USACE 2012

FUTURE CORPORATE AND HQ DESIGN STUDY

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW AND SURVEY SUMMARIES

Appendix B: Interview and Survey Summaries

"*If you want to know your future, look at what you are doing in this moment." – Ancient Tibetan saying.*

In keeping with this philosophy, the USACE 2012 team embarked on a journey to ask people we serve (customers and stakeholders) and people who serve (our employees) what their views of the Corps present and ideal future were with special emphasis on our headquarters and regional offices. Thirty personal interviews with stakeholders in the Executive Branch, Army, Air Force, Department of Defense, Congress, other governmental agencies, private industry, and associations were conducted. In addition, responses were received from over 80 personal interviews with Headquarters, Division, and Lab representatives, District personnel, and more than 350 online responses from Emerging Leaders and regional and Washington Headquarters employees. Questions were designed to address concerns and needed improvements, versus telling us what was going well.

We analyzed feedback received from all groups both quantitatively and qualitatively. Our intent was to capture ideas and recurring themes and sort them according to respondent group and popularity. Although not every comment was captured on the spreadsheets, a concerted effort was made to capture major ideas and concerns, and to combine like comments. All issues within the scope of this study have been included. Issues raised outside the scope of study have been referred to appropriate organizations or individuals for action. The actual questions used and analyses of the most frequent responses may be found subsequent pages.

Individuals surveyed both within and outside the Corps were remarkably similar in their responses. Respondents told us that we needed to transform. Our current culture, organizational structure, and way of doing business were found to be less than optimal for serving the nation today and tomorrow. Although opinions varied widely on just what our current situation was and how it might be improved, some common themes emerged from both major groups. The themes validated the emphasis areas of the Corps' Strategic Vision – People, Process and Communication – since the majority of comments made dealt with one of these topics. The Views of Those We Serve and Those Who Serve section of this report discussed some of the major concerns expressed to us in these 3 areas. The following contains some desired "ideal future" traits:

People

Relationships – Improvement in internal and external relationships is one of the most desired features in the feedback. Internally, we should support and position each other for success as "One Corps/One Team", be decisive, and take personal responsibility. Externally, we should build strong relationships based on openness, honesty and respect with our customers and stakeholders to achieve success together.

Responsiveness – When a request for assistance is made, everyone expects prompt, courteous and helpful service. If the individual summoned does not have the answer, they should make a concerted effort to find it or to find a knowledgeable person in a timely fashion.

Human Resources – Despite the fact that we anticipate having substantial turnover in the next several years due to an aging workforce, our ability to hire new people is hindered by excessive regulation and bureaucratic procedures. A simplified, rapid response process that accurately

matches talents with needs is required now. In addition to our traditional technical prowess, skills are needed in communications, interpersonal relationships and business skills. Employees need to be provided with interesting, challenging and dynamic ways of providing public service, be encouraged to innovate, and be rewarded for both personal and team accomplishments. Satisfied employees will in turn, satisfy those they serve.

Leadership – Leaders should be positive, nurturing individuals who encourage cooperation and shared knowledge, encourage innovation and allow honest mistakes, and provide the support and resources needed for their employees to succeed. Leaders at all levels should be willing to share lessons learned both across the organization and with those we serve so that everyone may benefit.

Process

Roles & Responsibilities – Providing quality products and services for the nation requires the following focus: Strategic at HQ, Operational at MSC's, and Tactical at Districts. HQ builds national relationships with customers and stakeholders, develops a strategic plan with policies and programs that address their needs, and provides resources for accomplishing them. MSC's build regional relationships, develop operational plans for accomplishing national programs on a regional basis, and transfer resources for accomplishing them. Districts build local relationships and with resources received, tactically accomplish the national and regional objectives in the operational plan.

Expertise: Technical expertise is needed to support our core missions, to ensure quality, and to facilitate transfer of lessons learned. In general, expertise should be located at the lowest level practical "where the rubber meets the road". Labs and centers should provide state of the art tools and knowledge to meet needs today and tomorrow. A national pool of subject matter experts should be ready to respond where needed. As a general rule, those we serve prefer to deal with someone close to and knowledgeable about their area(s) of interest.

Reviews: Ideally, reviews should occur once, be seamless and require that data be submitted only once. Authority should be delegated to the lowest level practical in the organization. Overcoming layers of bureaucracy should enable us to become leaner and more efficient. When new policies and programs are needed to support the nation or to improve ourselves, feedback is needed from throughout the Corps and from those we serve to develop them.

Communication

Customers & Stakeholders: Frequent communication with those we serve, listening to their needs versus telling our opinion, being honest about our capabilities, and cooperatively developing solutions is desired.

Employees: Employees are the life's blood of the Corps. We must keep them aware and involved in changing conditions and needs.

Knowledge: Sharing lessons learned across the organization and with stakeholders, and capturing knowledge before an employee or a long-time partner walks out the door are essential.

Value: We must effectively communicate our Value to the Nation. This includes our Civil Works missions like flood and coastal storm damage reduction, emergency response, navigation, regulatory, hydropower, environment, recreation, and water supply, along with playing an active role in support of Army Transformation and Homeland Security.

Strategic – In addition to acknowledging and addressing the concerns of our critics, strategic, proactive communication should be used to prevent misunderstanding, to honestly portray capabilities, and to acknowledge opposing viewpoints.

In order to accomplish this type of positive change, respondents encouraged our team to be: holistic, bold, to remember that form should follow function, to challenge barriers to innovation, and to focus on being world-class and serving the nation.

Appendix B: External Views – Summaries

Question 1 - From your point of view, how would you describe the ideal Corps of 2012?	Those We Serve Groups Responding									
	Cong. App.	Cong. Auth.	Other Cong.	Army	Other DOD	Fed.	Assoc. & Spon.	Envir.	Tribal	Total
National Interest - Comes first. Must balance budget with reality. In terms of national importance - Navigation is first, flood damage reduction second, and environmental third priority. 1- Programs in the national, not local interest. Federal government can't solve everyone's problems. Too much project focus now.		1				2		2		5
Environmental restoration work will increase - May depend on success of Everglades.	2					1		1		4
Bureaucracy - Reduced to minimal structure, streamlined with appropriate management controls & flexible.				1		1	1			3
Core missions will continue - focus more on this.	1					1	1			3
Cost - Flexible with this such as reducing S&A - Share efficiencies across districts, etc. Need to be more cost effective.					1	1	1			3
Responsive - More responsive to external Agency needs.							2	1		3
Obligations Rate - Maintains a high rate. Rate of military construction is important.				2						2
Civil Works - Mission continues with emphasis on flood control. Corps should not walk away from CW.				2						2
Infrastructure - Smart infrastructure for Objective Force is needed from Corps - take installations out of dark ages & save money. Corps needs to be involved to retain relevancy. DPW/O&M Work is in the future - $650 now and growing. Functionally integrate Corps into DA installations.				2						2
MSC's - 8 is too many, need to cut costs.				2						2
Communication - Share good ideas with customers, etc. Communicate more.					1		1			2
Contracting out increasing.	1					1				2
Efficient - More of this needed.							2			2

Question 2 - What technical expertise and core functions should the Corps maintain?	Those We Serve Groups Responding									
	Cong. App.	Cong. Auth.	Other Cong.	Army	Other DOD	Fed	Assoc. & Spon.	Envir.	Tribal	Total
Engineering - Sufficient to design and review projects to withstand intense scrutiny - 1	3	1		1		3		1		9
Environmental - restoration, ecology, etc.	3		1			3		1		8
Planning to include master planning	1	1		2		3				7
Flood Damage Reduction	3		1				1			5
Biologist and Other Environmental - In one cadre. Need more of them focused on restoration. May want to export EIS to another federal agencies to eliminate dueling biologists - 1						2		1		3
Economic - This has eroded, no longer a Chief Economist - 1	1	1				2				4
Contracting/Procurement - Be innovative, too conservative – 1. Look at DB+ contract for a good example				2	1		1			4
Navigation	2		1							3
Construction Management			1	1	1					3
HVAC & Utility - In-house				1	1		1			3
Planning - Quality is uneven today. May need a core cadre for						2	1			3
Program & Project Management - PM's certified - 1				1		1	1			3
Tribal Issues - Focus on adding employees who are aware of and sensitive to the culture & protocols of tribes. - Integrate management plans and partnerships.									1	1
Tribal Issues - Funding and expertise to manage lands within the exterior boundary of the reservation.									1	1

Question 3 - How would you describe your ideal working relationship with the Corps?	Those We Serve Groups Responding									
	Cong. App.	Cong. Auth.	Other Cong.	Army	Other DOD	Fed	Assoc. & Spon.	Envir.	Tribal	Total
Relationship - Pretty good with Corps right now, very responsive. Having liaisons from HQ is good - 1		1		3						4
Consistency - Not as consistent, responsive as needed in all locations & levels.	3									3
Developmental Assignments - Between HQ and field personnel are needed to share perspectives. Ideal is to have someone with local expertise and national perspective. Current detailee has done well with this.	3									3
Relationship - Pretty good with HQ right now.	2			1						3
Dialogue - Free flow of information, no us/them				1	1	1				3
Dialogue - Give us honest answers, yes or no & help us find solutions. Let us (especially young staffers) know what might lead to criticism		1				2				3
Relationship - Has gone up and down over time. Better with some offices than others. Could be improved	1					1	1			3
Congressional Contacts - Should have a primary for the House and one for the Senate.	2									2
Information - HQ contacts with answers preferred, no middlemen. Have little contact with district and division folks. Want someone with in-depth knowledge of the matter, not just a briefer.	2									2
Communication - Very important. Need to hear both good and bad news from the Corps. Ex. One COL was proactive in bringing up a problem and developing a solution				1	1					2
Ideal - Does everything the committee/sponsors requests, but realizes that is not possible.		1					1			2

Question 4 - Can you recommend some ways that we could improve our relationship with stakeholders?	Those We Serve Groups Responding									
	Cong. App.	Cong. Auth.	Other Cong.	Army	Other DOD	Fed	Assoc. & Spon.	Envir.	Tribal	Total
Responsiveness - Don't always receive what they need when they need it. Districts and divisions don't have the sense of urgency committees do.	4						1			5
Fact sheets take too long to produce - the building blocks of the budget and committee must have to do work.	3									3
Fact sheets - Should be accurate, concise, straightforward and understandable. Format is not always followed in the field, to include study status and estimated completion date. Military format is good - Corps sheets superior to other agencies.	3									3
Listen - And maintain good communications				2			1			3
Communication - Public needs more knowledge of Corps activities. Includes publishing a list of all backlog projects.			1			1	1			3
Communication - Two-way is needed. If you ask customers for good ideas, give them feedback on them even if it isn't a good idea. Let folks know and understand the process. Involve early and often				1			2			3
Generally good relationship now	1			2						3
Congress - Maintain good relations with. Champions of old are missing				1		1				2
Output - Advocate more output per person in moving projects ahead. Corps oversees large teams, but what does each person do? At meetings, Corps sometimes outnumbers sponsor							2			2
Stakeholders - Need to understand stakeholder's issues and increase interaction. Know all of them	1					1				2
Air Force - Assist with RM, PM and planning					1					1
Air Force - Fix relationship with them, they don't want to use the Corps any longer.				1						1
Army Transformation – Support This				1						1

Question 5 - Do you have any specific concerns with the Corps of Engineers?	Those We Serve Groups Responding									
	Cong. App.	Cong, Auth.	Other Cong.	Army	Other DOD	Fed.	Assoc. & Spon.	Envir.	Tribal	Total
Costs too much - need to explain value	1			3		1	1			6
Timeliness - Takes too long to conduct studies and reviews	2						2			4
Bureaucratic - Too bureaucratic. Actually 5 levels - district, division, HQ, ASACW and OMB - 1				2			2			4
Communication - Need to improve public communications and outreach. Do great things, but don't tell our story well. Corps is too inwardly focused. Be open and take your knocks.	1					2	1			4
Benefits - Must ensure that analytical procedures accurately evaluate the economic and environmental costs and benefits of its projects and use independent technical review to validate the evaluation procedures. NED approach may not be the best - 1	1					1	1			3
Fact sheet timeliness and quality. Hope P2 will help with this.	2									2
Integrity - Underlying concern with this. Concern about cooking the books. May also be biased toward large construction projects.	1		1							2
Technical Review - Quality of this must be improved. Not multiple levels, but a team that is objective and removed from the local political situation. Ok to look at internally as long as it is objective, multi-disciplinary team. Depend on you for technical quality		1		1						2
Corps Reform - Concerned about getting caught in this and in President's Management Agenda. Must be very difficult for Corps employees. Corps may not stand the test of time with privatization push.				1			2			3
Empowerment - Discussed along with powering down, but actions do not reflect words and sponsor's expectations are not met							2			2

Question 6 - The Corps is changing its way of doing business to be more inclusive and to make the customer more of a co-producer and more engaged in the project delivery process. How are we doing? Do you feel the Corps embraces you as an equal member of the Project Delivery Team? Does the Corps adequately address your project specific needs?	Those We Serve Groups Responding									
	Cong. App.	Cong. Auth.	Other Cong.	Army	Other DOD	Fed.	Assoc. & Spon.	Envir.	Tribal	Total
Communications - Be proactive. Don't wait for us to call. Let us know how the projects are going early on, especially with issues that go critical. Tell the good stories. Don't sit back and wait		1		1	1					3
Equal Member - Yes, can work together				2		1				3
Inclusive - More of this is apparent. State is the driver on 1 project to push openness				1				1		2
PDT - Concept is good, but don't lose national focus						2				2
AERC - Responding to needs. Web-based portal is excellent							1			1
AERC - Treated as an equal partner. Not always treated as a valued customer							1			1
Briefings - Don't brief member's staffs before committee staff (Ex. American River Flood Control). Would like to receive the same level of information as the Appropriations staff		1								1
Business - Methods need improvement. Ex. Change voicemail to reflect person's availability. Why do HQ folks go home at 3 PM when that is 12 PM on the west coast?							1			1
Collaborative Partnership - Just started at a very high level. Working well so far						1				1
Committee - Not part of the team, must remain independent to ensure objectivity & see that federal interest is served.		1								1
Cost-Overruns - A major concern				1						1
Design-Build - Need more of this				1						1

Question 7 - What do you see as important challenges to the Corps in meeting the future needs of the Nation? Do you have any suggestions or advice that you would like to share with the Corps?	Those We Serve Groups Responding									
	Cong. App.	Cong. Auth.	Other Cong.	Army	Other DOD	Fed.	Assoc. & Spon.	Envir.	Tribal	Total
Challenges										
Integrity - Must restore integrity as premier public engineering provider. Express regret and move on				1		2				3
Core Missions - Decide what you are about, get Corps house in order						2	1			3
Defensive Approach - Must lose this. Ex. Kunsan issue was good because Corps and Air Force admitted problems. Must be candid					1	1				2
Mission Creep - Watch out for this, everyone should not be doing everything						2				2
National Perspective is essential						2				2
Budget - Not enough money to do all of the things the Corps wants to do		1				1				2
Communicate value to the nation and Army and have people understand what the Corps does				1		1				2
Analysis - Complete and objective is needed.						1				1
Balancing environmental and economic issues	1									1
CALFED - Major involvement by Corps needed here. Doing lots of little pieces at high costs. Corps could manage a comprehensive program, especially the ecosystem restoration projects. Reclamation board could be the partner							1			1
Civil Works - Directorate is smaller and role of DCW has been diminished yet support staff in HQ is growing.	1									1
CMANC - Does not agree with Civil Works strategic plan							1			1
Common Measures - OMB is looking at this to see about the possibility of combining agencies or work with like missions to avoid duplication						1				1

Question 7 Continued - What do you see as important challenges to the Corps in meeting the future needs of the Nation? Do you have any suggestions or advice that you would like to share with the Corps?	Those We Serve Groups Responding									
	Cong. App.	Cong. Auth.	Other Cong.	Army	Other DOD	Fed.	Assoc. & Spon.	Envir.	Tribal	Total
Comprehensive Basin-Wide Planning and Execution. Ex. Sediment management in bays with less environmental impact							1			1
Continuous, real-time management of channel ship interface - traffic is so dense, as a significant storm can halt all traffic. Corps budget process doesn't allow swift action for situations like this							1			1
Suggestions										
Communication - Value to the Nation hasn't been well communicated. Get out in front of issues or hire someone to do it. Need to share great stories. Improve how others perceive the Corps	1				1	1				3
Focus - Decide what you want to be. What is the most important? What would you focus on if you were smaller?						1	1			2
Partnering - Improve partnering with other agencies, admit no one has all of the answers						1	1			2
Base Civil Engineers - Need to receive updates					1					1
Broad Issues - Could work on getting public healthier with outdoor recreation, using science, technology & expertise to help educational institutions, promoting active, healthy lifestyles that prevent crime, and kids who like the military like outdoor life								1		1
Centers of Expertise - Consider expanding them with regional centers	1									1

Question 7 Continued - What do you see as important challenges to the Corps in meeting the future needs of the Nation? Do you have any suggestions or advice that you would like to share with the Corps?	Those We Serve Groups Responding									
	Cong. App.	Cong. Auth.	Other Cong.	Army	Other DOD	Fed.	Assoc. & Spon.	Envir.	Tribal	Total
Communication - When west coast ports close due to labor dispute, it is a national issue. Why isn't it when ports shut down due to lack of dredging?	1									1
Competition - Corps needs to be more competitive - hassle to deal with the federal government rules and regulations, process is too long. Must streamline or will become irrelevant.	1									1
Corps Reform - Responsible for providing the most efficient, cost-effective and environmentally friendly solution to each community's problems. Congress needs to understand these issues, hold Corps accountable, increase transparency and independent review of projects, and broader congressional role for improving and enhancing accountability.			1							1
Customer Goals - Should be aligned with Corps goals					1					1
Divesting - Flood control projects to local or state interests may not be a good idea.		1								1
Eliminate - Economically inefficient and low use projects and focus resources on more viable projects.	1									1
Improve relations with DOD and Sec Army - hard for Congress to justify Corps when Army wants to divest.	1									1
Installation Infrastructure R&D - Needed				1						1

Question 8- Is there anything else you would like the Corps to consider that has not been addressed in the above questions?	Those We Serve Groups Responding									
	Cong. App.	Cong. Auth.	Other Cong.	Army	Other DOD	Fed.	Assoc. & Spon.	Envir.	Tribal	Total
Army Installation Management Organization - Look at how Corps will interface with them. Need total synchronization, not just one liaison. Why not put districts in IMA regions? How do IMA and USACE together achieve the SECARMY's envisioned efficiencies?				3						3
Innovative Work - Should stay in house to maintain expertise. Contract out routine work. There is a long-term private sector push to get all of the design work.	2									2
Direct Funding - Try to obtain for military support				2						2
Army Resource Managers - Would like a process for the Corps to train Army RM's on appropriations, Congress, contracting, etc.				1						1
ASACW - Look at value of G.O. position there				1						1
BRAC & Environmental - Need to streamline and get Army out of these processes earlier				1						1
Communicate value. Market self. Tell of successes (kept current and relevant to customer) and admit mistakes				1						1
Contracting - Innovation is needed. Ex. Residential Communities Initiative is used now, but Corps fought it				1						1
Coordinate Better - work schedules							1			1
Core Competencies - Get back to basics				1						1
Corps - Its own worst critic							1			1
Corps - Needs improvements, but is unique in what it can do for the Nation							1			1

Appendix B: Internal Views – Summaries

Question 1 – What is the ideal role of HQ versus the ideal role of MSC's?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
HQ - National policy development and interpretation of Administration policies, prepare legislation. Works for the Administration in support of Congress. The corporate perspective.	8	16	9	16	162	4	9	24	248
HQ - National issues and relations with Congress, Administration, other federal agencies, NGO's, private sector, foreign countries, etc. - Primary Sr official contact	7	19	7	12	88	3	6	11	153
HQ - Provide sustained resources, budget preparation, corporate systems, work prioritization - strategic investment portfolio.	2	7	3	3	96	2	4	5	122
HQ - Provides positive support for the field to deliver products & services - coordination between divisions etc. versus hindering them.	2	4	1	1	97	1	2	5	113
HQ - National program development, management & monitoring with P2, PMBP, IT/IM, etc. Prepare legislation	5	9	7	11	65	2	4	8	111
HQ - National command and control and standardization (military and civil).	4	6	3	6	55	1	5	5	85
HQ - Work closely with Pentagon and OMB - includes tracking info for HQDA	3	9	6	4	45	3	6	4	80
HQ - Strategic Planning	6	12	5	7	37	2	6	4	79
HQ - Quality assurance oversight.	1	2	1	2	43			2	51
HQ - Set vision, ideals, corporate goals, clear plan.	2	4	3	3	26	1	2	7	48
MSC's - Works with regional contacts, other feds, states, regional stakeholders,	2	16	6	5	53	3	7	4	96
MSC's - Sets operational direction based on HQ strategic plan/intermediate goals, align HQ policy to regional setting.	3	3	3	7	67	2	4	7	96
MSC's - Program management, budgets, regional execution.	2	15	4	4	48	2	6	9	90
MSC's - Quality Assurance - independent review, how to prevent problems, don't wait until the end of the game	4	14	6	5	51	2	6	1	89
MSC's - Regional command and control, extension of HQ	3	14	3	7	42	1	3	3	76

Question 1 Continued – What is the ideal role of HQ versus the ideal role of MSC's?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
MSC's - Provide positive support/resources for districts to provide products & services, source of information.	2	4	1	3	56	1	2	5	74
MSC's - Regional policy development, review and implementation	2	8	1	3	48	2	3	6	73
MSC's - Regional work brokering/prioritization/Regional business center. Resourcing should be fairly distributed.	4	9	3	4	21	2	4	3	50
MSC's - HQ forward	3	3	3	4	6				19

Question 2 - What technical expertise/core functions does the Corps need and where should it reside?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
HQ - Technical disciplines to support all core missions	3	11	1	3	37	2	1	4	62
HQ - Develop & coordinate policy expertise - technical basis needed to do this. Draft legislation.	1	8	1	5	18	1	2	3	39
HQ - Engineering, design & construction management expertise	1	4	1	2	28		1	2	39
HQ - Watershed/water resources management, includes economics & planning	1	5	1	3	7	1		2	20
HQ - Program managers	1	3	3	1	9	1	1	1	20
HQ - Able to build relationships, competent workforce and develop technical doctrine based on national criteria.	1	2	3	2	3		2	1	14
HQ - Future capabilities for R&D, strategic planning	2	2	2	1	2		3	1	13
HQ - Real estate		2	1		8			1	12
HQ - Contracting expertise, includes SADBU		3	1	2	3		1		10
HQ - Resource management		2	1		5		1	1	10
HQ - Environmental assessment		1	1	1	7				10
MSC's - Some technical expertise (state of practice)	2	7	1	1	12		3	6	32
MSC's - Quality assurance, oversight, design review. A failure in project design could lead to a catastrophic failure – 1. Oversee R&D. Mid-level executive - 1	1	4	3	2	15	1	4		30
MSC's - Engineering & construction management expertise	1	4	3	1	6	1	1	2	19
MSC's - Planning core, including watersheds		4	3	1	9	1		1	19
MSC's - Program managers		5	3	3	4	2		1	18
MSC's- Business administration, Regional business center	1	4	1	2	3	1	1	1	14
MSC's - Independent technical review expertise. POD setting up a regional ITR office	2			1	9		1		13

Question 2 Continued - What technical expertise/core functions does the Corps need and where should it reside?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
MSC's - Advisor to commander and district needed - knows where to find expertise, etc.	1		1	2	2		1	1	8
MSC's - Regionally funded technical centers.	1				7				8
MSC's - Operations		3	1	1	1			1	7
Labs/Ctrs - Technical expertise centers + R&D (state of art)	1	6	3	5	44	2	5	7	73
Labs/Ctrs - Engineering of all types	1	2	2	1	4	1	3	1	15
Labs/Ctrs - Engineering & construction management expertise, H&H, building science	1	1			5	1	1	2	11
Labs/Ctrs - Unique, unusual technical expertise such as chemical, energy & material engineering		3		1	5			1	10
Labs/Ctrs - Providing expertise that is eroded from districts. Warehouse of information.			1	2	2	1	1		7
Districts - Technical experts (state of practice) - primary level of technical expertise aside from R&D & centers	4	13	5	7	65	3	4	13	114
Districts - Engineering, design & construction management expertise, H&H		4	13	1	36	4	2	7	67
Districts - Real estate, perhaps fewer with this capability		2	2	1	10	2		4	21
Districts - Water resources planning		2	2	1	8	1	1	4	19
Districts - Environmental assessment, scientific		1	1		10	1		4	17
Districts - Project management		1	1	4	6	1	1	1	15
Districts - Environmental, coastal engineering & navigation					6	2	1	4	13
Districts - Contracting, includes SADBU		2	1	1	4	1		2	11
Districts - Operational functions, some could be regionalized.	1	2	1	1	3	1	1		10

Question 2 Continued - What technical expertise/core functions does the Corps need and where should it reside?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
Select districts - Military engineering and design - roads, facilities, HTRW, etc.			1		6	1	1	1	10
Level of Expertise - Linked to missions and functions at each level. Different dimensions of policy, planning execution, monitoring and advisory. It should also be based on customer needs. Span of control and scope need to align with organization		4	3	3	67	3	3	7	90
Expertise - Hydropower, navigation, dam building, hydrology geotech, etc. are critical. - Traditional core missions	1	1	2	2	35	5	3	3	52
Expertise - Engineering design & construction management - foreign and domestic	1	2	2	1	37	3	1	1	48
Knowledge Base - Location is not critical, access is. Geographical boundaries of districts and MSC's are too constraining & don't allow for efficient sharing of resources		3	1	1	18	1	1	2	27
Expertise - Environmental all types, clean-up, research, etc.		1	1	1	19	1		3	26
Expertise - Planning			1		14	2		1	18
National Centers of Expertise - Like National Board for Rivers, tribal relations, etc. needed + national cadre of experts to call upon		3		1	2	2		4	12
Multi-Level Expertise - Critical at all 3 - PM, Planning, Design, Construction, Construction Mgmt, Contracting and Legal - depth and focus will differ.		2	2	1	4	1	1	1	12
Expertise - Support Homeland Security, critical infrastructure		2	1		6	1	1	1	12

Question 3 - Is there redundancy between HQ and MSC's? (all shown are Yes) What functions can be eliminated totally or assigned to 1 level?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
HQ - Too much command & control from HQ to districts	2	4	2	1	2	1		3	15
HQ - Too much overlap, layers, especially with review or projects & policies. HQ policy review tends to look like technical review	1	1	1	1	6	1		3	14
HQ - Too much technical emphasis & positions. Due in part to Design-Build trend		5		3	2			1	11
HQ - Shouldn't do daily operational activities		1		1	3	1	4	1	11
HQ - Delegate some program management to MSC's	1	3	1	1	2		1		9
HQ - Seems too large, high maintenance	1	1			5	2			9
HQ - No technical line functions & review		2	1		4		1		8
HQ - Policy work is excessive	1	1	1				2	2	7
HQ - Should delegate PCA's & FCSA"s to MSC's - this process is broken and under resourced.		2		1	2			1	6
HQ - Should do program mgmt (analysis, priorities and testimony), MSC commanders don't need to testify.					1			4	5
MSC's - Suggest EEO, Security, Safety, IM, Contracting, and SADBU at lead district in MSC, and RE at HQ (unnecessary duplication of support functions at MSC's).	1	4	3	3	2	2			15
MSC's - Eliminate and possibly form some super districts. No role to perform, just an additional layer of management. Support team concept may make it possible to replace MSC functions. – 1. MSC's simply duplicate what HQ does and drives up our costs. MSC's also duplicate what districts do.				1	8			4	13
MSC's - Don't need to pass through reports.	1			3	6	1		1	12
MSC's - Policy work should be eliminated	1	1		1	2	2			7
MSC's - Should focus on regional business management		3	1		1				5
MSC's - Too many technical people		2		2					4
MSC's - Don't need HR, consider contracting it out.		1	2			1			4

Question 3 Continued - Is there redundancy between HQ and MSC's? (all shown are Yes) What functions can be eliminated totally or assigned to 1 level?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
RMB's - Are micromanaging districts		1		1			1	1	4
MSC's - Eliminate oversight of some policy and guidance.		1		1	1	1			4
MSC's - Should make tough decisions versus passing on to HQ and say No to districts when necessary to enforce HQ policy.					4				4
MSC's - Reduce in number, 2-3 with small staffs who are very knowledgeable of regulations and policies - 1					3			1	4
Redundant - Reviews -policy etc, reviewing a problem. Something is wrong when there are more people reviewing an issue at HQ versus at MSC's. HQ and MSC's want to do operational items. May be an issue of layering rather than redundancy.	1	5	1	4	15	2			28
Redundant - Support functions - could be handled by an organization like HECSA or at a district where MSC is co-located	1	7	4	2	6	1			21
Redundant - Reporting Requirements - Lots of information flow between all 3 levels with no value added. Too many datacalls. OMBIL should be fully implemented	1	2	1	1	11	2		2	20
Redundant - Don't need all functions at HQ, MSC's and Districts		2	2	3	5	1	1		14
Redundant - Technical responsibilities - belong at lowest level, reviews to include documents at MSC's or lower			2	2	5	1	1		11
Redundant - Command & control (MSC's and HQ)			1	2	3	2	1		9
Redundant - Actions at HQ and MSC should not be duplicates. Sometimes, MSC is a wobbly stepping stone between HQ and districts		1	1	1	2	2			7
Redundant - Compliance checking		3			4				7
Redundant - RM at all 3 levels, centralize like F&A? Too many people trying to track funds. Give districts the funds needed to perform a task.			1	1	2			2	6

Question 3 Continued - Is there redundancy between HQ and MSC's? (all shown are Yes) What functions can be eliminated totally or assigned to 1 level?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
Redundant - Some program mgmt functions at HQ and MSC's		2		1	3				6
No redundancy between HQ and MSC's - May want to assign an HQ or MSC lead for major customers. Different roles		1		1	44				46
Duplication - Needed for QA, technical quality in some critical areas Upper MS fiasco involved a draft report that had not undergone HQ review - 1		1	1	1	23				26

Question 4 - Is there anything we should stop doing at the HQ or MSC levels that we are doing now? (Some overlap with #3)	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
HQ - Stop developing technology tools the field cannot afford and that take forever plus unfunded mandates. USACE requirements should be determined prior to the year of execution. District indirect costs have skyrocketed due to support offices (RM, IM, RE, PARC) issuing guidance to field based on DA/DOD guidance without coordination or B/C ratio. Cut our losses when needed.	3	4	4	3	12	3	2	4	35
HQ - Duplicating & lengthy reviews, too many data calls/annual reporting requirements. - Seldom see benefit from data calls or how they contribute to a metric of success. Need to track projects seamlessly into programs and HQ and MSC's only need to track programs. Not enough staff at HQ to look at data – 1. Particularly bad with RE items - can add 4-6 mos of processing tine on standardized documents	2	3		3	13	1		5	27
HQ - Data calls are excessive. - Seldom see benefit from data calls or how they contribute to a metric of success. Stop requesting data in different formats.	1	2		2	13	1		6	25
HQ - Be more sensitive to impacts of uncoordinated stovepipe taskings.		2	3	1	6	1		2	15
HQ - Stop doing project-specific command & control. Shouldn't brief individual projects, only national and controversial issues.		3		2	5	1	1	1	13
HQ - Stop executing/providing operational tech support & technical document development. Manage less lead more.	1	3	1	3	5				13

Question 4 Continued - Is there anything we should stop doing at the HQ or MSC levels that we are doing now? (Some overlap with #3)	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
HQ - Stop developing so many plans and ideas that are not being coordinated from/by HQ, and do not seem to be synchronized with the USACE Campaign Plan. - Focus on a few, high payoff objectives versus too many good ideas. Don't have enough time to support the districts and do all of the initiatives. Usually just 1 proponent for many programs - test this - 1			1		11				12
HQ - Needs to use PMBP- many groups don't communicate - SES to 15's, military to SES, etc. Break down stovepipes.		2	1	1	3			3	10
HQ - Delegate PCA approval to MSC's, but provide adequate resources for		2		1	5			2	10
HQ - Stop responding to congressional inquiries/doing technical review on individual issues/projects & individual employee concerns	1	1	1	1	2		1		7
MSC's - Should stop doing project specific technical review		3		2	5	1	1		12
MSC's - Focus on customers and relationships, business	1	4		1	4		1		11
MSC's - Eliminate their passing/sanitizing of papers function		1		1	4	2		1	9
MSC's - Be operational, not policy development. Could provide operational services like CEFMS to support the districts - CEFMS is a good concept, but is too labor intensive.		1		1	4	1			7
MSC's - Should get out of production business. Shouldn't dictate priorities to districts since their knowledge is more limited. Manage more and lead less		1		2	3			1	7
MSC's- Should clearly define & improve QA	1	1	1		3				6
MSC's - Eliminate some support functions - could regionalize at MSC or at 1-2 districts in MSC.	1	1			3	1			6

Question 4 Continued - Is there anything we should stop doing at the HQ or MSC levels that we are doing now? (Some overlap with #3)	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
MSC's - Quality assurance has been diluted.		1		1	3				5
MSC's - Unknown functions. Powering down has created "41 divisions" and left MSC's waving in the wind. Need fewer, empowered MSC's					3			2	5
MSC's - Concentrate on regional interface, program management and command and control.		1			4				5
USACE - Conferences such as ENFORCE, Senior Leaders Conference, Strategic Management Review, PDT, etc. are too frequent and not adequately cost effective or affordable. Too frequent to allow time to implement good ideas generated. - Don't eliminate them, but synchronize and link these forums and spend more time networking with customers.					5				5
USACE - Less reporting in PRB's and CMR's. Instead of major items and exceptions (programmatic issues, customer relations, future work), minutia details are covered. Consider use of executive information support system like USFS uses. Several votes to eliminate CMR's					5				5
USACE - Stop taking on new or additional responsibilities while shrinking resources. Say no to projects without funding					5				5
USACE - Stop making GS-13 - 15's highly paid clerks. They are performing admin tasks since admin personnel are gone instead of performing the work they were hired to do. Yet, some support staff personnel keep hiring more people. In other cases, support staff has disappeared and technical employees are expected to be all things - HR, photography, financial management, clerical, etc. Streamline business processes.					4				4

Question 5 - What are we not doing that we should be doing or not doing well that we need to do better?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
USACE - Communicating our Value to the Nation and Army with a strategic communications plan, celebrate our successes. Chief needs to be sure they understand our relevancy. Would like to see more national program information from a single source. Need a corporate brand. One corporate office should approve communications - 1	1	6	2		19	3	2	2	35
USACE - Need to partner outside our organization to include other federal partners. Improve relationships. Needs to be a concerted, focused effort on how we can cooperatively support each other.	1	5	4	2	15	2	3		32
USACE - Training and Learning - Need sharing info and lessons learned and a strong proponent for training. - Training leads to important networking. Need a push LL system that doesn't overload folks with data. Not ensuring Learning Org is being deployed. Design more learning opportunities around program responsibility areas. Office names are so confusing it is hard to find internal counterparts.	1	2	4	2	17	2		2	30
USACE - Army Transformation - Proactively support Army transformation instead of waiting for an invitation. Installation support (IMA) is critical. Army has 30 year plan, Corps 5 year plan. Apply lessons learned from other programs to assist. We are not the Corps of Civil Works. Need to look at the broader facility engineering context and develop alternatives to construction	1	4			15	5	4		29
USACE - Quality - Assure mission is accomplished at highest competence and have good tech review. Need better technical and policy review. Invest in state of the art technologies & procedures. Better coordination on quality with HQ also needed. Need to improve ITR. Under-resourced to do QA. Also cost engineering - 1	1	3	2	4	15		2	1	28

Question 5 Continued - What are we not doing that we should be doing or not doing well that we need to do better?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
USACE - Do more strategic planning at all levels and an outreach plan. Need an annual plan to implement strategic document. Have a draft CW strategic plan. Where is HTRW or Military plan? Each MSC and district doing their own think with business performance systems and measures	1	4	1	1	14	1	4		26
USACE - Leaner, more efficient, more flexible, leverage resources well. Support functions are growing as primary mission areas are fading. Need G&A below 40%	2	2	3	2	9	2	2	1	23
USACE - Need tools to support PMBP - metrics, enforcement, reward, etc. clear measures of success. Consider use of Malcolm Baldrige or ISO for corporate performance. We must have corporate standards. - The critical few, not the many we currently have. Must measure customer satisfaction. USACE PMBP teams are dysfunctional		3	1	1	11			5	21
USACE - Communication - Improve management information for decision-making & use common vocabulary. Much information is not transferred from the MSC to the districts. Have lost contact between the top and bottom of the organization. Employees should know their counterparts at all levels. Need direction and guidance in a timely manner. More face to face meetings	2		1		17			1	21
USACE - Customers - Listen to them. Some districts are very involved with customers and stakeholders others aren't. Stop supplying what we think they need - Cadillac versus Chevy, one size fits all. Our metrics versus theirs	1	1	1	2	10			5	20

Question 5 Continued - What are we not doing that we should be doing or not doing well that we need to do better?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
HQ - Develop clear, consistent, current policies & messages and ensure understanding in the field. Includes why it is essential to build understanding and cooperation. – 1. Issue guidance in a timely fashion. Ex. Authority to collect administrative fees - obtained in 98 & 99 & still don't have a corporate policy. - Losing significant revenue because of this one item alone. Doing very little, so MSC's have to do more - 1 Policy development is not getting enough emphasis	4	5	3	1	15				28
HQ & SES - Improve relationships with the senior leaders of Army, DOD and OMB. HQ has very limited knowledge of OMB activities	1	7	1	2	6	1	1		19
HQ - PMBP - Needs to embrace PMBP. Organization is a reflection of its leadership - must promote and practice. Have doctrine beyond PMBP.	1	5	3	1	2				12
HQ - Programs - Needs to be more aggressive with legislative program and work more closely with ASA CW from beginning to end. Obtain the authorities needed for watershed approaches to planning.	2	4	1	1	2	1			11
HQ - Senior leaders need to leave ivory towers and have regional interface with people other than their regular internal & external counterparts. Field developmental assignments would also help.	2	3	2	1	3				11
HQ - Organization - Needs to be better, decide on major roles.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		7
HQ - Business processes need to be improved.		2		1	2	1			6
HQ - Get ahead of automation fronts, use more at facilities		2		1	1		1		5
HQ - Staff actions from a corporate perspective, be constructive.		2	2		2				6
HQ - MSC Support Teams in HQ are a good idea		2	1		3				6

Question 5 Continued - What are we not doing that we should be doing or not doing well that we need to do better?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
MSC's - Quality assurance needs improvement. MSC participation in critical events is not occurring nor are spot checks and audits of products. QA compromised when MSC involvement stopped.		8		1	7		1		17
MSC's - RBC's /BMO's- Need to improve operation of them. Districts are working as independent business units versus providing technical support via Project Delivery Teams. Should be doing consolidated acquisition planning, not each district separately. Corporate resources of the MSC should be available to all districts.		2		2	9		1	2	16
MSC's - Need more regionalization across MSC boundaries.		1		1	1	1	1		5
MSC's - Focus on relationship building.		1	1		2		1		5
MSC's - Assist districts with large regional projects, help avoid outgunning of staff by other agencies. Formally oversee regional projects and be resourced accordingly.				1	2		2		5
MSC's - Need more delegations to districts.		1	1	1					3
MSC's - Regional technical review center (working in one MSC).		1		1	1				3
MSC's - Grow regional divisions (3?)	1				2				3
MSC's - Keep post 3086 positions from being cut.		1							1

Question EL 5 Are internal bureaucratic requirements affecting the effectiveness of our service to customers? Ideally, what would you eliminate? (Question only posed to Emerging Leaders)	Those Who Serve Group Responding - Emerging Leaders Online
USACE - Reviews - Take far too long up the chain and then guidance is often inadequate. Delegate authority to lowest level possible. Make them concurrent where multiple layers are needed so that all changes may be made at one time.	6
USACE - Data Calls - PM's request a lot for upward reporting. Eliminate unnecessary feedback. Upward reporting is taking too much time away from customers. Customer does not like paying for all of our "normal" reports.	3
USACE - Legal - Reduce level of legal review (mandated for routine construction procurements etc). This has slowed our progress down to a crawl. Customers sign agreements within 3 mos with other Feds. Only 1 level of technical review, why 3 for legal?	2
USACE- IM/IT - Use off the shelf software for basic upward reporting. Existing multiple reports are costly and time consuming - takes time away from customers. Should be one-time inputs.	2
USACE - Bureaucracy - Far too bureaucratic. PMBP should help	2
USACE - CEFMS - Spending $100 to chase $1. Would like to see efficiency improved by having actions like CEFMS, notices of non-selection for positions, etc. centralized versus everyone doing their own.	2
USACE - Bureaucracy - My district division has eliminated most of this, but other offices in the district have not.	1
USACE - Bureaucratic requirement complainers are "simply too lazy to do the job they are required to do."	1
USACE - Change - We need the flexibility to deal with changing conditions and customer needs.	1
USACE - Eliminate - PMP's for small reimbursable projects like IDIQ task orders, AE studies & JOC task orders. Eliminate charrettes for projects less than $1 million since avg. cost for this is $100K. Eliminate project reporting for projects under $250K	1
HQ - Contracting - Eliminate most of functions of the PARC office except some policy issues and push those to MSC or lower.	1
HQ - One Corps - HQ offices don't appear to talk to each other, so why should the rest of the agency act like One Corps?	1
HQ - Team, would like to see HQ as part of the team District folks can call and work out problems. Get in trouble now if MSC is bypassed.	1

Question 6 - What concerns do you most frequently hear from your customers and stakeholders? Who are your key customers and stakeholders?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
Cost - Too expensive. Includes overhead for our "Business improvement projects". The "Corps may be slow, but it is expensive." Some military customers think too much is spent on higher levels and not enough where the rubber meets the road. We do not need new computers every year and there is too much TDY. If you want to know what TDY is a waste, look at the location. – 1. Commercial engineering firms are much cheaper	2	18	4	5	85	2	6	16	138
Process - Too slow, need to get to implementation sooner for projects with merit. Includes HQ/internal review approval time as a major factor for slowness. Can't maintain a schedule. Includes time for signature by DASA (I&H) . Pentagon is very slow. – 1. Customers just want the project built. Formulation, justification is too slow. Initially, it may be slow to get authorization. Then, delays often come from waiting on sponsor funding & decisions. - 1	1	15	7	5	75	2	4	13	122
Communication - Need to communicate with customers and stakeholders early and often & understand their needs. - Listen versus tell. Need to educate them on approval process. Corps doesn't listen - states of IL and IN Authorities, etc are confusing We conduct meetings, take notes and never take action then ask the same questions 2 years later.	1	5	4	4	29	1	3	5	52
Responsiveness - Poor, very important to customers. One USAF customer found all Corps employees out teleworking during a visit	3	3	2		28		2	2	40

Question 6 Continued - What concerns do you most frequently hear from your customers and stakeholders? Who are your key customers and stakeholders?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
Competency - eroding - only 1-2 people deep in some areas. Customers don't like learning we no longer have a capability Becoming a pass through, political agency		1	2	2	21	1		2	29
Bureaucratic - Too much of this. PCA example used. Too many layers Resist change Too many high grade employees and very few workers.	1	2		1	17	1	2	2	26
Arrogant - Project this attitude & don't listen. Won't partner with other agencies - EPA, HUD. Tries to take missions - EPA, USFWS		4	2	1	16			1	24
Standardization - None across district, MSC boundaries - inconsistent treatment of customers and application of policies and pricing especially in Civil Works & regulatory. Why do military districts cost more than civil districts? – 1. Why can't you do it like XXX district/division? - IL and IN		6	3	2	9			2	22
Mistakes - We don't pay for our own mistakes or admit them		4	1		14	2			21
Insular - Corps does too much work with its own hands. Rice bowl mentality. Not invented here mentality. Try to take away choice from customers.		2			14		2		18
Quality - Sometimes lacking or poor		4	2		8	1			15
Public Credibility - Needs to be restored. Hear that we are untrustworthy and cannot do an unbiased study. – 1. Decision documents are not supportable, have lost objectivity.			1	1	9		1	1	13

Question 7 - What does an ideal USACE 2012 look like to you? How should it be different than today?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
USACE - Leaner. Eliminate duplicate layers. Use early outs Less talk and fluff, more action. Focus on what we do best. Resources meeting needs and not payroll	2	10	4	7	38	3	5	6	75
USACE - Good image and credibility, world's experts in some areas. Producing quality products & services. Relationships good with diverse groups. Present at key forums. Premier engineering and construction agency. Our 9-11 response is a good example to emulate. People clamber for what we bring. Use of formal standing external review panel. - 1	1	4	6	2	27	1	5	9	55
USACE - More efficient and flexible. - Fewer boundary conflicts. Highly reflexive and adaptable organization. Pockets of expertise available to everyone.	2	5	4	6	19	1	3	7	47
USACE - Actually working corporately as a team, more matrixed. Vertical teams must be real, streamlined & efficient. PDT's streamlined. PDT behind the scenes and seamless. Everyone has something to contribute, fun environment. Corps team, not District etc team Teams of civilians and contractors working together	1	7	5	4	16	1	2	8	44
USACE - Improved expertise - viewed as innovative technical experts who have rapid response. Robust agency of scientists and engineers working on several mission fronts where performance is measured and rewarded accordingly.	3	5	3	2	14		2	6	35
USACE - Greater emphasis on support to military & National Security strategy & better coordination with them - closer ties to these customers. Better positioned to support all of DOD & OCONUS. More infrastructure work	2	2			22	2	1	2	31

Question 7 Continued - What does an ideal USACE 2012 look like to you? How should it be different than today?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
USACE - More regionally focused to provide products & services to include internal culture. Leading with solutions. Regionally run and centrally controlled with many local service centers		5	3	4	13		3	2	30
USACE - Many positions will be outsourced including those readily available in the private sector. May become quasi-government	2	7	2	7	7			1	26
USACE - Better understood by Congress, Army, OMB, IMA, etc.	1	5	3	1	9	1	3	2	25
USACE - Advocates for environmentally sound water resource projects. System engineering solutions to environmental problems. Key provider for environmental restoration. Supports sustainable development.	1	2	2	1	15		1	2	24
HQ - Smaller		2		1	8	1	3	1	16
HQ - National focus and proponent for programs. - Policy and strategy organization. Could enter into worldwide contracts	1	2			3		2		8
HQ - Be more responsive to MSC's, Districts - less other duties added and more value added		1			1		2	1	5
HQ - Less technical review and technical staff.	1	1			1		1		4
HQ - Why is the MACOM not integrated?	1				2				3
HQ - Bigger		1							1
HQ - EC Small						1			1
HQ - HR and RM replaced with computer dbase and a few analysts						1			1
HQ - No directors of CW and MP. Need to consolidate them.						1			1
HECSA - Smaller and tailored		1							1
MSC's - RBC's will function as true business centers. Need more control over funding and budget execution to do this.		5	1		7		1		14

Question 7 Continued - What does an ideal USACE 2012 look like to you? How should it be different than today?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
MSC's - Should be allowed to do regional stuff & be center of gravity, not districts.	1	4			2		3		10
MSC's - Smaller		2		1	4	2			9
MSC's - Eliminate them or rotate folks in and out. What value does the middle tier add in a project delivery setting?		2		3					5
MSC's - Organized for technical success.		1	1			1	1		4
MSC's - Some more robust, could have Military PM assigned to East, Central and West MSC. Customized for regional needs.		2	1		1				4
MSC's - Similar to now, maybe fewer. Maybe POD, East, West & Central - 1					4				4
MSC's - Watershed focused and resourced for that			2				1		3
MSC's - More clearly defined role.	1	1			1				3
MSC's - Advocates for district programs & provide career management for regional staff.		2							2
Labs - Only a couple needed		1							1
Labs & Centers- Accomplishments are shared.						1			1
Technical Centers - Need 2 with world class experts		1							1

Question 7 Continued - What does an ideal USACE 2012 look like to you? How should it be different than today?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
Districts - Technical experts across nation who serve as local, regional and national PDT members. Mix capability wherever needed. Do tech review	1	4	1	3	4				13
Districts - Fewer and fewer with full service					8	1			9
Districts - Delete MSC's & create some super Districts similar to NAVFAC Engineering Field Divisions and Engineering Field Activities				1	1				2
Districts - Focused on projects and less FTE for peripheral items					2				2
Districts - Fully empowered					2				2

Question 8 - What do we have to do today to achieve our "ideal future" tomorrow?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
USACE - Determine who we serve and why, what is Corps 2012? Analyze trade-offs. Align our priorities and actions. This was needed a long time ago. Divest of other activities. Get rid of functions and spaces we can't compete in - 1 Face the fact that many of our services are available in the private sector. - 1	7	8	3	5	30	3	4	4	64
USACE - Act corporately with a clear strategic plan charge (5 or 10 year plan preferred) with achievable intermediate steps. Be prepared to adjust plan as needed. Eliminate bureaucratic barriers. We have the right people, just unharness them from the overly tedious reporting requirements that do not serve our customers. We need to identify what the biggest technical task will be over the next 10 years. Vision linked to policy, resources and objectives.	2	11	6	3	24	3	4	5	58
USACE - Structure and build relationships for success (rebuild damaged relationships), keep organization relevant. Deeper relationships in DC. Closer relationships between us and those who use our technology. Closer to other agencies and professional organizations, states. Collaborative sustainable development focus	5	11	6	3	15	1	3	3	47
USACE - Communicate relevancy to Army & our role in national security. Contact CNN for tips. Support Army Transformation. Stress the fact that many other nations come to the Corps for expertise that others are trying to reduce or eliminate. – 1. Concentrate on delighting ACSIM and IMA's - 1 Promote our capabilities	1	5	2	2	27	1	2	3	43

Question 8 Continued - What do we have to do today to achieve our "ideal future" tomorrow?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
USACE - Be more businesslike, more cost effective and professional, more accountable, manage work better. Reduce contract cost burdens such as changes, and provide better value. Analyze every position to determine if it directly contributes to mission and customer satisfaction at the lowest cost. Stop providing life support for organizational inefficiencies that regale in achievements in the past. What do we use to drive CW O&M efficiency? Look at statutory requirements versus bureaucratic extras. – 1. Streamline communications Simplify procedures	2	4	2	4	18		3	2	35
USACE - Be proactive. Take advantage of circumstances to improve the Corps. Regularly reposture to support future needs. Eliminate stigma of change. Complex solutions are required, not just a matrix organization. Plan for a dynamic tomorrow. Arrive at a water policy and project formulation process that is deemed fair.	1	6	2	1	11	1	2	2	26
USACE - Reputation/Image needs improving, Strategic Communications is weak, need to tell story better. Overcome being viewed and used as a tool of individual Congress members. Must be trusted. Admit our problems and failures. Need an ethic of serving the taxpayers, not just a particular sponsor.	2	4	1	1	14		3	1	26
USACE - Communicate value to the nation, more sophisticated. Need to build a Corps brand. Take on critics - 1	1	4		1	13		1	3	23
USACE - IT - Integrate HQ and RBC processes with supporting IS systems. Corporate information system. Standardize IT better. Technical specialists and managers shouldn't spend so much time managing funds - improve financial system. One site that has all pertinent information, not multiple sites. Concentrate on what we need versus nice to have. Embrace new technology methods.	1	2	1	2	11	1	2	2	22

Question 8 Continued - What do we have to do today to achieve our "ideal future" tomorrow?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
USACE - Retain our expertise and resources, especially in engineering. Determine what future expertise is needed. Need the right balance of in-house and contract personnel. Need to become the Corps of Engineers again and not look like the rest of the Federal government. Don't become a Corps of business administrators. Keep technically challenging work in-house	1	2		2	15			2	22

Question 9 - What other concerns do you have about USACE 2012?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
USACE - Will become a granting or contracting out agency. Contractors don't serve customers as well as dedicated government employees. Customers will figure out that they can get better service elsewhere at a lower cost if this continues. Initial efficiencies from cutting back, but then private contracting inefficiencies will surface and customers will be unhappy. We should be the Corps of Engineers not the Corps of PM or contracting out	1	1		1	21			3	27
USACE -Must focus on being world-class & serving the nation. Our role is to serve the people of the US. How can we make the people we serve more satisfied with our products and services? - 1	2	6	3	1	10		3	3	25
USACE - Be more situationally aware and eliminate untouchable attitude. Get our heads out of the sand. Have never seen an organization so out of touch with its business. – 1. Are we asking what the most pressing national needs are internally and externally?	1	6	2	3	5	1	4	1	23
USACE - We will die a slow death if we don't change. - Need to realize this corporately. Don't just take surveys that don't lead anywhere – 1. We are a ship adrift. You sell the Corps through actions, not commercials. - 1	2	3	2	2	9		2	2	22
USACE - Maintain technical expertise, core competencies - Some erosion with loss of vertical organization.		2	3	1	13		2	1	22
USACE - Others will determine future of USACE. USACE will be radically changed long before 2012		4	1	1	12		1	1	20

Question 9 Continued - What other concerns do you have about USACE 2012?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding								
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist	Lab/Ctr	EL	Total
USACE - Privatization, FAIR Act, Sec Army proposal will require a lot of time and resources and throw us off track. Will lose dedicated people and institutional expertise with contracting out. Best will leave. Must be honest with employees on what's going to happen.			1	1	12			2	16
USACE - Technical expertise is eroding. May not be able to maintain all of our competencies. Not hiring enough engineers or giving them quality engineering work to do. – 1. Why pursue advanced engineering degrees when you can earn more as a PM without an advanced degree, registration or even technical expertise? Brain drain is occurring Restore expertise in planning, design and construction - 1	1	3	1		9		1	1	15
USACE - Need to make better use of current technology, especially automation. Systems should be web-based, not screen based and state of the art. Stop cramming bad new IT tools down our throats. Efforts like SET initiative are good.	1	1	1	1	7	1	1	2	15
USACE - Retention issues - 53% of workforce and 71% of senior leaders eligible for retirement in next 5 years. - Loss of institutional knowledge. We must mentor and nurture our people & provide diverse, enjoyable, challenging work & fair advancement opportunities. Benefits are declining. Must offer more than public service. Many employees are retiring with negative feelings toward Corps management. - 1			1	1	9			4	

Question 10 - Is there anything else you would like the study team to consider?	Those Who Serve Groups Responding							
	HQ	SES	G.O.	MSC	HQ MSC On	Dist.	Labs/Ctr	Total
Task Force - Needs to look at entire organization, including districts - don't be too limited by upfront constraints. Be objective in appearance and fact. Look at current responsibilities and manpower requirements.		4	1	3	4	1	1	14
Task Force - Be radical, great people in Corps want real change. Be courageous - this study takes courage. Think outside the box and define future challenges and technologies, not just that we will continue to be engineers. - 1	1	2	1		3	1	1	9
Task Force - Obtain customer, employee and stakeholder feedback - Includes Congress. Use IPR's to keep updated		2	1	1	4		1	9
Task Force - Form should follow function. Don't change just to change. See what is working first.		1	1		1		1	4
Task Force - Challenge the barriers of innovation and reality. Seek needs of the future.		1		1	1		1	4
Task Force - Report - Concerned it will end up on shelf. Believe current Chief will take action on a good study.					1	1	2	4
Task Force - Learn from previous Reorganization Studies		1		2				3
Task Force - Change is feared, have inertia, turf protection, and job loss impacts to deal with.					1		2	3
Task Force - Chief's leadership is excellent & what we need					1		2	3
Task Force - Take this effort very seriously & do a good job			1		1		1	3
Task Force - Use some outside consulting for effort. Consider use of business performance consultant and development of performance foundation. Internally, we keep reinventing the culture we want. Many employees are leaving because of a lack of leadership across the organization and our inability to fix that.		1			1		1	3

Question 11 EL- Over the next 10 years, what does the Corps have to do to retain you as an employee? (Question only posed to Emerging Leaders)	Those Who Serve Group Responding - Emerging Leaders Online
USACE - Advancement Opportunities - Provide these to give more opportunities for leadership & growth, and greater challenges. - Other agencies are.	12
USACE - Integrity - Show more of this to include correcting unethical behavior of managers and others in leadership positions.	4
USACE - Reward - Technical proficiency and management skills. Equate pay with performance. Not everyone is the same.	4
USACE - Respect - Treat me with dignity and respect and listen to me. Acknowledge that I am important and do good things for the Corps.	3
USACE - Thanks for the opportunity to respond. Good luck.	3
USACE - Benefits like flexitour and telework, long-term training, insurance are important to maintain.	2
USACE - Empowerment - More needed. Trust me and support me.	2
USACE - Location - Should not have to leave home to get promoted.	2
USACE - Outsourcing - Don't outsource me. Stem this tide.	2
USACE - Contracting - Stop changing the DAWIA requirements.	1
USACE - Costs - Must be reduced.	1
USACE - Co-workers should be talented.	1
USACE - Dual track manager/supervisor versus technical ladder would help.	1
USACE - Employees - Remember that without great people, you can't keep doing great things.	1
USACE - IT/IM - Let engineers be engineers instead of doing data input multiple times to systems that don't talk to each other.	1
USACE - Leadership - Show me how I have emerged as a leader.	1
USACE - Nothing. Will be retiring when eligible.	1
USACE - O&M Backlog - We need to be proud of our facilities, so address this.	1
USACE - Opportunities - Provide opportunities to help others in the Corps.	1
USACE - Pride - Show me a proud workforce.	1