



## Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

October 4, 2005

### MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM:

*James T. Campbell*  
SUSAN J. GRANT  
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

SUBJECT:

Call for Fiscal Year 2005 Support Cost by Functional Activity

This memorandum and attachments provide guidance for reporting FY 2005 Support Cost by Functional Activity (SCFA). The Office of the Chief Financial Officer collects and analyzes support cost information from contractors operating 28 Department sites. This information is classified into 22 functional categories and enables the Department to identify and better analyze the cost of supporting mission programs. This information also reveals the magnitude and trends underlying specific activities.

Specific details regarding submission of support cost data are in the attachments, including sites required to submit information and procedures for submitting and certifying data. User logon ID's and passwords will be provided to each Federal contact in November. Your electronic submission is to be completed by December 16, 2005. A certified hard copy is to be submitted to the Office of Internal Review (CF-1.2, GTN) by December 23, 2005.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has completed an audit of FY 2004 SCFA data and cost saving initiatives. The GAO is expected to issue a report of their findings later this month. Any follow-up recommendations or additional actions that are required will be distributed at that time.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this report, please contact John Newell, Director, Office of Internal Review, on (202) 586-8921. Technical questions and final submissions should be directed to Ben Chatterson ([Ben.Chatterson@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Ben.Chatterson@hq.doe.gov)) or Richard Heller ([Richard.Heller@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Richard.Heller@hq.doe.gov)), SCFA Team Leaders. Both Ben and Richard can be contacted on (301) 903-2551.

Attachments



Printed with soy ink on recycled paper

Distribution

**FIELD CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICERS**

**Chicago Operations Office**

**Environmental Management Consolidated Business Center**

**Golden Field Office**

**Idaho Operations Office**

**National Energy Technology Laboratory**

**National Nuclear Security Administration Service Center**

**Oak Ridge Operations Office**

**Pittsburgh Naval Reactors Office**

**Richland Operations Office**

**Savannah River Operations Office**

**Schenectady Naval Reactors Office**

**Strategic Petroleum Reserve Project Office**

bcc:

**Bob Meyers, NNSA AL**  
**Cort McCammon, ID**  
**Jim Crytzer, OR**  
**Lisa Maul, OH**  
**Lance Schlag, EMCBC**  
**Thomas Fekete, SR**  
**Tim Rea, Golden**  
**Martin Straka, CH**  
**Kay Mamiya, RL**  
**Sharon Weiss, SPRO**  
**Michael Cunningham, PNR/SNR**

## Department of Energy Support Cost by Functional Activity Report Guidance

This attachment provides overall guidance for preparation of the Support Cost by Functional Activity Report, including procedures for submitting and certifying the data. Field offices are responsible for the quality of the data, including support cost categories, site profiles and cost-saving initiatives.

### Sites Required to Report

Support costs are to be reported for all contractors listed on page 6 of this attachment. Reported costs for Management and Integrating (M&I) contractors should reflect the total site and incorporate all prime subcontractors.

### Report Certification

A certification (Attachment 2) must be signed and submitted from each responsible Field CFO. The certification is to ensure that the support cost categories, site profiles and cost saving initiatives are accurate.

### Reporting of Support Cost and Mission Specific Cost

For purposes of determining functional cost, contractors will classify their cost as either mission specific or as support cost. Mission Specific costs are classified in two categories: Capital/Construction and Mission Specific Operating. Support costs are classified as 22 Functional Support cost elements grouped under three categories: General, Mission, and Site Specific. Classification of cost shall be determined without regard to funding source, or classification as direct or indirect cost. In addition, costs are reported on a prime basis, rather than fully distributed cost. Do not report fully loaded costs for either mission direct or support areas. Since most accounting systems lose the identity of distributed cost, it is essential to classify the cost in the defined categories prior to distributions.

Report FY 2004 actual costs by functional support cost element for each of the major categories using the exact structure and formats provided in the Functional Cost Web Page (<https://scfa.doe.gov>).

Functional support costs should be identified as much as possible using the contractors' existing accounting systems and overlaying financial structure. This structure may be organization, work breakdown structure, cost type, or a combination. In any case, reported costs need to be traceable (through mapping) to the accounting records, either directly or by using standard reconciliation methods, and reconcilable to the total site costs shown in the Standard Accounting and Reporting System (STARS).

Costs are reported by functional classification regardless of fund source. For example, costs for Environmental Support and for Maintenance are reported in the respective functional support element, and are not included in the mission direct category. Therefore, Mission Direct costs for the environmental program do not include costs for environmental support, maintenance, etc. Many direct funded activities may be classified in a "support" cost category rather than as "mission direct" cost.

Reported data should also be based on gross costs; miscellaneous cash reimbursements or other collections should be ignored.

When reporting costs, please note that payroll taxes and benefits will follow labor dollars. Materials, travel, etc., should be reported in the functional support element that consumes the resource, and prime capital and construction costs will be reported as a separate category.

The contractors actually performing the work will report costs incurred for work performed between other field offices and DOE contractors. This includes work between contractors at a site and reimbursable inter-contractor work orders.

Functional support costs that are normally paid by a contractor, but that are actually being paid by a field office, are to be included in the report in the appropriate category(s).

#### Service Centers

Service Centers pose unique problems in reporting functional support costs because of their characteristics. There is no single best way to report them. Given that a consistent approach needs to be taken, please report all Service Center costs within the functional support element to which they most directly relate (even though many of these costs are subsequently charged directly to a program). Service center costs that do not fit one of the other 22 elements should be included in Laboratory/Technical Support.

#### Taxes

In the past, the amount reported for Taxes was significantly less than the true amount of our tax expenditure, and it was necessary to revise your submissions. We understand that Sales and Use taxes are spread through all cost categories and separating them for reclassification to the Taxes category might be a draconian task. Given increased outside interest in this category, please continue to review the amounts you have identified as taxes. If these amounts are not up to at least a 90-percent accuracy level, then it is assumed some taxes are being reflected in functional cost categories other than taxes and you are asked to do the following:

1. **Non-Sales/Use Taxes:** For all taxes except for sales and use taxes, provide as a part of your site profile an amount for all other taxes for each year that is at least at the 90-percent level of accuracy for these non-sales/use taxes. Furthermore, because the effect on total functional support costs should be zero, if you do have any of this type of tax included outside the tax category, it will be necessary to reduce some other categories by the same amount as that reclassified to taxes. Therefore, as a part of your site profile, provide the amounts by category, which must be reduced so that the net adjustment will equal zero. The HQ CFO will enter any prior-year adjustments.
2. **Sales and Use taxes:** Please make a rough estimate of the total site amount of Sales and Use tax that was not previously reflected in the tax category. Provide this information as a part of your site profile. We will not adjust the various categories for these Sales and Use tax amounts.

For FY 2005, please ensure that the tax line includes all non-sales/use taxes and that your site profile includes a rough estimate of total site sales/use tax. As with all the functional support cost categories, please be sure to fully explain, as a part of your site profile, any significant changes in the tax category.

#### **Data Collection**

The FY 2005 functional cost data will again be collected through a web-based input form. The current link is <https://scfa.doe.gov>

Richard Heller (301-903-4422) will control access to log on to the system at each site. A login ID and password will be provided to each field site contact from the FY 2004 report. Additional IDs can be made available upon request.

Your electronic submission is to be completed by December 16, 2005. A certified hard copy is to be submitted to the Office of Internal Review (CF-1.2, GTN) by December 23, 2005.

## Site Profiles

The purpose of the site profile is to assist in HQ understanding of the submissions and to help with the defense of department-wide total functional support costs before Congress. The site profile should be as succinct as possible (preferably not more than two pages) and should be understandable by a reader relatively unfamiliar with your site.

The site profile will include three sections: Background, Trends, and Cost Saving Initiatives.

**Background** - In this section, provide a very brief description of the mission of the site and the physical characteristics of the site (such as size in square miles, approximate number of buildings, size of the workforce, etc.). This section may either be textual or a list of bullets.

**Trends** - Provide an explanation of:

1. The trend in total Functional Support Costs from FY 2001 to FY 2005.
2. The trend in total Functional Support Costs as a percentage of total site costs from FY 2001 to FY 2005.
3. Major anomalies in the year-to-year data for any of the categories.
4. Major cost drivers that may cause a site's costs to appear out of line with similar sites.

For each of these explanations:

1. Always include in the text the dollar amount of the change or item being explained.
2. If a revision results in changing cost between categories, show the dollar amount of change for both the gaining and losing category.

Note: During data entry, you will be prompted for an explanation whenever the cost change from the previous year exceeds 20%. Any explanation included during the data entry process does not need to be repeated for the trending section.

## **Cost Saving Initiatives**

Describe major cost savings initiatives that have been undertaken to reduce support cost. Be sure to include only those initiatives that reduced cost in FY 2005. This information should be sufficient for a reader to fully understand the scope and magnitude of the initiative and the activities impacted. In addition, your response should be adequate to assess the possibility of migrating the initiative to other DOE sites.

Information may also be presented in the form of a chart to demonstrate the impact on current and/or future savings. For example;

During FY 2005, XYZ Site entered into a 3-year agreement with Fly Away Travel Agency to obtain a 15 percent discount on travel arrangements made through its agency. During FY 2005, XYZ achieved net savings of \$500,000. Savings in FY 2005 were reduced by an investment of \$10,000 in software necessary to develop travel itineraries compatible with Fly Away Travel Agency's travel system.

	<u>2005</u>
Savings	\$510,000
Investment	10,000
Net Savings	\$500,000

The GAO would like evidence that the Department is adequately promoting cost saving initiatives throughout all contributing locations. If you have an instance of utilizing a cost saving initiative included in an earlier Support Cost by Functional Activity report, please include the name, savings realized, and year reported by DOE in this section.

#### Peer Reviews

Peer reviews were designed by the Financial Management Systems Improvement Council (FMSIC) to enlist contractors from several DOE locations to review the functional cost methodology at another DOE site and verify that the data has been collected consistent with our established guidelines and definitions.

The GAO has questioned the Department regarding the fact that we have not gone out to all contractors and performed detailed reviews of their functional cost data. Our response has been that peer reviews are conducted within the Department and this provides us with an adequate comfort level that the data is being reviewed for accuracy, completeness, and consistency across the 28 sites that submit functional cost data.

The Department expects full cooperation regarding participation in peer reviews and strongly supports FMSIC in their efforts to schedule and monitor functional support cost peer reviews as outlined to the GAO.



## SUPPORT COST BY FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITY REPORT

SUBMITTING LOCATIONS

Ames Laboratory  
 Argonne National Laboratory  
 Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory (PNR)  
 Brookhaven National Laboratory  
 Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory  
 Hanford Site

Idaho National Lab

Kansas City Plant  
 Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory (SNR)  
 Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory  
 Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory  
 Los Alamos National Laboratory  
 National Renewable Energy Lab  
 Nevada Test Site  
 Oak Ridge Environmental Management  
 Enrichment Facility  
 Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
 Pacific Northwest National Laboratory  
 Pantex Plant  
 Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory  
 Rocky Flats Plant  
 Sandia National Laboratories  
 Savannah River Site

Strategic Petroleum Reserve  
 Stanford Linear Accelerator  
 Waste Isolation Pilot Plant  
 West Valley Demonstration Project  
 Yucca Mountain  
 Y-12 Plant

TOTAL OF 28 SUBMISSIONS

MAJOR SITE CONTRACTORS

Iowa State University  
 University of Chicago  
 Bechtel  
 Brookhaven Science Associates  
 University Research Associates  
 Fluor-Daniel  
 Bechtel Hanford Incorporated  
 CH2M Hill  
 Bechtel BWXT Idaho LLC  
 Battelle Energy Alliance  
 CH2M-WG Idaho LLC  
 Honeywell, FM&T  
 Lockheed Martin - KAPL  
 University of California  
 University of California  
 University of California  
 Midwest Research Institute  
 Bechtel Nevada

Bethel Jacobs  
 UT-Battelle, LLC  
 Battelle Memorial Institute  
 BWXT  
 Princeton University  
 Kaiser Hill  
 Lockheed Martin Sandia Corp  
 Westinghouse Electrical Corp.  
 Wachenhut Services, Inc.  
 Dyn McDermott Petroleum  
 Stanford University  
 Westinghouse Electric Corp.  
 West Valley Nuclear Services  
 Bechtel-SAIC  
 BWXT

## FY 2005 Support Cost by Functional Activity Submission

Sites:

My staff and/or I have reviewed our final Support Cost by Functional Activity submission for the sites noted above and as entered and displayed on the DOE Web Page (<https://scfa.doe.gov/>).

We believe this accurately reflects our current support cost trends, within the attached "Limitations of Support Cost." In addition, we believe the cost saving initiatives and the claimed dollar savings to be accurate.

---

CFO Signature

---

Date

Please return this signed response to:  
Richard Heller, ME-100, Germantown (301-903-4422).  
or  
([Richard.Heller@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Richard.Heller@hq.doe.gov)) if scanned into pdf format  
or  
signed copies may be faxed to 301-903-2550.

Thank you.