

Appendix H Programs Management Subplan

1. Purpose

This appendix establishes the process to assure the production of high quality Civil Works and Military documents and supplements the guidance provided in the basic South Pacific Division (CESPD) Quality Management Plan. This guidance establishes a framework of general policies and principles to achieve quality Programs Management services to meet or exceed customer requirements, and is consistent with Corps policies and regulations. The guidance includes:

Main Body of Appendix H	Quality Management of Programs Management products
Enclosure 1	Civil Works Program Development and Execution
Enclosure 2	Military Program Management

2. Applicability

This appendix applies to all activities of the Civil Works Management Division and Military Programs Division in CESPD and Districts, which are involved in the management of projects and preparation, review, and approval of program management documents.

Enclosure 1

Quality Management of Civil Works Program Development and Execution

1. Purpose

This sub-plan establishes the quality management procedures in the Civil Works Management Division in CESPD and for the districts' program and project management activities. It is intended to provide quality assurance and quality control guidance for program management products generated by the districts in the South Pacific Division (CESPD). The guidance establishes a framework of general policies and principles to assure that products are consistent with Corps policies and regulations.

2. Applicability

This appendix applies to all activities of the Civil Works Management Division, Directorate of Civil Works and Management and CESPD Districts, which are involved in the management of projects and preparation, review, and approval of program management documents. The quality management process that is established in this appendix applies to program development and execution documents produced as part of the CESPD Civil Works program:

- a. Budget Justification Statements
- b. Testimony in Response to Congressional Hearings on Energy and Water Development Appropriations
- c. Congressional Members Facts Sheets
- d. Fact Sheets for Implementation of Work Added by Congress
- e. Budgetary Documents and Data for the 10-year Program
- f. Budgetary Documents and Data for the Capability Program
- g. South Pacific Division Project Data Sheets
- h. Other Miscellaneous Documents, Including Schedules of Obligations and Expenditures and Requests for Reprogramming of Funds
- i. Project Cooperation Agreements (PCA)
- j. Design Agreements
- k. Project Management Plans (PMP)
- l. Memorandum of Agreement's (MOA)
- m. Memorandum of Understanding's (MOU)
- n. Feasibility Cost-Sharing Agreements (FCSA)

3. References

This appendix implements, or otherwise reflects, portions of the guidance presented in the following references:

3.1. Website for USACE Legal Services Model Project Cooperation Agreements,
<http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/cecc/ccpca.htm>

3.2. CECW-AG Memorandum, Model Agreement for Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED), 3 Dec 1996.

- 3.3. CECW-B/CECW-A Memorandum, Agreements for Specifically Authorized Civil Works Projects and Separable Elements Involving Non-Federal Construction Work, Advances of Non-Federal Funds, or Contributions of Non-Federal Funds for Construction in the Absence of Federal Appropriations-Guidance Memorandum, May 1998
- 3.4. CECW-L/CECW-/CECW-P Memorandum, Integration of Project Cooperation Agreements (PCA's) and Supporting Project Documents, 17 March 1994.
- 3.5. CECW-ZA Memorandum, 24 March 1999, subject: Delegation of Authority for Post-Authorization Decision Documents.
- 3.6. CESP-D-ET-P Memorandum, 20 April 1999, subject: Guidance for Post-Authorization Decision Documents
- 3.7. CESP-D-PM-M, Signature Authority, 22 May 1998
- 3.8. Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year (Budget Year 2003)
- 3.9. Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year (Budget Year 2003) Analytical Perspectives
- 3.10. Corps of Engineers Civil Works Program Guidance (Annual EC)
- 3.11. Principles and Guidelines for District Support Teams, South Pacific Division, January 2001.
- 3.12. Public Laws, Executive Orders, Policy Documents and Regulations as shown in Table 1.

Table 1
References

PL 84-99	Emergency Flood Control Funds
PL 92-500	The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972
PL 97-348	Coastal Resources Barrier Act
PL 99-662	Water Resources Development Act of 1986
PL 101-508	Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990
PL 101-591	Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990
PL 101-601	Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act
PL 102-580	Water Resources Development Act of 1992
PL 103-62	Government Performance and Results Act of 1993
EO 11514	Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality
EO 12088	Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards
EO 12512	Federal Real Property Management
EO 12856	Federal Compliance with Right-To-Know Laws and Pollution Prevention

Table 1
References

	Requirements
EO 12893	Principles for Federal Infrastructure Investments
EO 12906	Coordinating Geographic Data Acquisition and Access: The National Spatial Data Infrastructure
OMB Cir A-11	Preparing and Submitting Budget Estimates
AR 11-2	Army Programs Management Control
AR 385-10	Army Safety Program
EM 1110-1-2909	Engineering and Design – Geospatial Data and Systems, 1 Aug 1996 w/change 2, 1 Jul 1998
ER 5-1-11	US Army Corps of Engineers Business Process, 17 Aug 2001
ER 11-1-320	Civil Works Emergency Management Programs, 1 Oct 1998
ER 11-2-220	Civil Works Activities, General Investigations, 29 Jul 1977
IER 11-2-240	Civil Works Activities, Construction & Design, 6 Aug 1996
ER 11-2-290	Civil Works Activities, General Expenses, 31 Jul 1986
ER 25-1-2	Life Cycle Management of Automated Information Systems (AIS), 31 Aug 1999
ER 37-2-10	Accounting and Reporting Civil Works Activities, 1 Apr 1969
ER 1105-2-100	Planning Guidance Notebook, 22 Apr 2000
ER 1110-1-8156	Policies, Guidance, and Requirements for Geospatial Data and Systems, 1 Aug 1996
ER 1110-2-100	Periodic Inspection and Continuing Evaluation of Completed Civil Works Structures, 15 Feb 1995
ER 1110-2-1302	Civil Works Cost Engineering, 31 Mar 1994
ER 1130-2-500	Partners and Support (Work Management Policies), 27 Dec 1996
ER 1130-2-510	Hydroelectric Power Operations and Maintenance Policies, 13 Dec 1996
ER 1130-2-520	Navigation and Dredging, Operations and Maintenance Policies, 29 Nov 1996
ER 1130-2-530	Flood Control, Operations and Maintenance Policies, 30 Oct 1996
ER 1130-2-540	Environmental Stewardship, Operations and Maintenance Policies, 15 Nov 1996
ER 1130-2-550	Recreation, Operations and Maintenance Policies, 15 Nov 1996
ER 1165-2-119	Modifications to Completed Projects, 20 Sep 1982
ER 1165-2-131	Local Cooperation Agreements for New Start Construction Projects, 15 Apr 1989
ER 1165-2-164	Construction of Harbor and Inland Harbor Projects by Non-Federal Interests, 1 Oct 1990

Table 1
References

ER 1165-2-400	Recreation Planning, Development and Management Policies, 9 Aug 1985
EC 570-1-11	Army Programs – USACE Manpower – Corp of Engineers Manpower Requirements Systems, 30 Apr 2001 (Errata #1)
EC 11-2-182	Army Programs – Availability, Obligation and Use of General Expenses and Other Civil Funds in Fiscal Year 2002, 31 Dec 2001

4. Definitions

The definition of terms used in this appendix is generally consistent with the definitions provided in the mainbody of this Quality Management Plan. Within the text of this appendix, certain definitions are expanded upon to place them in a context that is appropriate for Civil Works program development and execution.

5. Relationship of the Division and District

5.1. Division. The South Pacific Division, Civil Works Management Division is responsible for quality assurance of Civil Works program development and execution documents prepared by the districts. The Civil Works Management Division shall perform the quality assurance function for the documents listed in the paragraph 2 to monitor proper adherence to guidance and policy.

5.2. Districts. Districts are responsible for controlling quality for all work that they accomplish. The districts shall be responsible for the development and implementation of generic quality control plans for program development and execution documents, which may be supplemented for products with unique issues.

6. Division Quality Assurance Responsibilities

6.1. Chief, Civil Works Management Division. The Chief, Civil Works Management Division is responsible for the following quality assurance activities:

6.1.1 Provide oversight of Civil Works program development and execution.

6.1.2 Assure district quality control processes are followed for all products developed by the districts' Civil Works programs and project management organizations.

6.1.3 Evaluate the portion of the districts' quality management plans that cover program development and execution products.

6.1.4 Maintain interfaces with regional agencies regarding the SPD region wide issues related to the Civil Works program and monitor customer satisfaction.

6.2. CESPDP Program Development Manager. The CESPDP program development managers are assigned specific Civil Works Appropriation programs (General Investigations; Construction, General; Continuing Authorities; and Operations and Maintenance, General) to oversee. The program managers are responsible for maintaining a viable and aggressive Civil Works program. The program managers are also responsible for managing the quality assurance program for the program development products developed by the districts. To fulfill these responsibilities the program development managers roles include the following:

6.2.1. Provide consultation regarding program development policy issues.

6.2.2. Be an advocate of the districts' studies and projects and overall Civil Works program.

6.2.3. Participate in formulating programming strategies for studies and projects for Civil Works program development.

6.2.4. Facilitate the resolution of policy and budget formulation issues on program development documents with HQUSACE and others.

6.2.5. Participate in the District Budget Conferences.

6.2.6. Participate in milestone conferences and other significant meetings with the district and HQUSACE.

6.2.7. Represent the Division Commander on program development issues at local sponsor and public forums such as regularly scheduled meetings of the California Water Commission and California Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference.

6.3. CESPDP District Civil Works Program Manager. Each District Civil Works Program Manager is assigned to a specific district support team (DST) that will oversee the activities of a specific district. The DST is responsible for maintaining a viable and aggressive Civil Works program. As a member of the DST, the District Civil Works Program Manager is responsible for managing the quality assurance program for the program management products developed by the districts. To fulfill these responsibilities the District Civil Works Program Manager's role includes the following:

6.3.1. Provide informal consultation regarding program management policy issues.

6.3.2. Be an advocate of the districts' projects and programs.

6.3.3. Participate in formulating strategies for projects during project development.

6.3.4. Facilitate the resolution of policy and legal issues on program management documents with HQUSACE and others.

6.3.5. Participate in the district's Project Review Board (PRB).

6.3.6. Participate in milestone conferences and other significant meetings with the district and HQUSACE.

6.3.7. Participate in the development and negotiation of the Project Cooperation Agreement with the non-Federal sponsor.

6.3.8. Act as a nominal lead of the assigned DST in its effort to help a districts execute its projects, providing leadership to the DST in those activities specified in Appendix B of Reference 3.11, Principles and Guidelines for District Support Teams .

7. District Quality Control Responsibilities

The program development offices, the project manager and the project delivery team have the responsibility of achieving quality products and projects. The roles and responsibilities of all the participating individuals shall be described in the districts' quality management plan. The development and quality management for all civil works program development and execution products shall follow the districts' quality control plan and shall exercise the necessary independent review process.

7.1. Product Review.

7.1.1. The quality control of Budget Justification Statements, Congressional Members Fact Sheets, Fact Sheets for Implementation of Work Added by Congress, Budgetary Documents and Data for the 10-year Program, and Budgetary Documents and Data for the Capability Program and all execution documents, i.e. PCAs, MOAs, MOUs, FCSAs and Design Agreements will follow the guidelines in this QMP and the districts' QMP which prescribe the procedures for assuring policy compliance as well as regulatory compliance (See paragraph 3 References).

7.1.2. Document Preparation.

7.1.2.1. The Program Development Office and project delivery team must develop the budget documents, but the ultimate responsibility for the documents are with the Program Development Office and project manager. Input from all the team members should be incorporated into the preparation of the documents to accurately assess the cost, schedule and program requirements for completing a project. This input shall be essentially complete before review is undertaken and the branch and section chiefs shall be responsible for accuracy of their information.

7.1.2.2. For Civil Works studies and projects, the schedule for development, review and approval of budget documents is provided within issued HQUSACE and CESPD program development guidance.

7.1.3. Review of Budget Documents. Final review of the budget documents shall be limited to recognized experts in program development policies and procedures. These individuals will be key staff members in the generic quality control plan and would normally be the Chief of the Program Development Office and other senior district staff. This review shall insure that the document reflects a coherent logic and that the assumptions, scopes, schedules and estimates are consistent, complete and reasonable. The reviewers will work with the project manager to resolve issues raised during the review and unresolved issues will be brought to the deputy for Programs and Project Management (DPM) for resolution.

7.1.4. Project Management Plan (PMP).

7.1.4.1. The project team must develop the PMP but the ultimate responsibility for the PMP is with the project manager. Input from all the team members should be incorporated into the plan to accurately assess the cost and the time involved for completing the project. This input shall be essentially complete before review is undertaken and the branch and section chiefs shall be responsible for accuracy of their information.

7.1.4.2. The QCP for activities during the implementation phase of a product shall be embedded within the PMP.

7.1.4.3. For Civil Works projects, the timing of development, review and approval of PMPs is provided within existing HQUSACE and CESPD planning and program management guidance.

For projects in the Continuing Authorities Program (CAP), a programmatic PMP may be used. CAP projects requiring greater definition or unique activities should use a limited PMP tailored to the size and complexity of products.

7.1.5. Independent Review of PMP. Final review of the PMP shall be limited to a single recognized expert in project management policies and procedures. This individual shall be selected from a list that would be included in the generic quality control plan and would normally be an experienced project manager who has not directly participated in the project. This independent review shall insure that the document reflects a coherent logic and that the assumptions, scopes, schedules and estimates are consistent, complete and reasonable. The reviewer will work with the project manager to resolve issues raised during the review and unresolved issues will be brought to the Deputy for Programs and Project Management (DPM) for resolution. The independent review of PCAs, MOAs, MOUs and Design Agreements shall include legal review as well as that of the independent technical reviewer. The technical reviewer will assure all required signatures as well as the required components such as, comments and responses from the independent review, are submitted in the package for higher echelon review. This review will be in accordance with the references in paragraph 3.

7.1.6. Final documentation. Proper documentation is a key component of an effective review process. Significant decisions must be recorded and the entire process must leave a clear audit trail. The documentation of the review shall be included in the project files, where it will be subject to audit. The purpose of the review documentation is to show the full scope of the review and to assure action items are appropriately tracked to a resolution or request for policy decision. Documentation and resolution of issues is the final step prior to district certification.

7.2. District Certification. For program development activities, the DPM will sign Certifications of Compliance in accordance with requirements contained in the annual Program Development Guidance EC, including a Management Control Evaluation Checklist as well as Certifications contained in this Regulation, as appropriate. The district certification is the guarantee that the quality of the product is of the standard expected of the district. The Certifications will accompany the submittals of the products, where appropriate, that are submitted to CESPD.

The DPM will sign a certification for the PMP that indicates that the independent review process has been completed and that all issues have been resolved, prior to the approval of the PMP. The district certification is the guarantee that the quality of the product is of the standard expected of the district.

All PCAs, MOAs, MOUs and Design Agreements shall include a legal certification as well as the certification of the DPM. The certifications will accompany the submittals of the products that are submitted to CESPD.

7.3. Role of the Program Development Manager in Budget Document Quality: The program development manager must be a strong proponent of the products used in the formulation, defense, and execution of the Civil Works program. The program development manager also will ensure that adequate time and resources are provided to perform the review of all products. To ensure that quality expectations are met above, the program development manager will ensure that certification requirements are met prior to transmittal of a product to CESPD.

7.4. Role of the Project Manager in Execution: The project manager must be a strong advocate of a product/project for which he/she is also a member of the product delivery team. The project manager also will ensure that adequate time and resources are provided to perform the independent review all products. To ensure that quality expectations are met in accordance with the USACE Business Process ER 5-1-11, the project manager will ensure that certification requirements are met prior to product/project approval by the District Commander or transmittal of a product to CESPD.

8. Quality Assurance Process

Quality assurance by CESPD shall include the following:

8.1. Informal, On-going Consultation. A primary duty of the program manager and the DST members is to consult with district counterparts on matters concerning technical and policy issues throughout program/project development and prior to submission of any documents to CESPD. Documents received in CESPD should not require extensive review because most issues and concerns should have been resolved during the product formulation stage.

8.2. District PRB. Participation by the District Civil Works Program Manager and/or other DST members at the district PRB is an important component of the quality assurance process. They are responsible for keeping program development managers informed of schedule and cost changes as well as other project issues with resource impacts.

8.3. Review of Program Development and Execution Products. CESPD shall conduct quality assurance reviews of the quality control processes associated with program management products (see paragraph 2) as well as required document approvals and occasional quality control reviews to verify acceptability of the products being produced following the quality control processes. These reviews are for the purpose of identifying systemic problems and possible improvements to the process and assuring compliance with current policy.

9. Delegated Authorities

Paragraph 3 above includes the ERs and policy memorandums that govern the delegation of signature authority for PCAs, MOAs, MOUs and PED agreements. Generally, signature authority of PCAs are governed by HQUSACE or ASA(CW). Signature authority of PCAs are not delegated unless specifically requested by the district and approved by higher headquarters. For PCAs that do not deviate from the latest approved model, signature authority may be delegated to the district, but care will be taken for projects that are not generally supported by the administration. In the case of MOAs and MOUs, the signature authority has been delegated to the district for routine memorandums. Controversial and high visibility memorandums should be coordinated with CESPD prior to execution. PMPs are to be approved by the districts' PRB.

Enclosure 2 Military Program Management

1. Purpose

This appendix establishes the quality management procedures for Military Programs in the Directorate of Military and Technical Services in CESPD and its districts. It is intended to provide quality assurance and quality control guidance for Military Programs products generated by the districts in the South Pacific Division (CESPD). The guidance establishes a framework of general policies and principles to assure that products are consistent with Corps policies and regulations.

2. Applicability

This appendix applies to all Military Construction (MILCON) activities of the Directorate of Military and Technical Services and CESPD Districts which are involved in the management of Military projects and preparation, review, and approval of Military program management documents, particularly project management plans (PMP's).

3. References

The following regulations/document contain references pertaining to the management of MILCON projects. These referenced documents need to be considered when developing a PMP.

3.1. AR 415-15 Army Military Construction Program Development and Execution, dated 4 Sep 1998.

3.2. DAIM-FD/CEMP-MA memorandum dated 20 Jan 00, subject: Revised Guidance for Procedures and Approval of Changes in MILCON Projects Funded by MCA, UMMCA and AFH Appropriations.

3.3. AR 415-1-16 Construction Fiscal Management, dated 30 September 1993

3.4. AR 415-4-41 Work Authorization and Funds for Air Force Military Construction dated 31 March 1993.

3.5. USACE Policy on Post-Award Engineering Services for Military Projects dated 14 October 1998 and clarifications of this policy by CEMP-MA memorandum dated 6 February 2001 subject: Post Award Engineering Services and CEC-G memorandum dated 8 April 2001 subject: CECC-G Bulletin No. 01-03, Post Award Engineering Services.ER 5-1-11, Program and Project Management Regulation

3.6. HQUSACE (CEMP-ZA) memorandum dated 30 July 1996, subject: Los Angeles District MILCON Design Funds Management Plan.

4. Relationship of the Division and District

4.1. Division. The South Pacific Division, Military Programs District Support Team is responsible for quality assurance of Military program management documents prepared by the districts. The Military Programs District Support Team shall perform the quality assurance function for the documents mentioned in the above paragraph to assure proper adherence to guidance and policy.

4.2. Districts. Districts are responsible for controlling quality for all work that they accomplish. The districts shall develop and keep up to date their own quality management plans, to be consistent with this plan. The districts shall be responsible for the development and implementation of generic quality control plans for program management documents, which may be supplemented for products with unique issues.

5. Division Quality Assurance Responsibilities

5.1. Military Programs District Support Team. The Military Programs District Support Team is responsible for the following quality assurance activities:

5.1.1. Provide oversight of SPD Military Programs management.

5.1.2. Assure district quality control processes are followed for all products developed by the districts.

5.1.3. Approve the portion of each districts quality management plan that cover program management products.

5.1.4. Maintain interfaces with major commands or other appropriate organizations to monitor customer satisfaction.

5.2. CESPD Program Managers. The CESPD program managers are assigned specific districts or programs to oversee. The program managers are responsible for maintaining a viable and aggressive geographic or functional program. The program managers are also responsible for managing the quality assurance program for the program management products developed by their districts or functional program. To fulfill these responsibilities the program managers roles include the following:

5.2.1. Provide informal consultation regarding program management policy issues.

5.2.2. Be an advocate for district projects and programs.

5.2.3. Participate in formulating strategies for projects during project development.

5.2.4. Facilitate the resolution of policy and legal issues on program management documents with HQUSACE and others.

5.2.5. Participate in the district Project Review Boards (PRB).

5.2.6. Participate in milestone conferences and other significant meetings with the district and HQUSACE.

6. District Quality Control Responsibilities

The project manager and the project team have the responsibility of achieving quality products and projects. The roles and responsibilities of all the participating individuals shall be described in the district quality management plan. The development and quality management for all program management products shall follow the district quality control plan, and the district shall exercise a limited independent review process.

6.1. Product Review.

6.1.1. Project Management Plan. The project delivery team must develop the PMP but the ultimate responsibility for the PMP is with the project manager. Input from all the team members should be incorporated into the plan to accurately assess the cost and the time involved for completing the project. This input shall be essentially complete before review is undertaken and the branch and section chiefs shall be responsible for accuracy of their information.

6.1.2. Independent Review. Independent review of the PMP shall be limited to a single recognized expert in project management policies and procedures. This individual shall be selected from a list that would be included in the generic quality control plan and would normally be an experienced project manager who has not directly participated in the project. This independent review shall insure that the document reflects a coherent logic and that the assumptions, scopes, schedules and estimates are consistent, complete and reasonable. The reviewer will work with the project manager to resolve issues raised during the review and unresolved issues will be brought to the Deputy for Programs and Project Management (DPM) for resolution.

6.1.3. Final documentation. Proper documentation is a key component of an effective review process. Significant decisions must be recorded and the entire process must leave a clear audit trail. The documentation of the review shall be included in the project files, where it will be subject to audit. The purpose of the review documentation is to show the full scope of the review and to assure action items are appropriately tracked to a resolution or request for policy decision. Documentation and resolution of issues is the final step prior to district certification.

6.2. District Certification. The DPM will sign a certification for the PMP that indicates that the independent review process has been completed and that all issues have been resolved, prior to the approval of the PMP by the district Project Review Board. The district certification is the guarantee that the quality of the product is of the standard expected of the district. The certifications will be made available to the Military Program District Support Team during Command Inspection Visits.

CESPD R 1110-1-8
App H (Encl 2)
30 December 2002

6.3. Role of the Project Manager: The project manager must be a strong advocate of a product/project for which he/she is also a member of the product delivery team. The project manager also will ensure that adequate time and resources are provided to perform the independent review of all products. To ensure that quality expectations are met in accordance with Reference 2.f, above, the project manager will ensure that certification requirements are met prior to product/project approval by the District Commander.

7. Quality Assurance Process

Quality assurance by CESPD shall include the following:

7.1. Informal Consultation. A primary duty of the program manager is to consult with district counterparts on matters concerning technical and policy issues which may affect development, modification or use of Project Management Plans. PMP's should not require extensive review because most issues and concerns should have been resolved during the development stage.

7.2. Participation at the District PRB. As indicated above, participation by the CESPD program manager at the district PRB is a key component of the quality assurance process.

7.3. Review of Program Management Products. CESPD shall conduct quality assurance reviews of the quality control processes associated with program management products. These reviews are for the purpose of identifying systemic problems and possible improvements to the process and assure compliance with current policy