

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

EC 11-2-202
Change 2

CECW-ID

Circular
No. 11-2-202

6 June 2012

Army Programs
CORPS OF ENGINEERS CIVIL WORKS DIRECT PROGRAM
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT GUIDANCE
FISCAL YEAR 2014

1. Change 2 to EC 11-2-202, 31 March 2012, updates and revises information in the document and is annotated as follows:

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page(s)</u>	<u>Paragraph(s)</u>
MAIN	i and ii	Table Of Contents
MAIN (Section 2)	2-2 thru 2-5	2.

FOR THE COMMANDER:



STEVEN L. STOCKTON, P.E.
Director of Civil Works

CECW-ID

Circular
No. 11-2-202

6 June 2012

Army Programs
CORPS OF ENGINEERS CIVIL WORKS DIRECT PROGRAM
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT GUIDANCE
FISCAL YEAR 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subject	Paragraph	Page
SECTION 1		
Purpose.....	1.....	1-1
Applicability.....	2.....	1-2
Distribution Statement.....	3.....	1-2
References.....	4.....	1-2
Conventions.....	5.....	1-2
Program Development – Special Policy, Guidance and Initiatives for FY 14.....	6.....	1-2
Performance Based Budgeting.....	7.....	1-3
Budget Policy.....	8.....	1-4
Reports to Congress.....	9.....	1-10
Contracts and Budget Development.....	10.....	1-11
Systems/Watersheds.....	11.....	1-12
Multi-year Funding Streams for Civil Works Programs.....	12.....	1-13
Cost Estimating for Civil Works Studies/Projects.....	13.....	1-14
Project Economics.....	14.....	1-15
Budget Data Submissions.....	15.....	1-17
Justification Materials and Congressional Books.....	16.....	1-23
Balance-to Complete Report.....	17.....	1-28
Certification and Verification of Compliance Requirements.....	18.....	1-28
Budget Development Coordination.....	19.....	1-31
Deviations, Errors and Improvements to EC 11-2-202.....	20.....	1-31
SECTION 2		
CW Budget Transformation - Top-Down Approach to Budget Formulation.....	1.....	2-1
CW Budget Transformation - Systems Approach to Budget Formulation.....	2.....	2-2
CW Planning Modernization - Feasibility Study Program Execution/Delivery ..	3.....	2-7

TABLE OF CONTENTS
 (Continued)

GLOSSARY	Glossary - 1
TABLES	
	Table Page
Cost Estimate Update Rates	1 1-32
Summary of Submission Requirements	2 1-32
Codes	3 1-32
<i>Watershed Pilot Funding Levels</i>	4 2-9
ILLUSTRATIONS	
	Illustration Page
Certification of Compliance with Section 3(D) of Executive Order 12906 and Paragraph 8.j. of ER 1110-1-8156.....	1 1-33
Certification of Compliance with Coastal Barrier Resources Act	2A..... 1-34
Certification of Compliance with Coastal Barrier Resources Act	2B..... 1-35
Management Control Evaluation Checklist.....	3 1-36
Certification of Use of Management Control Evaluation Checklist	4 1-42
Verification of Compliance with ER 1105-2-100 for BCR Updates	5A..... 1-43
Construction Project-level Data Sheet for BCR Updates.....	5B..... 1-44
Sample Management Control Evaluation Checklist	6 1-44
Glossary of Acronyms	7... Glossary 15
APPENDICES	
	Page
Appendix A References.....	A-1
Appendix B Homeland Security/Emergency Management.....	B-1
Appendix C Environment.....	C-1
Appendix D Flood Risk Management.....	D-1
Appendix E Hydropower.....	E-1
Appendix F Navigation	F-1
Appendix G Recreation	G-1
Appendix H Regulatory	H-1
Appendix I Water Supply.....	I-1
ANNEXES	
	Page
Annex I Investigations and MR&T Investigations	I-1
Annex II Construction and MR&T Construction.....	II-1
Annex III Operation & Maintenance and MR&T Operation & Maintenance	III-1
Annex IV Expenses	IV-1
Annex V Revolving Fund - Plant Replacement and Improvement Program (PRIP)	V-1
Annex VI Automation Program.....	VI-1

EC 11-2-202
Change 2
6 Jun 12

During the FY 2013 Budget Briefings to the Office of Management and Budget, the Corps examiners learned of our efforts and encouraged us to continue the approach for future Budget Development efforts.

b. *Guidance.* During the development of the FY 2014 Budget Development, CECW-ID will work with the DCG, C&EO to identify which Business Lines will develop criteria to support the assessment of individual work packages and implement a top-down budgeting approach for the FY 2015 Budget Development, in parallel with the normal performance-based budget submission.

2. CW Budget Transformation – Watershed/System Approach to Budget Formulation.

a. *Intent.* Each MSC is directed to select one watershed/system within their geographic boundaries and develop a pilot “watershed-based budget”. For the purpose of this exercise, a ‘watershed-based budget’ is defined as a sustainable, five-year set of prioritized and performance-based project-level investment options. Development of these investment options must include collaboration with and input from community, state, federal, Tribal and non-governmental stakeholders, thus providing the broad-based support and leveraging of resources for the watershed/system activities that will be proposed for Federal funding each year. Each pilot budget must be developed in parallel with the normal budget development process and must not impact the MSC FY14 budget submission scheduled for 29 June 2012.

b. *Purpose.* Re-thinking how best to prioritize and finance water resource investments for the 21st century has become a necessity given the fiscal restraints the Nation is currently facing and will continue to face for the foreseeable future. In this regard, a watershed/system-based approach:

(1) *ensures proposed investment options are integrated into a whole that preserves and enhances performance and sustainability at the system level.*

(2) *requires team thinking about water resources development and management in the context of multiple purposes rather than single purposes and thus facilitates the search for comprehensive and integrated solutions.*

(3) *considers the investment needs and priorities of all the business programs within the watershed/system.*

(4) *focuses on funding the highest performing, highest priority projects to achieve the water resource needs of the watershed/system.*

(5) may fund lower performing projects at a level below that needed to perform the project's authorized purposes.

(6) improves opportunities for public and private groups to identify and achieve common goals by unifying on-going efforts and leveraging resources.

c. General.

(1) MSCs must develop analytical perspectives to determine the mix of investments in maintenance, operations, improvements, reallocations, major rehabilitation, new construction, planning, and design activities that will maximize system performance, safety, reliability and sustainability over time.

(2) Building the MSC pilot watershed/system budget must be established around the National Watershed Vision (NWV) concept and be tied to the National Priorities/Goals and National Objectives provided below. The NWV establishes the watershed concept as a "forcing function" for integrating Local, State, Tribal and Federal water resource efforts, focusing on the effects or outcomes of efforts for each watershed/system.

(3) A watershed/system approach identifies the feasible, acceptable and suitable alternatives which align and integrate political, technical, and fiscal strategies needed to maximize watershed/system performance and sustainability at the system level.

(4) Use of the National Priorities/Goals described below are paramount to developing the "pilots". However, they have not been formally approved for the FY 14 Budget. Dialogue with Army and the Office of Management and Budget must still occur to confirm/update them.

(a) DRAFT National Priorities/Goals:

- Provide for the National Defense*
- Continue to Reduce the Deficit*
- Create Jobs and Restore the Economy*
- Improve Resiliency and Safety of Communities and Water Resource Infrastructure*
- Restore and Protect the Environment*
- Maintain Global Competitiveness*
- Increase Energy Independence thru Renewable Energy*
- Improve Quality of Life*
- Support Research and Innovation That Lead to New American Jobs and New American Industries*

(b) DRAFT National Objectives:

- *Support National Defense at Home and Abroad*
- *Recapitalize, operate and maintain water resource infrastructure and a reliable waterborne transportation system to provide maximum benefit to the Nation*
- *Develop, Restore and Protect the Nation's waters, wetlands, and related natural resources*
 - *Reduce the risks of flooding and build the Nation's response capabilities to extreme events*
 - *Improve federal energy, water, and petroleum efficiency, managing, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions toward agency-defined targets*
 - *Double exports from FY2010 to FY2015*
 - *Provide reliable, renewable hydropower benefits to the nation*

d. Short-term Goal. The short term goal of this effort is to develop a watershed/system budget development process for one watershed/system in each MSC. The different approaches taken by each MSC will be compared and analyzed by HQ with the "best in class" to assist in the formulation of future budget development guidance. The focus will be on transforming the Civil Works budget process by incorporating National goals and objectives and a watershed/system approach.

e. Long-term Goal. The long term goals of this effort are to:

- (1) better align and defend proposed investment options in a more comprehensive and integrated manner;*
- (2) better identify benefits and outputs that are performance-based, address the highest priority issues within the watershed/system and are of the highest value to the nation;*
- (3) evaluate how the proposed investment options integrate or complement ongoing or proposed actions of other Federal water resource agencies, Tribes, state, local governments, our partners and other non-federal bodies;*
- (4) increase transparency of MSC involvement in development of the budget and*
- (5) develop a sustainable multi-year program, identifying essential investment options required to reach each watershed/system's goals and objectives.*

f. Guidance. The FY14 MSC pilot watershed/system budget development process will enable HQUSACE to evaluate different approaches to assist in the formulation of future budget development guidance.

(1) General. The MSC pilot watershed/system budget must include a five-year sustainable plan/program that meets national priorities with a focus on effects of funding decisions for each watershed/system. These project-level investment options will:

(a) compete for funds across multiple Corps Business Lines;

(b) will include funding for studies/projects in the Investigations, Construction, and O&M Accounts;

(c) be built in increments and funding levels using work packages to ensure they are performance based; and

(d) must be translatable to Corps Business Lines so that they may compete for annual funding as MSC requirements within the annual MSC budget submission.

(2) Stakeholder Input. Input from other Federal agencies, states, Tribes, and other stakeholders will be critical in the development of both a baseline watershed/system assessment and associated watershed/system priorities to ensure that Corps actions are integrated with other stakeholder actions in the watershed/system in order to maximize outputs from a watershed/system perspective. Watershed/system priorities should link to National Priorities/Goals and National Objectives (see above) and be developed based on the unique aspects of the each watershed/system. As part of the MSC submission to HQUSACE, each MSC must document the linkage to the National goals and objectives, as well as how stakeholder input was obtained and how this input shaped the overall watershed/system prioritization. This documentation must be submitted in a Microsoft Word format that is developed by the MSC.

(3) Funding Level Definitions: The establishment of well-defined funding levels will enable wise investment decisions across business lines and watershed/systems. Funding levels must fully describe what is attained relative to the requirements and outcomes for achieving the National Priorities/Goals and National Objectives. Proposed funding for each Funding level must be based on requirements and outcomes, and not "salami sliced" across all projects or Business Lines. These outcomes must support/align with the National Priorities/Goals and National Objectives in a demonstrable and defensible way. This demonstrated support /alignment will be included in the MSC's briefing on their budget. MSC's may consider applying the already-developed National BL-specific strategies and performance measures to their MSC "as a demonstrable and defensible way." This approach must ensure that investment decisions are based on the highest performing, highest priority projects within the watershed/system that contribute towards achieving the established priorities of the watershed/system. The following is a general description of the funding levels.

EC 11-2-202
Change 2
6 Jun 12

Additional guidance defining the type of Business Line activities that may be funded for each Funding level is documented in Table 4 Watershed Pilot Funding Levels.

(a) Level 1. The Baseline funding level to accomplish the minimum level of effort necessary (i.e., critical life safety, priority projects/studies, priority Business Lines) to maintain benefits that contribute to obtaining the National Priorities/Goals for the watershed/system.

(b) Level 2. Consists of the additional budget items above Level 1 funding that should consist of logical, HIGH PRIORITY items of work that contribute to the National Priorities/Goals for the watershed/system. The basis for adding items of work will be demonstrable beneficial impact resulting from accelerating project completion and/or improved performance, such as cost savings achieved by combining work items OR MORE EFFICIENTLY FUNDING COMPLETION. For O&M projects, the cumulative of Level 1 and 2 cannot exceed 90 percent of the average 5-year average for the watershed/system.

(c) Level 3. Consists of the Recommended funding level of effort/requirements for specific studies and projects within the watershed/system to meet the watershed/system priorities relative to the National Priorities/Goals and National Objectives.

(d) Level 4. The Capability funding level for studies and projects to fully meet the watershed/system's priorities relative to the National Priorities/Goals and National Objectives. The capability funding level is the amount that can be accomplished within the PY, and not based on individual study or project capability funding levels.

(4) Ranking Criteria. To ensure the highest priority work is identified, budget items should be based on the performance components and ranking criteria shown in each Business Line Appendix, and documented in the reference memorandum that will allow the development of a performance based budget that can be prioritized across Business Lines and Accounts.

(5) Five Year Plan. In order to formulate long term funding strategies, a Five Year Plan is required. The plan must be based on out-year requirements to meet the watershed/system priorities relative to the National Priorities/Goals and National Objectives. The Five Year Plan is to be documented for each study and project funding requirements by Funding level to document the out-year requirements. It is to include a recommendation on new start studies, project/study phases, and new start construction projects.

g. Submission Requirements:

(1) Each MSC will submit to CECW-ID a Pilot Watershed/System Budget by 31 July. The submission should maximize the use of the fiscal year 2014 Business Line spreadsheets. Information shall include:

(a) a ranking of work packages for each BL in the watershed/system. For ease in prioritizing, the Funding Level is to be documented in the Army Rank Column, with the ranking included in the Presidential Rank Column,

(b) ranking explanations;

(c) a watershed/system presentation, and

(d) a 5-year funding plan.

(e) Each MSC will submit an explanation of how they used the business line Program Objectives to determine the metric scores for the National Priorities/Goals for each incremental and funding level investment. The explanation should be comprehensive enough to allow an understanding of how metric scores were developed.

(2) During the first week of October each MSC will present their FY14 MSC Pilot Watershed/System Budgets. The presentation will emphasize how the incremental investments for the MSC's watershed/system support/align with the National Priorities/Goals and Objectives in a demonstrable and defensible way.

3. CW Planning Modernization – Feasibility Study Program Execution/Delivery.

a. In FY 2011, USACE initiated a significant effort aimed at improving Feasibility Program delivery, the reclassification and reset of feasibility Studies. The purpose of this initiative is to review all ongoing, protracted feasibility studies and reclassify to inactive those studies with limited likelihood of success so that we can focus our limited resources upon studies with the highest probability of success. Though significant progress was made in FY 2011, 288 of 653 ongoing feasibility studies were identified as eligible to be reclassified as inactive and there remains 350 active feasibility studies and another 68 feasibility studies ongoing for greater than 10 years.

b. CW Planning Modernization must focus on the highest performing projects and programs within the main water resources missions of the Corps by providing optimal funding and facilitating timely completions. This must be accomplished in concert with the creation of savings and efficiencies through reducing the portfolio of active studies.

EC 11-2-202
Change 2
6 Jun 12

The Corps has an unprecedented opportunity to better align our internal processes a our project development portfolio with National priorities to support a CW Program that is responsive to the changing needs of the Nation. The modernization of the CW Planning Program is one of the main focus areas for the transformation of the CW Program and is the responsibility of the Planning Community of Practice and all Commanders to execute.

c. Previously funded studies that have not received appropriations (to include work plans) in FY 10, 11, or 12 or are not in the FY13 Presidents Budget may not be proposed for funding in the FY 14 budget submission *unless the MSC has made a compelling case as to why the study should continue to be “active” in the 30 April 2012 data submission to HQ.* (NOTE: use of the word “appropriations (to include work plans)” and “or” in the statement above provides clarification to the original 8 Feb 2012 memorandum from the DCG, CEO).

TABLE 4 - WATERSHED PILOT FUNDING LEVELS

Funding Level	Account	Business Line					
		NAV	FRM	HYD	ENR/ENS	REC	WS
1	Investigations	- Initial increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Initial increment of work for continuing PED projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - No New Starts & New Phases	- Initial increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Initial increment of work for continuing PED projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - No New Starts & New Phases	- Initial increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Initial increment of work for continuing PED projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - No New Starts & New Phases	- Initial increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Initial increment of work for continuing PED projects of ecosystems of national significance. - No New Starts & New Phases	N/A	- Initial increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Initial increment of work for continuing PED projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - No New Starts & New Phases
	Construction	- Minimum requirements to meet critical life safety requirements. - Initial increment of work for continuing Construction projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - Fully fund continuing Dam Safety Assurance Project requirements for high priority/life safety projects. - No new Start projects.	- Minimum requirements to meet critical life safety requirements. - Initial increment of work for continuing Construction projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - Fully fund continuing Dam Safety Assurance Project requirements for high priority/life safety projects. - No new Start projects.	- Minimum requirements to meet critical life safety requirements. - Initial increment of work for continuing Construction projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - Fully fund continuing Dam Safety Assurance Project requirements for high priority/life safety projects. - No new Start projects.	- Initial increment of work for continuing Construction projects with ecosystems of national significance. - No New Start Projects.	N/A	N/A
	O&M	- Minimum funding requirements of High Use Projects. Includes minimal funding requirements for operation and routine maintenance activities to achieve safe operations. - Minimum funding to meet legal mandates. - Minimum life safety requirements. - No advance maintenance dredging. - No Moderate, Low, or Subsistent Harbors.	- Minimum level of routine and cyclical service operations costs. - Routine Dam Safety Maintenance. - Minimum funding for activities required to meet legal mandates - Minimum life safety requirements.	- Minimum funding requirements for minimum operation and critical routine and cyclical maintenance to ensure no forced outages. - Minimum funding for activities required to meet legal mandates. - Minimum life safety requirements.	- Minimum funding requirements for violation of Federal-State laws, and to prevent the loss of significant natural and cultural resources - Minimum funding for activities required to meet legal mandates. - Minimum life safety requirements.	- Minimum funding requirements for parks categorized as High Service Level. - Minimum funding for activities required to meet legal mandates. - Minimum life safety requirements.	- Minimal funding levels required to administer existing water supply contracts. - Minimum funding for activities required to meet legal mandates. - Minimum life safety requirements.
2	Investigations	- Next added increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Next added increment of work for continuing PED projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - No New Starts & New Phases	- Next added increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Next added increment of work for continuing PED projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - No New Starts & New Phases	- Next added increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Next added increment of work for continuing PED projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - No New Starts & New Phases	- Next added increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Next added increment of work for continuing PED projects of ecosystems of national significance. - No New Starts & New Phases	N/A	- Next added increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Next added increment of work for continuing PED projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - No New Starts & New Phases
	Construction	- Next added increment of work for continuing Construction Projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - No new Start projects.	- Next added increment of work for continuing Construction Projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - No new Start projects.	- Next added increment of work for continuing Construction Projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - No new Start projects.	- Next added increment of work for continuing Construction Projects ecosystems of national significance. - No new Start projects.	N/A	N/A
	O&M	Cumulative of Funding Level 1 and 2 Not to exceed 90% of 5-year average - 100% scheduled O&M for High Use Projects. - Advance maintenance dredging only for high priority projects. - 75% scheduled O&M for Moderate use Projects. - Minimum dredging requirement for Low Use, or Subsistence Harbors.	Cumulative of Funding Level 1 and 2 Not to exceed 90% of 5-year average: - Funding not to exceed 90% of annual requirements for: - Critical Operation and ongoing non-routine maintenance activities that will improve project OCA.	Cumulative of Funding Level 1 and 2 Not to exceed 90% of 5-year average: - Funding not to exceed 90% of annual requirements for: - Next added increment to include critical non-routine activities. - Funding to meet NERC reliability requirements.	Cumulative of Funding Level 1 and 2 Not to exceed 90% of 5-year average: - Funding not to exceed 90% of annual requirements for: - Fully fund requirements for prevention of the loss of significant natural and cultural resources - Prevention of violation of legal requirements.	Cumulative of Funding Level 1 and 2 Not to exceed 90% of 5-year average: - Funding not to exceed 90% for: - Additional funding requirements Critical, time-sensitive, least-cost activities at parks categorized as High Service Level. - Additional costs a to support continuing the current level of service for parks categorized as Medium Service Level.	Cumulative of Funding Level 1 and 2 Not to exceed 90% of 5-year average: - Funding level for renegotiation of existing water supply contract renewals. - Initial funding level for continuing reallocation studies.

TABLE 4 - WATERSHED PILOT FUNDING LEVELS

Funding Level	Account	Business Line					
		NAV	FRM	HYD	ENR/ENS	REC	WS
3	Investigations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next added increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Next added increment of work for continuing PED projects with BCR > 2.5 @7%. - First increment of work for PED projects with BCR < 2.5 with significant outputs from a watershed perspective. - New Start Reconnaissance Studies & New PED Phases with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next added increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Next added increment of work for continuing PED projects with BCR > 2.5 @7%. - First increment of work for PED projects with BCR < 2.5 with significant outputs from a watershed perspective. - New Start Reconnaissance Studies & New PED Phases with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next added increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Next added increment of work for continuing PED projects with BCR > 2.5 @7%. - First increment of work for PED projects with BCR < 2.5 with significant outputs from a watershed perspective. - New Start Reconnaissance Studies & New PED Phases with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next added increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Next added increment of work for continuing PED projects of ecosystems of national significance. - New Starts Reconnaissance Studies a& New Phases 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next added increment of work for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Next added increment of work for continuing PED projects with BCR > 2.5 @7%. - New Start Reconnaissance Studies & New PED Phases with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%..
	Construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next added increment of work for continuing Construction Projects with BCR > 2.5 at 7%. - First increment of work for projects with BCR < 2.5 with significant outputs from a watershed perspective. - Initial increment of work for continuing Construction Projects with BCR > 1 @7% - New Start Construction Projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next added increment of work for continuing Construction Projects with BCR > 2.5 at 7%. - First increment of work for projects with BCR < 2.5 with significant outputs from a watershed perspective. - Initial increment of work for continuing Construction Projects with BCR > 1 @7% - New Start Construction Projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next added increment of work for continuing Construction Projects with BCR > 2.5 at 7%. - First increment of work for projects with BCR < 2.5 with significant outputs from a watershed perspective. - Initial increment of work for continuing Construction Projects with BCR > 1 @7% - New Start Construction Projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next added increment of work for continuing Construction Projects of ecosystems of national significance. - New Start Construction Projects of ecosystems of national significance. 	N/A	N/A
	O&M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next added increment of O&M for High Use Projects to include advance maintenance dredging. - 100% of scheduled O&M for Moderate Use projects. - Minimum dredging requirement for Low Use, or Subsistence Harbors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next added increment of O&M to fund scheduled routine & non-routine maintenance items that will improve project OCA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next added increment of work to include major maintenance activities that are needed to sustain the expected future benefits of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fully fund requirements for prevention of the loss of significant natural and cultural resources - Prevention of violation of legal requirements. - Minimum funding to conduct scheduled ENS activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fully fund requirements Critical, time-sensitive, least-cost activities at parks categorized as High Service Level. - Additional costs to support continuing the current level of Service for parks categorized as Low Service Level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next increment of work for continuing reallocation studies. - New start reallocation studies.
4	Investigations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Capability funding for continuing and new PED projects consistent with Administration policy. - Studies & PED projects not consistent with policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Capability funding for continuing and new PED projects consistent with Administration policy. - Studies & PED projects not consistent with policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Capability funding for continuing and new PED projects consistent with Administration policy. - Studies & PED projects not consistent with policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Capability funding for continuing and new PED projects consistent with Administration policy. - Studies & PED projects not consistent with policy. 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding for continuing studies incorporating the new Planning Paradigm. - Capability funding for continuing PED projects with BCR > 2.5 @ 7%. - Studies & PED projects not consistent with policy.
	Construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding for all continuing and new start Construction Projects consistent with Administration policy. - Projects not consistent with policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding for all continuing and new start Construction Projects consistent with Administration policy. - Projects not consistent with policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding for all continuing and new start Construction Projects consistent with Administration policy. - Projects not consistent with policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding for all continuing and new start Construction Projects consistent with Administration policy. - Projects not consistent with policy. 	N/A	N/A
	O&M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding for High Use Projects. - Capability funding for Low Use or Subsistence Harbors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding of routine and non-routine and that are needed to sustain the expected future benefits of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability funding level for administration or renewal of water supply contracts. - Capability funding level for reallocation studies.