



HSDRRS COA Decision

"... we are on a burning platform – failure is not an option." - BG Michael J. Walsh, 26 Sept 08

Building Strong







Obtain a regional decision on the concept to deliver the HSDRRS by 2011

Building Strong



Problem Statement



Problem: MVN / HPO do not have enough resources to complete the HSDRRS on or ahead of schedule.

Solution: Maximize use of Regional / National resources needed to accomplish the mission.







- US Government commitment to 100 yr LOP in 2011 (USACE Operational Goal is June 2011).
- HPO organized as PM heavy with limited technical staff reliant on A/E, U5 and MVN.
- PRO draws most of its Technical Support from MVN.
- Extensive A/E support contracts are in place and are fundamental to program execution
- Design Criteria is mostly established, but interpretation / methods of analysis (sometimes even acceptance) are lagging – result is lack of consensus.
- Design decisions are the biggest threat to execution
- While design effort is critical now, real estate, environmental, contracting and construction effort will ramp up over time.
- Hurricane Gustav has heightened the urgency to deliver the HSDRRS many calls for 2010 completion.
- QA Review / COL Lee Letter recommendations can be spread across all COAs (or mixed and matched)
- Senior PM remains local in all COAs
- There are more requirements than resources within MVN / HPO
- Regional Technical Experts remain technical specialists in all proposed COAs
- MVD resources will require augmentation from outside the region



Assumptions



- Regional prioritizing across all Districts is an imperative
- Necessary funding to accomplish projects / program exists
- Additional funding not likely.
- No time extension of the 2011 completion date
- Current Org Structure remains in effect until 2010 2011 timeframe
- One Corps no "them" vs "us"
- Additional resources are available outside MVD to narrow resource gap
- IOT meet June 2011 deadline, there will be engineering effort before, during and after construction (declining respectively over time).



COA 3: COA 2 and Project Transfer



- HPO obtains design effort by polder from U5 / USACE as depicted above (each U5 District has an AO). PM relies on A/E and U5 TM to orchestrate design effort IOT deliver P/S on time. Minimize future reach-back requirements to MVN-ED
- PRO / MVN Civil Works obtains primary design effort from MVN-ED. U5 backup support for distinct projects (or parts of projects) provided by MVR. PM relies on MVN-ED TM to orchestrate design effort IOT deliver P/S on time. Ongoing U5 design effort for existing projects continues until that design feature is complete.
- In addition to above MVD transfers complete project responsibility (minus senior PM responsibility which would remain in HPO / MVN) of projects to U5 Districts (see examples above)



Advantages:

- Establishes U5 Command geographic responsibility.
- Enables District Chain of Command to prioritize resources
- Forces regional prioritization.
- Provides model for other functional areas
- Reduces competition for resources among MVN, HPO, & U5 (C2).
- Engages District elements in addition to E&C.
- Allows MVN to focus on remaining HSDRRS mission.
- Establishes a model for transferring projects outside the division.

Disadvantages:

- Assignments could disrupt functioning HSDRRS teams in the short term.
- Major assignments will impact ongoing CW's project priorities at each District.
- Transfer of non-HDRSS project diffuses effort on HSDRRS





- Course of Action 3 is approved
- Chief of Engineering in assigned District has authority for approval of that engineering product
- Districts backbrief BG Walsh/RCC/RMB NLT 2 wks
- QA Report and Rapid Improvement Event Memo Results out to field/COE
- Key Messages:
- ➤Our HSDRRS mission is # 1 district priority
- ➤We will deliver by June 2011
- ➤30 months and counting...
- >We got it, we own it, we believe
- Balance system needs and adjust delivery model