

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

PART ASSESSMENTS¹

¹ For each program that has been assessed using the PART, this document contains details of the most recent assessment. These details are presented in their original form; some programs have revised performance targets and developed or replaced performance measures since the original assessment. The PART summaries published with the 2006 Budget (in February 2005) provide current information on follow-up to recommendations and other updates.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Page</u>
Coastal Ports and Harbors.....	Moderately Effective.....	3
Coastal Storm Damage Reduction.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	14
Corps Hydropower.....	Adequate.....	24
Emergency Management.....	Moderately Effective.....	35
Flood Damage Reduction.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	48
Inland Waterways Navigation.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	59
Non-regulatory Wetlands Activities.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	72
Recreation Management.....	Moderately Effective.....	81
USACE Regulatory Program.....	Moderately Effective.....	94

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Ports and Harbors
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	88%	56%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The purpose of this Corps program is to develop and maintain key portions of the nation's marine infrastructure (such as navigation channels, jetties and breakwaters) at the nation's coastal ports and harbors in support of the Corps navigation mission. The navigation mission is to provide safe, reliable, efficient, and environmentally-sustainable waterborne transportation systems (channels, harbors and waterways) for movement of commerce, for national security needs, and also for recreation.

Evidence: The Corps works with other federal agencies, state and local governments (including port authorities) and parties in the private sector (including dredging contractors) to maintain 299 commercial harbors, through which 2 billion tons of cargo move annually, and 627 smaller harbors, many of which are dependednt upon Corps-maintained and assisted ports and harbors. The program is authorized under various Rivers and Harbors Acts and Water Resources Development Acts.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The U.S. is a world power, with worldwide commercial and economic interests. Navigation is one mode of the Nation's total transportation network: air, rail, truck, ship, and pipeline. Moreover, world trade is expected to grow in the future. Coastal ports and harbors must be adequate to support this growth. Corps-supported ports and harbors also contribute to domestic trade and commerce and thereby contribute to a prosperous economy and the growth of well-paying jobs.

Evidence: More than one in four jobs in the U.S. economy is dependent on U.S. imports and exports. In the year 2002, total waterborne commerce was 2.34 billion tons of which 1.32 billion tons moved via Great Lakes and coastal ports. Approx. 95 percent of all commodity movement to foreign markets is by water. The value of goods coming from or going to foreign ports through Corps-maintained harbors was over \$260 billion in 2001. Of that amount, the value of exports was \$312 billion and the value of imports was \$302 billion.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts. Congress has decided that the Corps should play a role planning, financing and supervising general navigation features at the country's ports and harbors. The community of people concerned with coastal ports and harbors support the current division of responsibilities between the agency and port authorities with whom it works. The current program works reasonably well.

Evidence: The Corps was assigned responsibility for protecting and maintaining ports and harbors in 1824. The U.S. Constitution recognizes the quasi-public nature of the governance of ports and harbors in the commerce clause and port preference clause.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Ports and Harbors
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	88%	56%	Effective

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight20%

Explanation: The program works reasonably well and is free of fundamental structural flaws. However, there is a wide range of views on problems the program faces and the appropriate way to deal with those problems. Many program advocates see constrained funding as a serious problem. Some program advocates believe cost-sharing requirements should be modified in favor of state and local interests. Some program critics question the need for federal funding of ports and harbors. Ports and harbors invest an estimated \$1.7 billion each year for infrastructure including wharfs, warehouses, cargo handling equipment, roads and rails, administrative buildings and security improvements. Ports, in the view of these critics, could finance out of their own resources the infrastructure the Corps now pays for, including navigation channels, for example. To take a specific example, the Port Authority of NY and NJ invests \$1 billion each year. The Corps gives it more than \$100 million annually for dredging-related activities. The ports could pay for these expenses itself.

Evidence: The funding challenge can be met in several ways: (a) The Corps can cut costs by allocating limited resources to projects where they have maximum positive effect on the economy; or (b) States and local interests can be asked to assume a larger share of the cost of the program. The Administration's program attempts to strike a balance on each these strategies. The Administration's emphasis on benefit-cost assessments and other performance metrics is a clear effort to allocate limited resources to areas where they have the largest economic return. Cost sharing formulas provide a balanced approach, requiring those who benefit from the program to pay part of its cost.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight20%

Explanation: Corps coastal navigation funds are used to provide direct services to the users of navigation channels and waterways. The Corps assures successful program performance through use of two features of the program: 1) each new project is required to demonstrate positive net benefits; and, 2) a local sponsor must provide 50% of study costs and between 20 and 60% of construction costs. Corps maintenance expenses are reimbursed from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. These cost-sharing requirements help ensure that the Federal investments have the greatest impact.

Evidence: The budget process of ranking high use, high performance projects first results in mid-90 % availability. 149 ports in 30 states and Puerto Rico annually handle more than 1 million tons of cargo each. All eight Corps Major Subordinate Commands in the continental U.S., and 20 or 38 district offices, manage coastal port and harbor projects. In 2001, public port authorities spent \$2 billion on capital improvements to landside port facilities, which are served by Corps navigation projects.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight11%

Explanation: These measures express long-term goals and assess the effectiveness of the components that result in program accomplishment and transportation savings.

Evidence: The March 2004 Civil Works Strategic Plan reflects performance measures for investing in navigation infrastructure. These measures have been updated and are reflected in the measures tab.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Ports and Harbors
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	88%	56%	Effective

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The March 2004 Civil Works Strategic Plan defines the long-term program goal as follows: to provide safe, reliable, efficient, and environmentally-sustainable waterborne transportation systems (channels, harbors, and waterways) for movement of commerce, for national security needs, and for recreation.

Evidence: See measures tab.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Annual performance measures reflect "glide paths" from baseline status to targets for long-term measures. Baseline and targets are under development.

Evidence: See measures tab.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: A number of measures are under development and baselines have not been established. Annual targets reflect glide paths from baseline status to long-term targets.

Evidence: See measures tab.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Cost sharing project sponsors participate in formulating and then financing navigation studies and projects.

Evidence: Reflected in cost sharing agreements for each study and project whereby sponsors participate in studies, contribute 50% of study costs and contribute lands, easements, and rights-of-way and cash to project construction.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Project by project review with further evolution of the process with input from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report on independent review and other Corps reviews conducted on an as-needed basis. However, external reviews are not a regular part of the process. The NRC recommended that external review only be applied to the most complex or controversial studies. Review process for each project requires coordination with other Federal, State and local agencies and interested parties and outside reviews are conducted on an as-needed basis. Other studies have utilized outside reviewers as well.

Evidence: The ASA(CW) has an office of Project Planning and Review and the Corps has recently created an Office of Project Review.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Ports and Harbors
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	88%	56%	Effective

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The budget is built in increments and the impact of varying increments on performance is displayed. Each increment (program level) defines what is achievable with each additional increment/decrement of funding within each business program.

Evidence: FY2006 budget Engineer Circular (EC 11-2-187) and budget submitted to OMB.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Corps has made significant progress in developing new long-term and annual performance measures. The Strategic Plan is continually reviewed and revised. It includes all interested parties in the mix of commentators through publication on the "WEB". The Corps is continuing to develop and refine performance metrics.

Evidence: The Civil Works Strategic Plan was published in March 2004 as a work in progress to respond to review concerns voiced by the Office of Management and Budget.

2.CA1 Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The tradeoffs of costs and benefits are conducted within the project development process in accordance with the P&G and Corps planning and project guidance. Development of the FY2006 agency budget request involved using multiple performance metrics to allocate resources to the highest return activities.

Evidence: Agency FY2006 budget EC and budget request, 1983 Principles and Guidelines, ER 1105-2-100.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The Corps collects physical performance data and uses it to manage facilities. This information is maintained in the Operations and Maintenance Business Information Link (OMBIL) as a source of basic project and performance information. Other measures are focused on financial activities; e.g., expenditures on schedule, activities completed on schedule.

Evidence: The Corps collects data on ship groundings, shoaling, and water levels and aggregates these data into overall "availability." The Navigation Data Center Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center collects all the waterborne commodity data annually for all ports, harbors, and waterways. The Navigation Data Center also tracks the location and usage of Corps and industry dredges for new and maintenance dredging activities. OMBIL also provides basic project and performance information.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Ports and Harbors
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	88%	56%	Effective

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Managers are accountable for schedules and for having projects open and available for traffic. Fixed-price contracts tightly specify performance requirements. The Corps accomplishes much of its studies and all of its construction by contract. ER 4115-1-17 prescribes "Construction Contractor Performance Evaluations", and record of performance is recorded in the Construction Contractor Appraisal System (CCAS) and used for future construction contract bidder qualification.

Evidence: ER 4115-1-17. Engineer Regulation and Pamphlet 1130-2-520, chapter 8. Dredging Information System shows all contract completion information and has contractor evaluations and performance documentation on file.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Funding is requested on an incremental basis - the amount the Corps can expend in that given Fiscal Year - instead of lump sum. Non-Federal funds are usually requested in the year needed and usage is scheduled accordingly. The Corps is concerned with the efficient obligation and expenditure of funds and diligently tracks financial performance through the Program Review Board and Resource Management Boards.

Evidence: HQUSACE Consolidated Command Guidance (CCG) published each August.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: (1) Each project undergoes value engineering analysis to identify ways to construct project at less cost and greater efficiency. (2) The principle of cost sharing with non-Federal project sponsors, represented by the Inland Waterways Users Board, results in a strong incentive to achieve cost efficiencies and an effective project. The Harbor Maintenance Tax is an ad valorem tax on the value of cargo shipped between U.S. and foreign ports and covers maintenance for non-fuel-taxed harbors.

Evidence: ER 1165-2-131 Local Cooperation Agreements for New Start Construction Projects; ER 1105-2-100 "Planning Guidance Notebook; ER 1110-2-1150 Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects; ER 1110-2-8151 Life Cycle Design and Performance. Annual Reports for the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and for the Inland Waterways Users Board. Dredging Information System shows contract data that includes the number of contract bidders and a comparison of bids to the Government estimate.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Ports and Harbors
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	88%	56%	Effective

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The Corps is a member of a multi-agency, intermodal (trucking, rail, and waterways) team addressing the nation's navigation (and other modal) needs by the year 2020. The Corps also coordinates extensively with cost sharing sponsors and stakeholders during planning, design, construction, and operation of specific projects. The Civil Works Strategic Plan is based on the watershed approach: working collaboratively with a broad range of stakeholders to help solve water resources problems in a sustainable manner; using systems approaches to understand the connections between natural and man-made systems; analyzing water resources problems on larger geographic scales; and striving to achieve multiple goals and functions using water and related resources in a balanced manner.

Evidence: Interagency Committee for the Marine Transportation System

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The Corps has a real time database (CEFMS) which tracks appropriated, scheduled, and expended funds. Projects which are behind schedule may have funds reprogrammed to other projects. The Corps has been making substantial progress in producing sound annual financial statements. The major obstacle is in determining the original cost of existing plant, equipment and property, which affects its balance sheet.

Evidence:

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The Corps uses yearly evaluations at the national, regional, and field operations levels to identify and correct management deficiencies. Management deficiencies are identified through a proven internal control procedure developed by the Corps management audit program and governed by an Engineer Regulation. This management control system is common to all business programs in the Corps. This program and yearly evaluation is applied at the national program level, the regional level, and the field operations level. There are mandatory corrective actions as a result of this program.

Evidence: ER 11-1-30 USACE Internal Management Control Program

3.CA1 Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: Defining documents include Project Management Plans, cost sharing agreements, plans and specifications and the terms of contracts, economic analyses (which must be kept current for new projects). Project Management Plans are the master document for defining deliverables and goals. Reprogramming provides flexibility to reallocate funds when schedules must be modified. The Corps tracks obligation and expenditure data through its financial systems. The agency is negotiating partnership agreements to ensure the agency is working effectively with port authorities.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Ports and Harbors
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	88%	56%	Effective

- 4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight:17%
- Explanation: Funding constraints, and higher spending priorities elsewhere in the federal government, have resulted in reduced funding for coastal ports and lower availability, reliability, and efficiency.
- Evidence: The Corps has kept the system in running order, but maintenance backlogs have increased. FY03, FY04, and FY05 budgets proposed to give maintenance priority to high-use projects over lower-use projects. The agency request for FY 2006 provides no funds for purely recreational harbors.
- 4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%
- Explanation: Annual goals are adjusted to reflect budget decisions..
- Evidence:
- 4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: YES Question Weight:17%
- Explanation: The results of a cost-savings initiative for operations have been implemented Corps-wide. New technologies have been applied to reduce the duration of scheduled and unscheduled outages. Headquarters and Division FTE have been reduced 30% over 10 years.
- Evidence:
- 4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:17%
- Explanation: There are no similar programs.
- Evidence: U.S. Constitution, commerce clause and port preference clause.
- 4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%
- Explanation: The Corps performs economic feasibility analyses of investments in new facilities and major rehabilitations. New investments are reviewed through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process by the public, interest groups and other Federal agencies.
- Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Ports and Harbors
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	88%	56%	Effective

4.CA1 **Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?**

Answer: LARGE
EXTENT

Question Weight: 17%

Explanation: Schedules and targets are adjusted to reflect budget and appropriation decisions. Some projects have required reauthorization due to cost growth. Projects are authorized with the cost-ceiling that allows for a maximum 20% increase in constant dollars. Congress must approve projects exceeding the maximum.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Ports and Harbors
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	88%	56%	Effective

Measure: Effectiveness of cost management
Additional Information: Measures effectiveness of management controls for design and construction

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Percent change in constant dollar balance to complete programmed work on all ongoing, budgetable construction projects
Additional Information: Measure assesses progress in reducing backlog of ongoing, budgetable construction projects

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Percent of time navigation infrastructure with high levels of commercial traffic is available to current commercial users, weighted by commercial tonnage
Additional Information: Measure expresses long-term goal and assesses availability of high-commercial use harbors, channels, and locks for current commercial usage

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual/Long-term
-------------	---------------	---------------	---------------------------------------

Measure: Percent of Chiefs reports recommending projects for authorization that meet criteria for reflecting watershed principles in the recommended plan
Additional Information: Measure expresses long-term goal and assesses progress in watershed-based planning

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual/Long-term
-------------	---------------	---------------	---------------------------------------

Measure: Percent of projects exceeding facilities condition index (FCI) standard. The measure assesses the agency's performance in meeting its maintenance objectives. (Baseline and targets are under development.)
Additional Information: Measure expresses long-term goal and assesses progress in attaining standard for condition

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	Under development		
2006			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Ports and Harbors
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	88%	56%	Effective

2007

Measure: Value of Construction projects completed this year. This measure is designed to encourage the timely completion of cost-beneficial projects. In more specific terms, it is the present value of net benefits attributable to projects completed this fiscal year. (Baseline and targets are under development.)

Additional Information: Measure assesses effectiveness of reconnaissance phase in identifying opportunities for transportation savings

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2005	Under development		
2006			
2007			

Measure: Number of partnership agreements the Corps has signed with top 299 coastal ports. Measure indicates progress in establishing productive working relationships between the Corps and port authorities.

Additional Information: Measure assesses effectiveness of feasibility phase in identifying potential national economic development benefits

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	4	4	
2005	25		
2006	50		

Measure: Total net benefits (PV) attributable to PEDs completed in FY

Additional Information: Measure assesses effectiveness of PED in enabling transportation savings

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Ports and Harbors
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	88%	56%	Effective

Measure: Total benefits (PV) realized by construction projects completed in FY
Additional Information: Measure assesses effectiveness of construction program in realizing transportation savings

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

Measure: Percent of time low use navigation infrastructure is available to all current users, unweighted
Additional Information: Measure expresses long-term goal and assesses availability of low-commercial use channels, harbors, and locks to all current users

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual/Long-term
-------------	---------------	---------------	---------------------------------------

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Storm Damage Reduction
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	44%	63%	28%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The purpose of the program is to reduce coastal erosion damages resulting from hurricanes and coastal storms. The program achieves this purpose primarily through cost-shared implementation of structural solutions such as jetties, seawalls, and long-term beach nourishment, mostly the latter. Nonstructural solutions, such as home buyouts and elevations are also employed but much less frequently. The largest and most controversial component of the program is its individually authorized long-term beach nourishment projects, which involve regular placement of sand on shorelines for up to fifty year terms.

Evidence: The program was first authorized in the 1936 Flood Control Act and modified in subsequent Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, and Water Resource Development Acts over the years. Individual storm damage reduction projects may be authorized for additional purposes, which include ecosystem restoration or mitigation of damages from operating Federal navigation projects. Separate cost-share formulas are applied to non-storm damage reduction purposes.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: There is a growing need to address the impacts of shoreline erosion on existing public infrastructure in coastal communities. Shoreline erosion is exacerbated by a range of factors, including coastal development, Federal navigation infrastructure, and upland dams. The Federal role in addressing these impacts, however, should be more limited than it is currently, as the long-term financial commitments associated with 50 years of periodic beach re-nourishment are extremely large and may, in some situations, even induce further development on the coastline.

Evidence: On the east and Gulf Coasts, coastal dynamics are heavily affected by Federal navigation projects such as channel stabilizing jetties which prevent the downdrift movement of sand. On the West coast upland dams prevent transport of sediment downstream where it can nourish beaches. While the East and Gulf coasts are more susceptible to hurricanes, the West coast faces strong winter storms (for example, El Nino) that occur every few years.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: There is some overlap between the Corps and FEMA efforts. The two agencies do not have a history of collaboration, yet both perform storm damage mitigation activities. State and local governments also finance shore protection activities within their respective jurisdictions, but those efforts would either be in partnership with or independent of this program. Lastly, individual homeowners and businesses may protect their own property through structural or nonstructural measures, but the Corps' program does not provide funding for protection of private beaches.

Evidence: The following Federal agencies provide storm damage reduction assistance in the form of direct financial support, technical assistance, grants, or loans: Corps; Economic Development Administration (Dept of Commerce); FEMA; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (Dept of Commerce); Dept of Housing and Urban Development. Various state and local governments participate in shore protection activities, and private entities may finance protection of their own property.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Storm Damage Reduction
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	44%	63%	28%	Demonstrated

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: There are concerns about the unintended consequences of the long-term beach renourishment projects on coastal development, which is regulated at the state and local level. There are also concerns about the extent of Federal financing for 50-year renourishment projects whose benefits are largely localized. Further, many state and local project sponsors are not prepared to assume full financial responsibility for the continuing renourishment costs that remain after the Federally authorized project is 'complete'. The Corps' Regional Sediment Management program is exploring how to integrate the planning and management of the beach nourishment program with other water resources activities.

Evidence: The Corps' National Regional Sediment Management Program is exploring innovative strategies to better integrate the planning and management of water resources activities that affect or are affected by sediment systems and processes in order to more efficiently manage the Nation's sediment resources.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The intended beneficiaries for individual storm damage reduction projects are those communities whose residents, properties, economic and public sector activities and services are at risk of storm and hurricane damages. Beneficiaries are location specific, as are the delivered damage reduction products and services; thus there is a high degree of congruence between potential and actual beneficiaries. With the exception of some non-structural activities (evacuation), beneficiaries can only be protected on a defined hazards area basis.

Evidence: Project beneficiaries participate financially in the project feasibility study, and, if the project is Congressionally authorized, they participate as cost-sharing partners in the construction of the project. They assume financial responsibility for maintaining the project upon completion.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight 11%

Explanation: The Corps recently developed a few new long-term measures that reflect the purpose of the program, but not its outcomes. One measure tracks how well projects incorporate watershed principles in their study and design documents. Another measure tracks how well projects meet original cost estimates. Other long-term measures, such as the facility condition index rating, are still under development at this time. One of the analytical strengths of this program is the benefit-cost analysis that is used to formulate individual projects.

Evidence: A benefit-cost ratio is developed for each authorized project, which showing the estimated return on the investment. Still lacking is an aggregate measure (such as the average or median benefit-cost ratio for the program) of the overall return on the investment in this program. Such a measure should be developed in collaboration with other Federal hazard mitigation programs. Newly developed long-term measures were included in the Corps GPRA Strategic Plan, released in March 2004.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight 11%

Explanation: The Corps is still refining and collecting baseline data for the long-term measures listed above. When baseline data is available for the measures, however, that information will be used to set specific performance targets in the budget request.

Evidence: Baselines and targets for new measures are under development.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Storm Damage Reduction
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	44%	63%	28%	

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The Corps developed a measure to track the economic benefits realized from projects for which construction and design has been completed. However, the program still needs more outcome-oriented measures that are aligned with the its long-term goals, such as the percent reduction in annual storm damages attributable to Corps projects. The budget prioritizes funding for construction estimated to yield a higher return, per dollar invested.

Evidence: In developing the program budget and making funding allocation decisions, the Corps ranks competing projects in the initial phase of construction by their remaining benefits, relative to their remaining costs. This project ranking process is aimed at maximizing the return from the total program. Re-nourishment projects that are performed to mitigate the impacts of Federal navigation projects are given special consideration in funding decisions.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Baseline program performance data is only available for a limited number of annual measures that were recently developed. The Corps will collect additional data in the upcoming year.

Evidence: For annual measures recently developed and approved, the Corps will begin collecting and organizing baseline data this year.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The Corps' primary partners are its non-Federal project cost-sharing partners, project contractors and FEMA. Cost-sharing project sponsors have a vested interest in ensuring that project costs do not exceed original estimates, and the Corps uses performance clauses in its construction contracts to help ensure further that cost and schedule goals are met. The Corps does not collaborate sufficiently with FEMA in its program execution, goal-setting, or performance measurement in order to reduce inefficiencies in the duplication of efforts.

Evidence: Greater collaboration is needed among the Corps and its program partners, especially FEMA, to track the results of Federal hazard mitigation efforts and reduce program inefficiencies.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: There has not been a comprehensive, independent evaluation of this program's effectiveness and relevance to the problem of coastal storm impacts, and there is not an institutional mechanism for conducting regular independent evaluations of the program. The National Academy of Science conducted an evaluation of the Civil Works planning and design program and recommended more independent review of individual projects and studies. In the past, independent external review of individual projects has been done on a limited basis, just for complex or controversial studies. The Corps has an Office of Water Project Review to oversee implementation of the NAS recommendation.

Evidence: The National Academy of Sciences reviewed the Corps planning program on a program-wide basis in 1999 and 2004 and recommended more independent, external review of individual project plans and proposals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Storm Damage Reduction
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	44%	63%	28%	Demonstrated

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The 2006 Budget for Corps construction links funding to the estimated return on a project, but the Corps still needs to more improve the linkage between overall program performance goals and the associated funding request. The Corps is currently finalizing a strategy for full-cost budgeting, to account for and assign to specific programs all funding items.

Evidence: The 2006 Budget proposes a more explicit and transparent performance-based framework for ranking and funding storm damage reduction projects.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The Corps is continuing to make progress in the development of long-term and annual performance measures that will support GPRA goals of more performance-based budgeting and program management. The Corps still needs to develop one or two key outcome-oriented measures that focus on improving the return from the overall program.

Evidence: The Corps released its GPRA strategic plan in 2004 and is continuing to refine its performance goals in consultation with OMB and program stakeholders.

2.CA1 Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Underlying each authorized storm damage reduction project is a benefit-cost analysis that evaluates a range of alternatives and their associated tradeoffs and recommends the alternative yielding the greatest return on the investment. The recommended alternative also satisfies environmental and other regulatory constraints. The budget allocates funds among projects based on these estimates of projects' remaining benefits relative to their remaining costs,

Evidence: The Federal Principles and Guidelines and Corps Engineering Regulations provide the guidance on how the Corps conducts its analysis of alternatives.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Program and project managers carefully track the execution of appropriated funds primarily for reprogramming purposes. Currently, however, there are no mechanisms in place for the systematic collection and tracking of program performance data largely because performance measures are still under development or have only recently been developed. Part of the reason why data is not collected is because the program only this year began developing performance measures. The Corps is currently developing a more performance-based approach to reprogramming decisions --- a good first step to using integrated performance and financial data for improved program management.

Evidence: Currently, the Corps only regularly tracks and reviews the rate of expenditure of appropriated funds. funds. Program managers review this data regularly in order to make fund reprogramming decisions.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Storm Damage Reduction
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	44%	63%	28%	Demonstrated

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The Corps accomplishes much of its studies and all of its construction activities by fixed price contracts that tightly specify performance requirements. However, the Corps does not routinely perform an ex post facto comparison of estimated versus actual benefits and costs for completed construction projects.

Evidence: Corps accomplishes much of its studies and all of its construction activities by contract. Fixed price contracts tightly specify performance requirements. ER 4115-1-17 prescribes "Construction Contractor Performance Evaluations" and record of performance is recorded in the Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System (CCAS) AIS and used for future construction contract bidder qualification.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: A major concern of the Corps is the efficient obligation and expenditure of funds, and the Corps is diligent in the tracking of such through Project Review Boards & Resource Management Boards that monitor the obligation and expenditure of project funds.

Evidence: The Corps of Engineers Financial Management System (CEFMS) is a distributed, real-time database that allows project managers to track work orders and their associated costs and funding streams.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: In the project study and design phase, each project undergoes value engineering analysis to identify ways to construct the project more inexpensively and efficiently. Further, cost-sharing agreements with non-Federal project sponsors results in a strong incentive to achieve cost efficiencies and an effective project.

Evidence: Various internal policies and engineering regulations prescribe analytical methodologies for cost-effective project design and construction.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: This is an area in need of much improvement. The Corps does not routinely meet with FEMA to coordinate the delivery of services or share lessons learned about their respective programs. Greater coordination is needed and should be pursued in the near-term.

Evidence: An interagency working group could be developed to address this organizational weakness.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Storm Damage Reduction
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	44%	63%	28%	Demonstrated

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Program and project managers carefully track the expenditure of appropriated funds. Also the Corps has been making substantial progress in producing sound annual financial statements, but the agency has not yet received a clean audit for its most recent fiscal year accounting records. In this and other Corps programs, there have been problems with the Corps' management of continuing contracts for construction projects, largely because the use of these contracts has not received sufficient oversight from program managers. Without assurance of the availability of future appropriations, district staff could execute large, multi-year contracts which impose outyear funding requirements that must be met in subsequent years in order to avoid potential contract suspension or termination costs. The result is a loss of flexibility in formulating a performance-based program budget.

Evidence: The Budget proposes modifications to the Corps contract authority to address recent problems in managing its existing multi-year continuing contract authority. Also the Corps has recently developed improved contract management controls. Regarding the Corps' financial statements, the major obstacle in the Corps resolution of its audit difficulties is in determining the original cost of existing plant, property, and equipment, which affects its balance sheet.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: This program has demonstrated some progress in implementing the President's Management Agenda, as part of the Corps overall management improvement efforts.

Evidence: The Corps released its GPRA strategic plan last year which included new performance measures for this program to better inform budget and management decisions.

3.CA1 Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Deliverables are defined on a project by project basis through various decision documents and these deliverables are tracked through the Corps of Engineers Financial Management System (CEFMS). The Corps annual budget provides data on projected contract requirements. The Corps use of reprogramming provides flexibility in the management of construction contracts. The Corps mostly uses fixed-price contracts that address risks due to weather and seasonal changes and include appropriate safeguards to cover unsatisfactory performance. Project justification data is kept current; economic analysis can be no more than three years old at the time a project is being considered for construction.

Evidence: Deliverables and cost and schedule goals are defined in Project Management Plans, Cost Sharing Agreements, and Design Agreements that are executed by the Corps and Non-Federal project partners. Detailed plans and specifications specify the scope of construction performance requirements. CEFMS enables each district to track expenditure data against schedules on a monthly basis, and the Corps annual budget provides details on projected contract requirements.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Storm Damage Reduction
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	44%	63%	28%	Demonstrated

- 4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight:17%
- Explanation: The program only recently developed long-term performance goals, and more progress is needed in the development of more outcome-oriented long-term measures that reflect the program's success in reducing national storm damages.
- Evidence: Annual Flood Damage Prevention reports and the analysis of Corps benefits provided by the addition of completed projects to the infrastructure reflects that damages prevented are increasing.
- 4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight:17%
- Explanation: Annual performance measures for this program were only recently developed and are still being refined, so it is not yet possible to evaluate the program's success in achieving annual goals for those measures.
- Evidence: Specific performance targets are still under development for recently developed measures.
- 4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%
- Explanation: To more cost-effectively address the Federal interest in beach renourishment activities, the Administration has proposed funding limits on long-term renourishment activities. The agency has also developed stronger management controls for administering multi-year construction contracts in this and other Corps programs.
- Evidence: The Corps is implementing changes in multi-year contract management that should help achieve improved efficiencies in reaching program goals.
- 4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%
- Explanation: The program is somewhat unique in the Federal government, as discussed above, and the large scope of this program relative to similar state, local and private efforts makes it difficult to draw comparisons on program performance.
- Evidence: The Corps will begin working with other Federal agencies to develop common inter-agency measures for performance comparison and improvement purposes.
- 4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%
- Explanation: The Corps employed the National Academy of Sciences to do a comprehensive review of Civil Works study program procedures with the goal of improving the planning processes. The NAS review found the planning program to be relatively effective and made recommendations for improvement, including more regular independent review of project studies.
- Evidence: The Corps has employed the NAS in the past to assess its planning process and has been found to be an effective process.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Storm Damage Reduction
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	44%	63%	28%	Demonstrated

4.CA1 **Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?**

Answer: LARGE
EXTENT

Question Weight: 17%

Explanation: The Corps recently developed a few program goals but it is still collecting data to set baselines and targets.

Evidence: Baseline and target data for program goals are being collected this year.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Storm Damage Reduction
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	44%	63%	28%	Demonstrated

Measure: Total benefits (PV) realized by construction projects completed in fiscal year
Additional Information: Measure assesses effectiveness of construction program in reducing storm damages.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	Baseline		
2005			
2006			

Measure: Percent change in constant dollar balance to complete programmed work on all ongoing, budgetable construction projects
Additional Information: Measure assesses progress in achieving strategic objective of reducing backlog of ongoing, budgetable construction projects.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	5%		
2005	4%		
2006	3%		

Measure: Average percentage deviation of actual, price-level adjusted costs from original estimated costs for projects completed in fiscal year
Additional Information: Measures quality of cost estimating and effectiveness of management controls for design and construction

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	Baseline		
2005	10%		
2006	9%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Coastal Storm Damage Reduction
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	44%	63%	28%	Demonstrated

Measure: Percent reduction in national flood and storm damages that are attributable to Corps storm damage reduction projects.
Additional Information: Measure assesses the level of contribution made by Corps and other Federal mitigation programs to reduction of overall flood and storm damages.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	NA		
2005	NA		
2006	NA		

Measure: The Corps is developing a measure to track the percent reduction in national flood and storm damages that are attributable to Corps storm damage reduction projects.

Additional Information: Measure assesses the level of contribution made by Corps and other Federal programs to reduction of overall flood and storm damages.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2004	Baseline		
2005	NA		
2006	NA		
2007	NA		
2008	NA		
2009	NA		
2010	NA		

Measure: Total benefits realized by completion of construction and/or design of projects in the fiscal year (Baseline and targets under development)

Additional Information: Measure assesses the effectiveness of construction and design work in reducing storm damages.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Corps Hydropower
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	100%	100%	33%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The purpose of the Corps of Engineers Hydropower program is to produce hydroelectric power at 75 multi-purpose Federal reservoirs that house 345 power generating units. Each of projects was constructed and operates under individual project authorizations and for multiple purposes (such as flood damage reduction, protection of threatened or endangered fish and wildlife and commercial navigation), including hydropower production.

Evidence: The program authorization is found in the 1938 Flood Control Act as well as in the 75 individual project authorizations. See also the Flood Control Act of 1944. Under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 the Corps is authorized to protect threatened or endangered fish/wildlife at operating projects.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program was originally authorized to make electricity available and spur economic development in less developed parts of the country, but the Corps Hydropower Program continues to help meet regional need for stable, reliable, and low-cost electrical power across the Nation. The program generates 24 percent of the Nation's hydropower supply --- three percent of total electric power --- most of which is produced in the Pacific Northwest. Because hydropower facilities have the unique ability to start quickly and adjust rapidly, Corps powerplants also provide ancillary benefits in contributing to the stability and reliability of the electrical grid and providing a critical emergency power reserve.

Evidence: In 2003, the program produced approximately enough energy to serve 10 million households at one-tenth the cost of fossil-fuel power production. The program also helps stabilize and maintain the reliability of the electric power distribution grid through voltage support, reactive power, ancillary services and at some plants, the ability to blackstart the electrical grid after a blackout.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program produces hydropower that is sold by Federal Power Marketing Administrations (PMAs) at cost to supplement the production of hydropower by the Bureau of Reclamation in the West and by other, non-Federal entities elsewhere. Private and other non-Federal entities also produce hydropower but not at Corps-owned facilities and not at-cost.

Evidence: The Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and the Flood Control Act of 1944 dictate the terms under which the Corps produces and makes available to the PMAs at-cost hydropower.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Corps Hydropower
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	100%	100%	33%	

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program would benefit from expansion of direct financing arrangements between the Corps and the Power Marketing Administrations. The shift to direct and/or customer funding in certain Corps regions has enabled regional/system-wide improvements and bulk purchasing of power generation components rather than individual projects competing for limited funds through the appropriations process, resulting in improved efficiency. Another continuing challenge for the Corps is the need to balance the projects' hydropower production with the other authorized reservoir purposes and uses, to reflect changing conditions and national values. Finally, consideration should be given to improving the way in which major rehabilitation work is financed.

Evidence: The hydropower system requires significant investments of preventative maintenance and rehabilitation on a recurring basis as determined through ongoing monitoring of facility conditions, yet, as GAO has reported, the delays and uncertainty associated with the appropriations-based financing have resulted in a lack of investment in these facilities, and consequently, a decline in the program's performance. Consistent with its strategic goals, the Corps should work toward improving its management of the hydropower program to better reflect the increased National interest in protecting fish and wildlife at Corps reservoirs.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program effectively meets its statutory requirement to provide power first to designated 'preference customers' and then to non-preference customers, through the regionally based PMAs. Both the Corps and the PMAs consult with these customers on a regular basis to determine needs, program issues, and future potential rate impacts.

Evidence: Federal statutes require the program to produce and make available at-cost power to defined groups of "preference customers" through the Power Marketing Administrations.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight 11%

Explanation: The program has three long-term performance measures that reflect the program purpose: Forced-Outage Rate; High Load (Peak Power) Availability Rate; Production Efficiency (System-Wide Capacity as a Percentage of System-Wide Nameplate Capacity); and Condition Efficiency Assessment (CEA) Rating. Together, these measures are used to set long-term production and efficiency goals on a regional basis. However, the program needs additional measures --- first, a measure that tracks how well Corps facilities compare with other similar Federal and non-Federal production facilities in terms of cost efficiency. Second, as the largest user of Corps reservoirs, the hydropower program should (in cooperation with other programs using the reservoirs) begin developing a measure that assesses how well the program balances the hydropower related use of the reservoir against other authorized uses of the reservoirs.

Evidence: The Condition Efficiency Assessment (CEA) rating is a valuable measure also used by the Bureau of Reclamation Hydropower Program that will enable plant managers to track the condition of individual generating units and better manage and plan for future repairs. Baseline data for the CEA will be available in 2005. In the meantime, the Corps is using Production Efficiency, a measure based on average unit age and the number of de-rated units per hydropower facility.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Corps Hydropower
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	100%	100%	33%	

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Ambitious targets and timeframes have been set for Forced Outage Rate, Peak Season Availability and Production Efficiency. The achievement of these targets, however, could depend on the availability of appropriated funds for investment in facility repairs and major rehabilitations. Where direct financing arrangements exist between the Corps and the PMAs for the operation and maintenance costs at hydropower plants (or among the Corps, PMAs and customers for direct customer funding of major rehabilitations), the achievement of long-term goals is more realistic.

Evidence: The 2006 Budget Request incorporates long-term performance targets for the measures adopted in the Civil Works Strategic Plan.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program's annual performance measures are designed as steppingstones to demonstrate the program's annual progress toward achieving its long-term goals.

Evidence: The Civil Works Strategic Plan and the Corps 2006 Budget Request state the program's annual performance measures and the program uses these measure to set performance targets and track performance trends.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program has baseline data and targets are being set for use in the 2006 budget request. for Forced Outages, Peak Power Availability, and Production Efficiency.

Evidence: The Corps does not have baseline data on Cost Efficiency, as this measure is still under development.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The Power Marketing Administrations (PMAs) and Preference Customers serve as "watchdogs" on the availability and cost of power. The Corps works closely and regularly (monthly) with them through regional alliances and working groups to review planned investments, performance goals, and system conditions. However, the PMAs' project funding and management decisions often are not weighed against other project purposes and the impacts of those decisions on the recreation, flood control or navigation-related purposes of the project.

Evidence: The Corps-PMA shared performance goals focus on "forced outages" and "system availability" and are regional in nature. However, the Northwest Joint Operating Committee has developed both system performance and environmental goals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Corps Hydropower
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	100%	100%	33%	

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Haddon-Jackson and Associates, an independent consulting firm generally regarded as the leader in benchmarking hydroelectric powerplants in the U.S. and Canada, was contracted by two of the PMAs (BPA and SEPA) to evaluate operations at Corps facilities in the Pacific Northwest, South Atlantic and Lakes & Rivers Divisions against other Federal and private hydropower producers. These three regions account for 75 percent of the total program's power production. The remaining regions are not currently participating in independent benchmarking efforts. The operations plan for each reservoir is developed in consideration of all authorized purposes and of other applicable Federal laws; however, there has not been a comprehensive evaluation of the impact of hydropower operations at Corps reservoirs on competing uses of those reservoirs.

Evidence: The regions that are not currently participating in the Haddon Jackson benchmarking effort are planning to join the Haddon Jackson or EUCG benchmarking groups in the near future.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: In the past, budget requests have not explicitly associated funding levels with the achievement of annual and long-term goals, but the development of the FY06 budget has focused on linking budget requests to performance targets.

Evidence: The Corps development of the 2006 links various funding levels to performance increments. Past budget submissions have only loosely connected funding alternatives with annual and long-term goals.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Corps hired a national hydropower team coordinator in 2002, and has taken other steps to improve its strategic planning efforts, including the following: contracting out for independent benchmarking studies; collaborating with other Hydropower producers to develop a condition evaluation assessment rating tool and a model for risk-based strategic investment decisions; validating a national database for forced outages and other performance indicators (OMBIL); and initiating the development of a 5-10 year asset management plan. Once the Hydropower Asset Management Plan is implemented, (HydroAMP) the Corps will be able to set priorities, regionally and nationally (as needed), among competing maintenance needs.

Evidence: The program has engaged in internal and collaborative efforts with other hydropower producers to develop better facility assessment and management methodologies that will enable more precise, long-term strategic planning.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Corps Hydropower
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	100%	100%	33%	

2.CA1 **Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The multi-year collaborative effort to develop Hydropower Asset Management Plan (HydroAMP), a standard for equipment condition assessment modeling of risk-based strategic investment decisions, is estimated to be completed by the end of 2004. Once completed, the HydroAMP model will enable the Corps to conduct a credible analysis of investment alternatives and make decisions accordingly. In addition, twice a year the Corps employs a process for strategic planning, evaluation and adjustment of program investments in hydropower facilities.

Evidence:

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The program uses a national database to extract and compile individual plant performance information by region and yield performance reports comparing regional and national program data against annual targets. The Corps reviews performance and financial information regularly with the PMAs and preference customers in each region. However, the Corps and the PMAs could improve their monitoring and response to environmental conditions affected by hydropower-related decisions.

Evidence: OMBIL reports and other sources of performance information for individual projects and regions are reviewed regularly by the Corps with its partners and customers and used to make management and investment decisions.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Regional and local Federal managers are held accountable for their program management performance which is either directly or indirectly tied to maintaining project schedules and costs as well as satisfactory issue resolution and problem solving. Construction contractors are also held accountable for contracted work at the plants through contract performance clauses that identify financial penalties for missed schedules and rate contractors' performance.

Evidence: The Corps personnel performance management system --- Total Army Performance Evaluation System --- links program and project managers' performance with achieving program goals. Regarding contractors, performance clauses are included in all construction contracts which explicitly state agreed upon cost and work schedules.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Corps Hydropower
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	100%	100%	33%	

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The obligation and expenditure of Federal and partner funds are tracked in the Corps automated, real-time financial management database (Corps of Engineers Financial Management System, or CEFMS) and tracking reports are reviewed monthly by the Program Review Board to ensure expenditures are aligned with purposes expressed in appropriations and outlined in Memoranda of Agreement with partners.

Evidence: Cost schedules are tracked for every project, and deviations from the approved cost schedules require corrective action.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The Corps Hydroelectric Design Center and Hydropower Analysis Center (HDC and HAC) pursue and leverage the latest technological efficiencies in project design, economics and operation. The Corps is currently implementing a DoD approved, nation-wide asset management system called FEM (Facilities and Equipment Maintenance), which allows for automated tracking of work orders related to individual units and their maintenance and repair histories for more efficient asset management and strategic planning purposes. The program also has an automated system for tracking and reporting project performance, including efficiency indicators such as costs per kilowatt-hour of power produced, to better align program efficiencies. Finally, each power plant maintains efficiency curves for each generating unit to maximize operational efficiency of the generating units and usage of the water supply.

Evidence:

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The Hydropower program has developed a strong working relationship with DOE, Bureau of Reclamation, Hydro Quebec, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, PMAs, and Preference Customers to share best practices and discuss national policy issues.

Evidence: The Corps has developed regional collaborative forums (management alliances and working groups) to review operational performance, cost and management issues with PMAs and Preference Customers.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The program tracks the rates at which funds are scheduled, obligated, and expended, but it is not currently using an earned value management system. No material weaknesses were found for the program during the most recent audit, but the overall Civil Works program has not received a clean audit opinion on recent fiscal year financial records. Although the program collects and tracks financial and performance information fairly regularly, the information needs to be more integrated in its collection and review so that it is more useful for program management purposes.

Evidence: The Corps tracks financial information through the Corps of Engineers Financial Management System, which is distributed and linked throughout all the Corps offices and is available at each individual powerplant. The system enforces the 30-day prompt payment act for contracted services and is available almost real-time to all users. This system still needs to be integrated more fully with the program's performance information tracking system to support performance-based program management.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Corps Hydropower
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	100%	100%	33%	

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: There currently are no reported management deficiencies for the Hydropower program. However, the national program management team should try to improve the integrated collection and tracking of performance and financial data at the regional and national levels to ensure progress is being made toward annual performance and cost efficiency targets.

Evidence: The Corps uses an Internal Control Program to audit management deficiencies at the program level. The PMAs also perform yearly audits of all program costs by region for calculation of rates.

3.CA1 Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The program uses Performance Based Service Contracting methods to track project performance through the life of a contract. Contract requirements are linked to performance outcomes to the maximum extent possible.

Evidence:

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: Only two out of five regions (Lakes and Rivers Division and Mississippi River Division) are making adequate progress toward long term targets for Forced Outages and Unit Availability goals.

Evidence: Progress continues to be made on decreasing forced outages in the Northwest through direct funding arrangements. In the Southeast and Southwest, forced outage rates are increasing; however, preference customer funding agreements are being put into place to improve timely financing of asset improvements to avoid potential breakdowns.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: Three of the five regions (Northwestern Division, South Atlantic Division and Southwestern Division) are not meeting annual performance goals.

Evidence:

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: Due to decreased budgets, some cost efficiencies have been generated by program managers and operators out of necessity - however, program goals are mostly unmet. Improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness have resulted from regional preference customer funding agreements that enhance opportunities for system-wide improvements and regional purchases.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Corps Hydropower
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	100%	100%	33%	

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: SMALL
EXTENT

Question Weight: 17%

Explanation: Corps power plants have a higher forced outage rate than Bureau of Reclamation power plants and other non-Federal power producers. There has not been an overall comparison of the Corps program with other Federal and non-Federal programs regarding other performance indicators, including cost efficiency.

Evidence: Studies by GAO and an independent benchmarking entity found that the Corps hydropower plants were less reliable than their non-Federal counterparts, largely because of the lack of and uncertainty of funding for facility maintenance and repairs.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: SMALL
EXTENT

Question Weight: 17%

Explanation: Benchmark studies involving three regions show that the program does not measure up to industry standards for reliability and efficiency.

Evidence:

4.CA1 Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?

Answer: SMALL
EXTENT

Question Weight: 17%

Explanation: Within the constraints of appropriations-based program funding, forced outage rates continue to increase and power plants are unable to run efficiently. Compromises have been and continue to be made to optimize project life and generation capacity and minimize risk of future forced breakdowns.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Corps Hydropower
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	100%	100%	33%	

Measure: Percent of regions achieving system-wide forced outage rate of 2 percent.

Additional Information: Measures system reliability against industry standard.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2004	Baseline	40%	
2010	100%		

Measure: Percent of regions achieving system-wide forced outage rate of 2 percent.

Additional Information: Percentage of regions achieving a system-wide annual forced outage rate of 2 percent. Measures system reliability against industry standard.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2002	n/a	40%	
2003	n/a	40%	
2004	Baseline	40%	
2005	60%		
2006	60%		
2007	80%		
2008	80%		
2009	80%		
2010	100%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Corps Hydropower
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	100%	100%	33%	

Measure: Regions meeting peak availability target
Additional Information: Percentage of regions achieving a system-wide availability of 95 percent during peak demand season. Measures system reliability.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010	100%		

Measure: Regions meeting peak availability target
Additional Information: Percentage of regions achieving a system-wide availability of 95 percent during peak demand season. Measures system reliability.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2002	n/a	40%	
2003	n/a	40%	
2004	0.4	20%	
2005	0.4		
2006	0.6		
2007	0.6		
2008	60%		
2009	80%		
2010	100%		

Measure: Regions meeting efficiency target
Additional Information: Percentage of regions achieving a system-wide capacity of 98 percent of nameplate capacity. Measures efficiency of generating units.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010	100%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Corps Hydropower
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	100%	100%	33%	

Measure: Percentage of regions whose system-wide production capacity is 98 percent of nameplate capacity.
Additional Information: Percentage of regions achieving a system-wide capacity of 98 percent of nameplate capacity. Measures efficiency of generating units.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2002	n/a		
2003	n/a		
2004	Baseline	80%	
2005	80%		
2006	80%		
2007	100%		
2008	100%		
2009	100%		
2010	100%		

Measure: Regions meeting cost efficiency target
Additional Information: Percentage of regions whose facilities achieve cost efficiency (as measured by cost per megawatt, adjusted for unit size) comparable to similar, non-Federal facilities

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
-------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------------------

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Emergency Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	60%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is authorized to undertake activities including disaster preparedness (all natural hazards), advance measures, emergency operations (disaster response and post-flood response), rehabilitation of flood control works, and provision of emergency water due to drought or contaminated source. These activities are funded in the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies (FCCE) account.

Evidence: Public Law (PL) 84-99 (33 U.S.C. 701n) authorizes USACE to provide emergency response/disaster assistance. USACE plans for all natural disasters. Response and recovery under its own authority (FCCE) include flood fights (direct and technical assistance), provision of emergency water, advance measures, and restoration of federal/non-federal flood control works. Other response and recovery activities are funded by external authorities (i.e. Stafford Act) and guided by Emergency Support Function #3.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: USACE focuses on the flood preparedness, response and recovery assistance to state and local customers that is beyond their capabilities, as well as preparedness activities under the Federal Response Plan (Stafford Act), Emergency Support Function (ESF) #3 - Public Works and Engineering.

Evidence:

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: All activities under PL 84-99 and those funded by FEMA under the Stafford Act provide assistance beyond state and local government capabilities. USACE has unique capabilities (emergency contracting, subject matter experts, teams, Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC), etc.) to plan for and execute Federal Response Plan (FRP) missions (the provision of potable water, ice and emergency power, debris removal and disposal, temporary housing, temporary roofing, structural safety inspections and support to urban search and rescue). USACE is the lead federal agency for design, construction and maintenance of primary flood control works (Flood Control Works). USACE supplemental assistance under these authorities that does not duplicate any other federal or non-federal agency.

Evidence: PL 84-99 (ER5001-1, Civil Emergency Management Program), USACE is designated as the lead federal agency for the Interagency Levee Task Force (OMB and Council on Environmental Quality memo dated 18 Feb 1997). USACE is also designated as the lead Federal agency for Public Works and Engineering under the Federal Response Plan (Stafford Act). An MOA exists with Natural Resources Conservation Service that delineates watershed responsibilities, preventing overlap of Flood Control Works activities

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Emergency Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	60%	Effective

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: An annually funded program that addresses not only preparedness, but also a "baseline" or average annual funding level for emergency operations, FCW rehabilitation, emergency water supply, and advance measures would be more effective than relying on supplementals to fund such responses. Such funding would better meet anticipated needs and avoid disrupting other USACE programs by borrowing their funds while awaiting supplementals. A post flood, USACE led interagency process exists for reviewing rehabilitation and or non-structural measures, but a pre-flood process would improve program design. Also, post-flood rehabilitation cost-sharing should be reviewed to determine if it provides the proper incentives for local planning.

Evidence: The 04 and 05 budgets proposed funding the program at a level that would address anticipated emergency operations, but these proposals were rejected. Funds were provided in supplementals.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Program is carefully managed and targeted to augment and/or assist state and local governments efforts to prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters and other emergencies. For example, Disaster Preparedness provides for the necessary planning and coordination required to effectively respond to the needs of all 50 states and U.S. Territories. Emergency Operations provides a mechanism to provide direct and/or technical supplemental assistance to states to protect lives and prevent major property damage. The non-Federal FCW that are a part of the USACE Rehabilitation Inspection Program (RIP) must meet prescribed standards to be a part of the program, must be properly maintained and rehabilitation assistance is only provided to the targeted structures that are active in the RIP. Other elements of the program, such as Emergency Water and Advance Measures are only provided to target beneficiaries to meet prescribed program purposes and requirements when local/state capabilities have been exceeded.

Evidence: Since 199, USACE has expended emergency management funds under FCCE to provide direct and/or technical assistance to protect lives and prevent major property damage in approximately 40 states and U.S. territories. ER 500-1-1 outlines policy and guidance and EP 500-1-1 outlines procedures that ensure that program funds are consistently targeted to the proper beneficiaries to effectively meet program purposes.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight 13%

Explanation: Measures have been developed in coordination with OMB. The goal is to improve the Emergency Management program through the sustaining of current capabilities (teams, cadres and utilization of current technology/equipment) and development/implementation of strategic initiatives that address the needs of the entire Public Works and Engineering/Emergency Management community (Federal, state and local). The long-term goals emphasize readiness in terms of having resources in place, and have quantitative, outcome measures associated with them.

Evidence: USACE has established preliminary long-term performance measures (contained in this document) that will help determine the condition of the FCW in the Rehabilitation and Inspection Program by tracking the execution of inspections and rehabilitations. In addition, measures will track the readiness status of the Deployable Tactical Operations Systems, Planning and Response Teams, Crisis Action Teams, Crisis Management Teams and PL84-99 field response teams.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Emergency Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	60%	Effective

-
- 2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%
- Explanation: Initial targets and timeframes have been developed for longterm measures.
 Evidence: Contained in Measures tab.
- 2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%
- Explanation: Measures are under development in coordination with OMB. Long-term goals focus on establishing plans and readiness. Short-term, outcome oriented goals relate to actual responses to an emergency.
 Evidence: Selecting, credentialing and training of Planning and Response Teams and Emergency Support Function #3 Cadre. Intensive inspection program in the Rehab. and Inspection Program ensures FCW integrity. Performance measures for PRTs and ESF #3 Cadre members have been developed.
- 2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%
- Explanation: Initial targets have been developed in coordination with OMB.
 Evidence: Contained in Measures tab.
- 2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%
- Explanation: USACE coordinates with stakeholders on a national, regional, local and private basis to discuss and establish goals for planning and response capability improvements.
 Evidence: Public sponsors participate in the FCW Rehab and Inspection Program and support the program objectives/goals. Advance Contract Initiative (ACI) contractors have been involved in training, exercises and meeting to enhance our response capabilities. FEMA/USACE critiques occur annually to discuss issues surfaced in previous years response. Regional Response Workshops for floods, hurricanes and earthquakes engaged all partners and stakeholders in the identification of long term goals and critical issues.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Emergency Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	60%	Effective

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The Emergency Management life cycle is the standard business practice for USACE. The life cycle includes planning/preparedness, response/recovery, evaluation and corrective actions. Evaluations of responses have been conducted by USACE personnel, external partners and contractors. This is an ongoing requirement within Emergency Management.

Evidence: These evaluations include: 1) Independent Assessment and Assistance Teams (composed of USACE personnel not immediately involved in the response, contractors and other agency representatives) review responses and provide results to the responding MSC and HQUSACE. 2) After Action Reports identify Lessons Learned. 3) Federal Emergency Management Agency/USACE Critiques address key issues that require resolution. 4) Audit Response Teams, that include other DoD personnel outside USACE, deploy to evaluate USACE performance. 5) The Engineer Inspector General inspection of USACE disaster response operations, dated Feb 2001, determined that overall it was a well managed process.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: For FY 06, budget requests are tied directly to the accomplishment of established performance goals/measures.

Evidence: While every FCCE activity with the exception of preparedness is dependent on the frequency and magnitude of the occurrence of disasters, all major activities under this authority have performance goals and measures.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The Life Cycle business process for USACE FCCE program includes a Corrective Action process to help insure that USACE is a "Learning Organization" with regards to Emergency Management. The Readiness 2000 (R2K) Initiative is an example of a strategic initiative that was implemented in 1999 to correct deficiencies in the emergency management program. Current reexamination of R2K is addressing any improvement or changes that are required to meet changing demands.

Evidence: Readiness 2000 decision memo, dated April 1998, signed by the Director of Civil Works. Homeland Security Strategic Planning Initiative. Senior Leadership Seminars with FEMA and other federal and state stakeholders. Remedial Action Program and After Action Reports from interagency workshops and exercises.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Emergency Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	60%	Effective

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The evaluation of current responses through the Independent Assistance and Assessment Team (IAAT) and the post-disaster After Action process have revealed critical issues that require corrective action measures to be conducted. The IAAT deploys during emergency response operations to assist and identify lessons learned from the perspective of USACE, partners and customers.

Evidence: Past corrective actions established a trained Emergency Support Function #3 Cadre, Mission/Functional Planning and Response Teams, and changes in Advance Contract Initiative contracts that provide life saving measures to disaster victims. ENGLink ECA and mission tracking modules provide critical performance and assessment data. ESF #3 Team Leader disaster performance evaluations by FEMA (DHS).

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: USACE has developed extensive policy, procedures, guides, checklists and agreements that ensure the regulation of costs, schedule and performance results during both response and recovery operations. This addresses the requirements for both the USACE program managers and external partners.

Evidence: EP500-1-1 contains checklists for all FCCE activities. Project Cooperation Agreements are required from public sponsors for all rehab and advance measures projects. Timelines for all Corps roles in the FRP are defined in the USACE ESF #3 Field Guide. USACE Audit Teams assess the execution of contracts and missions.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Funds for preparedness are issued at the beginning of each FY and obligated and expended in accordance with an approved schedule. Funds for rehab of Flood Control Works, emergency operations, advance measures are allocated, obligated and expended, as emergency conditions dictate.

Evidence: Corps Engineers Financial Management System track funding obligations and expenditures. Project Cooperation Agreements outline financial requirements of public sponsor. ER 11-1 320 and ER 500-1-1 outlines financial and schedule requirements, respectively.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Numerous products/procedures have been developed to improve time and cost efficiency in mission execution. Advance Contract Initiative contracts which provide emergency supplies are competitive, "Best Value Source Selection" contracts. Criteria include ability to perform and reach full production under emergency conditions.

Evidence: ESF 3 Field Guide, Mission Guides, Advance Contract Initiative Contracts, EP 500-1-1. Contracts are awarded in advance, but there is no payment until contractor is asked to perform. Contractors hire and subcontract in the disaster area, to the maximum extent possible.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Emergency Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	60%	Effective

- 3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%
- Explanation: Extensive coordination has occurred with the FEMA concerning the USACE role in the Federal Response Program (FRP). USACE has also partnered with support agencies listed in the ESF #3 annex to the FRP. Additional coordination concerning flood plain management and mitigation issues is also underway to ensure that no conflicts exist with the implementation of respective programs.
- Evidence: USACE has liaison at FEMA HQ to collaborate and coordinate programs, including the FCW inspection program. USACE coordinates with the National Association of Flood Plain Managers. USACE participates with 26 other Federal agencies (e.g. DOT, USDA, EPA, DHS, etc.) in Emergency Support Function Leader Group/Catastrophic Disaster Response Group/Regional Interagency Steering Committee help establish common goals and objectives. USACE MOA with Natural Resources Conservation Service on watershed delineation.
- 3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%
- Explanation: Funds for preparedness are allocated by HQUSACE at the beginning of each FY and obligated and expended in accordance with an approved schedule. Funds for rehab of FCW, emergency operations, advance measures are allocated, obligated and expended, as emergency conditions dictate. All funds are issued via work allowance. Obligations and expenditures are tracked via CEFMS.
- Evidence: HQUSACE distributes funds under the appropriate class/category for a given activity as outlined in ER 11-1-320. HQUSACE monitors status of distributed FCCE funds and recalls any unobligated balances on a periodic basis. Funds for the repair of damaged FCW are distributed by phases, as outlined in all Project Information Reports (i.e. investigation, engineering and design, construction). ER500-1-1 requires: repairs to FCW have correct local/federal cost share, positive benefit/cost ratio and assistance provided during emergency operations are supplemental to state/local efforts. Funds for inspections of FCW in this program are budgeted and distributed every other year based on inspection schedules.
- 3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%
- Explanation: In 2001, the Engineer Inspector General evaluated management practices within the EM program. Several were identified as needing improvement or change to include proper alignment with Program Management Business Process and Emergency Management Training Program. Several areas were identified where management practices were exemplary.
- Evidence: Subsequent steps have been taken to correct the deficiencies to the point that the program is used as an exemplar. Command inspections are also conducted for EM mission areas. Critiques identified significant improvements and USACE has taken steps to implement recommendations.
- 4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:20%
- Explanation: Goals were put in place in FY04 establish benchmark.
- Evidence: Data collected in FY 04 and 05 and prior years demonstrate progress in achieving long term goals

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Emergency Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	60%	Effective

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Goals were put in place in FY04 establish benchmark.

Evidence: Data collected in FY 04 and 05 and prior years demonstrate progress in achieving annual goals

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: USACE strives to improve coordination with federal, state and local stakeholders through the conduct of exercises, training and workshops. These efforts help better educate all parties in the FCCE program and helps to better define and implement program goals. Advanced Contract Initiative has help save money during disaster response.

Evidence: Advanced Contract Initiative saved 22% on ice and 17% on water costs. Leveraging national teams saves training costs. Cost per students for training has been reduced by approximately 15% since FY02.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The FCCE program is similar to other emergency programs in providing supplemental assistance to state/local interests. However, assistance provided, advance measures, emergency water supply and rehabilitation of FCW as well as Public Works and Engineering is unique. USACE has worked closely with FEMA, other federal agencies, and state and local interests to ensure our program effectively augments and supplements other programs.

Evidence: USACE role in support of the FRP. USACE authorities outlined in ER500-1-1 and EP 500-1-1.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: USACE is assessed externally by President's FEMA and internally through multi-level assessments on the effectiveness of the FCCE Program during response, recovery and after action phases of a disaster.

Evidence: 1) After Action reports/meetings identify lessons learned to improve future responses 2) IAAT reviews disaster responses and immediately provides corrective actions to USACE. 3) Audit response teams review USACE execution and insures that laws/regs are followed. 4) USACE Engineer Inspector General assessed disaster response operations, Feb 2001, determined that overall it was a well managed process.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Emergency Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	60%	Effective

Measure: Percent of time that Planning Response Team is in Green state of readiness to respond to Stafford Act emergencies under Emergency Support Function#3.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the percent of the time that Planning Response Teams (PRT) for a given mission area are in the Green state of readiness (trained, fully staffed, ready to deploy).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2008	95%		

Measure: Percentage of Federal and Non-Federal Flood Control Works (FCW) in Rehabilitation and Inspection Program (RIP) with a satisfactory conditional rating.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the condition of Federal and non-Federal projects (approximately 3000) in the Rehabilitation and Inspection Program as reported by inspection reports completed during FY. Measurement shown reflects percent of projects with FCW with a satisfactory or higher rating.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	NA		
2005	NA		
2006	88%		
2007	90%		
2008	92%		

Measure: ESF #3 Cadre Performance

Additional Information: Measures the percentage of time that the performance of ESF #3 TL/ATL are rated at or above "Highly Successful" in support of FEMA under the FRP. Refers to performance paid for by FEMA, but confirms readiness rating.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	NA		
2005	NA		
2006	88%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Emergency Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	60%	Effective

2007	90%
2008	92%

Measure: Deployable Tactical Operations System readiness Index

Additional Information: Measures the percentage of time that the national deployable support equipment and teams are in GREEN readiness status.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	NA		
2005	NA		
2006	88%		
2007	90%		
2008	92%		

Measure: Develop/maintain/exercise preparedness plans

Additional Information: Measures development/maintenance/exercising of contingency plans, SOPs, Guides, etc. IAW 1yr/5yr. MSC/District workplans (Flood/Hurricane/FRP (natural disasters), etc.)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2010	95%		

Measure: Execution of the National Training Program

Additional Information: Demonstrates the effective execution of the national training program through the measurement of costs reduction for training/individual in reference to the FY03 baseline.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2003	100%		
2004	92%	0.92	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Emergency Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	60%	Effective

2005	90%
2006	88%
2007	86%

Measure: PRT Performance

Additional Information: Measures the percentage of time that the performance of the PRT are rated at or above "Highly Successful" in support of FEMA under the FRP.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	84%		
2005	86%		
2006	88%		
2007	90%		

Measure: ESF #3 Cadre Performance

Additional Information: Measures the performance of ESF #3 TL/ATL during response in support of FEMA under the FRP.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	80%		
2005	82%		
2006	84%		
2007	86%		
2008	88%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Emergency Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	60%	Effective

Measure: PL84-99 Response Team Readiness

Additional Information: This measure tracks the percent of the time that PL84-99 Response Teams are in the Green state of readiness at the beginning of flood/hurricane season (trained, fully staffed, ready to deploy).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2008	95%		

Measure: Percentage of Federal and Non-Federal Flood Control Works (FCW) in Rehabilitation and Inspection Program (RIP) with a satisfactory conditional rating.

Additional Information: Tracks the condition of Federal and non-Federal FCW (approximately 3000) in the RIP. Provides an opportunity to judge program and expected project performance as the projects age and potentially deteriorate. Measurement shown reflects cumulative percent of projects with satisfactory rating (will be in national database).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2008	95%		

Measure: FCW (Levees, floodwalls, etc.) inspections performed.

Additional Information: Percent of scheduled inspections performed for all non-Federal Flood Control Works in RIP, as required by ER 500-1-1.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2008	95%		

Measure: Percent of time solutions are developed and implemented prior to next flood season.

Additional Information: Percent of time solutions are developed and implemented (either repaired to pre-flood conditions or possible non-structural alternative) prior to the next flood season. (May be impacted by circumstances beyond USACE control, such as obtaining cost-sharing agreements and right-of-ways, reoccurring floods etc.).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2008	84%		

Measure: FCW (Levees, floodwalls, etc.) inspections performed.

Additional Information: Percent of all non-Federal FCW inspected as per funded and scheduled annual work plan requirements.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	NA		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Emergency Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	60%	Effective

2005	NA
2006	90%
2007	92%
2008	94%

Measure: Percent of time solutions are implemented prior to next flood season.

Additional Information: Percent of time solutions are developed and implemented (either repaired to pre-flood conditions or possible non-structural alternative) prior to the next flood season. (May be impacted by circumstances beyond USACE control, such as obtaining cost-sharing agreements and right-of-ways, reoccurring floods etc.).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	90%	92%	
2005	90%		
2006	90%		
2007	90%		

Measure: Percent of time that Planning Response Team is in Green state of readiness to respond to Stafford Act emergencies under Emergency Support Function#3.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the percent of the time that Planning Response Teams are in the Green state of readiness (trained, fully staffed, ready to deploy) as measured during FY.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	90%	93%	
2005	90%		
2006	90%		
2007	90%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Emergency Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau:
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	60%	Effective

2008 90%

Measure: PL84-99 Response Team Readiness

Additional Information: This measure tracks the percent of the time that PL84-99 Response Teams are in the Green state of readiness (trained, fully staffed, ready to deploy) as measured during FY.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	NA		
2005	NA		
2006	85%		
2007	88%		
2008	90%		

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Capital Assets & Service Acquisition Programs

Name of Program: Flood Damage Reduction

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	Reduce flood damages to the nation through structural, non-structural, Flood Plain Mgt, Planning Assistance and other technical assistance programs.	1936 Flood Control Act. Supplemented by other various Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, and Water Resource Dev. Acts over the years	20%	0.2
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Flood damage reduction projects requested by sponsors comprise the program with each project defining a solution to a need. Program focuses on (1) reducing risk of flood damage to existing development and (2) providing technical assistance to state and local governments to prevent future flood damage.	Formal study investigations and Project Reports. Congress shows interest and need through authorizations (regular and contingent).	20%	0.2
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Program is designed to reduce flood damages by means of authorized and justified projects or through technical assistance programs.	Letters, and authorizing (Water Resources Development Act) and appropriations documents. Feasibility studies are authorized in response to actual flooding or new conditions expected to lead to flooding. Projects are planned, jointly with a local sponsor to reduce damages so long as economically justified. Studies include inputs from affected Federal and State agencies and individuals. After study, projects are authorized and project reports published in Congressional Committee Reports.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	Other agencies address the same issue, but generally each has a different focus and/or different program tools, such as insurance and hazard mitigation programs.	FEMA provides hazard mitigation and insurance; Natural Resources Conversation Service used to provide small watershed projects. The Corps program is comprehensive through holistic, basin-wide, watershed-centered studies and projects. The Galloway Report called for more State involvement with the Corps and FEMA.	20%	0.2
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	The Corps program provides for applying solutions that (1) directly address reducing existing flood damages and (2) utilize Corps technical assistance to support other Federal and non-Federal agencies devoted to preventing flood damages. The program is a good program, but not optimal. The Corps should put more emphasis on non-structural solutions and avoid designing projects to provide 100-year protection when it may not be economically justified, but allow property owners to avoid flood insurance, and more closely coordinate its general approach with FEMA.	Recent program improvements include Corps regulation 1105-2-100 that stipulates that communities participating in a flood damage reduction project must prepare and publicize throughout the region a flood plain management plan to reduce the impact of future flood events in the project area and to make citizens aware of remaining flood risks. Also, the local sponsor is asked to ensure the level of protection provided by the Corps projects.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					100%	80%

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	No	The Corps broad goal is to reduce flood and storm damage reduction in the nation.	Basically, this goal is to maintain the status quo. The Corps is working with OMB to develop specific, long-term goals that focus on outcomes.	11%	0.0
2	<i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	The Corps' annual goals are to make flood damage reduction investments where benefits exceed costs and to ensure that projects operate as designed. Two investment performance measures include #1 the net annual benefits of flood project investments and #2 ratio of expected project benefits to actual construction costs, with a target of completing projects within their estimated costs so that actual costs are less than estimated benefits, thus maintaining a benefit-cost ratio >1. Two operating measures are the % of time flood projects carry out their purpose, with a target >95% and the % of time that projects are not operable due to maintenance needs, where the target has not yet been established.	Investment measure #1 (net benefits), should have a goal attached to it, such as maximizing program net benefits. Investment measure#2 (ratio of expected benefits to actual costs) is a cost monitoring issue. This Corps should be concerned with how are costs are managed. Even if a project remains justified (Benefit/Cost>1), the Corps should find out why costs increased. Regarding operational goal #2, the Corps uses % time storm damage infrastructure sustains its purpose as a measure and proposes to add the % of projects not operable at design level due to maintenance needs. A more outcome oriented goal for consideration would be to allocate maintenance funds where they will be most effective in preventing loss of life and damages to public and private property.	11%	0.1
3	<i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	Sponsors (e.g, flood control districts) make inputs and participate financially in flood studies and projects.	Reflected in cost sharing agreements for each study and project whereby sponsors participate in studies, contribute 50% of study funds, and cash, and contribute lands, easements and rights of way to project construction (up to 35%).	11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	No	The Corps cooperates on a project by project basis with related programs, as well as coordinating operating rules and regulations prior to publication with interested parties. The Corps collaborates with technical assistance program clients. However, the Corps does not meet routinely, with FEMA NRCS, and TVA to compare notes or share lessons learned about their respective programs.	Continued coordination, especially with FEMA is needed to work towards reduction in national flood damages particularly to those areas not yet protected. Evacuation plans should be effected in a comprehensive multi-agency fashion. The Corps is moving towards examining interrelated problems on a watershed basis. This approach should encourage useful collaboration.	11%	0.0
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	No	Project by project review with further evolution of the process with input from the National Academy of Sciences report on independent review and other Corps reviews conducted on an as needed basis. However, external reviews are not a regular part of the process.	Review process for each project requires coordination with other Federal, State and local agencies and interested parties and outside reviews are conducted on an as needed, but not a regular basis. The NAS did review the Corp's probability based flood model.	11%	0.0
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	Yes	The budget is built in increments and the impact of varying increments of funding is displayed both in terms of the appropriation accounts(general investigations, construction, and operation and maintenance) as well as the impacts on each business program in the business breakout in the Program Memorandum that explains the Corps Annual Budget Request to OMB.	Each (program level) defines what is achievable with additional increments/decrements of funding for each business program, which is presented in its annual budget request.	11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	The Strategic Plan is continually reviewed and revised. It includes all interested parties in the mix of commentators through publication on the "WEB."	The Corps meets with interested parties including principals from other agencies & develops specialized training to improve project development processes. The Corps needs to respond to studies like the National Wildlife Federation Frequently Flooded Lands.	11%	0.1
8 (Cap 1.)	<i>Are acquisition program plans adjusted in response to performance data and changing conditions?</i>	Yes	Program development is highly dynamic with levels changing in response to varying priorities. Flood project plans and operations are based on the latest hydrographs.		11%	0.1
9 (Cap 2.)	<i>Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule and performance goals?</i>	Yes	The program is based on participation by non-Federal project sponsors so it can only address food damage problems where sponsors are willing to participate. Within that universe of problem areas, the tradeoffs of cost and benefits are conducted within the project development process.	Each increment (program level) defines what is achievable with each additional increment and/or decrement of funding.	11%	0.1
Total Section Score					100%	67%

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Questions	<i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	The annual Flood Damages Prevented report displays the damages prevented by project, by state and by area throughout the country.	Annual Flood Damage Prevention reports; Project delivery process includes a formal reporting on "meeting Project Sponsor commitments" which are negotiated with local sponsor each fiscal year.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	Corps accomplishes much of its studies and all of its construction activities by contract. Fixed price contracts tightly specify performance requirements. ER 4115-1-17 prescribes "Construction Contractor Performance Evaluations" and record of performance is recorded in the Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System (CCAS) AIS and used for future construction contract bidder qualification.	Performance requirements of Federal Agency, non-Federal project sponsor and contractors performing project study and project construction activities are governed by Project Cooperation Agreements; Feasibility Cost sharing Agreements; PED Agreements; Construction Contractor Performance Evaluations, and formal reporting on "meeting project sponsor commitments."	9%	0.1
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	A major concern of the Corps within the Flood Damage reduction program (and others) is the efficient obligation and expending of funds and the Corps is most diligent in the tracking of such expenditures.	Project Review Boards & Resource Management Boards Monitor Performance measures as dictated by consolidated command guidance and other directives. 87% of available funds are obligated.	9%	0.1
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	(1) Each project undergoes value engineering analysis to identify ways to construct project at less cost and more efficiently. (2) The principle of cost sharing with non-Federal project sponsors results in a strong incentive to achieve cost efficiencies and an effective project.	(a) Cost sharing agreements for all phases of work. (b) Value engineering evaluation prior to project construction which is done to assure the a project responds to the need in the most efficient and cost-effective manner.	9%	0.1
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	Yes	Project costs are budgeted incrementally (both studies and construction) with the full costs budgeted over a period of years. This procedure is pursuant to 33 US Code 621 and authorized in the River and Harbors Act of 1922.	The Corps does not use the count retirement costs funded through the Office of Personnel Management, but has consistently allocated costs among construction projects. The Corps absorbs executive direction (headquarters, etc) in the general expenses account. All other costs are allocated to projects.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	The Corps has a real time database (CEFMS) which tracks appropriated, scheduled, and expended funds. Projects which are behind schedule may have funds reprogrammed to other projects. The Corps has been making substantial progress in producing sound annual financial statements. Its major obstacle is in determining the original cost of existing plant, property, and equipment, which affects its balance sheet. Funds are distributed by HQUSACE under the appropriate class/category for a given activity as outlined in ER 11-1-320.	HQUSACE continually monitors the status of distributed FCCE funds and recalls any unobligated balances on a periodic basis. Funds for the repair of damaged FCW are distributed by phases, as outlined in all Project Information Reports (PIR) (i.e. investigation, engineering and design, construction). ER500-1-1 states that repairs to FCW under this program requires local/federal cost share and a positive benefit/cost ratio and assistance provided during emergency operations are supplemental to state/local efforts. Funds for inspections of FCW in this program are budgeted and distributed every other year based on inspection schedules.	9%	0.1
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	The Corps uses yearly evaluations at the national, regional, and field operations levels to identify and correct management deficiencies.	Management deficiencies are identified through a proven internal control procedure developed by the Corps management audit program and governed by and Engineer Regulation. This management control system is common to all business programs in the Corps. This program and yearly evaluation is applied at the national program level, the regional level, and the field operations level. There are mandatory corrective actions as a result of this program.	9%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
8 (Cap 1.) <i>Does the program define the required quality, capability, and performance objectives of deliverables?</i>	Yes	Done on a project by project basis. Examples of defining documents that contain the relevant elements can be provided	Project by project, these factors are defined in the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreements, Project Cost Sharing Agreements, and Design Agreements signed by the Corps and Non-Federal project cost sharing partners. Detailed Plans and Specifications specify the scope of construction performance requirements which govern contractor performance.	9%	0.1
9 (Cap 2.) <i>Has the program established appropriate, credible, cost and schedule goals?</i>	No	When formulating proposed investments, the Corps assumes schedules that do not reflect likely funding constraints. Where total project costs exceed estimates by 20% in real terms, the Corps will examine the discrepancy. The Corps may estimate costs well, but does not routinely collect data that would support an assessment of the overall quality of its cost estimates.	Corps FY budget data contains overall expenditure and completion schedules. Internal "operating budget" at each District breaks out expenditure schedules by month. Recently, the Corps has adopted a performance measure where it compares the estimated costs of completed projects with the projected benefits to ensure that the project's benefit cost ratio is maintained. This is another way of monitoring costs and should prove useful.	9%	0.0
10 (Cap 3.) <i>Has the program conducted a recent, credible, cost-benefit analysis that shows a net benefit?</i>	Yes	Done on a project by project basis and summed across the entire program	Project by project and kept current in that the economic analysis can be no more than 3 years old at the time a project is being considered for construction..	9%	0.1
11 (Cap 4.) <i>Does the program have a comprehensive strategy for risk management that appropriately shares risk between the government and contractor?</i>	No	The Corps does not use performance-based contracts as often as it should. The way in which it uses "continuing" contracts can constrain the ability of the government to allocate available funds the following year to a higher-priority project or purpose.	The Corps mostly uses fixed-price contracts that include safeguards to cover unsatisfactory performance.	9%	0.0
Total Section Score				100%	82%

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal's)?</i>	Small Extent	Some progress towards the general goal can be seen by the damages prevented by existing projects and additional benefits provided by completed new projects.	The Corps estimates that from 1991 to 2000 its projects prevented roughly \$20.8 billion in flood damages. Projects under construction will yield another \$1.5 billion per year in avoided damages. Despite Corps efforts, actual annual damages to the nation are increasing each year due to development in unprotected floodplains and increased runoff in protected areas due to development in upstream areas and other reasons.	17%	0.1

<p>Long-Term Goal I: Reduce flood and storm damages in Nation's flood hazard areas. Target: Measures are under development Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal II: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal III: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>

2	<i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	Small extent			17%	0.1
---	--	--------------	--	--	-----	-----

<p>Key Goal I: Investment Goal: net annual benefits association with flood program (no maximizing objective.) Performance Target: no target, goal is under discussion. Actual Performance:</p>
<p>Key Goal II: Operation and Maintenance Goal: Projects not available due to maintenance needs Performance Target: 0%</p>

Actual Performance: this goal is under discussion.

Key Goal III: Operation and Maintenance Goal: Ensure that flood protection infrastructure will function properly.

Performance Target: Maintain flood protection infrastructure performance through inspections and repair of any deficiencies.

Actual Performance: FY 00 & FY 01 all projects performed as intended when subjected to flooding, according to situational reports.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Large Extent		Justified projects formulated based on maximizing net benefits operate to increase damages prevented each year. Corps strives to minimize operations costs.	17%	0.1
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	Large Extent	The Corps is unique in its mission as shown in Sec I - Q#4, but we are working to develop common inter-agency measures of performance for comparison purposes.	The Corps is working with other Federal Agencies (FEMA & NCRS) to develop common inter-agency measures. Net benefits per dollar invested is one of these.	17%	0.1
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Yes	Corps has employed the National Academy of Sciences to do a comprehensive review of its study program procedures with the goal of improving the planning procedures.	The Corps has employed the NAS in the past to assess its planning process and has been found to be an effective process. Flood projects have not been plagued by same problems as navigation projects.	17%	0.2
6 (Cap 1.)	<i>Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?</i>	Yes	See actual performance discussed in Key Goal II above.	Projects completed in FY 00 & FY 01 reflect reasonable performance in terms of cost management.	17%	0.2
Total Section Score					100%	67%

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Capital Assets & Service Acquisition Programs

Name of Program: Inland Waterways Navigation

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	The purpose of the program is to operate, maintain, and upgrade (either through major rehabilitations or new investments) the 11,000 mile Inland Waterway Navigation System in order to provide water transportation, an efficient, low cost method of commercial transport.	The annual lock traffic is 2.7 million barges and 600,000 recreation vessels. Inland waterway moves 630 million tons. Waterway share of freight shipments in the U.S. 17% is in tons and 20% in ton-miles. About 16% of all domestic coal and 50% of US grain bound for export move on inland waterway.	20%	0.2
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Corps navigation facilities provide efficient transportation at low cost to shippers. The savings are passed to the nations' consumers and producers.	Data suggest that water transportation is more fuel-efficient than shipment by rail or truck. On average, inland waterway barges move one ton of cargo 514 miles per gallon of fuel, compared with 202 miles for rail or 59 miles for truck. A single 1500-ton hopper barge holds the equivalent cargo of 15 rail cars or 58 trucks. This efficiency results in average transportation cost savings of \$10.70 per ton to shippers and consumers.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Federal operation, maintenance and management is critical for a system that is open to all users and, unlike railroads, is managed for multiple national objectives (navigation, flood damage reduction, hydropower, water supply, recreation, and environmental stewardship) that transcend state boundaries. Private operation of the system by users would create conflicts with other water resource management objectives. State operation would be impractical, leading to conflicts between upstream and downstream states with different water management priorities. States also vary in having the financial resources for planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance of new and existing water resource infrastructure. Reservoir storage for navigation and other downstream purposes may occur in states without direct access to or financial benefit from navigation.	The vast majority of the inland waterway system is a single network comprised of 11,000 miles of rivers, canals, and intracoastal waterways that pass through and between 21 states. In FY 99, 3.4M vessels (towboats, barges and recreational craft) passed through Corps locks in over 735 K lockages.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	<i>Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?</i>	Yes	Maintaining investment in facilities and operating inland waterways ensures continuation of the efficiencies of a low cost method of transport. These efficiencies make the nation's consumers and producers better off by reducing the cost of transporting basic commodities, contribute to the economy of the nation's heartland, and facilitate international trade. There is only one Inland Waterway System. It is not redundant of state, local or private efforts. The Corps has attempted to transfer facilities with little commercial traffic to States, but has had limited success meeting the financial demands of the potential new owners.	Over \$73 billion in cargo move on inland waterway shipped from 38 states. Recent data show that internal traffic accounts for 59% of all domestic waterborne commerce tonnage. Coastwise tonnage is 21% of the total, likewise 11% and intraport and inter-territory 9%.	20%	0.2
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	The Corps operates and maintains the Inland Waterway System, within its existing authority, from the perspective of the national interest, pursuing multipurpose management objectives, including navigation, hydropower, water supply, recreation, flood damage reduction, and environmental stewardship. Staffing at locks is at minimum levels. Parts of the system experience congestion and delays from seasonal traffic peaks due to aging locks that are undersized for modern tow configurations. The Corps works closely with the towing industry to manage these delays through industry towboat-assist measures and improved crew training, and in the long-term, through economically justified investments in lock modernization. However, there are justified projects awaiting construction. Management options, such as lock scheduling and/or lockage fees, and reducing operations on low-use segments, have not been embraced by either Corps or by user groups.	The National Academy of Science recommended that the Corps consider lock scheduling and lockage fees in both operating the system and evaluating new investments. Some believe that Corps overstates the economic importance of many low-use navigation segments. When viewing the construction backlog, users point to the surplus in the Inland Waterway Trust Fund, which is funded by diesel fuel taxes levied on them. This fund is only available to appropriate half of cost of eligible construction projects. Each year, more funds come into the fund than are spent for this purpose. However, each year, general funds provide the other half of construction plus all of the operating and maintenance costs.	20%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
-----------	------	-------------	---------------	-----------	----------------

Total Section Score				100%	80%
----------------------------	--	--	--	-------------	------------

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</i>	No	The Corps' long term goal is to provide efficient movement of waterway commerce in light of transport demand--keeping barge waiting times down at locks and to keep the entire system (high-use and low-use segments) in running order.	Basically, this goal is to maintain the status quo. It is indistinguishable from the annual goal. The Corps is working with OMB to develop specific, long-term goals that focus on outcomes.	11%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	<i>Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?</i>	Yes	The Corps' performance goal for investment is to make economically efficient investments to support the needs of waterborne commerce. The Corps invests in projects where benefits exceeds cost. Its goal for each project under construction is to keep costs down sufficiently to maintain a benefit-cost ratio greater than one. Also, the Corps reports total expected annual benefits from projects under construction. The Corps operating goal is to maintain a high degree of system availability. This goal is reflected in its annual performance targets, which are measured in terms of (1) the percent of time that system facilities are available for barge users when the want to use the facilities and (2) the ratio of costs for breakdown maintenance to total costs of scheduled maintenance. The Corps goals are to maintain a high degree of facility availability and to minimize the ratio of breakdown to preventative maintenance expenditures.	The goal of the investment component is to undertake investments when benefits exceed costs and to hold construction costs down sufficiently to keep expected benefits less than costs. This is not an ambitious cost-containment goal. The higher the benefit-cost ratio the more room there is for cost growth. The Corps should devise a goal that focuses directly on cost-containment. Also, the Corps reports expected annual benefits of projects under construction, but does not explicitly manage its construction portfolio to maximize such benefits. One operating goal is to maintain high degree of availability of its facilities. Recently, the Corps has set a more ambitious goal for high-use waterways than for low-use waterways. This encourages better use of resources. The goal of minimizing the ratio of breakdown maintenance to preventative maintenance is not an outcome measure.	11%	0.1
3	<i>Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</i>	Yes	The Corps inland waterway navigation system users are represented by the Inland Waterway Users Board. It recommends priorities for new system increments and major rehabilitations. Highest priorities are accorded to those projects that reduce waiting times at key locks.	For 2002 the Inland Waterways User Board made recommendations on 4 studies, 5 projects under design, 6 projects under construction, and 5 major rehabilitations. The Board has not supported operational changes and has opposed fees.	11%	0.1
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	The Corps is a member of a multiagency, intermodal (trucking, rail, port and waterways) team addressing what is needed to meet the nation's navigation (Marine transportation System) needs by the year 2020.		11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	<i>Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?</i>	No	For each of the major components of the Inland System, the Corps identifies problems and conducts economic feasibility studies of new facilities or on navigation facilities needing rehabilitation. Such studies include system effects and are conducted by the Corps as part of open process that includes stake holders. Independent evaluations do not occur on a regular basis. In one such evaluation, the National Academy of Science (NAS) criticized the Corp's Upper MS navigation study. It commended the Corps for attempting to use a new economic model for evaluating inland waterway benefits, but had serious problems with assumptions and data used.	Ongoing Corps regional studies have identified at least another 16 projects as likely candidates over the next decade at a cost of over \$1.1 billion. The Corps responded to the NAS Upper MS study by substituting an older model that appears to overstate benefits by not considering the effect on demand of alternative product destinations or congestion. Subsequently, Congress authorized the Corps to contract with the NAS on options for incorporating external review into its planning process. This report recommended regular external reviews and was forwarded to Congress in July 2002 and the Corps is considering its findings.	11%	0.0
6	<i>Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?</i>	Yes	The Corps receives its appropriations in accounts that reflect the life cycle of its projects --general investigations (reconnaissance & feasibility studies), construction, and operations and maintenance rather than by business purposes -- navigation, flood control, ecosystem restoration, recreation, etc. These accounts support all business purposes. The Corps breaks out appropriations by business line and aligns them with performance objectives in its annual performance plan.	The impact of alternative funding levels on navigation and other business lines is provided in the Corps' annual budget request.	11%	0.1
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	The Strategic Plan is continually reviewed and revised. It includes all interested parties in the mix of commentators through publication on the "WEB"	Meetings with interested parties and with principals from other agencies & development of specialized training to improve project development processes	11%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
8 (Cap 1.) <i>Are acquisition program plans adjusted in response to performance data and changing conditions?</i>	Yes	Corps inland navigation system has a performance goal of system availability and development and construction of justified rehabilitations or new facilities. Definable "deliverables" relate to O&M packages and to completion of a construction project (either rehab or new project.)	Average waterway O&M costs/ton mile is 1.6 mills compared to 3.9 mills for railway. Waterway capital costs /ton mile is 1.7 mills compared to 2.6 for railway. Data are needed to compare performance with systems in Europe and Latin America.	11%	0.1
9 (Cap 2.) <i>Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule and performance goals?</i>	Yes	In its economic analyses of proposed new investments, the Corps assumes that the projects could be built on an efficient schedule, which may not be achievable due to funding constraints. The Corps recognizes such funding constraints in its annual budget request in presenting the impact of alternative 10-year schedules on costs and benefits.	Regarding operation and maintenance, the Corps has analyzed the Inland Waterway System for cost savings since 1997 and has conducted a benefit-cost analysis. The benefit- cost analysis concluded that all but one segment was justified. However, the analysis is based on national averages and the findings may not be applicable to low-use segments. Additional study of these segments is required to improve outputs and performance.	11%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	78%

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)					
Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</i>	Yes	The Corps collects physical performance data and uses it to manage facilities. Other measures are focused on financial activities; e.g., expenditures on schedule, activities completed on schedule.	The Corps collects data on lock outages, ship grounding, shoaling, and water levels and aggregates these data into overall "availability."	9%	0.1
2 <i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	Projects that "slip" in execution have funds reprogrammed to meet overall program obligations and expenditure goals. Managers are accountable for schedules and for having projects open and available for traffic.		9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	Funds for each FY are scheduled to be expended in the FY received. Non-Federal funds are usually requested in the year needed and usage is scheduled accordingly.	The Corps execution rates for General Investigations, Construction, and O&M for FY 2001 were 98%, 100%, and 100%. There are no data by business purposes.	9%	0.1
4	<i>Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</i>	Yes	(1) Each project undergoes value engineering analysis to identify ways to construct project at less cost and more efficiently. (2) The principle of cost sharing with non-Federal project sponsors, represented through the Inland Waterway User Board, results in a strong incentive to achieve cost efficiencies and an effective project.		9%	0.1
5	<i>Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?</i>	Yes	Corps budget accounts (e.g., General Investigations, Construction, and Operations and Maintenance) contain all annual costs for the studies, construction, and operation and maintenance associated with navigation facilities. Appropriate indirect, overhead, and administrative costs are included in these estimates. Proposed spending for each navigation project is identified in Congressional Justifications. Project costs are budgeted incrementally (both studies and construction) with the full costs budgeted over a period of years. This procedure is pursuant to 33 US Code 621 and authorized in the River and Harbors Act of 1922.	Corps regulations govern calculation of indirect, overhead, and indirect rates and charges. The Corps does not account retirement costs funded through the Office of Personnel Management, but has consistently allocated costs among construction projects. The Corps absorbs executive direction (headquarters, etc) in the general expenses account. All other costs are allocated to projects.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	The Corps has a real time database (CEFMS) which tracks appropriated, scheduled, and expended funds. Projects which are behind schedule may have funds reprogrammed to other projects. The Corps has been making substantial progress in producing sound annual financial statements. Its major obstacle is in determining the original cost of existing plant, property, and equipment, which affects its balance sheet.		9%	0.1
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	The Corps uses yearly evaluations at the national, regional, and field operations levels to identify and correct management deficiencies.	Management deficiencies are identified through a proven internal control procedure developed by the Corps management audit program and governed by an Engineering Regulation. This management control system is common to all business programs in the Corps. This program and yearly evaluation is applied at the national program level, the regional level, and the field operations level. There are mandatory corrective actions as a result of this program.	9%	0.1
8 (Cap 1.)	<i>Does the program define the required quality, capability, and performance objectives of deliverables?</i>	Yes	Corps inland navigation system has a performance goal of system availability and development and construction of justified rehabilitations or new facilities. Definable "deliverables" relate to O&M packages and to completion of a construction project (either rehab or new project.)	Average waterway O&M costs/ton mile is 1.6 mills compared to 3.9 mills for railway. Waterway capital costs /ton mile is 1.7 mills compared to 2.6 for railway transportation. Data are needed to compare performance with systems in Europe and Latin America.	9%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (Cap 2.) <i>Has the program established appropriate, credible, cost and schedule goals?</i>	No	When formulating proposed investments, the Corps assumes schedules that do not reflect likely funding constraints. When total project costs exceed estimates by 20% in real terms, the Corps will examine the discrepancy. The Corps may estimate costs well, but it does not routinely collect data that would support an assessment of the overall quality of its cost estimates. Corps regions are developing plans for replacement of aging navigation facilities. Although there is no formal national plan, the Inland Waterways User Board recommends nationwide-priorities.	Corps FY budget data contains overall expenditure and completion schedules. Internal "operating budget" at each District breaks out expenditure schedules by month. Recently, the Corps has adopted a performance measure where it compares the estimated costs of completed projects with the projected benefits to ensure that the project's benefit cost ratio is maintained. This is another way of monitoring costs and should prove useful.	9%	0.0
10 (Cap 3.) <i>Has the program conducted a recent, credible, cost-benefit analysis that shows a net benefit?</i>	No	The Corps continually analyzes new investments and major rehabilitations and recently analyzed current operations. Regarding new investments, the Corps (per the Principles and Guidelines) uses efficient construction schedules in its benefit-cost analyses that may not be implementable due to funding constraints. Also, the National Academy of Science evaluated the Corps analysis of the Upper Ms River Inland Navigation Project and concluded that its economic model was an improvement over current practice, but had some theoretical and data problems. The results of this study raise questions about current Corps inland navigation benefit-cost studies. Studies of new investments are public and are reviewed within the Corps, but are not independently reviewed. The operating study was not independently reviewed.	The average benefit-cost ratio for new projects and major rehabilitations is 3 to 1, which the Corps characterizes as robust investments. But these ratios do not account for the the possible effects of constrained funding causing construction delays. The Corps benefit-cost analysis of its waterway operations concludes that there is a 14.1 to 1 benefit/cost ratio and operating all but one segment is justified. The benefits (transportation savings) are \$6.584 million and the average costs are \$477 million. The study assumes that the transportation savings for each commodity shipped is equal to the average transportation cost savings for that commodity. This finding may not be correct for low-use segments of the waterway.	9%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
11 (Cap 4.) <i>Does the program have a comprehensive strategy for risk management that appropriately shares risk between the government and contractor?</i>	No	The Corps does not use performance-based contracts as often as it should. The way in which it uses "continuing" contracts can constrain the ability of the government to allocate available funds for the following year to a higher-priority project or purpose.	The Corps mostly uses fixed-price contracts that include safeguards to cover unsatisfactory performance.	9%	0.0

Total Section Score	100%	73%
----------------------------	-------------	------------

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

Questions	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 <i>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?</i>	No The Corps' long term goals are (1) to invest in modern, efficient transportation systems to improve commodity movement by keeping barge waiting times down at locks and (2) to keep the system in running order. The long term goals are indistinguishable from the annual goal.	The Corps has made investments to increase transport efficiency and decrease waiting times and has operated and maintained the system. Since 1990, twelve new waterway lock chambers on eight rivers have opened to move traffic more efficiently, but there is congestion at key locks. The Corps has kept the system in running order, but maintenance backlogs have increased. FY03 and FY04 budgets proposed to give maintenance priority to high-use segments over low use segments.	17%	0.0

<p>Long-Term Goal I: Invest in modern, efficient waterway transportation system to improve commodity movement. Target: No target Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>
--

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	<p>Long-Term Goal II: Keep the Inland Waterway system in running order. Target: There are annual targets. Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>					
	<p>Long-Term Goal III: Target: Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>					
2	Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?	Small extent	(1) Annual Investment goals: to produce net annual benefits and complete navigation projects meeting a benefit-cost investment criterion. (2) Annual operating goal: make facilities available when the tows and barges want to use them and minimize ratio of breakdown maintenance expenditures to preventive maintenance expenditures (new measure)	The Corps continues to make economically justified investments that will produce net benefits, but it did not complete any inland waterway projects in FY 01 and FY02. It does not allocate construction funds to maximize program net benefits. The Corps met its system FY01 availability goals for the entire waterway, but system available data are unavailable for FY 02. The Corps' proposed new measure (the ratio of breakdown expenditures to preventative maintenance expenditures) is not an outcome measure.	17%	0.1
<p>Key Goal I: Meet system availability targets for waterways segments</p>						
<p>Performance Target: FY 2002 target for Segments: 90% for high use (>1billion ton-miles) and < 85% for low use (<1 billion ton-miles) Actual Performance: Actuals:- FY 01 93.5% for entire system (segment data unavailable): FY 02 -< 85% high use, <85% low use.</p>						
<p>Key Goal II: Complete construction projects keeping costs down sufficient to maintain benefit-cost ratio>1.</p>						

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
		Performance Target: No specific target Actual Performance: No projects completed in FY01 and FY02.				
		Key Goal III: Other annual goals are being assessed to determine whether conversion from output to outcome goals is feasible. Performance Target: Actual Performance:				
		Footnote: Performance targets should reference the performance baseline and years, e.g. achieve a 5% increase over base of X in 200C				
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Large Extent	Key investments have enabled system throughput to rise over time to meet growing demands. The results of a cost-savings initiative for operations have been implemented Corps-wide. New technologies have been applied to reduce the duration of scheduled and unscheduled outages. Beginning in FY 2002, budgets have proposed redirecting funds from low-use segments (<1 million-ton-miles) that provide lesser economic return to high-use (>1million ton segments that provide higher economic return for the constrained O&M dollars.	A Development Program to reduce costs has produced several innovations. "Float in" (components constructed of site and hauled in by water) and "in the wet" (working on construction in the water) technology is expect to save a total of \$74 M at the new Braddock Locks and Dam on the Monongahela River (PA) and the Olmsted Locks and Dam on the Ohio River. The McAlpine Lock incorporates roller compacted concrete for lock chamber facilities and is expected to save \$51M during its construction. J.T. Myers Lock extension uses "in-the-wet" construction and is expected to provide \$22M in construction cost savings. A new gate lifter (the SHREVE) can reduce the "down time" for lock miter gate replacement from 30 days to 7 days.	17%	0.1

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Capital Assets & Service Acquisition Programs

Name of Program: Non-regulatory Wetlands Activities

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	Is the program purpose clear?	Yes	This assessment covers Corps efforts to establish, re-establish, rehabilitate, enhance, or protect/maintain wetlands through a Corps project. Their purpose is to improve the natural functions and values of existing wetlands and/or to create additional wetlands. These wetlands activities are not treated as a separate program within the Corps. They occur in several contexts: (1) when the principal purpose of a project is ecosystem restoration; (2) in navigation or flood and storm damage reduction projects that require mitigation for wetlands losses; and (3) where the Corps is responsible for wetlands that occur naturally within the boundary of a completed project or have been created by the formation and operation of a Corps reservoir.	Engineer regulation 1165-2-501.	20%	0.2
2	Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?	Yes	Corps wetlands efforts offset some of the environmental losses that resulted under past construction practices, help to mitigate for wetlands losses from ongoing Corps construction and current project operations, and contribute to efforts to enhance the natural value of the Nation's water resources.		20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?	Yes	While some Corps projects have led to large wetlands losses, the Corps increasingly is involved in projects whose purpose is to restore degraded wetlands. Its current efforts generally contribute toward achievement of the national "no net loss" of wetlands goal.	The Administration, in December 2002, issued a wetlands mitigation action plan that affirms its support for "no net loss" of wetlands as a national goal.	20%	0.2
4	Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?	Yes	While other Federal agencies, State and local agencies, non-profit organizations, and commercial interests undertake wetlands restoration and mitigation projects, they generally will not do so where Congress appears likely to fund the study or construction of a Corps wetlands project. The prospect of Corps funding usually is sufficient to preclude redundancy.		20%	0.2
5	Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?	No	The Corps often does not seek out the best opportunities nationwide for wetlands restoration. It also needs to develop ecological and cost criteria for determining when a proposed wetlands investment is justified.	The Corps tends to focus its efforts on the site-specific problems that Congress has identified in study authorizations and has selected for funding.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					100%	80.0%

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)						
	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?	No	Corps wetlands activities improve or protect habitat at particular sites (or replace lost habitat, in the case of mitigation) and contribute toward the national "no net loss" of wetlands goal. However, the Corps does not have specific, ambitious long-term goals that focus its efforts where, and how, the Corps can best contribute to the overall national wetlands goal.	Corps feasibility studies that support Congressional project construction authorizations.	11%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?	No	The Corps does not have annual performance goals for wetlands activities that demonstrate the extent of its progress toward achieving long-term goals. On projects under construction and on completed projects that the Corps operates and maintains, project managers report whether (yes/no) they have fulfilled established wetlands mitigation requirements. This indicates which mitigation actions are on schedule, but does not measure the extent of their progress, the long-term prospects for ecological success on each project, or the aggregate impact of these efforts. For ecosystem restoration projects, annual goals are difficult to formulate due to measurement problems and because habitat improvements in different settings often are not directly comparable.	Project manager reports.	11%	0.0
3	Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?	Yes	For projects that the Corps turns over to a non-Federal partner when the Corps has completed construction, the local project sponsor must agree to maintain any wetlands as specified in the supporting project documents and the applicable Corps manuals.	Project Cooperation Agreements.	11%	0.1
4	Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?	Yes	When it plans an ecosystem restoration project involving wetlands or a project that involves wetlands mitigation, the Corps looks for opportunities to leverage resources with other wetlands programs that are active in the geographical area. The Corps has signed agreements with non-Federal and with other Federal agencies to facilitate cooperation in developing effective solutions to wetlands problems and to manage wetlands at Federal projects.	Memoranda of Agreement and Memoranda of Understanding with other Federal agencies, State agencies, and other non-Federal entities.	11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?	No	Neither the Corps nor any outside party has conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the long-term ecological success of Corps wetlands projects, stewardship activities, or mitigation efforts. In addition, after a local project sponsor assumes responsibility for operation and maintenance of a completed project, the Corps generally does not monitor the project's environmental performance.		11%	0.0
6	Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?	No	The Corps recognizes the need for measures that would show the outcomes that its wetlands efforts could achieve under a range of possible funding levels.		11%	0.0
7	Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?	Yes	The Corps is committed to developing a strategic plan that includes appropriate measures and goals for its wetlands efforts.		11%	0.1
8 (Cap 1.)	Are acquisition program plans adjusted in response to performance data and changing conditions?	Yes	In some cases, the Corps adjusts its approach to wetlands restoration by incorporating lessons learned from its previous efforts. More basically, the Corps involvement in several large ecosystem restoration efforts amounts to a response to environmental losses that resulted under its past construction practices.	Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program.	11%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (Cap 2.) Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule and performance goals?	No	While the Corps evaluates alternatives to identify the point at which a further investment at a proposed site would no longer improve the environmental return significantly, it does not have ecological and cost criteria for determining when the cost of the underlying project is justified. It needs to examine, from a national perspective, how the return on investment at the proposed site compares to the return on investing a comparable sum at a broad range of other possible locations.	Corps feasibility studies that support Congressional project construction authorizations.	11%	0.0

Total Section Score				100%	44.4%
----------------------------	--	--	--	-------------	--------------

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?	No	The Corps does not routinely collect basic performance information needed to manage its wetlands activities and improve performance.		9%	0.0
2 Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?	Yes	The Corps expects its project managers to oversee all contractor work and to determine whether it conforms to plans and specs, remains within cost, and stays on schedule. However, the Corps generally does not hold its project managers and program partners responsible for ensuring the long-term ecological success of wetlands restoration and mitigation efforts.	Corps quality assurance reports on project design; Corps quality control reports on construction schedules.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?	Yes	The Corps places great emphasis on meeting internal targets for obligations and expenditures each year. It often reprograms funds to address unanticipated contract requirements, flood emergencies, or other priorities. This helps to achieve its internal targets for the obligation and expenditure of funds, but could adversely affect schedules in particular program areas (such as wetlands). Monthly project review board meetings at the District, Division, and Headquarters levels focus on appropriation accounts and specific projects, but do not address the status of obligations and expenditures at the program level.	SF 131s; Corps of Engineers Financial Management System reports; monthly project review board meetings.	9%	0.1
4	Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?	Yes	The Corps evaluates whether the wetlands projects that it proposes represent an efficient and cost-effective way -- at that site -- to improve the natural functions and values of existing wetlands or to create additional wetlands. It uses competitive bidding for the physical work.	Corps feasibility studies that support Congressional project construction authorizations.	9%	0.1
5	Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?	Yes	The Corps estimates and budgets for the full annual cost of its wetlands activities, including all relevant direct and indirect costs, administrative costs, and overhead. For stewardship activities, it identifies the incremental output for each "work package" to support incremental funding decisions. However, the Corps generally does not have measures that show how changes in funding levels would affect wetlands outcomes.	Corps Project Management Automated System reports.	9%	0.1
6	Does the program use strong financial management practices?	Yes	The Corps tracks the rate at which each project manager obligates and spends funds.	Corps Project Management Automated System reports.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?	Yes	The Corps uses yearly evaluations at the national, regional, and field operations levels to identify and correct management deficiencies.	Assessment reports of the Corps Internal Control Program.	9%	0.1
8 (Cap 1.)	Does the program define the required quality, capability, and performance objectives of deliverables?	Yes	The Corps oversees all design work and the preparation of plans and specifications that define the required quality, capability, and performance objectives of its projects.	Project-specific engineering and design work.	9%	0.1
9 (Cap 2.)	Has the program established appropriate, credible, cost and schedule goals?	No	At the national level, the Corps has no process for setting priorities among the many potential wetlands projects. It has not established appropriate, credible schedule goals for the program as a whole. The Corps may estimate costs well, but does not routinely collect data that would support an assessment of the overall quality of its cost estimates. Where total project costs exceed estimates by 20% in real terms, the Corps will evaluate the reason for the discrepancy.		9%	0.0
10(Cap 3.)	Has the program conducted a recent, credible, cost-benefit analysis that shows a net benefit?	No	The Corps does not try to quantify the net benefits of its wetlands activities in monetary terms, not should it do so. However, it needs to develop ecological and cost criteria for determining when a proposed wetlands investment is justified. With such criteria, it also could rank the many potential wetlands activities in terms of their net benefits to society relative to their cost. Until then, it is hard to say whether the program as a whole is using available funds well.		9%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
11(Cap 4.) Does the program have a comprehensive strategy for risk management that appropriately shares risk between the government and contractor?	No	The Corps does not use performance-based contracts as often as it should. The way in which it uses "continuing" contracts can constrain the ability of the government to allocate available funds the following year to a higher-priority project or purpose. The Corps mostly uses fixed-price contracts that include safeguards to cover unsatisfactory performance.		9%	0.0
Total Section Score				100%	64%

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?	No	Until the program has developed more specific, long-term goals, it will be hard to assess whether it is making progress toward them.		17%	0.0
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p style="text-align: center;">Long-Term Goal I: The Corps is working to develop long-term goals that focus on outcomes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Target:</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Long-Term Goal II:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Target:</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Long-Term Goal III:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Target:</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p> </div>					
2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?	Small extent	For projects under construction and completed projects that the Corps operates and maintains, the number that report having fulfilled established mitigation requirements has improved from 56% in FY 98 to 78% in FY 01.		17%	0.1
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p style="text-align: center;">Key Goal I: The Corps is working to develop measures and annual goals that would reflect progress toward long-term goals.</p> <p>Performance Target:</p> </div>					

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Actual Performance:					
	Key Goal II:					
	Performance Target:					
	Actual Performance:					
	Key Goal III:					
	Performance Target:					
	Actual Performance:					
3	Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?	No	The program does not track the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of its wetlands efforts.		17%	0.0
4	Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?	Small extent	The cost to establish an acre of wetlands can vary greatly. On average, it appears to be higher for Corps projects than for the projects undertaken by other Federal agencies.	Wetlands common measure exercise, FY 2003 and FY 2004 Budgets.	17%	0.1
5	Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?	No	The Corps recognizes the potential benefits that could result from a quality, systematic evaluation of its wetlands efforts.		17%	0.0
6 (Cap 1.)	Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?	Small extent	Due to a variety of factors, the Corps often does not complete wetlands projects or mitigation work within the time frames established in project planning documents. The schedules that it sets each fiscal year once construction has begun are more realistic. The Corps may estimate costs well, but does not routinely collect data that would support an assessment of the overall quality of its cost estimates.	Comparison of the schedules in project planning documents with final project construction schedules.	17%	0.1
Total Section Score					100%	17%

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	86%	53%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Corps is authorized and directed by statutes to provide outdoor recreation opportunities for the American public at its multi-purpose water resources projects. The Corps Civil Works Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2004-2009 http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/hot_topics/cw_strat.pdf reflects recreation program goals consistent with a Natural Resources Management mission that promotes diverse recreation opportunities in a way that is holistic, balanced, fiscally responsible and consistent with the Corps Mission, including sound environmental stewardship.

Evidence: The Corps primary authorizing statutes for recreation are: Section 4 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 to provide outdoor recreation facilities at its projects and enter into agreements with nonfederal public agencies for this purpose; Public Law 89-72 mandating that full consideration be given to outdoor recreation and fish & wildlife enhancement as equal project purposes; and Section 208a of Public Law 104-303 directing the Secretary of the Army to provide recreation opportunities at water resources projects operated, maintained or constructed by the Corps. The NRM Mission is to manage and conserve natural resources under Corps jurisdiction, consistent with ecosystem management principles while providing quality outdoor public recreation experiences to serve the needs of present and future generations. See the complete mission at: <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/usace-docs/eng-regs/er1130-2-550/c-2.pdf>.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Corps conserves natural resources and provides public recreation opportunities for current and future generations that contribute to the quality of American life on Corps-managed water resources projects. Visitors are attracted by the unique experiences that water-oriented recreational resources offer.

Evidence: Annual visitation statistics show that Corps projects receive almost 400 million recreation visits annually. In 2003, the Corps conducted a Recreation Stakeholders meeting to identify current and emerging recreational requirements. Feedback included: improving partnering opportunities, improving recreation-related infrastructure, and making a long-term commitment to sustainable, water-resource based recreation that balances the needs of diverse recreation needs with resource protection. Two national listening sessions and 14 regional listening sessions on water resources issues were conducted in 2000. Feedback from recreation interests included: making recreation an emphasis area, building and improving recreation facilities, and maintaining recreation facilities currently in use.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	86%	53%	Effective

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Recreation opportunities provided occur on the approximately 12 million acres of lands and waters managed by the Corps. Statutory provisions authorizing recreation differ from those of other Federal recreation providers such as the National Park Service (NPS), The U.S. Forest Service (USDAFS), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), etc. Inherently, the Corps Recreation Program is water-resource based and urban market oriented as opposed to other programs that are primarily land based and rural oriented. The significance of the urban orientation is evident in that 80% of Corps lake and river projects are uniquely situated within 50 miles of major metropolitan areas and 94% are within a two-hour drive.

Evidence: The Corps provides 21% of recreational opportunities on Federal lands on less than 2% of the Federal land base. The Corps provides 35% of all recreational fishing within the US on lakes over 10 acres in size and 15% of freshwater boating. A survey of National Recreation Reservation Service (NRRS) users in 2002 indicates significant demographic differences between USDAFS & Corps visitors. This includes differences in education levels, income levels and ethnicity. Additional comparisons with NPS will be available in 2004. Currently, 75% of reservations made through the NRRS are for Corps facilities.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Recreation Program is designed to balance sustainable environmental stewardship with diverse recreational demands and multiple project uses such as flood control, hydropower, navigation and water supply. However, program performance might be enhanced if the program were on a more secure financial footing. Tight budgets crowd out spending on recreation programs since many parties believe that users could pay for this program and that scarce federal funding should be used for other programs where the beneficiary pays option does not exist.

Evidence: The Civil Works Strategic Plan is supported by a set of implementation plans including Master Plans, Operational Management Plans and annual work plans to ensure balanced use and sound environmental stewardship to benefit current and future generations. Current legislative authorities and agency policy require that major new recreation development on Corps managed lands includes the participation of a cost share sponsor. Currently, 43% of developed parks are operated on an outgrant basis by an entity other than the Corps. Outgranting of parks is accomplished when an entity is interested in and proves it has the capability to operate and manage the park successfully. All activities of the Corps are governed by the Environmental Operating Principles. See: <http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/cepa/envprinciples.htm>.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Water-resources based recreation is the primary emphasis for the Corps program and distinguishes it from other Federal agency recreation programs. Opportunities include fishing, boating, and water-skiing along with associated activities such as camping, hiking, wildlife viewing, picnicking, and participating in environmental education and water safety programs. Specific recreation use is managed via special use permits and associated fees for activities or facilities such as camping, festivals, fishing tournaments, group pavilions, and athletic fields.

Evidence: Agency policies, as articulated in Engineering Regulation 1130-2-550, Recreation Operations and Maintenance Policies, guide the management of the Recreation Program. The budget guidance for the development of the FY06 recreation budget is specific regarding the goals and objectives of the Recreation Program and the Recreation Program Budget. Modernization initiatives are underway to address changing recreation needs such as accommodating modern recreational vehicles that require larger campsite pads and higher electrical voltage than the sites were originally designed for.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	86%	53%	Effective

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: In accordance with the Civil Works Strategic Plan, Recreation program goals include: provide justified outdoor recreation opportunities in an effective and efficient manner at all Corps-operated water resources projects; provide continued outdoor recreation opportunities to meet the needs of present and future generations; and provide a safe and healthful outdoor recreation environment for Corps customers. An emphasis is placed on safeguarding future generations' access to natural resources which reflects a unique long-term performance commitment.

Evidence: These goals and associated measures are contained in the Civil Works Strategic Plan and shared within the Recreation Community of Practice on the NRM Gateway.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Performance goals and measures have been identified and partially deployed. Full implementation of the measures will occur in early FY 05. At that time, targets and timeframes will be established.

Evidence: Performance measure baselines, targets and timelines will be developed in FY05. The current target for customer satisfaction is 90% of surveyed customers rating the program as acceptable or better. Acceptable recreation service levels have been established that require scoring between a point range of 30-39. Facility Standards have been developed that are designed to provide a uniform level of quality nationwide at Corps-managed parks. See: <http://corpslakes.usace.army.mil/employees/facilities/review-final.html> .

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Currently, the Corps uses 4 primary annual performance measures for the Recreation program.

Evidence: Annual performance measures include: customer satisfaction, recreation unit day availability per year, recreation facility condition index, and national economic development impacts. Additional measures used for management purposes include cost recovery (revenue collected) and number of visitors served.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Preliminary baselines have been developed using FY2004 data. These will be refined and targets will be established in FY 05, based on performance data and evaluations of the FY04 program results.

Evidence: FY 06 Budget Development Guidance. <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/cecwb/EC06draft.pdf>

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	86%	53%	Effective

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: Partners are essential to the Corps Recreation program. Recreation program goals are shared with partners such as concessions, volunteers, challenge partnerships and surrounding communities via involvement in land use planning initiatives along with periodic coordination meetings, stakeholder meetings, national listening sessions, and special demonstration projects. The purpose of this exchange is to ensure that quality recreation experiences are provided for the visiting public in a safe, efficient and balanced manner.

Evidence: Partner interest has resulted in several specialized lake demonstration programs. The Federal Lakes Demonstration Program in 1996-99 included 13 Corps lakes tasked with focusing on improving efficiency, innovation and partnering. Six additional demonstration projects to facilitate and enhance partnership opportunities were identified for FY 05. Six Partnership Demonstration Projects have been identified pursuant to the Recreation Modernization Initiative in the FY05 President's Budget to facilitate and enhance partnership opportunities. There are currently 27 national MOAs and MOUs between the Corps and partners such as: Association of Partners for Public Lands, Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation. See: <http://corpslakes.usace.army.mil/employees/cecwon/mou.html>. Many individual lake and river projects have supplemental or additional agreements with local or regional partners as well. 43% of recreation areas on Corps projects are managed by others. They include: 500 concessions, 593 state parks, 600 local government parks, and 421 quasi-public areas. There are also 21 Cooperating Association agreements and many challenge partnerships at Corps projects.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: Several independent program evaluations have been conducted. These include: participation in the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) for recreation since 2001; a Roper-Starch survey authorized by the American Recreation Coalition (ARC) since 1998; using Corps customer comment cards to assess visitor satisfaction, and audits by the Army Audit Agency, the Department of Defense Inspector General, and the Government Accounting Office.

Evidence: The 2003 overall ACSI score for the Corps is 76 as compared to a government aggregated average of 70.9. This represents a 4.1% improvement over the 2001 score of 71. This score also indicated that the Corps recreation program has a high level of visitor trust and a low level of complaints. The ARC "Outdoor Recreation in America 2001" survey by Roper-Starch indicated that 62% of respondents scored the overall recreation industry as performing moderately well to very well. Corps customer comment card surveys reveal that 90% of respondents rated the overall quality of facilities and services as good or very good. Army Audit Report 97-26, "Corps Managed Recreation Areas" found that the Recreation program was managed in an "efficient and business-like manner", but could improve fee collections and financial databases. An audit is currently underway to examine revenue collection from outgranted lands (many of which are recreation-related) and recreation fee collection.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	86%	53%	Effective

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: An attempt to link budget more closely to performance was made in the FY 05 budget with limited results. A more aggressive effort is being implemented for FY 06. This includes incremental budget linkages. Baselines and targets will be established in early FY05.

Evidence: The FY 06 budget includes efficiency improvements and budget increment analysis based on: serving the visiting public at acceptable service levels, improving facilities via repair and/or replacement, modernizing facilities, accessibility improvements to serve persons with disabilities, efficiency improvements to existing sites, new facility construction in an existing areas, improvements related to the Lewis & Clark Bicentennial Commemoration, partnerships, and Healthier US. A Recreation Program Performance Improvement Initiative is under development to provide a comprehensive, coherent process to assess, monitor and improve program performance for effective and efficient provision of quality recreation opportunities. The purpose of the initiative is to make a good program even better.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The Corps Recreation program is part of a holistic strategic planning effort that includes the Army Strategic Plan, the USACE Strategic Plan, the CW Strategic Plan, and annual Corps Recreation Leadership Advisory Team strategic planning efforts. Legislative proposals are submitted for specific needs as required. Program management is completing a strategic planning document that will build on the program's strengths and provide a set of guidelines that will help ensure program managers implement policies that are consistent country-wide.

Evidence: The Recreation Leadership Advisory Team (RLAT) consists of members of the Corps Recreation Community of Practice. This team conducts an annual Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis to determine future needs and establishes strategic goals for the Recreation Program consistent with the CW Strategic Plan. Recreation program, needs identified by the RLAT such as budget-linked performance measurement and economic benefit analysis are addressed by pursuing targeted research and development through the Recreation Management Support Program (RMSP). RLAT recommends changes to legislative authorities to improve program capabilities; e.g. establishment of Cooperating Associations and Challenge Partnerships. The Corps submitted proposed legislation to support the proposal in the President's FY05 Budget to authorize entrance fees and make part of the receipts available without further appropriation to support the recreation program. Comprehensive Land Use Policy will be implemented in FY05 to address current conditions and provide a coherent construct within which to make decisions about appropriate use of Corps managed lands.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	86%	53%	Effective

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: A concerted effort to collect performance information for the Recreation program has been underway since 1996. Modified measures are proposed for FY 06 that will provide an holistic overview of program performance. Some measures are collected for upward reporting whereas others are used internally to improve program assessment and management.

Evidence: Historical performance measures include: user fee revenues, visitor satisfaction, number and value of volunteers, number of visitors participating in interpretive/educational programs, visitor satisfaction with the quality of natural resources, recreation unit day availability, and recreation efficiency. Outgrant partners are assessed on revenue, visitation, safety, and compliance with legal requirements, such as accessibility for persons with disabilities.

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Annual performance assessments are performed on Natural Resources Management (NRM) employees such as park rangers, lake managers, and project managers. Annual assessments of partner outgrants are performed by a combination of Operations and Real Estate personnel. The Corps also has an internal performance tracking system.

Evidence: Regular execution and performance assessments of Corps programs with both vertical and horizontal integration include: Command Management Review (CMR), Program Review Board (PRB), and the Program and Budget Advisory Council (PBAC). Annual evaluations of partner outgrants includes assessments of revenue, effectiveness and facility condition.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Agency records show good historical funding execution for the Recreation program. Funds are scheduled for commitment on a quarterly basis. Quarterly and yearly execution is monitored through 2101/3011A reports from the Corps of Engineers Financial Management System (CEFMS), with oversight provided through the Command and Control Information Review (CCIR) process. Using CEFMS capability, this monitoring may be accomplished by business program.

Evidence: Budget and expenditure information for all program areas, including the Recreation program, is contained in the Operations and Maintenance Business Information Link, which derives information from CEFMS. Information on actual appropriations is maintained by the Programs Integration Division. Data from these sources indicate there is very little carry over of funds to succeeding FYs.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	86%	53%	Effective

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Corps uses a suite of software tools to track expenditures, efficiencies and performance. The Corps has also been a leader on several E-government initiatives that improve efficiency and effectiveness of recreation program management. A combination of partnering and outsourcing is used to provide recreation opportunities.

Evidence: The Corps of Engineers Financial Management System (CEFMS) is the primary financial tracking tool used across the Corps and it promotes efficient financial management practices. It is linked to the Project Management automated information system (P2) and to the Operations and Maintenance Business Information Linke (OMBIL). OMBIL allows comparisons across the Recreation Program. The Information Technology Investment Portfolio System (ITIPS) is used to select, identify and control information technology investments that are directed at improving the effectiveness of the Recreation Program. E-Government Recreation-related initiatives, which are designed to improve efficiency and effectiveness and in which the Corps has played a leadership role include: Recreation 1-Stop (including the NRRS), Volunteer.gov and Partnerships.gov. Information on Recreation partners may be found in 2.5. Outsourcing has also been used to improve efficiency in Operations and Maintenance.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Corps participates in an extensive array of Recreation coordination initiatives involving government, private sector and nonprofit organizations.

Evidence: Collaboration occurs with: Recreation 1-Stop (including Recreation.gov and NRRS), monthly Federal Interagency Accessibility Team, Interagency Fee Council, Partnership Council, National Association of State Park Directors, National Recreation & Park Association, National Association of Interpretation, Partners Outdoors, American Recreation Coalition, and the National Environmental Education and Training Foundation, among others. This collaboration has resulted in numerous joint initiatives such as NRRS, Fee Free Days, and National Public Lands Day among others.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The rating criteria result in a "NO" answer for this section. However, the Corps uses software programs discussed in 3.4 to track financial performance. CEFMS is a real time tracking tool. We are in a challenging position in that our Recreation program is tightly integrated with other project purposes such as Flood Damage Reduction, Hydropower and Navigation where assets are shared across programs. In addition, our program is part of the overall US Army financial audit. We are committed to achieving an unqualified audit opinion, however, have been unable to do so because of difficulties in areas outside the purview of the recreation program.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	86%	53%	Effective

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: Management deficiencies are minor, with the exception of section 3.6 above. To address minor deficiencies in effectiveness and efficiency, the Corps has developed strategies with implementation activities that are included in the CW Strategic Plan, Master Plans, Operational Management Plans, Annual plans, policy guidance and legislative proposals.

Evidence: Minor deficiencies are addressed through periodic policy, efficiency and effectiveness reviews. Specific program areas having had recent reviews include recreation use fees, shoreline management, challenge partnerships, cooperating associations, facility and service standards, park closure and turnback policies and others. AAA findings have led to improvements in ranger safety and training. The Environmental Review Guide for Operations Program is used to check for environmental sustainability of the Recreation program to include corrective actions.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Data on long-term performance is incomplete, but demonstrates progress in areas such as improving visitor satisfaction. Deployment of new FY 06 performance measures will provide critical baseline information to track future performance.

Evidence: As stated in 2.6, visitor satisfaction as measured by ACSI has improved from 71 in 2001 to 76 in 2003. Corps visitor comment cards show that our target goal of 90% of visitors rating the Recreation program as acceptable or better is being achieved.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: As stated previously, partners such as outgrants, are critical to the Corps ability to provide Recreation opportunities to the public. Their performance is reflected in national surveys such as ACSI and ARC's Roper-Starch effort. Annual goals will be established in FY06 following collection of baseline information.

Evidence: Additional baseline data will be collected in FY 06 for: number of visitors served, annual net benefits, recreation unit day availability per year, visitor satisfaction and facility condition index.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Information on improved efficiencies will be determined pending receipt of future performance measurement data. Some information is available, however, relative to visitor satisfaction and the number of visitors served.

Evidence: As we gain experience and data, we will build upon and improve our assessment process. Targeted incremental budget initiatives and a proposed methodology for improving recreation efficiencies will assist in this effort. "Good Enough to Share" best practices will continue to be shared on the NRM Gateway. Efficiency information tracked for management purposes includes: cost recovery (revenue collected) and occupancy rates.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	86%	53%	Effective

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Formal surveys provide information on areas such as visitor satisfaction. Informal comparisons are available via the many interagency collaboration initiatives the Corps participates in. The Corps fills a unique niche in specializing in water-based recreation opportunities.

Evidence: ACSI, Roper Starch, NRRS, and visitor survey cards results show favorable comparisons among other recreation providers as discussed in 2.6. Informal comparisons are available via collaborative partnerships discussed in 3.5. As discussed in 1.3, 2.6 and other sections, Corps performance compares favorably with other recreation providers.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Independent program evaluations have been conducted. These include: participation in the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) for recreation since 2001; a Roper-Starch survey authorized by the American Recreation Coalition (ARC); using Corps customer comment cards to assess visitor satisfaction and audits by the Army Audit Agency, the Department of Defense Inspector General, and the Government Accounting Office.

Evidence: The Corps contracts for the annual ACSI (partnership with the University of Michigan School of Business, American Society for Quality and CFI) survey. The Corps also collaborates with and provides information to the American Recreation Coalition for their periodic Roper-Starch assessments. Findings from GAO, AAA and DODIG reports are used as a basis for program improvement. The latter has included improvements in outgrant/concession operations and fee collection..

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	86%	53%	Effective

Measure: Recreation Unit Day Availability

Additional Information: An output performance measure of recreation capacity or opportunity.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2005	Baseline		
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			

Measure: Facility Condition Index. This is an output measure of the quality of facilities available at Corps recreation areas. The U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Lab is designing several computerized maintenance management systems. The recreation management program will use one or more of these systems to allocate O&M spending. (Baselines and targets are under development.)

Additional Information: An output measure of the quality of opportunities provided to our visitors relative to facilities.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2005	Under development		
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	86%	53%	Effective

Measure: National Economic Development Benefits. This is an estimate of the net economic benefits produced by the Corps recreation program. It includes an estimate of the additional income earned as a result of the Corps recreation program. (Baselines and targets are under development.)

Additional Information: This is an outcome measure of our provision of quality recreation opportunities and related benefits.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2005	Under development.		
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			

Measure: Customer Satisfaction

Additional Information: This is an outcome measure of the percent of visitors satisfied with the quality of their recreation experience.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2005	Baseline		
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	86%	53%	Effective

Measure: Recreation Unit Day Availability
Additional Information: An output performance measure of recreation capacity or opportunity.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	Baseline		
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

Measure: Cents per dollar of agency operation and maintenance spending that program beneficiaries pay for through user fees, lease payments, and other fees and contributions. It is a measure of the extent to which program beneficiaries (rather than federal taxpayers) pay for the program. It is also an indicator of consumer satisfaction and community support.
Additional Information: An efficiency measure indicating consumer satisfaction and community support.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2003	0.13	0.13	
2004	0.14	0.14	
2005	0.14		
2006	0.16		
2007	0.16		
2008			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	86%	53%	Effective

Measure: National Economic Development Impacts
Additional Information: This is an outcome measure of our provision of quality recreation opportunities and related benefits.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	Baseline		
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

Measure: Visitor Satisfaction
Additional Information: This is an outcome measure of the percent of visitors satisfied with the quality of their recreation experience.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	Baseline		
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	67%	91%	78%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The purpose of the program is to protect, maintain and restore the nation's aquatic resources in a way that enhances and balances environmental and economic development values and objectives. The program does this by means of regulations and related measures. The Corps is responsible for regulating the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States and to do so in a way that serves the public interest. The regulatory program has taken this broad overarching goal or purpose and developed three long-term supporting goals based on it. The three goals are: 1. No net loss of aquatic resources; 2. Avoidance and minimization of damage to aquatic resources where that is possible; and 3. Permits issued promptly and expeditiously within specified timeframes. In order to determine if these goals are being met through the daily administration of the program, the Corps developed 8 annual performance measures designed to link budget levels with performance and also provide data on the three long-term goals.

Evidence: The Clean Water Act (CWA) statute (33 USC 1344) defines the purpose of the program as follows: " To restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters." The CWA regulations (33 CFR Part 320.1a) provide additional information on the "public interest review" which is designed to balance both the protection and utilization of important natural and other resources, including aquatic resources.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Congress specifically recognized the need to limit the discharge of dredged or fill material into the nation's waters. The program is designed to balance the protection and restoration of aquatic resources with the need to encourage (or avoid discouraging) productive economic activity. The Corps' permit program provides an avenue through which investment projects in the private sector and in the public sector affecting wetlands can be evaluated in a comprehensive manner and implemented while simultaneously protecting the Nation's waters.

Evidence: The Corps' Regulatory Program (specifically Section 404 of the CWA) is designed to balance the protection of aquatic resources with proposed development providing fair, flexible, and balanced permit decisions. It thereby makes it possible to resolve in a productive way issues that might otherwise be controversial and contentious. The program processed more than 81,000 permits in FY02 impacting approximately 26,000 acres and required more than 58,000 acres of wetlands as mitigation (including creation, restoration, enhancement, and preservation). As a point of comparison, 58,000 acres is equal in size to slightly over 90 square miles. That's 1.3 times the size of the District of Columbia.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Three statutes form the basis for the Regulatory Program: the Clean Water Act, the Rivers and Harbors Act, and the Marine Protection, Resources, and Sanctuaries Act. Regulations promulgated based on the Acts provide authority to the Corps over activities and discharges into waters of the United States. Section 404 of the CWA also assigns responsibility for a portion of the program to EPA or the states. The federal and state agencies coordinate these roles to avoid duplication. The Corps program is complementary to the CWA Section 401 program within most states which allows the states to certify that proposed discharges meet water quality standards. The Corps is also the only agency to regulate the placement of structures in navigable waters to protect interstate commerce.

Evidence: Corps regulations (33 CFR Part 320.1a(5)) have been written to avoid duplication. Regulations discuss associated laws and the Corps responsibilities within these laws and the general procedures to follow with the other agencies (33 CFR Part 320.3 and Part 320.4).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	67%	91%	78%	Effective

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program was originally designed in the mid-1970s and has undergone measurable evolution in the last 30 years. Program experience and court rulings have redefined the program over time to address concerns and any major flaws. External challenges remain and the program continues to evolve. See the evidence column to the right for specific examples. While many environmentalists perceive the program as permitting too many projects, some landowners, farmers and small businesspeople believe the Corps has been overly aggressive in protecting wetlands of low value. The agency is attempting to strike a reasonable balance among contending views on this issue. Some program critics say the program slows and discourages economic growth and development.

Evidence: An example of a potentially major flaw that was corrected was the revisions to the Nationwide Permit Program (33 CFR Part 330). Initially, the Nationwide Permits were designed to expedite processing of smaller projects. As the effects of proposed projects were evaluated, the Corps began to reduce the acreage limits of these Nationwide Permits to insure environmental impacts were reduced while maintaining the expedited permit processing. Changes to the program instituted in 2003 in response to the SWANCC ruling of 2001 are examples of current challenges that will more exactly define program jurisdiction.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Program resources are directed to the Project Managers in the field and their supervisors who make day-to-day permit decisions. Remaining resources (10-15% of the total, depending on the budget year) provide assistance to the Project Managers such as improved automation, technical research on wetlands and waters related topics, and technical assistance on direct permits issues.

Evidence: The Corps budget in FY 2002 was \$138 M; 85% of this amount was directed to support manpower needs of the District offices.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: As stated above in answer to question 1.1 and also in the Civil Works Strategic Plan, the program's goal is to administer the Regulatory Program in a manner that a) protects, maintains and enhances the aquatic environment (programmatic no net loss of wetlands) and b) do this in a way that enhances and balances environmental and economic development values and objectives. The program has taken this broad overarching goal and developed three long-term support goals. These goals are: 1. No net loss of aquatic resources; 2. Avoidance and minimization of damage to aquatic resources; and 3. Permits issued promptly and expeditiously within specified Regulatory timeframes.

Evidence: YES

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	67%	91%	78%	Effective

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program continues to make progress towards its stated goals; namely increased permit processing efficiencies, avoidance and minimization of impacts, and the no net loss of aquatic resources. While program efficiencies are more interactive, the no net loss goal is ambitious and includes increasing permit compliance, addressing future issues associated with wetland mitigation and watershed planning in the next 5-7 years.

Evidence: There are three major initiatives working to assist the program with meeting its goal of no net loss of aquatic resources. The first is to increase permit compliance. The second initiative to improve mitigation involves the National Wetlands Mitigation Action Plan which addresses the goal of no net loss and the need to improve wetland mitigation. This interagency initiative is specifically designed to improve the success of compensatory mitigation. The third initiative, conducting permitting on a watershed basis is also an interagency effort that involves states and local communities. This effort will expedite permit decision-making through regional planning and improve mitigation success.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Annual performance measures include percent of Individual Permits issued in under 120 days, the percent of all permits issued in under 60 days, and six new goals dealing with enforcement and compliance. These annual performance measures were developed to insure the long-term goals will be met.

Evidence: In FY02, the Corps processed 61% of the Individual permits in under 120 days and 87% of all permits in under 60 days. The six new performance measures will be phased in starting in FY 2004. Baseline data on existing levels will be collected in FY04 in preparation for their introduction in 2005.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The goals of these performance measures dictate permit processing times (program efficiencies) and compliance measures with enforcement to address the no net loss goal. Baseline data for permit processing has been collected for the last 10+ years but the compliance data has been dependent on annual budget restrictions and is not consistent.

Evidence: Permitting statistics illustrate a rise in permit processing times over the last 10 years. By maintaining the existing high standards, Districts are forced to evaluate new ways to conduct permitting more efficiently. Mitigation and enforcement data exist but are not complete. Standards were set based on the need to bring these measures in line with the strategic goal of no net loss. The Corps and EPA are working on the Mitigation Action Plan (MAP) that has several tracking and reporting actions that are scheduled to be completed by the end of FY 2005.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: EPA, USFWS, NRCS, and other federal agencies maintain the "No net loss" as a goal. These and other federal agencies are joint signatories on the MAP which has an overall goal to improve compensatory mitigation, an important component of the "no net loss" goal.

Evidence: The Regulatory program has many governmental partners and a myriad of stakeholders. The divergent views of our partners and stakeholders result in each group supporting most of the long-term goals and at least one or more of the annual goals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	67%	91%	78%	Effective

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Different portions of the program have been the subject of various independent inspections. This is in addition to the normal inspections conducted every other year of each District. Also, the Corps is conducting peer reviews of many Districts to increase consistency across the country.

Evidence: The Corps IG comprehensive report (FY 2002), the GAO audit on in-lieu fee program (FY 2001), and the NRC study on mitigation (FY 1999-2000) are examples of high-quality studies. Additional work needs to be done to ensure quality output is in fact being produced.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Past budget submittals have concentrated on permit efficiencies and have not included the new annual performance measures. The proposed annual performance measures directly link budget requests to the accomplishment of the measures and long-term performance goals. The FY 2005 budget submittal includes these measures.

Evidence: Because the program can document the number of permit actions and number of mitigation sites using current information, the Corps can document the man-hours and overall budget requirements to meet these new performance measures. The data collected will provide information on the attainment of the long-term program goals.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program has developed revised and completely new performance standards that directly relate to the effectiveness of resource protection.

Evidence: The largest strategic deficiency was the lack of compliance effort for permits and mitigation to ensure that the goal of overall no net loss was being met. This can be illustrated by the NAS report on Compensatory Mitigation (NRC, 2000) Four of the new performance standards address this issue.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The Regulatory program collects permit processing data quarterly. Adjustments are made annually to the program.

Evidence: Every District must provide data on processing statistics to Headquarters every quarter. This data includes numbers and times for permit processing, enforcement data, and basic mitigation data. Summary data for the ten years is available for review. Future improvements to the system include a new database/permit tracking system that will allow efficient collection of data at the national level. As part of this system, the Corps intends to provide more data to the public on permit processing including on-line information regarding active permits.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	67%	91%	78%	Effective

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The Branch Chiefs are responsible for the permit processing within each District. In addition, the District Engineer is also responsible for these permit processing timeframes. Program partners are not responsible for cost and performance results. Applicants are indirectly responsible for timing issues

Evidence: Permit processing times are part of every Branch Chief, Section Chief, and the majority of Project Managers' annual TAPES (civilian annual evaluation program for the ARMY) performance plans.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Funds are obligated in each Branch in a timely manner that is monitored annually. Districts are expected to obligate 98% of their funds by the end of the FY. There are internal annual audits to determine if the funds are being obligated and spent in the correct manner.

Evidence: In FY 02, the program obligated approximately 96% of the funds allocated. Results of the internal audits have not uncovered any significant problems. A revised workload evaluation program is being developed in FY 2004 to be used in FY 2005.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Branch Chiefs are encouraged to develop program efficiencies within each District and pass these efficiencies to the other Districts. These efficiencies are measured through improved permit processing times for permits of like complexity. Improvements are also measured in terms of reduced cost and improved access to the public (electronic Public Notices are an example). IT improvements also include upgrades to the network and faster communication with field offices.

Evidence: Program efficiencies are easily measured in terms of increased number of permits processed and decreased processing times. These efficiencies would be measured at the District and Division level. General Permits significantly reduce processing times (nationwide average is less than 31 days). A concrete example of an IT upgrade is the development of the ORM (OMBIL Regulatory Module) permit tracking system to be installed in the Districts beginning in October 2003. ORM will be a dramatic improvement in permit tracking increasing efficiencies in the Districts, allowing HQ to analyze national data on a daily basis, and providing opportunities for applicants to submit and track applications on-line. Public access to general permit data on line will be available with installation of ORM.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	67%	91%	78%	Effective

-
- 3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%
- Explanation: One of the strengths of the Corps regulatory program is its collaboration with various federal, state, and local agencies. Through the Public Interest Review, the Corps solicits comments from the various stakeholder agencies. In most cases, extensive dialogue occurs between the agencies and the applicant to address the concerns of the agencies.
- Evidence: Collaboration and cooperation can be easily documented for the Section 401 CWA program with the states and EPA, with the US Fish and Wildlife Service on Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and the State Historic Preservation Offices through Section 106 of the Historic properties Act through documents such as memorandum of Agreement and other joint guidance.
- 3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%
- Explanation: The program is managed through the normal CEFMS program (Corps of Engineers Financial Management System), which enables tracking of obligations and expenditures in real time. Regulatory funds are under scrutiny through use of three work codes. Management of the program is under strong management control.
- Evidence: Data is available for the five year documenting the use of funds at the District and Division level. In FY 02, the program obligated approximately 96% of the funds allocated.
- 3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%
- Explanation: This program is constantly changing and evolving to reflect changes in law and science. Deficiencies are identified and addressed at the District, Division, and Nationwide levels. Meaningful steps that have been taken this Fiscal year include the Wetlands Regulatory Guidance Letter on Mitigation, the National Wetlands Mitigation Action Plan, and the initiative to address problems with the Wetland Delineation manual.
- Evidence: Recent and ongoing modifications to program design include a greater emphasis on watersheds, improving public access to information, improved use of geospatial data, and implementation of the National Wetlands Mitigation Action Plan. The Wetland Delineation manual is also being updated to include the latest science and account for regional conditions such as Alaska.
- 3.RG1 Did the program seek and take into account the views of all affected parties (e.g., consumers; large and small businesses; State, local and tribal governments; beneficiaries; and the general public) when developing significant regulations?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%
- Explanation: The Corps Regulatory program makes it a policy to gain public opinion on all new regulations, guidance, and policy issues. These opinions are incorporated into the proposed regulations, guidance, or policy papers.
- Evidence: The Advanced Notice of proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) is one example of the program seeking public comment. The Corps and EPA received more than 133,000 comments on the advanced notice. These comments are being incorporated into the proposed rule. Another example would be the National Wetlands Mitigation Action Plan and the incorporation of a stakeholder forum in the revisions to existing guidance.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	67%	91%	78%	Effective

3.RG2 **Did the program prepare adequate regulatory impact analyses if required by Executive Order 12866, regulatory flexibility analyses if required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act and SBREFA, and cost-benefit analyses if required under the Unfunded Mandates R** Answer: NO Question Weight: 9%

Explanation:

Evidence:

3.RG3 **Does the program systematically review its current regulations to ensure consistency among all regulations in accomplishing program goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The program conducts reviews of the regulations at regular intervals. Nationwide and General Permits are systematically reviewed, published for public comment, and renewed every five years. The Corps publishes changes to the existing regulations on a regular basis to account for program changes and the results of legal challenges.

Evidence: As an example, nationwide permits, accounting for approximately 70% of all Corps authorizations, are reviewed and reissued, with intense public involvement, every five years. The changes to the program after the Supreme Court Decision on the SWANCC case are part of the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

3.RG4 **Are the regulations designed to achieve program goals, to the extent practicable, by maximizing the net benefits of its regulatory activity?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The program includes options to conduct full reviews of large projects while processing the majority of smaller projects through the nationwide permit program. The Nationwide Permit Program (designed to streamline the majority of the permits for activities in waters of the United States) is reviewed, published for public comment, and issued with revisions every five years.

Evidence: Most (85%) of permits issued are General and Nationwide permits. This maximizes the benefits of the program to protect aquatic resources by expediting permits for those activities that have less than minimal impacts, both individually and cumulatively. In addition, the changes to the Nationwide Permit program over the last 10 years have increased the environmental protection standard while maintaining the streamlined processing.

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: Resources are being protected at least practicable cost to the regulated public.

Evidence: Program deals with a large number of permits annually, affecting a geographical area the size of the District of Columbia..

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	67%	91%	78%	Effective

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:16%

Explanation: The annual goal for Individual permits is not being met completely.

Evidence: The program was targeted to issue 70 percent of a key subgroup of individual permits in 120 days. It achieved 61% in 2001, 60% in 2002 and 56% in 2003,

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: The program has increased efficiency through the last several years based on increased use of Nationwide and General Permits. There is also the increased use of e-govt initiatives (including electronic Public Notices and on-line permit applications) as well as refinement of nationwide permit program.

Evidence: Cost efficiencies that can be measured easily include the use of electronic Public Notices instead of bulk mailings. This effort saves the taxpayers the cost of reproduction (each Public Notice generally includes 3-7 pages of text and at least 3 pages of maps and diagrams) as well as the postal charges. These costs are eliminated with the electronic format.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: Comparisons with other federal and state partners can be accomplished by interviews with applicants. Most, if not all, have favorable comments on the regulatory program.

Evidence: The Corps maintains records of the responses received on the questionnaires send out with each completed Individual Permit issued. The average score for the program was 3.3 out of 4 with more than 80% providing favorable comments.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:16%

Explanation: Yes, independent reviews have been positive and have yielded good recommendations for improving the program and its efficiency. Questions remain on quality. Program is working to address these.

Evidence: The Corps IG comprehensive report (FY 2002), the GAO audit on in-lieu fee program (FY 2001), and the NRC study on mitigation (FY 1999-2000).

4.RG1 Were programmatic goals (and benefits) achieved at the least incremental societal cost and did the program maximize net benefits? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: Yes. The program balances protection of aquatic resources with needed development. The Nationwide Permit Program provides expedited permit processing of the majority of the proposed actions; in order to qualify, these actions must have minimal impacts both individually and cumulatively.

Evidence: Continued revisions to the Nationwide permit program have reduced impacts while at the same time streamlining the permit process.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	67%	91%	78%	Effective

Measure: No net loss of Aquatic Resources

Additional Information: Measure evaluates efficiency of the program to protect aquatic resources (AR). The measure evaluates the acres of AR lost through permitted and non-permitted activities (enforcement actions) and compares these to the acres of AR mitigated. This long-term goal will be measured through the output from annual performance measures 6 through 11.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2005	NNL		

Measure: The Corps shall complete a compliance inspection/audit on all active mitigation banks and in lieu fee programs each fiscal year.

Additional Information: Measure designed to check status of mitigation banks and in-lieu fee programs annually.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	0.25		
2005	1		

Measure: Resolution of Non-compliance with permit conditions. The Corps will reach resolution on non-compliance with permit conditions and/or mitigation requirements on 50% of activities that are unresolved at the end of the previous fiscal year and have been determined to be non-compliant with permit conditions during the current fiscal year. Resolution for this measure shall include removal of the fill material, processing of an After-the-Fact permit, requirement for compensatory mitigation, referral to EPA, or resolution by the requirement for monetary compensation as a punitive measure.

Additional Information: Measure designed to address the compliance issue with those actions evaluated under performance measures 7-10.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	10%		
2005	5%		

Measure: No net loss of aquatic resources. The measure compares the acres of aquatic resources lost to the acres restored, replaced or otherwise mitigated.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2002	1:1	1:2.3	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	67%	91%	78%	Effective

2003	1:1	1:2.0
2004	1:1	
2005	1:1	

Measure: Percentage of active mitigation sites for which field inspections have been completed each fiscal year. This measure ensures developer has complied with the terms of his permit.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	5%		
2005	10%		

Measure: Percentage of Individual permits issued in 120 days or less of applicant's filing (excluding those with Endangered Species Act consultations lasting greater than 60 days). The program seeks to achieve its goals efficiently, at minimum feasible cost in terms of dollars, time and uncertainty.

Additional Information:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	>70%	61%	
2002	>70%	60%	
2003	>70%	56%	
2004	>75%		
2005	>75%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	67%	91%	78%	Effective

Measure: Avoidance/ minimization of Aquatic resources

Additional Information: Measure evaluates the acres of aquatic resources avoided and minimized through the permit process. This long-term goal will be measured through the output from annual performance measures 7 and 8.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term
2003	Yes/No		
2004	Yes/No		
2005	Yes/No		

Measure: Permits issued within Regulatory timeframes

Additional Information: This long-term goal addresses the efficiency of the program in issuing Department of the Army permits for authorized work in waters of the United States. This long-term goal will be measured through annual performance measures 4 and 5.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2001	Yes/No		
2002	Yes/No		
2003	Yes/No		
2004	Yes/No		
2005	Yes/No		

Measure: Percentage of Individual permits issued in 120 days or less of applicant's filing (excluding those with Endangered Species Act consultations lasting greater than 60 days).

Additional Information: The measure is designed to measure the efficiency of the processing program for Individual permits and to insure permits are processed in a timely manner. For FY 03 and earlier, the performance measure included those permits with ESA consultations.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	>70%	61%	
2002	>70%	60%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	67%	91%	78%	Effective

2003	>70%	56%
2004	>75%	
2005	>75%	

Measure: Percentage of General Permits issued in less than 60 days.

Additional Information: The measure is designed to measure the efficiency of the processing program for all permits and to insure permits are processed in a timely manner.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	>85%	87%	
2002	>85%	88%	
2003	>85%		
2004	>85%		
2005	>90%		

Measure: The Corps shall reach resolution on 40% of all enforcement actions (I.e., unauthorized activities) that are unresolved at the end of the previous fiscal year and have been received during the current fiscal year. Resolution for this measure shall include removal of the fill material, processing of an After-the-Fact permit, requirement for compensatory mitigation , referral to EPA, or resolution by the requirement for monetary compensation as a punitive measure.

Additional Information: This measure is designed to insure the Corps resolves enforcement actions on unauthorized activities. These resolutions will be documented in the database in insure the no net loss of AR is measured for these unauthorized activities.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2001	>20%	18%	
2002	>20%	20%	
2003	>20%		
2004	>20%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	67%	91%	78%	Effective

2005 >50%

Measure: Individual Permit Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections of 100% of all individual permits issued and constructed within the preceding fiscal year.

Additional Information: Measure designed to confirm acres of impacts and acres of avoidance/minimization to aquatic resources from Individual Permits

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	10%		
2005	1		

Measure: General Permit Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections of 100% of all General Permits (GPs and NWP) with reporting requirements issued and constructed within the preceding fiscal year.

Additional Information: Measure designed to confirm acres of impacts and acres of avoidance/minimization to aquatic resources from General Permits

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	10%		
2005	1		

Measure: Mitigation. The Corps shall complete field compliance inspections of 25% of active mitigation sites each fiscal year. Active mitigation sites are those sites authorized through the permit process and are being monitored as part of the permit process but have not met final approval under the permit special conditions (success criteria). The measure does not include mitigation banks and in lieu fee programs.

Additional Information: Measure designed to insure field verification of active mitigation sites that are required as part of Corps permits. Since all Corps mitigation sites have monitoring periods of at least 5 years, this measure would insure all sites are inspected.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual</u>	Measure Term: Annual
2004	5%		
2005	25%		