

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

PART ASSESSMENTS¹

¹This document contains details of the most recent program assessments as of the date the 2005 Budget was published (February 2004). Programs originally assessed for the 2004 Budget were reassessed only where evidence showed an agency's rating was likely to change. Programs not reassessed are presented in this document in the form of reprints of the original worksheets and are footnoted "FY 2004 Budget".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Rating	Page
Corps Hydropower.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	3
Emergency Management.....	Moderately Effective.....	12
Flood Damage Reduction.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	21
Inland Waterways Navigation.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	32
Non-regulatory Wetlands Activities.....	Results Not Demonstrated.....	45
USACE Regulatory Program.....	Moderately Effective.....	54

**OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)
Capital Assets & Service Acquisition Programs**

Name of Program: Corps Hydropower

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 this program is to produce power at 78 existing Federal dams, while meeting the other authorized purposes of these dams (such as flood damage reduction or commercial navigation) and applicable environmental requirements.	The 1938 Flood Control Act and individual project authorizations.	20%	0.2
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The program generates power to help meet the routine demand for power (base load) and to supplement the available power during periods of high use (peak periods). It can help to meet peak load demand on relatively short notice.	Corps report entitled "Value to the Nation."	20%	0.2
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	The Corps produces more than 20% of Nation's hydropower. While this represents only about 2% of the total electricity that we use, it is a significant source of power during peak use periods in some regions.	Corps report entitled "Value to the Nation."	20%	0.2
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	Corps dams supplement the hydropower available from other sources. Since water released for flood control, irrigation, or other purposes also will produce electricity if run through a generator, the Corps generally can provide power at a low marginal cost.	Various GAO reports.	20%	0.2
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	The Corps does not have an overall asset management strategy, nor does it try to establish priorities nationwide among the potential investments (maintenance work and major rehabilitation projects) that would achieve net benefits. Regional plans are under development. Due to statutory or other constraints, the Corps sometimes has been slow to revise the balance that it aims to achieve between hydropower and other project purposes to reflect changing conditions and national values.	In the Pacific Northwest, the Corps initially was slow to respond to declining native salmon populations.	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 assumes that its long-term goal is to maintain the status quo more or less indefinitely, i.e., to continue to provide power for as long as each of the 78 dams can operate. It has not evaluated how its role in hydropower production at these dams might change in the future or whether it should remain the same. The Corps is working to develop specific, long-term goals that focus on outcomes. Under long-standing Executive Branch policy, the development of additional hydropower sites is not a Federal responsibility.		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>	No	The program evaluates performance based largely on its ability to limit unscheduled power outages. The Corps is working to develop additional measures and annual goals that would reflect progress toward long-term goals. Over the next few years, the Corps seeks to reduce unplanned outages significantly (to 2.3%). This is relevant to the ability to generate power reliably in the near-term, but is not a long-term goal.	FY 2002 report of the Corps Chief Financial Officer.	11%	0.0
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 Power Marketing Administrations (PMAs) and certain wholesale electric cooperatives serve as "watchdogs" on the availability and cost of power, and work with the Corps to establish priorities for major rehabilitation work. These partners also advocate giving power generation a high priority compared to other uses of the water, which sometimes may conflict with the program's annual and/or long-term goals.	"Regional alliance" meetings with the PMAs.	11%	0.1
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	Corps hydropower managers and staff meet to exchange information on "lessons learned" with their counterparts in the PMAs, and in the Bureau of Reclamation, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Hydro-Quebec hydropower programs.	Regional alliance meetings with the PMAs and TVA; partnership meetings with the Bureau of Reclamation and Hydro-Quebec.	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	While the Corps works closely with the PMAs at the regional level on potential investments and other ways to improve performance, neither the Corps nor any outside party has conducted a recent, comprehensive evaluation of the program from a national perspective or has undertaken to identify gaps in performance information.		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	Internally, the Corps codes work items by business function (e.g., hydropower), which allows for an evaluation of the impact of budget and expenditure decisions. For operation and maintenance, the Corps budget presentation to Congress does not facilitate an evaluation of the overall hydropower program. It lists hydropower work primarily by project, along with all other (unrelated) work for that project.	Corps of Engineers Financial Management System; Corps budget justification materials.	11%	0.1
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	The Corps has hired a national hydropower team coordinator to help develop long-term goals, action plans, and metrics. The Corps lacks a national strategy for replacing aging power equipment. It does not require project managers periodically to seek public comment on, and to revise when appropriate, the basic operational rules that they follow at each dam when making trade-offs between power production and other project purposes.		11%	0.1
8 (Cap 1.)	<i>Are acquisition program plans adjusted in response to performance data and changing conditions?</i>	Yes	The Corps Hydropower Design Center reviews performance data to assess the condition of individual power units, and effectively incorporates the lessons that the Corps has learned from its past efforts to repair and replace hydropower equipment.	Corps Hydropower Design Center technical studies.	11%	0.1

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
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>	No	As it develops regional hydropower investment strategies, the Corps is considering the tradeoffs among cost, schedule, and performance goals. However, it also needs broadly to examine, from a national perspective, which of the potential projects it should be pursuing first and whether it is pursuing them soon enough. The Corps evaluates proposed major rehabilitations using the Principles and Guidelines for Federal water project investments. At each facility, the Corps also evaluates how best to improve power production capability within funding and other constraints.		11%	0.0

Total Section Score				100%	56%
----------------------------	--	--	--	-------------	------------

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 inspects its power facilities regularly to determine the condition of its power equipment and collects data on unscheduled downtimes. It uses this information in managing the program. The Corps uses this data to establish maintenance needs and when to replace aging equipment.	Corps reports of periodic inspections.	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	The Corps attributes most performance shortfalls in the hydropower program to a lack of funding, but generally holds managers responsible for achieving results within available funds. The Corps expects its managers to oversee all contractor work and determine whether it conforms to plans and specs, remains within cost, and stays on schedule.	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	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	The Corps places great emphasis on meeting internal targets for obligations and expenditures. The Corps 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 hydropower). 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	<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	The Corps Hydropower Design Center develops cost-effective solutions for hydropower equipment. The Corps uses competitive bidding for the physical work.	Corps hydropower design decision documents.	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	The Corps estimates and budgets for the full annual cost of the program, including all relevant direct and indirect costs, administrative costs, and overhead, and generally is able to identify how changes in funding levels would affect program performance.	Corps Project Management Automated System reports.	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 tracks the rate at which each project manager obligates and spends funds. It maintains detailed records on the original cost of existing hydropower plant, property, and equipment.	Corps Project Management Automated System reports.	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.	Assessment reports of the Corps Internal Control program.	9%	0.1
8 (Cap 1.)	<i>Does the program define the required quality, capability, and performance objectives of deliverables?</i>	Yes	The Corps oversees all design work and the preparation of plans and specifications that define the required quality, capability, and performance objectives of power equipment.	Project-specific engineering and design work.	9%	0.1
9 (Cap 2.)	<i>Has the program established appropriate, credible, cost and schedule goals?</i>	No	When formulating proposed major rehabilitations, the program assumes construction schedules that do not reflect likely funding constraints. The regions are developing plans for the replacement of aging hydropower equipment. At the national level, the Corps has no process for setting priorities among these potential 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.)	<i>Has the program conducted a recent, credible, cost-benefit analysis that shows a net benefit?</i>	Yes	Because the large Federal investment in existing projects has already occurred, in economic terms it represents a "sunk" cost. The Corps hydropower program evaluates the benefits and costs of most major capital investments. In the Pacific Northwest, however, the Corps is pursuing major rehabilitations to improve power efficiency without evaluating whether these are justified incrementally from a national economic perspective.		9%	0.1

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 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>	No	Until the program has developed more specific, long-term goals, it will be hard to assess whether it is making progress toward them. The FY 2003 Budget proposed to allow three Federal power marketing agencies to finance directly the cost of operating and maintaining Corps hydropower equipment. If enacted by Congress, this proposal would increase funding for maintenance, which would reduce the incidence of unplanned outages.	In a 1999 report (GAO/RCED 99-63), GAO concluded that a reduction in funding for maintenance and repair at certain Corps hydropower facilities in the Southeast, which resulted in an increase in unplanned outages, had led to an increase in power rates.	17%	0.0

<p>Long-Term Goal I: The Corps is working to develop long-term goals that focus on outcomes.</p> <p>Target:</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal II:</p> <p>Target:</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>
<p>Long-Term Goal III:</p> <p>Target:</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal:</p>

2	<i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	Small Extent	The program exceeds the annual goal for forced outages of its the draft Corps performance plan, but has not managed to achieve a 2.3% forced outage rate in most recent years. The Corps should update its annual targets for this measure.	FY 2002 report of the Corps Chief Financial Officer.	17%	0.1
---	--	--------------	---	--	-----	-----

Key Goal I: Minimize out of service time of facilities due to forced outages						
Performance Target:						
Actual Performance: 3.7% in FY 2000; 2.3% in FY 2001; and 3.7% in FY 2002.						
Key Goal II: The Corps is working to develop additional measures and annual goals that would reflect progress toward long-term goals.						
Performance Target:						
Actual Performance:						
Key Goal III:						
Performance Target:						
Actual Performance:						

3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Large Extent	The Corps is able to improve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in individual cases through better turbine design and other technology advances. However, overall program performance is less than it was 15 years ago. Much of the Corps hydropower equipment is approaching the end of its design life.	Ft. Randall hydropower rehabilitation decision document; various GAO reports.	17%	0.1
---	--	--------------	--	---	-----	-----

4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	No	The Corps experienced a forced outage rate of 3.7% in FY 2000. By comparison, at Bureau of Reclamation dams the forced outage rate was 1.5% in FY 2000.	Corps hydropower operational system performance reports.	17%	0.0
---	---	----	---	--	-----	-----

5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Small Extent	Although there has not been an independent evaluation that shows that the Corps hydropower program is effective and achieving results, the Corps is able to operate most of its hydropower equipment at any given time. The Corps recognizes the potential benefits that could result from a quality, systematic program evaluation.	Corps hydropower operational system performance reports.	17%	0.1
---	---	--------------	--	--	-----	-----

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6 (Cap 1.) <i>Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?</i>	Small Extent	Due to a variety of factors, the program often does not complete major rehabilitation projects within the time frame established in the project design documents. The schedules that it sets each fiscal year once construction work 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 design documents with final project construction schedules.	17%	0.1
Total Section Score				100%	28%

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: Emergency Management

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

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	<i>Is the program purpose clear?</i>	Yes	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is authorized to undertake activities including disaster preparedness (all-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.	Public Law (PL) 84-99 (33 U.S.C. 701n) provides USACE the authority to provide emergency response/ disaster assistance. Engineering Regulation 500-1-1 outlines policies and guidance and Emergency Procedure 500-1-1 provides procedures. USACE Civil Emergency Management Mission Statement articulates program purpose.	20%	0.2
2	<i>Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	USACE focuses on the flood preparedness and response 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.	Public Law 84-99, ER500-1-1 and EP500-1-1 The Stafford Act provides the authority and the Federal Response Plan (FRP) provides the procedures for the USACE response under ESF #3.	20%	0.2
3	<i>Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?</i>	Yes	Past disasters have demonstrated the immediate need for supplemental federal assistance when state/local capabilities are exceeded. Program is designed to constantly improve and maintain readiness to meet these needs effectively and efficiently to save lives and protect property.	Responses to Midwest Floods of 93 & 95, California Floods 97 & 98, Miss and Ohio River Floods 97 & 02, West Virginia Floods 01 & 02, Hurricane Georges 98, Hurricane Floyd 99, Northridge Earthquake 94, etc.	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	All activities under PL 84-99 and the Stafford Act are designed to provide assistance that is beyond state and local government capabilities. USACE has unique capabilities to plan for and execute Federal Response Plan (FRP) missions (emergency contracting, subject matter experts, teams, Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) workforce, etc.). USACE is recognized as the lead federal agency for design, construction and maintenance of primary flood control works (Flood Control Works). USACE provides supplemental assistance under this authority that does not duplicate any other federal or non-federal agency.	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 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with Natural Resources Conservation Service. 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	20%	0.2
5	<i>Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?</i>	No	- While a "post-flood" USACE led interagency process exists for examining rehabilitation and/or non-structural alternatives, a "pre-flood" interagency federal mitigation strategy for addressing future alternatives in advance would improve program design. - An annually funded program that addresses not only preparedness, but also a "baseline" or average annual funding level for emergency operations, FLOOD CONTROL WORKS rehabilitation, emergency water supply, and advance measures could provide a sufficient funding balance to better meet anticipated needs, without disrupting other USACE programs.	- An example of a successful PL84-99 rehabilitation alternative is the nonstructural demo-project that contributed to the expansion of the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge (following CA Floods of '97 in cooperation with Fish and Wildlife Service). 33CFR203.50 addresses Non-Structural Alternatives. - Reliance on supplemental funding is not optimal. The Corps can redirect funding from other programs, but disrupts other Corps programs and is not conducive to good management. Often, required repairs and other continuing work is often deferred until Congress provides supplemental emergency funding.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					100%	80%

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)						
	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

	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	USACE goal is to improve Emergency Management (Emergency Management) program through the sustaining of current capabilities and development/implementation of strategic initiatives that address the needs of the entire Public Works and Engineering Emergency Management community. The individual elements of the long-term strategic initiative include detailed mission analysis, partnering analysis, integrated management of existing programs, capability sustaining, and identification areas for improvement in the program. The long-term goals emphasize readiness in terms of having resources in place, but they should have quantitative, outcome measures associated with them.	Emergency Management Strategic Vision 2006. USACE works with State and local communities when their response capabilities are exceeded as determined by Federal Emergency Agency (Federal Emergency Management Agency). Examples are work with the NYC Dept. of Design and Constr. to manage debris removal after the Trade Center collapse and with the District of Columbia Dept. of Public Works on providing drinking water, temporary power, debris removal, ice and temporary housing.	14%	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>	No	Initial annual performance measures have been developed to assess the readiness of key teams/personnel, the integrity of federal and non-federal FLOOD CONTROL WORKS, and the status of key external partnering relationships. In some cases it is difficult to distinguish between the long-term and short-term goals. The long-term goals need some quantitative, outcome measures associated with them. Since the long-term goals focus on establishing plans and readiness, than there should be short-term, out-come oriented goals related to actual responses to an emergency.	Selecting, credentialing and training of Planning and Response Teams and Emergency Support Function #3 Cadre. A more intensive inspection program in the Rehabilitation and Inspection Program would ensure FLOOD CONTROL WORKS integrity.	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
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	Nationally, regionally and locally USACE meets with stakeholders to discuss and establish goals for planning and response capability improvements. In addition public sponsors participate in the Flood Control Works (FLOOD CONTROL WORKS) Rehabilitation and Inspection Program and thus support the program objectives/goals.	Advance Contract Initiative (ACI) contractors have been involved in training, exercises and meeting to enhance our response capabilities. FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY/USACE Remedial Action Plan (RAP). Regional Response Workshops for floods, hurricanes and earthquakes engaged all partners and stakeholders in the identification of long term goals and critical issues.	14%	0.1
4	<i>Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?</i>	Yes	Extensive coordination has occurred with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY) 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.	FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY/USACE Remedial Action Plan and USACE has liaison at FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY Headquarters to collaborate and coordinate programs, including the FLOOD CONTROL WORKS inspection program. USACE coordinates with the National Association of Flood Plain Managers. USACE representatives participate 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.	14%	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>	Yes	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.	These evaluations include: 1) Independent Assessment and Assistance Teams that review responses and provide results to Headquarters USACE. 2) After Action Reports identify Lessons Learned. 3) Federal Emergency Management Agency/USACE Remedial Action Plan addresses key issues that require resolution. 4) Audit Response Teams deploy to evaluate USACE performance.	14%	0.1
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>	No	From FY99 to FY02 no annual appropriation were received and the program depended on supplemental appropriations to execute critical activities. By the end of FY 02, all supplemental appropriation funds will likely be obligated.	This program has been resourced primarily through supplemental appropriations due to the variations in requirements based on actual emergency/disaster events (Energy &Water Appropriation, Supplemental Appropriation).	14%	0.0
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?</i>	Yes	The Readiness 2000 (R2K) Initiative, that was implemented in 1999, corrected deficiencies in the emergency management program. The Emergency Management Strategic Vision 2006 (V6) Initiative reexamined R2K and addressed strategic initiatives for Emergency Management thru 2006. The V6 deficiencies are currently being identified and a schedule for correction established.	Readiness 2000 decision memo, dated April 1998, signed by the Director of Civil Works. Draft Emergency Management V6 summary memo. Senior Leadership Seminars with FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY and other federal and state stakeholders.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					100%	57%

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

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

	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 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 IATT deploys during emergency response operations to assist and identify lessons learned from the perspective of USACE, partners and customers.	Past corrective actions have led to the establishment of a trained Emergency Support Function #3 Cadre response personnel and Mission Planning and Response Teams, and the development and awarding of Advance Contract Initiative (ACI) contracts that provide life saving measures to disaster victims. ENGLink ECA and mission tracking modules provide provides critical performance and assessment data.	14%	0.1
2	<i>Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</i>	Yes	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.	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 mission areas clearly identified in the FRP are established in the USACE ESF #3 Field Guide. USACE Audit Teams are trained and ready to respond.	14%	0.1
3	<i>Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</i>	Yes	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.	Corps Engineers Financial Management System (CEFMS) used to track funding obligations and expenditures. PCA outlines financial requirements of public sponsor. ER 11-1 320 and ER 500-1-1 outlines financial and schedule requirements, respectively.	14%	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	Numerous products/procedures have been developed to improve time and cost efficiency in mission execution. ACI contracts to provide emergency supplies are competitive, "Best Value Source Selection" contracts. Criteria include ability to perform and reach full production under emergency conditions.	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.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
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>	No	From FY99 to FY02, the program depended on supplemental appropriations to execute certain activities. The FY 03 Budget provides \$20 million for the program, but this is \$60 million below the average funding required historically. Only preparedness requirements are budgeted since other program activities are dependent on actual events (event driven) and anticipate supplementals.	Since this is an emergency management program, annual costs vary significantly based on actual events and/or changing missions (Energy & Water Appropriation, Supplementals).	14%	0.0
6	<i>Does the program use strong financial management practices?</i>	Yes	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. Status of undistributed FCCE funds are continually tracked by HQUSACE.	CEFMS tracks obligations and expenditures.	14%	0.1
7	<i>Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</i>	Yes	The Engineer Inspector General conducted an investigation into the 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. Command inspections are also conducted for EM mission areas. Remedial Action Plan identified significant improvements and USACE has taken steps to implement recommendations.	Subsequent steps have been taken to correct the deficiencies to the point that the program is used as an example. Moreover, support functions are better aligned to deliver critical readiness training and exercises due to the realignment and relocation of the Readiness Support Center and the Tactical Support Center to Mobile, AL. Previously, these two facilities were located separately in CA and AL respectively.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					100%	86%

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
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>	Large Extent	Initiatives like Readiness 2000 (R2K) were utilized to correct deficiencies in the EM program. Emergency Management Strategic Vision 2006 (V6) results will also be implemented to correct identified deficiencies and shortfalls.	R2K and V6 Initiatives. Program has made progress towards the long-term goals it defines, but the goals need to emphasize measurable outcomes.	20%	0.1
---	---	--------------	--	--	-----	-----

<p>Long-Term Goal I: Develop, staff and train Mission Planning and Response Teams (PRT) for mission assignments under the FRP</p> <p>Target:</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal: USACE now has 43 nationally staffed and trained mission PRTs ready to respond to disasters (both inside and outside the Continental US).</p>					
<p>Long-Term Goal II: Develop scopes of work and award contracts for the provision of potable water, ice and emergency power, debris removal and disposal and temporary roofing.</p> <p>Target:</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal: USACE is currently has national contracts for ice and potable bottled water and regional contracts for emergency power, debris removal and disposal and temporary roofing</p>					
<p>Long-Term Goal III: Improve levee performance and address project deficiencies through a more effective inspection program. Improve our capability to provide Technical Assistance for flood mitigation technical services to state and local entities.</p> <p>Target:</p> <p>Actual Progress achieved toward goal: The newly revised EP 500-1-1 provides standardized procedures for inspection, reporting and ranking as well as the database and fields to be maintained. In addition, USACE has begun the development of a national levee database to track status of all Flood Control Works in the program, evaluation of expedite flood fight (FF) techniques and development of a FF handbook for local and State officials</p>					

2	<i>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</i>	Small Extent	Annual Performance Goals outlined below. (Program needs to develop additional outcome measures).		20%	0.1
---	--	--------------	--	--	-----	-----

<p>Key Goal I: Attain and maintain a high, consistent state of preparedness.</p> <p>Performance Target: Meetings held with all FEMA Regions, all state Emergency Services Agencies to conduct action planning for predominant</p> <p>Actual Performance: Participate in quarterly Regional Interagency Steering Committee meetings with all ten FEMA Regions. Conduct annual FEMA/USACE RAP(Remedial Action Plan) meeting with reps from all levels within both organizations. Conduct Regional Response Workshops with Federal State and local stakeholders to address key issues. Assigned lead USACE district to each state to facilitate required action planning.</p>					
<p>Key Goal II: Attain and maintain a high, consistent state of preparedness.</p> <p>Performance Target: 95% of all Federal and non-Federal levees are inspected as per funded and scheduled annual work plan requirements. 90% of all identified deficiencies are corrected prior to next flood season.</p> <p>Actual Performance: USACE has begun development of a national levee database to track status of all FLOOD CONTROL WORKS. Revised EP500-1-1 provides consistent standards for levee inspection program.</p>					
<p>Key Goal III: Provide leadership to ensure effective and efficient long-term recovery with emphasis on the nation's water resources</p>					

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
			Performance Target: 90% of key response personnel at all command levels have been trained, exercised or have managed a disaster within last year. Actual Performance: Successful conduct of Senior Leadership Seminar, Regional Response Workshops and Division and District training and exercise program.			
			Footnote: Performance targets should reference the performance baseline and years, e.g. achieve a 5% increase over base of X in 2000.			
3	<i>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</i>	Yes	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 Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies program and helps to better define and implement program goals. USACE combined the Tactical Support Center and Readiness Support Center to leverage resources and capabilities into one organization. ACI initiative has help save money during disaster response.	Advanced Contract Initiative saved 22% on ice and 17% on water costs. Leveraging national teams saves training costs. Combining the two centers saved approximately \$500K annually.	20%	0.2
4	<i>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?</i>	Yes	The FCCE program is similar to other emergency programs in that it provides supplemental assistance to state/local interests. However, the assistance provided in flood response and recovery, advance measures, emergency water supply and rehabilitation of FLOOD CONTROL WORKS 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.	USACE role in support of the FRP. USACE authorities outlined in ER500-1-1 and EP 500-1-1.	20%	0.2
5	<i>Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</i>	Yes	USACE was assessed as "effective" citing "Consistently high performance" by OMB on the President's FY03 Report Card.	OMB President's Report Card. The USACE/FEMA "Remedial Action Program"/ Post-disaster workshops identified issues/ resolved problems so USACE can better achieve results.	20%	0.2
Total Section Score					100%	80%

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%

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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).

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

Section Scores				Overall 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.

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.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

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.

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:

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

- 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.
- 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,

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

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

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

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

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	0.1		
2005	0.5		

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	
2003	1:1	1:2.0	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program

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
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

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%	
2003	>70%	56%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program

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
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%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program

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 to 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
2004	>20%		
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	0.1		
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	0.1		
2005	1		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: USACE Regulatory Program
Agency: Corps of Engineers-Civil Works
Bureau: Regulatory Program

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	0.05		
2005	0.25		