;+2.5</p>

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation Or Law
<i>Business Practices</i>				
<i>Cost of Doing Business</i>				
RM05 Military Consolidated Total Labor Multiplier (TLM) CDO Districts Fund Type Groups: All Military CERM-P	Military Consolidated TLM evaluated as a multiple or ratio of total costs associated with each direct labor dollar to the base pay for each direct labor dollar. SOD: Cost of Doing Business (CODB) Military Matrix Report (CEFMS) Data extracted from columns: 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 17 Visibility: MSC / Mil Districts	A measure of cost efficiency and competitiveness. The TLM expresses, as a multiple, the ratio for each direct labor hour required to recoup the organization's labor costs, fringes, and overheads (Departmental and G&A). The TLM does not include direct non-labor charges. A high multiple relative to other organizations indicates excessive or non-competitive costs. Note: Non-CDO Mil TLMs – See RM05a, b, & c	The calculation for TLM is as follows: A. Use 1 as the base salary labor hour. Add the effective rate. B. Multiply G&A rate by (A) above. C. Multiply Departmental Overhead by (A) above. D. TLM = A+B+C	Target = 2.43 GREEN: $\leq 2.43$ AMBER: Actual 2.44 to 2.54 (> target < 5% above the target) RED: Actual $\geq 2.55$ ( $\geq 5\%$ above the target) Note: Ratio will not be formally evaluated in FY02 due to Consolidated Departmental overhead (CDO) test. FY 02-04 CODB Targets may be found in Chapter 2, Section 3.
RM06 Military Real Estate TLM CDO & Non-CDO Districts CERM-P	SOD: CODB Military Matrix Report Data extracted from columns: 5, 18, 19 and 20 Visibility: MSC / Mil Districts	See Military Consolidated TLM above.	See Military Consolidated TLM above.	Target = 2.36 GREEN: $\leq 2.36$ AMBER: Actual 2.37 to 2.47 (> target < 5% above the target) RED: Actual $\geq 2.48$ ( $\geq 5\%$ above the target)

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<p>RM07 Civil Consolidated Total Labor Multiplier (TLM) <b>CDO Districts</b>  CERM-P</p>	<p>Civil Consolidated TLM evaluated as a multiple or ratio of total costs associated with each direct labor dollar to the base pay for each direct labor dollar. SOD: Cost of Doing Business (CODB) Civil Matrix Report (CEFMS)</p> <p>Data extracted from columns: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 19 and 22</p> <p>Visibility: MSC / Civ Districts</p>	<p>A measure of cost efficiency and competitiveness. The TLM expresses as a multiple the ratio for each direct labor hour required to recoup the organization's labor costs, fringes, and overheads (departmental and G&amp;A). TLM does not include direct non-labor charges. A high multiple relative to other organizations indicates excessive or non-competitive costs.</p> <p>SMALLER DISTRICTS: Total civil direct labor base ≤\$15 million</p> <p>MIDDLE DISTRICTS: Total civil direct labor base &gt;\$15 and &lt;\$29 million</p> <p>LARGER DISTRICTS: Total civil direct labor base ≥\$29 million</p> <p><b>Note: Non-CDO Civ TLMs – See RM07a, b, &amp; c</b></p>	<p>The calculation for TLM is as follows:</p> <p>A. Use 1 as the base salary labor hour. Add the effective rate.</p> <p>B. Multiply G&amp;A rate by (A) above.</p> <p>C. Multiply departmental overhead by (A) above</p> <p>D. TLM = A+B+C</p>	<p><b>SMALLER DISTRICTS:</b> TARGET is 2.55</p> <p><u>GREEN</u>: ≤ 2.55 <u>AMBER</u>: Actual 2.56 to 2.67 (&gt; target &lt; 5% above the target) <u>RED</u>: Actual ≥ 2.68 (≥ 5% above the target)</p> <p><b>MIDDLE DISTRICTS:</b> TARGET is 2.50</p> <p><u>GREEN</u>: ≤ 2.50 <u>AMBER</u>: Actual 2.51 to 2.62 (&gt; target &lt; 5% above the target) <u>RED</u>: Actual ≥ 2.63 (≥ 5% above the target)</p> <p><b>LARGER DISTRICTS:</b> TARGET is 2.47</p> <p><u>GREEN</u>: ≤ 2.47 <u>AMBER</u>: Actual 2.48 to 2.58 (&gt; target &lt; 5% above the target) <u>RED</u>: Actual ≥ 2.59 (≥ 5% above the target)</p> <p>Note: Ratio will not be formally evaluated in FY02 due to Consolidated Departmental overhead (CDO) test.</p> <p><b>FY 02-04 CODB Targets may be found in Chapter 2, Section 3.</b></p>

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<p>RM08 Civil Operations &amp; Maintenance (O&amp;M) TLM CDO &amp; Non-CDO Districts</p> <p>CERM-P</p>	<p>SOD: CODB Civil Matrix Report Data extracted from columns: 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16</p> <p>Visibility: MSC / Civ Districts</p>	<p>A measure of cost efficiency and competitiveness. The TLM expresses as a multiple the ratio for each direct labor hour required to recoup the organization's labor costs, fringes, and overheads (departmental and G&amp;A). TLM does not include direct non-labor charges. A high multiple relative to other organizations indicates excessive or non-competitive costs.</p> <p>SMALLER DISTRICTS: O&amp;M direct labor base ≤\$10 million</p> <p>MIDDLE DISTRICTS: O&amp;M direct labor base &gt;\$10 and &lt;\$22 million</p> <p>LARGER DISTRICTS: O&amp;M direct labor base ≥\$22 million</p>	<p>The calculation for TLM is as follows:</p> <p>A. Use 1 as the base salary labor hour. Add the effective rate.</p> <p>B. Multiply G&amp;A rate by (A) above.</p> <p>C. Multiply departmental overhead by (A) above</p> <p>D. TLM = A+B+C</p>	<p><b>SMALLER DISTRICTS:</b> TARGET is 2.48</p> <p><u>GREEN</u>: ≤ 2.48 <u>AMBER</u>: Actual 2.49 to 2.59 (&gt; target &lt; 5% above the target) <u>RED</u>: Actual ≥ 2.60 (≥ 5% above the target)</p> <p><b>MIDDLE DISTRICTS:</b> TARGET is 2.35</p> <p><u>GREEN</u>: ≤ 2.35 <u>AMBER</u>: Actual 2.36 to 2.47 (&gt; target &lt; 5% above the target) <u>RED</u>: Actual ≥ 2.48 (≥ 5% above the target)</p> <p><b>LARGER DISTRICTS:</b> TARGET is 2.25</p> <p><u>GREEN</u>: ≤ 2.25 <u>AMBER</u>: Actual 2.26 to 2.36 (&gt; target &lt; 5% above the target) <u>RED</u>: Actual ≥ 2.37 (≥ 5% above the target)</p>

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<p>RM09 Consolidated Chargeability For Military</p> <p><b>CDO Districts</b></p> <p>Design Chargeability</p> <p><b>Non-CDO Districts</b></p> <p>CERM-P</p>	<p>Labor charged directly to projects evaluated as a proportion of all labor costs.</p> <p>SOD: Cost of Doing Business (CODB) Military Matrix Report (CEFMS) Data extracted from columns: 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 17</p> <p>Data extracted from columns: 1, 6, 8 and 14</p> <p>Visibility: MSCs</p>	<p>LABOR EFFICIENCY: Percent of total labor charged directly to projects and programs. The categories of work included are planning, engineering and design, contracting, and construction costs.</p>	<p>CHARGEABILITY = <u>Direct labor costs</u> (Direct labor+indirect labor+absence amount)</p> <p>NOTE: A low chargeability indicates an inefficient distribution of direct and indirect labor-too much labor is indirectly charged or workload is not sufficient to support current workforce. An excessive rate could imply there may not be sufficient administrative staff to perform mission or we are overcharging our customers for administrative tasks.</p>	<p>TARGET: 60%</p> <p><u>GREEN</u>: 58-64% (≤ 3% below target or &lt; 7% above target)</p> <p><u>AMBER</u>: 57%, 65-67% (&gt;3% below target and &lt; 7% below target or ≥7% above target and &lt;12% above the target)</p> <p><u>RED</u>: ≤ 56% or ≥ 68% (≥ 5% below target or ≥ 12% above the target).</p>
<p>RM10 Consolidated Chargeability For Civil</p> <p><b>CDO Districts</b></p> <p>Design Chargeability</p> <p><b>Non-CDO Districts</b></p> <p>CERM-P</p>	<p>Labor charged directly to projects evaluated as a proportion of all labor costs.</p> <p>SOD: CODB Civil Matrix Report (CEFMS) Data extracted from columns: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 19 and 22</p> <p>Data extracted from columns: 3, 4, 18 and 21</p> <p>Visibility: MSCs</p>	<p>LABOR EFFICIENCY: Percent of total labor charged directly to projects and programs. The categories of work included are planning, engineering and design, contracting, and construction costs.</p>	<p>CHARGEABILITY = <u>Direct labor costs</u> (Direct labor+indirect labor+absence amount)</p> <p>NOTE: A low chargeability indicates an inefficient distribution of direct and indirect labor-too much labor is indirectly charged or workload is not sufficient to support current workforce. An excessive rate could imply there may not be sufficient administrative staff to perform mission or we are overcharging our customers for administrative tasks.</p>	<p>TARGET: 60%</p> <p><u>GREEN</u>: 58-64% (≤ 3% below target or &lt; 7% above target)</p> <p><u>AMBER</u>: 57%, 65-67% (&gt;3% below target and &lt; 7% below target or ≥7% above target and &lt;12% above the target)</p> <p><u>RED</u>: ≤ 56% or ≥ 68% (≥ 5% below target or ≥ 12% above the target).</p>

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<i>Cost of Doing Business General &amp; Administrative Overhead</i>				
RM11 Military General And Administrative (G&A) Overhead <b>CDO Districts</b>  CERM-P	G&A overhead evaluated as a percentage of base salary dollars and fringe benefits.  SOD: Cost of Doing Business (CODB) Military Matrix Report (CEFMS)  Visibility: Districts	Efficiency of indirect costs for general and administrative activities. Indirect costs charged to military workload divided by base labor and fringe charged to that workload.  SMALLER DISTRICTS: Total military direct labor base ≤ \$13 million  LARGER DISTRICTS: Total military direct labor base > \$13 million  <b>Note: Non-CDO Mil G&amp;A – See RM11a</b>	G&A Percentage =  $\frac{\text{(G\&A Costs Charged Mil Workload)}}{\text{Base salary dollars + fringe benefits}}$  NOTE: Efficiency of indirect costs for general and administrative activities. If this percentage is too high, indirect costs exceed amount necessary to perform mission and/or workload may not be sufficient to absorb the base overhead staffed.	<b>CONUS:</b> SMALLER DISTRICT: Target: 26% <u>GREEN</u> : ≤ 26-28% (≤ target and <10% over the target) <u>AMBER</u> : 29-30% (≥ 10% over the target and <20% over the target) <u>RED</u> : ≥ 31% (≥ 20% over the target) LARGER DISTRICT: Target: 24% <u>GREEN</u> : ≤ 24-26% (≤ target and <10% over the target) <u>AMBER</u> : 27-28% (≥ 10% over the target and <20% over the target) <u>RED</u> : ≥ 29% (≥ 20% over the target)  <b>OCONUS:</b> SMALLER DISTRICT: Target: 30% <u>GREEN</u> : ≤ 30-32% (≤ target and <10% over the target) <u>AMBER</u> : 33-35% (≥ 10% over the target and <20% over the target) <u>RED</u> : ≥ 36% (≥ 20% over the target) LARGER DISTRICT: Target: 28% <u>GREEN</u> : ≤ 28-30% (≤ target and <10% over the target) <u>AMBER</u> : 31-33% (≥ 10% over the target and <20% over the target) <u>RED</u> : ≥ 34% (≥ 20% over the target)  Note: Ratio will not be formally evaluated in FY02 due to Consolidated Departmental overhead (CDO) test.

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
RM12 Civil General and Administrative (G&A) Overhead CDO Districts  CERM-P	Indirect costs evaluated as a percentage of based salary dollars and fringe benefits.  SOD: CODB Civil Matrix Report (CEFMS)  Visibility: Districts	Efficiency of indirect costs for general and administrative activities. Indirect costs charged to military workload divided by base labor and fringe charged to that workload.  SMALLER DISTRICTS: Total civil direct labor base ≤\$15 million  MIDDLE DISTRICTS: Total civil direct labor base >\$15 and <\$29 million  LARGER DISTRICTS: Total civil direct labor base ≥\$29 million  <b>Note: Non-CDO Civ G&amp;A – See RM12a</b>	$\text{G\&A Percentage} = \frac{\text{(G\&A Costs Charged Civil Workload)}}{\text{Base salary dollars + fringe benefits}}$ NOTE: If this percentage is too high indirect costs exceed amount necessary to perform mission and/or workload may not be sufficient to absorb the base overhead staffed.	<b>CONUS:</b> SMALLER DISTRICT: Target: 32% <u>GREEN</u> : ≤ 32-34% (≤ target and <10% over the target) <u>AMBER</u> : 35-37% (≥ 10% over the target and < 20% over the target) <u>RED</u> : ≥ 38% (≥ 20% over the target)  MIDDLE DISTRICT: Target: 27% <u>GREEN</u> : ≤ 27-29% (≤ target and <10% over the target) <u>AMBER</u> : 30-31% (≥ 10% over the target and < 20% over the target) <u>RED</u> : ≥ 32% (≥ 20% over the target)  LARGER DISTRICT: Target: 23% <u>GREEN</u> : ≤ 23-25% (≤ target and <10% over the target) <u>AMBER</u> : 26-27% (≥ 10% over the target and < 20% over the target) <u>RED</u> : ≥ 28% (≥ 20% over the target) <b>OCONUS:</b> SMALLER DISTRICT: Target: 33% <u>GREEN</u> : ≤ 33-36% (≤ target and <10% over the target) <u>AMBER</u> : 37-39% (≥ 10% over the target and < 20% over the target) <u>RED</u> : ≥ 40% (≥ 20% over the target)  Note: Ratio will not be formally evaluated in FY02 due to Consolidated Departmental overhead (CDO) test.

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation Or Law
<i>Business Practices</i>				
<i>Cost of Doing Business</i>				
RM05a Military Design Total Labor Multiplier (TLM) <b>Non-CDO Districts</b> Fund Type Groups: All Military (Non-DERP)  CERM-P	Military TLM evaluated as a multiple or ratio of total costs associated with each direct labor dollar to the base pay for each direct labor dollar.  SOD: Cost of Doing Business (CODB) Military Matrix Report (CEFMS) Data extracted from columns: 1, 6, 8, and 14  Visibility: MSC / Mil Districts	A measure of cost efficiency and competitiveness. The TLM expresses, as a multiple, the ratio for each direct labor hour required to recoup the organization's labor costs, fringes, and overheads (Departmental and G&A). The TLM does not include direct non-labor charges. A high multiple relative to other organizations indicates excessive or non-competitive costs.	The calculation for TLM is as follows:  A. Use 1 as the base salary labor hour. Add the effective rate.  B. Multiply G&A rate by (A) above.  C. Multiply Departmental Overhead by (A) above.  D. TLM = A+B+C	Target = 2.44  <u>GREEN</u> : $\leq 2.44$  <u>AMBER</u> : Actual 2.45 to 2.56 ( $>$ target $<$ 5% above the target)  <u>RED</u> : Actual $\geq 2.57$ ( $\geq$ 5% above the target)  <b>FY 02-04 CODB Targets may be found in Chapter 2, Section 3.</b>
RM05b Military Design (BRAC/DERP) TLM <b>Non-CDO Districts</b>  CERM-P	SOD: CODB Military Matrix Report Data extracted from column: 10  Visibility: MSC / Mil Districts	See Military TLM above.	See Military TLM above.	Target = 2.46  <u>GREEN</u> : $\leq 2.46$  <u>AMBER</u> : Actual 2.47 to 2.58 ( $>$ target $<$ 5% above the target)  <u>RED</u> : Actual $\geq 2.59$ ( $\geq$ 5% above the target)

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
RM05c Military Construction TLM <b>Non-CDO Districts</b>  CERM-P	SOD: CODB Military Matrix Report Data extracted from columns: 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17  Visibility: MSC / Mil Districts	A measure of cost efficiency and competitiveness. The TLM expresses, as a multiple, the ratio for each direct labor hour required to recoup the organization's labor costs, fringes, and overheads (Departmental and G&A). The TLM does not include direct non-labor charges. A high multiple relative to other organizations indicates excessive or non-competitive costs.	The calculation for TLM is as follows: A. Use 1 as the base salary labor hour. Add the effective rate. B. Multiply G&A rate by (A) above. C. Multiply Departmental Overhead by (A) above. D. $TLM = A+B+C$	Target = 2.38  <u>GREEN</u> : $\leq 2.38$  <u>AMBER</u> : Actual 2.39 to 2.50 (> target < 5% above the target)  <u>RED</u> : Actual $\geq 2.51$ ( $\geq 5\%$ above the target)  FY 02-04 CODB Targets may be found in Chapter 2, Section 3.

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation(s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
<p>RM07a Civil Design Total Labor Multiplier (TLM) <b>Non-CDO Districts</b></p> <p>CERM-P</p>	<p>Civil design TLM evaluated as a multiple or ratio of total costs associated with each direct labor dollar to the base pay for each direct labor dollar. SOD: Cost of Doing Business (CODB) Civil Matrix Report (CEFMS) Data extracted from columns: 3, 4, 19 and 22</p> <p>Visibility: MSC / Civ Districts</p>	<p>A measure of cost efficiency and competitiveness. The TLM expresses as a multiple the ratio for each direct labor hour required to recoup the organization's labor costs, fringes, and overheads (departmental and G&amp;A). TLM does not include direct non-labor charges. A high multiple relative to other organizations indicates excessive or non-competitive costs.</p> <p>SMALLER DISTRICTS: Direct labor base <math>\leq</math>\$15 million</p> <p>MIDDLE DISTRICTS: Direct labor base <math>&gt;</math>\$15 and <math>&lt;</math>\$29 million</p> <p>LARGER DISTRICTS: Direct labor base <math>\geq</math>\$29 million</p>	<p>The calculation for TLM is as follows:</p> <p>A. Use 1 as the base salary labor hour. Add the effective rate.</p> <p>B. Multiply G&amp;A rate by (A) above.</p> <p>C. Multiply departmental overhead by (A) above</p> <p>D. TLM = A+B+C</p>	<p><b>SMALLER DISTRICTS:</b> TARGET is 2.55</p> <p><u>GREEN</u>: <math>\leq</math> 2.55 <u>AMBER</u>: Actual 2.56 to 2.67 (<math>&gt;</math> target <math>&lt;</math> 5% above the target) <u>RED</u>: Actual <math>\geq</math> 2.68 (<math>\geq</math> 5% above the target)</p> <p><b>MIDDLE DISTRICTS:</b> TARGET is 2.53</p> <p><u>GREEN</u>: <math>\leq</math> 2.53 <u>AMBER</u>: Actual 2.54 to 2.65 (<math>&gt;</math> target <math>&lt;</math> 5% above the target) <u>RED</u>: Actual <math>\geq</math> 2.66 (<math>\geq</math> 5% above the target)</p> <p><b>LARGER DISTRICTS:</b> TARGET is 2.50</p> <p><u>GREEN</u>: <math>\leq</math> 2.50 <u>AMBER</u>: Actual 2.51 to 2.62 (<math>&gt;</math> target <math>&lt;</math> 5% above the target) <u>RED</u>: Actual <math>\geq</math> 2.63 (<math>\geq</math> 5% above the target)</p> <p><b>FY 02-04 CODB Targets may be found in Chapter 2, Section 3.</b></p>

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
RM07b Civil Planning TLM <b>Non-CDO                      Districts</b>  CERM-P	SOD: CODB Civil Matrix Report Data extracted from columns: 1 and 2  Visibility: MSC / Civ Districts	A measure of cost efficiency and competitiveness. The TLM expresses as a multiple the ratio for each direct labor hour required to recoup the organization's labor costs, fringes, and overheads (departmental and G&A). TLM does not include direct non-labor charges. A high multiple relative to other organizations indicates excessive or non-competitive costs.	The calculation for TLM is as follows:  A. Use 1 as the base salary labor hour. Add the effective rate.  B. Multiply G&A rate by (A) above.  C. Multiply departmental overhead by (A) above  D. $TLM = A+B+C$	TARGET is 2.55  <u>GREEN</u> : $\leq 2.55$  <u>AMBER</u> : Actual 2.56 to 2.68 ( $>$ target $<$ 5% above the target)  <u>RED</u> : Actual $\geq 2.69$ ( $\geq$ 5% above the target)
RM07c Civil Construction TLM <b>Non-CDO                      Districts</b> (Except HTRW)  CERM-P	SOD: CODB Civil Matrix Report Data extracted from column: 8  Visibility: MSC / Civ Districts	See Civil TLM above.	See Civil TLM above.	TARGET is 2.48  <u>GREEN</u> : $\leq 2.48$  <u>AMBER</u> : Actual 2.49 to 2.60 ( $>$ target $<$ 5% above the target)  <u>RED</u> : Actual $\geq 2.61$ ( $\geq$ 5% above the target)

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
RM11a Military General And Administrative (G&A) Overhead Non-CDO Districts  CERM-P	G&A overhead evaluated as a percentage of base salary dollars and fringe benefits. SOD: Cost of Doing Business (CODB) Military Matrix Report (CEFMS)  Visibility: MSC / Mil Districts	Efficiency of indirect costs for general and administrative activities. Indirect costs charged to military workload divided by base labor and fringe charged to that workload.  SMALLER DISTRICTS: Direct labor base ≤ \$13 million  LARGER DISTRICTS: Direct labor base >\$13 million	$\text{G\&A Percentage} = \frac{\text{(G\&A Costs Charged Mil Workload)}}{\text{Base salary dollars + fringe benefits}}$ NOTE: Efficiency of indirect costs for general and administrative activities. If this percentage is too high, indirect costs exceed amount necessary to perform mission and/or workload may not be sufficient to absorb the base overhead staffed.	<p><b>CONUS:</b>                      SMALLER DISTRICT: Target: 27%  <u>GREEN</u>: ≤ 27-29% (≤ target and &lt;10% over the target)  <u>AMBER</u>: 30-31% (≥ 10% over the target and &lt;20% over the target)  <u>RED</u>: ≥ 32% (≥ 20% over the target)</p> <p>LARGER DISTRICT: Target: 25%  <u>GREEN</u>: ≤ 25-28% (≤ target and &lt;10% over the target)  <u>AMBER</u>: 29-31% (≥ 10% over the target and &lt;20% over the target)  <u>RED</u>: ≥ 32% (≥ 20% over the target)</p> <p><b>OCONUS:</b>                      SMALLER DISTRICT: Target: 31%  <u>GREEN</u>: ≤ 31-34% (≤ target and &lt;10% over the target)  <u>AMBER</u>: 35-37% (≥ 10% over the target and &lt;20% over the target)  <u>RED</u>: ≥ 38% (≥ 20% over the target)</p> <p>LARGER DISTRICT: Target: 29%  <u>GREEN</u>: ≤ 29-32% (≤ target and &lt;10% over the target)  <u>AMBER</u>: 33-35% (≥ 10% over the target and &lt;20% over the target)  <u>RED</u>: ≥ 36% (≥ 20% over the target)</p>

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
RM12a Civil Works General and Administrative (G&A) Overhead <b>Non-CDO Districts</b>  CERM-P	Indirect costs evaluated as a percentage of based salary dollars and fringe benefits.  SOD: CODB Civil Matrix Report (CEFMS)  Visibility: MSC / Civ Districts	Efficiency of indirect costs for general and administrative activities. Indirect costs charged to military workload divided by base labor and fringe charged to that workload.  SMALLER DISTRICTS: Direct labor base ≤\$15 million  MIDDLE DISTRICTS: Direct labor base >\$15 and <\$29million  LARGER DISTRICTS: Direct labor base ≥\$29 million	G&A Percentage =  $\frac{\text{(G\&A Costs Charged Civil Workload)}}{\text{Base salary dollars + fringe benefits}}$ NOTE: If this percentage is too high indirect costs exceed amount necessary to perform mission and/or workload may not be sufficient to absorb the base overhead staffed.	<b>CONUS:</b> SMALLER DISTRICT: Target: 33% <u>GREEN</u> : ≤ 33-36% (≤ target and <10% over the target) <u>AMBER</u> : 37-39% (≥ 10% over the target and < 20% over the target) <u>RED</u> : ≥ 40% (≥ 20% over the target)  MIDDLE DISTRICT: Target: 28% <u>GREEN</u> : ≤ 28-30% (≤ target and <10% over the target) <u>AMBER</u> : 31-33% (≥ 10% over the target and < 20% over the target) <u>RED</u> : ≥ 34% (≥ 20% over the target)  LARGER DISTRICT: Target: 24% <u>GREEN</u> : ≤ 24-26% (≤ target and <10% over the target) <u>AMBER</u> : 27-28% (≥ 10% over the target and < 20% over the target) <u>RED</u> : ≥ 29% (≥ 20% over the target)  <b>OCONUS:</b> SMALLER DISTRICT: Target: 33% <u>GREEN</u> : ≤ 33-36% (≤ target and <10% over the target) <u>AMBER</u> : 37-39% (≥ 10% over the target and < 20% over the target) <u>RED</u> : ≥ 40% (≥ 20% over the target)

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<i>Cost of Doing Business S&amp;A</i>				
RM13/RM14 Supervision and Administration (MILCON) and (O&M)  Fund Type Groups: All Military  CERM-P	Management of S&A costs evaluated by rates based on actual placement. Expenses and income, MILCON and O&M rates are established by MSC & Suballocated to Districts.  SOD: SA95 Report (CEFMS)  Visibility: Military and Environmental Districts	MILCON (RM16) and O&M (RM17) actual placement and expenses are totalled for the current fiscal year. Actual S&A rates are equal to actual expenses divided by actual placement.  <u>Significant variations</u> from S&A targets are defined as deviation which exceed the following: MILCON plus or minus 0.3 percent, O&M plus or minus 0.4 percent, and DERP plus or minus 0.6 percent. <u>Acceptable variations</u> are variations that are not significant.	The S&A rate is equal to the expenses divided by the placement for the current year.	<u>GREEN:</u> Actual S&A rates are within the acceptable variation of the S&A target (year-end) or monthly schedule. <u>AMBER:</u> Actual S&A rates are within 1% of the S&A target (year-end) or monthly schedule. <u>RED:</u> Actual S&A rates are over or under the S&A target (year-end) or monthly schedule by more than 1%. ER 415-1-16
RM15 S&A Gains And Losses  CERM-P	Solvency of the RF S&A accounts are impacted by the gains and losses generated by each MSC.  SOD: SA95 Report (CEFMS) 3021 Report (RF Results of Operations) (CEFMS)	Actual gain (losses) are equal to income minus expense. Scheduled income is calculated by multiplying scheduled placement times applicable flat rate.  <u>Significant variations</u> also include a fluctuation in either income or expenses that will cause the MSC to exhaust it's "checking" account at year-end.	$\text{Current FY Gains or Losses} = \text{Current FY Income} - \text{Current FY Expenses}$	<u>GREEN:</u> Actual gain/loss deviates from the S&A target (year-end) or schedule by an amount equal to or less than the acceptable variation. <u>AMBER:</u> Actual gain/loss deviates from the S&A target (year-end) or schedule by an amount equal to or less than 1% (times placement). <u>RED:</u> Actual gain/loss deviates from the S&A target (year-end) or schedule by an amount greater than 1% (times placement) <u>or</u> exhaust the MSC "checking" account at year end.

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation(s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
RM16 S&A Leakage  CERM-P	Collection of all earned income is required.  SOD: SA95 Report (CEFMS) Total Obligation Line Item (OLI) Leakage	S&A MILCON and O&M Leakage: Difference between expected and actual income.	Leakage = Expected Income – Actual Income  (Expected Income = Placement x S&A Rate)	<u>GREEN</u> : Leakage ≤ \$25K per military district <u>AMBER</u> : > \$25K thru \$100K per military district <u>RED</u> : Greater than \$100K per military district  “Overall division rating is based on average district performance (total leakage divided by number of military districts).”
<b><i>Budget &amp; Programs</i></b>				
RM17 Budget Execution: Direct OMA  CERM-B	Current Year Obligations Incurred Visibility: MSCs and Direct OMA-Funded FOA  SOD: PGM 918 and FADs Issued via PBAS	Reflects obligational progress in accordance with planned progress by FY quarter (cumulative).	Actual obligations incurred by end of quarter (cumulative), divided by total allotment issued by end of quarter (cumulative)	1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , & 3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr Rating: <u>GREEN</u> : ≥ 95%  <u>AMBER</u> : 85 thru 94%  <u>RED</u> : < 85%  4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr Rating: <u>GREEN</u> : ≥ 99.5%  <u>RED</u> : < 99.5%

**HUMAN RESOURCES**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
HR01 Organization Structure CEHR-E	Supervisory ratio is evaluated against the FY 02 USACE Goal of 1:10  SOD: DCPDS VISIBILITY: Districts	Ratio of supervision to non- supervisors	Ratio = 1 Supervisor : Number of non-supervisors divided by number of supervisors	Rating Criteria:  <u>GREEN</u> : Ratio =>1:10 <u>AMBER</u> : Ratio =>1:9.3 <1:10 <u>RED</u> : Ratio < 1:9.3

## EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<b><i>AFFIRMATION ACTION PROGRESS</i></b>				
EEO01 Affirmative Action Progress GS 13-15	Affirmative action progress toward ultimate workforce diversity goals for grades GS/GM13-15 of districts, divisions, headquarters, laboratories, and other separate reporting units evaluated by change in percentage representation of under represented groups.  SOD: ACPERS	This indicator measures organizations= progress toward parity in representation of minorities and women in grades GS/GM 13-15.	For each underrepresented group in each occupational category, grades 13-15, subtract percentage representation as of beginning of Fiscal Year from percentage representation as of end of quarters. Add all increases and decreases to yield total net change.	Rating Criteria: <u>GREEN</u> : Total net change>0.0  <u>AMBER</u> : Total net change= 0.0  <u>RED</u> : Total net Change<0.0
<b><i>EEO CASE RESOLUTION</i></b>				
EEO02 Informal Case Resolution	Cases resolved at informal stage (do not result in formal complaints) evaluated against the Army-wide average (51% of all cases being resolved at the informal stage).  SOD: Quarterly Report	This indicator measures organizations = resolution of EEO cases at the lowest level, where the commander has the most authority and discretion, and where costs and disruptions to the mission are minimized.	Divide informal cases resolved by total informal cases. Multiply quotient by 100.	Rating Criteria: <u>GREEN</u> : 51% or more resolved Informally.  <u>AMBER</u> : 38-50%  <u>RED</u> : 37% or less

## CORPORATE INFORMATION

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<p style="text-align: center;">CI01</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Information Assurance Vulnerability Alert (IAVA)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CECI</p>	<p>Identifies to what degree USACE has completed IAVA actions.</p> <p>Visibility Level: District Regional Enterprise</p> <p>Source of Data: Reports from field. Data is reported through each Command Information Assurance Officer to the MACOM IA Program Manager.</p> <p><a href="http://pso24.pso.usace.army.mil:1700/acertcomplyFY00.html">http://pso24.pso.usace.army.mil:1700/acertcomplyFY00.html</a></p>	<p>IAVA is a positive control mechanism that pushes alerts and advisories on IA security vulnerabilities to IA personnel. IAVA also requires the tracking of response and compliance to the messages.</p> <p>Compliance command-wide and by each command.</p> <p>FY02 Goal 100%</p> <p>Quarter Goal 25% Increase from previous quarter</p>	$\frac{\text{Number of actions}}{\text{Number of actions acknowledged}} \text{ And } \frac{\text{Number of actions}}{\text{Number of actions completed}}$	<p>Green = All actions completed Amber = All actions Acknowledged but not completed Red = Not all actions acknowledged or started</p> <p>AR 25-1</p> <p>Quarter Goal 25% Increase from previous quarter</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">CI02</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Modernization and Enhancement of CEEIS Communications Network</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CECI / CEERD-IV-Z</p>	<p>Measures modernization of routers on communications network.</p> <p>Visibility Level: Enterprise</p> <p>Source of Data: CEEIS DB</p>	<p>Replace outdated 3Com routers with CISCO routers at field sites.</p> <p>FY02 Goal 100%</p> <p>Quarter Goal 20% Increase from previous quarter</p>	<p>Install 25% of routers every quarter.</p>	<p>Green: 75% or more installed Amber: 54% to 74% installed Red: Less than 54% installed</p> <p>Quarter Goal 20% Increase from previous quarter</p>

## CORPORATE INFORMATION

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<p style="text-align: center;">CI03</p> <p>Compliance with ER 25-1-2, Life Cycle Management of Information Systems</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CECI</p>	<p>Identifies and measures command adoption and use of the AIS/IT project management policy in ER 25-1-2.</p> <p>Visibility Level: District Regional Enterprise</p> <p>Source of Data: ITIPS</p>	<p>Ensure the LCMIS process has been implemented by comparing number of MSCs etc. AISs to AISs that have met LCMIS Milestone approval.</p> <p>FY02 Goal 75% Quarter Goal 20% Increase from previous quarter</p>	$\% = \frac{\text{No. AISs with MDA approval}}{\text{No. of AISs}}$	<p>Green = 75 - 100%</p> <p>Amber = 50 – 74%</p> <p>Red = &lt; 50%</p> <p>Quarter Goal 20% Increase from previous quarter</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">CI04</p> <p>Improve the IT Capital Planning Process</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CECI</p>	<p>Identifies breadth and depth of command use of IT investment decision processes.</p> <p>Visibility Level: District Regional Enterprise</p> <p>Source of Data: ITIPS</p>	<p>Ensure visibility of well planned and budgeted funding of IT resources by comparing the number of IT investments obligated in CEFMS to the total number of IT investments budgeted in ITIPS.</p> <p>FY02 Goal 70% Quarter Goal 20% Increase from previous quarter</p>	$\% = \frac{\text{No. IT investments obligated}}{\text{No. of IT investments budgeted}}$	<p>Green = 70 - 100%</p> <p>Amber = 50 – 70%</p> <p>Red = &lt; 50%</p> <p>Quarter Goal 20% Increase from previous quarter</p>

LOGISTICS

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<p>LO01</p> <p>Personal Property Annual Inventory</p> <p>CELD-MS</p>	<p>Annual/cyclic inventory of nonexpendable personal property evaluated by % of items inventoried.</p> <p>Data captured from barcode scanners and reconciled electronically</p> <p>will update command charts</p> <p>SOD: MSCs (APPMS) MSC, DIST, FOAs, Labs</p>	<p>% of item inventoried is equal to</p> <p><u>(# items inventoried (365 days) by scanner)</u> (# items recorded on Property Book)</p>	<p>X 100</p>	<p>Rating Criteria:</p> <p>GREEN: 100%</p> <p>YELLOW: 95-99%</p> <p>RED: 94% and below</p> <p><i>Note: This is based on the Army/USACE Goal of 100% with the Army management Level set at 95%</i></p>

LOGISTICS

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<p>LO02</p> <p>Motor Vehicle Management</p> <p>CELD-T</p>	<p>Utilization rate evaluated by: Number of miles driven</p>	<p>Average mileage per vehicle driven for the quarter = total number of miles driven for the quarter divided by the average number of vehicles on hand.</p> <p>Projected miles driven for the quarter per vehicle = 2500 miles.</p> <p>Utilization Rate = average mileage per vehicle driven for the quarter divided by the projected miles driven per vehicle.</p> <p>Reported Utilization will be a Yearly rate based on the three previous quarters plus the currently submitted quarter.</p> <p>Special purpose vehicles will be reported under indicator LD07, Property Usage Standards.</p> <p>For Special Purpose Vehicles refer to indicator LD07.</p>		<p>Rating Criteria:</p> <p>GREEN: <math>\geq 85\%</math></p> <p>RED: <math>&lt; 85\%</math></p>
<p>LO03</p> <p>Vehicle Cost Per Mile</p> <p>CELD-T</p>	<p>Cost Per Mile (CPM) is the operating cost spent per mile for each vehicle in the fleet for the quarter.</p>	<p>Cost Per Mile = total operating cost divided by total miles driven for the quarter. (CPM is compared against Large Military Fleet averages published in GSA's Federal Motor Vehicle Fleet Report.)</p>		<p>GREEN: Meeting or less than Military CPM</p> <p>RED: Greater than Military CPM</p>

LOGISTICS

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<p>LO04</p> <p>Real Property Management Program – Current</p> <p>CELD-ZE</p>	<p>Current Adjusted Administrative space, owned and leased, evaluated by net sq ft/allocation</p> <p>SOD: MSCs (annual real property utilization survey)</p> <p>MSC, DIST, FOAs, Labs</p>	<p><i>ADMIN SPACE UTILIZATION</i> = <math>\frac{\text{TOTAL NET ADMIN SPACE}}{\text{TOTAL FACILITY ALLOCATION}}</math></p> <p>CURRENT ADJUSTED</p> <p>*Omits SF for waivers and space on military installations</p>		<p>Rating Criteria:</p> <p><b>GREEN:</b> ≤ 162 NSF/ALLOC</p> <p><b>AMBER:</b> &gt;162 &amp; ≤ 178 NSF/ALLOC</p> <p><b>RED:</b> &gt; 178 NSF/ALLOC</p>
<p>LO05</p> <p>Real Property Mgmt Program Plan</p> <p>CELD-ZE</p>	<p>Plan - Administrative space, owned &amp; leased, evaluated by space reduction according to plan:</p> <p>SOD: MSCs (Annual Real Property Utilization Survey)</p> <p>Dists, FOAs, Labs</p>	<p>Administrative Space Utilization Plan is the USACE approved field command plan to reduce excess space by meeting major milestones and reaching target utilization rate (162) by plan completion date.</p>		<p>Rating Criteria:</p> <p>Green: Approved plan meeting milestones</p> <p>Amber: Approved plan but slipping milestones with remedial plan being developed.</p> <p>Red: No Plan in place; or plan milestones slippage with no remedial action plan submitted.</p>

LOGISTICS

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<p>LO06 Inventory Assets CELD-MS</p>	<p>Calculation of Retention Level is evaluated by meeting minimum stockage criteria for a specified Essentiality Code.</p> <p>Calculation of Request Receipt Time criteria is evaluated by reviewing the stockage criteria for a specified time period.</p> <p>Inventory holding for Revolving Fund calculations is evaluated by reviewing items in hold status against total number of items held in inventory.</p>	<p>RETENTION LEVEL % =</p> <p>Number EC items other than "A" &lt; 3 demands 1 year ( _____ ) X 100</p> <p>total number EC items other than "A"</p> <p>REQUEST /RECEIPT TIME % =</p> <p>Number items received &gt; 10 days from order date ( _____ ) X 100</p> <p>total number inventory items</p> <p>INVENTORY HOLDING % = (REVOLVING FUND ONLY)</p> <p>Balance, end of period; CEFMS report screen #3.49S, Whse Operating Account Summary ( _____ ) X 100</p> <p>total number inventory items</p>	<p>Rating Criteria: GREEN: ≤ 5% of total inventory</p> <p>RED: &gt; 5% of total inventory</p> <p>GREEN: &gt; 10 days for ≤ 10% of total inventory</p> <p>RED: &lt; 10 days for &gt; 10% of total inventory</p> <p>GREEN: Revolving Fund inventory ≤ 5% of total inventory</p> <p>RED: Revolving Fund inventory &gt; 5% of total inventory</p> <p>Regulations: ER 700-1-1 &amp; AR 710-2-2</p>	

LOGISTICS

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<p>LO07 Property Usage Standards CELD-MS</p>	<p>Quarterly calculation of personal property usage evaluated by: (a) Meeting minimum standard in days, and/or (b) Meeting minimum standard in percentage of use. Visibility Level - Data gathered by property book and maintenance officers.  SOD: MSCs, Dists, FOAs and Labs</p>	<p>a. Floating plant property, and all capitalized property not specifically listed in, or similar to, any of the property categories in Table 1-5, EP 750-1-1, will have standard of 45 days minimum quarterly use.  b. For all other items (includes special purpose equipment) requiring usage reporting, compute quarterly use percentage with operational days as basis. Multiply number of days operated per year by 100, and divide product by number of operational days in the quarter. Compare % to that in Table 1-5.  Reporting Periods:  1<sup>st</sup> Qtr: 1 Oct – 31 Dec – 92 possible days 2<sup>nd</sup> Qtr: 1 Jan – 31 Mar – 91 possible days 3<sup>rd</sup> Qtr: 1 Apr – 30 Jun – 91 possible days 4<sup>th</sup> Qtr: 1 Jul – 30 Sep – 92 possible days</p>		<p>GREEN: ≥85%  AMBER: 75-84%  RED: 74% and below.  Regulations: ER 700-1-1 and ER 750-1-1.</p>

LOGISTICS

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<p>LO08 Equipment Operational (Availability) Rate CELD-MS</p>	<p>Equipment operational rates evaluated by percent of days equipment is available for use.  SOD: MSC's Operational and Maintenance Records.</p>	<p>An operational rate is another indicator to diagnose the performance level of an equipment management program. USACE has set operational criteria or a goal for command activities to strive for or surpass.</p> <p>Operational Rate:</p> <p><u>Available Days</u> Possible Days X 100</p> <p>Example: 82/91 = .901 X 100 = 90.1 (Green)</p>		<p>Green: 85% or higher</p> <p>Amber: 75 – 84%</p> <p>Red: 74% or less</p> <p>ER 750-1-1</p>

LOGISTICS

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
LO09 Equipment Maintenance Backlog CELD-MS	Equipment maintenance backlog rate is evaluated by percent of outstanding work orders against hours planned to accomplish work.  SOD: MSCs (Maintenance Cost & Repair Records), DIST, FOAs, LABS	The level of performance effectiveness and efficiency of an equipment management program can be determined by monitoring the scheduled or unscheduled maintenance actions that are incomplete at the end of the quarter.  <u>Maintenance Hours Incomplete</u> Total Maintenance Hours (Scheduled + Unscheduled) X 100 = Backlog  Example: $470/2550 + 1050 = 470/3600 = 0.1305 \times 100 = 13.05$ (Green)		Green: 15% or less Amber: 16-20% Red: 21% or higher

LOGISTICS

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
<p>LO10 Report of Survey Management Information CELD-MS</p>	<p>Summery data is complied and provided for Command Management Information</p> <p>Data collected provided to MSCs, Districts,FOAs, and the Laboratory</p> <p>SOD:Report of Survey Register for MSCs, Dist, FOAs, and Laboratory</p>	<p>Report of Survey Information:</p> <p>Lost items. #of ROS Documents processed = the number of documents to which a ROS number was assigned during the Reporting Quarter. #of ROS line items = the number of items on each document listed above. Total Value of all ROS = Value as listed on the documents listed above. Total Value Assessed to Individual = the amount of money withheld from an individuals pay if required to reimburse the government for the loss. Total loss to the Government = the Difference of <i>total value all</i> minus the <i>total value assessed to individual</i>.</p> <p>Damaged Items # of ROS Documents processed = the number of documents to which a ROS number was assigned during the Reporting Quarter. #of ROS line items = the number of items on each document listed above. Total Value of all ROS = Value as listed on the documents listed above. Total Value Assessed to Individual = the amount of money withheld from an individuals pay if required to reimburse the government for damaged items. Total loss to the Government = the Difference of <i>total value all</i> minus the <i>total value assessed to individual</i>.</p>		<p>No Rating Information – for management purposes only</p>

**SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
<b>Performance</b>				
SO01/SO02 Accident Prevention	Civilian Team Member Lost Time Incidents evaluated as rate.  SOD: Lost time cases: DOL, OWCP- New Case create reports. EXPOSURE: HQUSACE (CERM-U) via MSC, Districts and Lab Feeder Report	Rate reflects number of lost time injuries/illnesses per 200,000 worker hours (200,000 worker hours equals 100 worker years).	# of lost time cases multiplied by 200,000; that result divided by worker hours of exposure. Time period covered is prior 12 months.	Rating Criteria: <u>GREEN</u> : At or below 1.55 <u>AMBER</u> : Between 1.55 and 2.31 <u>RED</u> : At or above 2.31  (These are FY 01 Objectives. FY 02 Objectives to be issued early in FY 02.)
	Contractor Lost Workdays evaluated as a rate.  SOD: MSC and Lab Feeder Reports Divisions, Districts and Labs	Rate reflects number of lost workday injuries/illnesses per 200,000 worker hours (200,000 contractor worker hours equals 100 worker years).	# of lost workday cases multiplied by 200,000; that result divided by worker hours of exposure. Time period covered is prior 12 months	Rating Criteria: <u>GREEN</u> : At or below 0.84 <u>AMBER</u> : Between 0.84 and 1.95 <u>RED</u> : At or above 1.95  (These are FY 01 Objectives. FY 02 Objectives to be issued early in FY 02.)

**SMALL BUSINESS OFFICE**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
<p>Small Business (SB) SB01</p>	<p>Contracts awarded to small businesses evaluated by the dollars obligated as a percentage of total contract obligations. VISIBILITY: MSCs &amp; FOAs SOD: Standard Procurement System</p>	<p>The term small business includes small disadvantaged business, women-owned small business and section 8(a) businesses, but does not include historically black colleges and universities/minority institutions. The size of a firm, as a small business, is defined by industry size standards.</p>	$\frac{\$ \text{ Small Business Obligations}}{\$ \text{ Total US Business Obligations}}$	<p>Rating Criteria: USACE Goal 40% Statutory goal 23% <u>GREEN</u>: met or exceeded USACE goal <u>AMBER</u>: met statutory goal not USACE goal <u>RED</u>: statutory goal not met P.L. 100-656 SEC 502 &amp; 503, P.L. 105-135 SEC 603</p>
<p>Small Business Set Aside (SBSA) SB02</p>	<p>Contracts awarded through set aside to small businesses evaluated by the dollars obligated as a percentage of total contract obligations. VISIBILITY: MSCs &amp; FOAs SOD: Standard Procurement System</p>	<p>A set aside for small business (as previously defined) is the reserving of an acquisition exclusively for participation by small business concerns.</p>	$\frac{\$ \text{ Small Business Set-Aside Obligations}}{\$ \text{ Total US Business Obligations}}$	<p>Rating Criteria: USACE Goal 10% <u>GREEN</u>: met or exceeded goal <u>RED</u>: not meeting goal P.L. 85-536</p>

**SMALL BUSINESS OFFICE**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
<p>Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) SB03</p>	<p>Contracts awarded to small disadvantaged businesses evaluated by the dollars obligated as a percentage of total contract obligations.  <b>VISIBILITY:</b> MSCs &amp; FOAs  <b>SOD:</b> Standard Procurement System</p>	<p>A small disadvantaged business is a small business concern, including mass media, is at least 51 percent unconditionally owned by one or more individuals who are both socially and economically disadvantaged, the majority of the earnings directly accrue to such individuals, and whose management and daily business operations are controlled by one or more such individuals. Received certification from SBA. This term also means a small business concern that is at least 51 percent unconditionally owned by an economically disadvantaged Indian tribe or native Hawaiian organization. Small disadvantaged business is a subset of small business. Goals and performance includes awards to section 8(a) business firms.</p>	$\frac{\$ \text{ Small Disadvantaged Business Obligations}}{\$ \text{ Total US Business Obligations}}$	<p>Rating Criteria: USACE goal 13%                      Statutory goal 5%  <u>GREEN:</u> met or exceeded USACE goal  <u>AMBER:</u> met statutory goal not USACE goal  <u>RED:</u> statutory goal not met                      P.L. 100-656 SEC 502;                      P.L. 106-65 SEC 808</p>

**SMALL BUSINESS OFFICE**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
8(a) Awards [8(a)] SB04	Contracts awarded to 8(a) business firms evaluated by the dollars obligated as a percentage of total contract obligations. VISIBILITY: MSCs & FOAs SOD: Standard Procurement System	The 8(a) program is named for section 8(a) of the small business act from which it gets its authority. An 8(a) business firm is a small disadvantaged business, who is accepted by the small business administration.	$\frac{\$ \text{ 8(a) Business Obligations}}{\$ \text{ Total US Business Obligations}}$	Rating Criteria: USACE Goal 3.5% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded goal <u>RED</u> : not meeting goal P.L. 95-507
Women-owned Small Business (WOSB) SB05	Contracts awarded to women-owned small businesses evaluated by the dollars obligated as a percentage of total contract obligations. VISIBILITY: MSCs & FOAs SOD: Standard Procurement System	A women-owned small business is a small business that is at least 51 percent owned, controlled and operated by a woman or women who is(are) a U. S. Citizen(s). A woman-owned small business is also included in small business contract obligations.	$\frac{\$ \text{ Women-owned Small Business Obligations}}{\$ \text{ Total US Business Obligations}}$	Rating Criteria: USACE Goal 5% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded goal <u>RED</u> : not meeting goal P.L. 103-355
Historically Black	Contracts awarded to HBCU/MI evaluated by the	Historically black colleges and universities means institutions	$\frac{\$ \text{ Total HBCU/MI Obligations}}{\$ \text{ Total HBCU/MI Obligations}}$	Rating Criteria: USACE goal 10%

**SMALL BUSINESS OFFICE**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
Colleges and Universities/ Minority Institutions (HBCU/MI) SB06	dollars obligated as a percentage of total higher education institution obligations. VISIBILITY: MSCs & FOAs SOD: Standard Procurement System	determined by the Secretary of Education to meet the requirements of 34 CFR Section 608.2. Minority institutions means institutions meeting the requirements of para (3)(4) and (5) of Section 312(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1058).	\$ Total Education (HEI) Obligations	Statutory goal 5% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded USACE goal <u>AMBER</u> : met statutory goal not USACE goal <u>RED</u> : not meeting goal P.L. 100-180; P.L. 106-65 SEC 808
Small Business Research and Development (SB R&D) SB07	Contracts awarded to small business evaluated by the dollars obligated as a percentage of total research and development obligations. VISIBILITY: MSCs & FOAs SOD: Standard Procurement System	Research and development ordinarily covers basic research, exploratory development, advance development, demonstration/validation, engineering and manufacturing development, and operational system development.	$\frac{\$ \text{ Total SB R\&D Obligations}}{\$ \text{ Total R\&D Obligations}}$	Rating Criteria: USACE goal 40% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded goal <u>RED</u> : not meeting goal P.L. 97-219
Environmental Restoration Contracts	Prime contracts obligated plus subcontract dollars awarded to SDBs as	Procurements to support activities for the evaluation and cleanup of a contaminated environment.	$\frac{\$ \text{ SDB (Prime Obligation Plus Sub Awards)}}{\$ \text{ Total Environmental}}$	Rating Criteria: USACE goal 8% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded

**SMALL BUSINESS OFFICE**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
(HTRW) SB08	reported by prime contractors on SF 294s evaluated as percentage of total environmental restoration contracts obligations.. VISIBILITY: MSCs & FOAs SOD: Standard Procurement System and SF 294s	Includes preliminary assessments, site investigations, remedial investigations, risk assessments, feasibility studies, decision documents, designs, interim actions, remedial actions, short-term operation and maintenance, and any other actions at hazardous, toxic, and radioactive waste sites.	Restoration Obligations	goal <u>RED</u> : not meeting goal P.L. 99-499
Small Business Subcontracts (SBSUB) SB09	Subcontracts awarded to small businesses evaluated as percentage of total dollars awarded by large business. VISIBILITY: MSCs & FOAs SOD: SF 294s	Small Business (SB) as previously defined.	$\frac{\$ \text{ Total SB Subcontracts Awarded}}{\$ \text{ Total Subcontracts Awarded}}$	Rating Criteria: USACE goal 61.4% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded goal <u>RED</u> : not meeting goal P.L. 95-507
Small Disadvantaged Business Subcontracts (SDBSUB) SB10	Subcontracts awarded to small disadvantaged businesses evaluated as percentage of total dollars awarded by large business. VISIBILITY: MSCs &	Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) as previously defined.	$\frac{\$ \text{ Total SDB Subcontracts Awarded}}{\$ \text{ Total Subcontracts Awarded}}$	Rating Criteria: USACE goal 9.1% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded goal <u>RED</u> : not meeting goal P.L. 95-507

**SMALL BUSINESS OFFICE**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
	FOAs SOD: SF 294s			
Women-owned Small Business Subcontracts (WOSBSUB) SB11	Subcontracts awarded to women-owned small businesses evaluated as percentage of total dollars awarded by large business. VISIBILITY: MSCs & FOAs SOD: SF 294s	Women-owned small business (WOSB) as previously defined.	$\frac{\$ \text{ Total WOSB Subcontracts Awarded}}{\$ \text{ Total Subcontracts Awarded}}$	Rating Criteria: USACE Goal 5% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded goal <u>RED</u> : not meeting goal P.L. 103-355
Subcontract Reporting (SUBRPT) SB12	Number of correct summary subcontract reports (SF 295) evaluated as percentage of number of reports required from all contractors VISIBILITY: MSCs, FOAs SOD: SF295	Summary subcontract reports (SF 295) are required under construction contracts exceeding \$1 million, and supply/service contracts exceeding \$500 thousand.	$\frac{\text{Number of Correct Reports Received}}{\text{Number of Reports Required from all Contractors}}$	Rating Criteria: USACE goal 100% <u>GREEN</u> : met goal <u>RED</u> : not meeting goal P.L. 95-507
Designated Industry Groups (DIGS) Construction SB13	Construction contracts awarded to small business evaluated by the dollars obligated as a percentage of total construction contract obligations VISIBILITY: MSCs, &	Component of the small business competitiveness program that tested unrestricted competition in four designated industry groups (DIGS). Construction (excluding dredging) was one of the four industrial categories selected.	$\frac{\$ \text{ Total SB Construction Obligations}}{\$ \text{ Total Construction Obligations}}$	Rating Criteria: USACE goal 40% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded goal <u>RED</u> : not meeting goal P.L. 100-656 & P.L. 105-135

**SMALL BUSINESS OFFICE**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
	FOAs SOD: Standard Procurement System			
Designated Industry Groups (DIGS) A-E SB14	A-E contracts awarded to small business evaluated by the dollar obligated as a percentage of total A-E contract obligations VISIBILITY: MSCs, & FOAs SOD: Standard Procurement System	Component of the small business competitiveness program that tested unrestricted competition in four designated industry groups (DIGS). Architectural and engineering services (including surveying and mapping) was one of the four industrial categories selected.	$\frac{\$ \text{ Total SB A-E Obligations}}{\$ \text{ Total A-E Obligations}}$	Rating Criteria: USACE goal 40% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded goal <u>RED</u> : not meeting goal P.L. 100-656 & P.L. 102-366, P.L. 105-135

**SMALL BUSINESS OFFICE**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
Targeted Industry Categories (TICS) SB15	Contracts awarded to small businesses evaluated by the dollars obligated as a percentage of total contract obligations in specific TIC VISIBILITY: MSCs, Labs & FOAs SOD: Standard Procurement System	Targeted industry categories are 10 industry categories selected by the agency which have historically demonstrated low rates of small business participation. USACE has two TICS (turbine/generators and search and navigation equipment).	$\frac{\$ \text{ Total Small Business in Specific TIC Obligations}}{\$ \text{ Total Specific TIC Obligations}}$	Rating Criteria: USACE goal 10% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded Goal <u>RED</u> : Not meeting goal P.L. 101-656 & P.L. 102-366, P.L. 105-135
Dredging Small Business SB16	Contract awards to small businesses evaluated as a percentage of total dredging contract awards (excluding hopper and dustpan dredges). VISIBILITY: MSCs SOD: Standard Procurement System	Small Business (SB) as previously defined.	$\frac{\$ \text{ Total Small Business (Dredging) Contract Obligations}}{\$ \text{ Total Dredging Contract Obligations}}$	Rating Criteria: USACE goal 20% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded goal <u>RED</u> : not meeting goal P.L. 100-656 & P.L. 102-366, P.L. 105-135
Emerging Small	Contract awards to	Emerging small business is a	\$ Total ESB (Dredging)	Rating Criteria: USACE goal

**SMALL BUSINESS OFFICE**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
Business (ESB) SB17	emerging small business evaluated as a percentage of total dredging contract awards. VISIBILITY: MSCs SOD: Standard Procurement System	small business concern whose size is no greater than 50 percent of the numerical size standard applicable to the North American Industry Classification System code assigned to a contracting opportunity.	<u>Contract Obligations</u> \$ Total Dredging Contract Obligations	5% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded goal <u>RED</u> : not meeting goal P.L. 100-656 & P.L. 102-366, P.L. 105-135
HUBZone Set Aside (HUBZ SA) SB18	Contracts awarded through HUBZone set aside to small businesses evaluated by the dollars obligated as a percentage of total contract obligations. VISIBILILTY: MSCs & FOAs SOD: Standard Procurement System	A “set aside” for HUBZone small business (as previously defined) is the reserving of an acquisition exclusively for participation by HUBZone small business concerns.	\$ HUBZone Small Business <u>Set-Aside Obligations</u> \$ Total US Business Obligations	Rating Criteria: USACE Goal 2.5% <u>GREEN</u> : met or exceeded USACE goal <u>AMBER</u> : achieved 85% of USACE goal <u>RED</u> : achieved below 85% of USACE goal P.L. 105-135
Service-Disabled	Contracts awarded to service-disabled veteran-	Service-disabled veteran means a	\$ Total SDVOSB	Rating Criteria: USACE

**SMALL BUSINESS OFFICE**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
Veteran-Owned Small Business(SDV OSB) SB19	owned small business firms evaluated as a percentage of total contract obligations. VISIBILITY: MSCs & FOAs SOD: Standard Procurement System	veteran with a disability that is service-connected (as defined in section 101(16) of title 38, Untied States Code. Small Business (SB) as previously defined .	<u>Obligations</u> \$ Total US Business Obligations	Goal 3% <u>GREEN:</u> met or exceeded goal <u>RED:</u> not meeting goal P.L. 106-50
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Subcontracts (SDVOSBSub) SB20	Subcontracts awarded to service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses evaluated as a percentage of total dollars awarded by large business. VISIBILITY: MSCs & FOAs SOD: SF 294s	Service-disabled veteran-owned small business (SDVOSB) previously defined.	\$ Total SDVOSB <u>Subcontracts Awarded</u> \$ Total Subcontracts Awarded	Rating Criteria: USACE Goal 3% <u>GREEN:</u> met or exceeded goal <u>RED:</u> not meeting goal P.L. 106-50

**PRINCIPAL ASSISTANT RESPONSIBLE FOR CONTRACTING**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
<b>1. Professionalism</b>	All District Level Semi Annual Data- Call			
CEPR-O	<b>a. Certified Level III Acquisition Supervisors/ Managers Rate</b>	All 1100 series* Acquisition Workforce members level III certified supervisors and managers GS-12 or above.	<u>Acquisition Workforce Level III Certified</u> = Number of all supervisors/managers Level III Certified (GS-12 or above) <u>divided</u> by total number of all GS 12 or above, 1100 series supervisors/managers in the command <u>times</u> 100%.	Green: ≥90% Amber: 70-89% <u>Red</u> : ≤69%
CEPR-O	<b>b. Certified Level II Acquisition Personnel Rate</b>	All 1100 series* Acquisition Workforce members level II certified personnel GS-9 thru GS-12.  * USACE defines 1100 series acquisition workforce as all 1102s, 1105s, and 1103s.	<u>Acquisition Workforce Level II Certified</u> = (Number of all Level II Certified GS-9 thru GS-12 <u>divided</u> by total number of all GS-9 thru GS-12, 1100 series personnel eligible for level II certification in the command) <u>times</u> 100%. (Note: Since 1106s have no certification requirements, they are not included in this calculation.)	Green: ≥90% <u>Amber</u> : 70-89% <u>Red</u> : ≤69%
CEPR-O	<b>c. 1100 &amp; 800 Series Personnel Meeting or Exceeding DAWIA Rate/Section 808, NDAA</b>	All 1100 & 800 series acquisition work force personnel* who meet or exceed the DAWIA mandated minimum degree and education requirement of 24 semester business credit hours.	<u>1100 &amp; 800 Series Personnel Meeting or Exceeding DAWIA</u> = (All 1100 & 800 series acquisition work force personnel who meet or exceed the DAWIA mandated degree and 24 credit hours requirement <u>divided</u> by (the total number of all 1100 & 800 series acquisition work force personnel <u>minus</u> the number of 100 & 800	Green: ≥ 50% <u>Amber</u> : >25-49% <u>Red</u> : ≤24%





**PRINCIPAL ASSISTANT RESPONSIBLE FOR CONTRACTING**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
		and 1103s. The 800 series USACE personnel included in the Acquisition Workforce: (1) must be involved in construction contract administration; (2) must be a construction engineer (or architect), Civil Techs or Con Reps (802/809); (3) must be an ACO or in their feeder group at the GS 13 level or below.		
<b>2. Processes</b> (Director of Contracting)	All District Level Semi Annual Data- Call			
CEPR-O	<b>a. Credit Card Usage Rate</b>	All credit card purchases made by all command personnel compared to all purchases made under the credit card dollar threshold limit.	<u>Credit Card Usage</u> = (Total number of bank-reported credit card transactions of the command <u>divided</u> by the number of all simplified acquisition procedures (Total number of bank-reported credit card transactions plus the number reported on DD Form 1057 block f1)) <u>times</u> 100%.	<u>Green:</u> ≥ 90% <u>Amber:</u> 80-89% <u>Red:</u> ≤79%
CEPR-O	<b>b. Operational Efficiency</b>	The average cost of operations for every dollar awarded for the following categories: HTRW/Environmental Supplies	Sum of the total cost of operations relevant to each category <u>divided</u> by the sum of total dollars awarded for each category	<u>Green:</u> \$0.06 <u>Amber:</u> \$0.06 - \$0.10 <u>Red:</u> \$0.10

**PRINCIPAL ASSISTANT RESPONSIBLE FOR CONTRACTING**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
		Services Construction/Maintenance		
CEPR-O	<b>c. Ratifications</b>	All ratifications as defined in FAR and EFARS occurring within the reportable period.	Number of reported ratifications occurring within the reportable period as listed in EFARS 1.602-3.	<p><u>Green</u>: Zero (0) ratifications within the reportable period.</p> <p><u>Amber</u>: One (1) ratification within the reportable period.</p> <p><u>Red</u>: Greater than one (1) ratifications within the reportable period.</p>
CEPR-O	<b>d. Indefinite Delivery Contract (IDC) Usage</b>  <b>(1) IDC Obligation Rate.</b>	<p>All Indefinite Delivery Contracts (IDC) regardless of type (all "D" type contracts) as defined in FARS Subpart 16 and supplemental regulations. IDC calculations are performed individually for each area listed below, then combined for a total usage rate.</p> <p><u>HTRW Contracts</u>: TERC PRAC A-E IDT Envir. Service</p> <p><u>Civil/Military Contracts</u> A-E IDT Survey/Mapping</p>	<p>General formula for calculation of individual <u>IDC Obligation Rate</u> = (Total IDC obligations divided by the total available IDC contract capacity) times 100%.</p> <p>A cumulative Total IDC usage rate is calculated by summing the individual obligations and capacity data and using the formula above. (For this calculation use only that part of the IDC which has been exercised. The capacity of options that have not been exercised should NOT be included.)</p>	<p><u>Green</u>: ≥ 50%</p> <p><u>Amber</u>: 30-49%</p> <p><u>Red</u>: ≤29%</p>

**PRINCIPAL ASSISTANT RESPONSIBLE FOR CONTRACTING**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
	<b>(2) IDC(s) with less than 33% usage (Hollow)</b>	JOC Service/Supply  Total IDC USAGE Rate	The number of all IDC(s) that will expire within one year following the report date with a usage rate less than 33%.	<u>Green:</u> Zero IDCs with less than 33% usage rate within the reportable period. <u>Amber:</u> One (1) IDCs with less than 33% usage rate within the reportable period. <u>Red:</u> Greater than one (1) IDC with less than 33% usage rate within the reporting period.
CEPR-O	<b>e. Contractor Performance Evaluation Rate</b>	All contractor performance evaluations as required by FAR 42.15 and implementing USACE regulations. Data for the calculation is obtained thru a random sample of <i>twenty</i> recently completed (older than 90 days) contracts consisting of all contract types (to include IDCs) is selected. The official contract file is checked for a completed and processed evaluation.	<u>Contractor Performance Evaluation Rate</u> = (Number properly completed and processed evaluations divided by 20) times 100%.	<u>Green:</u> ≥ 90% <u>Amber:</u> 75-89% <u>Red:</u> ≤74%
CEPR-O	<b>f. Contract Audit Follow-up (CAF) Rate*</b> * Not a field reported item. This element is based data presented by HQUSACE CAF AO in	See DODD 7640.2, AFARS, and EFARS Subpart 15.890-3 and subsection therein. Calculation involves the complete, accurate, and timely submission of audit records in the semi-annual status		<u>Green:</u> = 100% <u>Amber:</u> N/A <u>Red:</u> < 100%

**PRINCIPAL ASSISTANT RESPONSIBLE FOR CONTRACTING**

Functional Area and Proponent	Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data	Definition	Calculation (s)	Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law
	the quarters.	report of specified contract Audit Reports.		
<b>3. Structure</b>	All District Level Semi Annual Data- Call			
CEPR-O	<p><b>a. 1100 Series Under Contracting</b></p> <p>(1) 1100 Series Co-located with Customer</p> <p>(2) 1100 Series in Matrix structure</p>	<p>In accordance with DAWIA, all 1100 series* personnel are to be under the supervision and control of the Chief of Contracting excluding the Small Business Personnel.</p> <p>Number of 1100 series personnel co-located with the technical unit, project manager or other customer</p> <p>Number of 1100 series personnel in a matrix/team structure with technical or project personnel</p> <p>* For this metric USACE defines 1100 series acquisition workforce as all 1102s, and 1105s.</p>	<p><u>1100 Series Under Contracting</u> = (Number of 1100 Series assigned and working in the Contracting Office divided by the total number of 1100 series personnel assigned to command) times 100%.</p> <p>Number of 1100 series personnel co-located with the technical unit, project manager or other customer</p> <p>Number of 1100 series personnel in a matrix/team structure with technical or project personnel</p>	<p><u>Green:</u> 100%</p> <p><u>Amber:</u> : 90-99%</p> <p><u>Red:</u> ≤89%</p>

**PRINCIPAL ASSISTANT RESPONSIBLE FOR CONTRACTING**

<b>Functional Area and Proponent</b>	<b>Indicator and Evaluation Visibility Level Source of Data</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Calculation (s)</b>	<b>Rating Criteria Governing Regulation or Law</b>
CEPR-O	<b>b. Rightsize/Utilize Acquisition Work Force Rate</b>	The Rightsize/Utilize Acquisition Work Force Rate is the percentage of the Acquisition Work Force (both 800 and 1100 series) properly maintained in support of critical mission functions (Hub/Liaison) and utilized by the Command's Acquisition Work Force Manager.	<u>Maintain/Utilize Acquisition Work Force Rate</u> = (The number of Acquisition Work Force (both 800 and 1100 series) properly rightsized and utilized divided by the Total number of Acquisition Work Force) times 100%.	<u>Green:</u> ≥40% <u>Amber:</u> 20-39% <u>Red:</u> ≤19%
<b>4. Automation</b>	All District Level Semi Annual Data- Call			
CEPR-O	<b>a. Use of Army Single Face to Industry (ASFI)</b>	SAAL-PA directed that solicitations be posted to the ASFI starting no later than 1 May 2000.	(Number of solicitations posted to ASFI <u>divided</u> by the total number of solicitations issued) times 100%	<u>Green:</u> ≥ 95% <u>Amber:</u> 80-94% <u>Red:</u> ≤79%
CEPR-O	<b>b. Solicitations Using Electronic Bids/Proposals</b>	Number of solicitations using electronic bids/proposals	(Number of solicitations using electronic bids/proposals <u>divided</u> by the total number of solicitations issued) times 100%	<u>Green:</u> ≥ 90% <u>Amber:</u> 70-90% <u>Red:</u> ≤69%

# Annex A

## RELATIONSHIP OF THE CCG TO PUBLIC LAW

The CCG is built on a clear and modern foundation of public laws. The four pillars of management in the U.S. Government noted below are dynamic, fully implemented by most Government organizations and directive in nature for all U.S. Executive Agencies. Our CCG and, indeed, our entire existing—and future—USACE management organization must answer to these Federal mandates. It follows then that our CCG must be fashioned so as to carefully reflect each of the following four overarching public laws for management.

- Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, (CFO)  
(Public Law 101-576)
- Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, (GPRA or Results Act)  
(Public Law 103-62)
- Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, (PRA)  
(Public Law 104-13)
- Clinger-Cohen Act, (formerly referred to as the Information  
Technology Management Reform Act [ITMRA])  
(Public Law 104-106), 1996

The relationship of our USACE CCG to each of these preeminent public laws is briefly summarized below.

**Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990.** This act broke new ground in public law for Federal management more than a decade ago. The CFO Act was the first of the quartet of major Federal management reforms made into public law. The CFO Act legally established both the definition and duties of all Federal CFOs—starting with creation of a completely revised and expanded set of duties and responsibilities for the Deputy Director for Management of the Executive Office of Management and Budget (OMB). This top-level official was named to be the Federal CFO and therefore, “the chief official responsible for financial management in the United States Government” (United States Code, title 31, sec. 201). The Corps has aggressively implemented the letter and intent of the CFO Act in naming our Director of Resource Management as our USACE Chief Financial Officer.

**Government Performance and Results Act of 1993.** The objective of the Results Act is to redirect Federal agencies’ current focus and preoccupation with processes and activities to a

focus on achieving desired program results. Program results are defined in terms of intended program outcomes (authorized program purposes), customer satisfaction, and service quality. To accomplish this redirection of management focus the Results Act requires the following actions:

- Develop a strategic plan by end of FY 97 and subsequently in three-year intervals. Each plan should:
  - Look forward at least five years.
  - Include the agency's mission statement.
  - Identify the agency's long-term goals.
  - Describe how the agency intends to achieve these goals through its activities and human, capital, information, and other resources.
- Submit an annual performance plan beginning in FY 99 and each succeeding fiscal year. The plan should:
  - Provide a direct linkage between strategic planning goals and program performance goals in terms of achieving mission, strategic goals, and authorized program purposes.
  - Contain the agency's annual program performance goals.
  - Identify the program performance measures the agency will use to assess its progress.

The Results Act requirement for a disciplined linkage of strategic planning to performance planning and accountability reporting is to facilitate the redirection of organizations to results-oriented management. A result orientation overcomes some of the limitations of measuring organizational success primarily in terms of activities and processes (e.g., funding account expenditure rates, number of decision documents completed on schedule, or regulatory permits processed). The Results Act directs management to measure success in terms of desired program results (e.g., improved flood damage prevention, improved navigation services, wetland acres preserved).

The distinction between measuring processes and outcomes is important. When an agency focuses on outcomes, it defines the "bottom line" of its business endeavors. Those who assess an agency's role and worth can do so in terms of the products and services the agency actually delivers. It is the program outcomes that make sense to the agency's customer base and to those who fund its programs.

The CCG aligns with the intent of the GPRA. Many of the component requirements of this act are present in the CCG and hold the potential to align annual organizational goals with

budget activities, performance indicators, measurement criteria, and resource guidance. With each edition of the CCG, we can more closely link program goals and resources with the USACE Strategic Vision.

The effect of the Results Act will not be to replace existing process performance measures with a different set of outcome measures, but to produce a more balanced set of performance measures. By implementing a **Balanced Scorecard** approach to measuring results across key dimensions of performance (e.g., program outcomes, customer satisfaction, service quality, management effectiveness and efficiency, and quality of work life), we can better plan for and achieve success in ways that meet stakeholder needs and expectations.

The USACE evaluation of mission execution (the Command Management Review or CMR) and internal Program Review Boards are evolving as management vehicles for implementing the USACE Strategic Vision. As these forums evolve and pick up the results-orientation dimension, they will also support fulfilling the objectives of the Results Act.

**Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.** This important member of the U.S. Code “quartet of modern resource management in the Federal Government,” is often overlooked when considering the laws which molded resource management in the government. In fact, without the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, modern Federal resource management—financial, human, or information resources—could not function or perhaps even exist, in any efficient, performance providing sense.

This national guidance is important to the Corps and the CCG because it requires Federal agencies to:

- Be responsible—in consultation with the senior official and the agency Chief Financial Officer (or comparable official), each agency program official shall define program information needs and develop strategies, systems, and capabilities to meet those needs.
- Develop and maintain a strategic information resource management plan that shall describe how information resource management activities help accomplish agency missions.
- Develop and maintain an ongoing process to—
  - Ensure that information resource management operations and decisions are integrated with organizational planning, budget, financial management, human resources management, and program decisions.
  - Fully and accurately account for information technology expenditures, related expenses, and results. This is accomplished in cooperation with the agency Chief Financial Officer or comparable official.

- Establish (1) goals for improving information resource management's contribution to program productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness; (2) methods for measuring progress towards those goals; and (3) clear roles and responsibilities for achieving those goals.
- Ensure that the public has timely and equitable access to the agency's public information.
- Provide public information maintained in electronic format and to provide timely and equitable access to the underlying data (in whole or in part).

Finally, this Act provides the first clear and understandable definitions for information resources, information resources management (IRM), and information technology (IT).

**Clinger-Cohen Act.** This act complements the GPRA in that the Chief Information Officer (CIO) and the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) partner together to ensure that information technology (IT) investments are aligned with business strategies and managed on a portfolio basis—including both risk and cost considerations, and that IT investments are directly linked with measuring business performance results. The CCG contains critical components to move the Corps further towards alignment with the ITMRA. Critical to the USACE CIO's FY 02 agenda will be:

- Integrating IT planning and Architecture 2000+ with corporate business strategies.
- Performing IT investment management through the Information Technology Investment Portfolio System (ITIPS).
- Providing increased definition to IT governance, including establishing core performance measurements and increasing emphasis on IT asset management.
- Promoting IT competencies throughout the workforce.
- Seeking opportunities where emerging IT can be leveraged for competitive business advantage, as well as business process improvements.
- Ensuring that information security policies, practices, and procedures are in accordance with Operations Order 99-001 (Positive Control).