

**BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
FISCAL YEAR 99
ANNUAL VALUE ENGINEERING PROGRAM REPORT**

PART I.

Senior Official Responsible for Value Program (VE): Name: Mr. Michael J. Roluti, Title: Director, Technical Service Center,
Address: P.O. Box 25007, Attention Code: D-8000, Denver, CO 80225-0007

Phone: (303)445-2720, FAX: (303)445-6379
E-Mail: mroluti@do.usbr.gov

For Technical Questions Please Contact: Mr. Frank McLean, Reclamation Value Program Manager, Technical Service Center,
Address: P.O. Box 25007, Attention Code: D-8170, Denver, CO 80025-0007

Phone: (303)445-3091, FAX: (303)445-6475
E-Mail: fmclean@do.usbr.gov

Reclamation Value Program (VE) Expenditures (\$'s Invested in VE this fiscal year): \$ 848,821

Dollar Share of Savings Provided to Contractors (Through the VECP program): \$ 42,470

Dollar Thresholds for each Value Program (VE) category (if different from \$1 million):

Construction projects are studied (unless waived for cause) if their cost exceeds \$500,000

Non-construction (procurement) actions are considered for study if their cost exceeds \$1,000,000.

TOTAL RECLAMATION INITIAL & LIFE-CYCLE COST SAVINGS (INCLUDING VECP SAVINGS) ATTRIBUTABLE TO VALUE PROGRAM (VE):							
A. Summary of cost savings and avoidances reported by category (See B, below):							
Category	Cost Savings		Cost Avoidance		Total Savings + Avoidance		Grand Total Savings + Avoidance In-House + Contract
	In-House	Contract	In-House	Contract	In-House	Contract	
Summary Totals	\$9,657,913		\$47,927,000		\$57,584,913	0	\$57,584,913
B. Total Reclamation Value Program (VE) Initial & Life-Cycle Cost Savings and Cost Avoidances (including VECP) by Category:							
1. Acquisition					\$0	0	0
2. Administration	\$945,388				\$945,388	0	\$945,388
3. Other (Specific Features)							
a. Construction Activities	\$1,436,325		\$47,927,000		\$49,363,325	0	\$49,363,325
b. Operations & Maintenance					\$0	0	0
c. Grants & Loans	\$7,276,200				\$7,276,200	0	\$7,276,200

C. Unless otherwise noted, the Bureau of Reclamation routinely validates reported cost savings, avoidance and other project data as follows:

Reclamation uses cost estimating personnel on all studies, VECP analyses, and other VE related activities to determine the most appropriate cost savings and/or avoidance estimates. Design teams then review the data and make specific estimates for the final determination of the accepted recommended savings and/or avoidance. Design teams report their determination of savings in Accountability Reports. The savings are subject to spot review and verification by the Program Coordinator, Program Manager, and IG audit.

PART II. VALUE PROGRAM (VE) PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Region/Project Title/Description/(Month & Year of Study)*	In House or Contract	Value Study or VECP Processing Cost	Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Type of Project	Contract- or VECP Savings	Award Amount	Award Date
1. GP-Lake Meridith Salinity Control (VE)(4/97)	In-House-TSC	\$15,000	\$554,000	\$0	Constructio	\$0	\$1,500,000	06/30/99
2. GP-Willow Creek Dam Modification(VP)(5/98)	In-House-TSC	\$15,000	\$235,000	\$0	Constructio	\$0	\$1,278,362	08/19/99
3. GP-Mudlake Rd, Spillway & Control Structure (VE)(2/94)	In-House-GP	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	Constructio	\$0	\$609,989	05/06/99
4. GP-Seminole Dam Spillway Repair (12/98)	Waiver-GP	\$0	\$0	\$0	Constructio	\$0	\$1,451,699	07/09/99
5. GP-Jim Lake Channel Extension (VECP)(2/99)	In-House-GP	\$1,000	\$28,775	\$0	Constructio	\$35,170		
6. GP-MW, Phase IV White River to Ceder Butte (VE)(3/97)	In-House-GP	\$39,300	\$3,920,700	\$0	Grant/Const	\$0	\$2,538,382	10/30/98
7. GP-MW, Lower Brule, Co. Line Road Pipeline (VE)(4/97)	In-House-GP	\$35,400	\$84,100	\$0	Grant/Const	\$0	\$514,368	06/30/99
8. GP-MW, Core Phase IV Vivian Rte (VP,7/95)(VE,8/96)	In-House-GP	\$46,500	\$3,271,400	\$0	Grant/Const	\$0	\$2,075,314	11/12/98
9. MP-Casitas Dam Modification (VE)(3/98)	In-House-TSC	\$20,000	\$402,500	\$0	Constructio	\$0	\$21,032,000	06/04/99
10.MP-Folsom Power Plant U 2 (5/99)	Waiver-MP	\$0	\$0	\$0	Constructio	\$0	\$2,248,808	09/29/99
11.MP-Placer County Water District 1999 (VECP)(7/99)	In-House-MP	\$700	\$4,250	\$0	Constructio	\$2,200		04/23/99
12.PN-Gr. Coulee Dam PP Upgrade Units G1-G18 (VE)(8/95)	In-House-PN	\$30,000	\$0	\$47,927,000	Constructio	\$0	\$40,546,000	06/25/99
13.PN-Hungry Horse Road Paving & S Protect (VE)(2/99)	In-House-PN	\$10,000	\$207,600	\$0	Constructio	\$0	\$1,297,000	08/10/99
14.PN-Hungry Horse Dam PP Control Bay Elevs. (7/98)	Waiver-PN	\$0	\$0	\$0	Constructio	\$0	\$879,000	08/18/99
15.PN-HH & Grand Coulee CO2 Fire Extinguishing Sys (1/99)	Waiver-PN	\$0	\$0	\$0	Constructio	\$0	\$1,237,000	09/17/99
16.PN-Echo Pump Plant - Stanfield (VECP)(4/99)	In-House-PN	\$1,000	\$4,200	\$0	Constructio	\$5,100		09/11/98
17.RSC-Building 67 Space Reduction (VE)(3/96)	In-House-TSC	\$1,000	\$701,388	\$0	Admin	\$0		Multiple
18.RSC-Warehouse Consolidation (VE)(3/96)	In-House-TSC	\$1,000	\$244,000	\$0	Admin	\$0		Multiple
19.RSC-Information Technology Business (VA)(5/97)	In-House-TSC	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	Admin	\$0		None
20.RSC-Denver Office Data Communications (VA)(12/96)	In-House-TSC	\$29,000	\$0	\$0	Admin	\$0		Multiple
21.RSC-PC/LAN Support (VA)(10/97)	In-House-TSC	\$52,800	\$0	\$0	Admin	\$0		Multiple
22.RSC-Comprehensive Facility Review (CFR) (VA)(7/99)	In-House-TSC	\$69,000	\$0	\$0	Admin	\$0		None
23.RSC-RSC Information Tech Strategic Plan (VA)(2/99)	In-House-TSC	\$7,120	\$0	\$0	Admin	\$0		None
Total		\$443,820	\$9,657,913	\$47,927,000		\$42,470	\$77,207,922	
Prior Year Studies not Previously Reported or Adjustments to Studies Reported in Prior Years								
24. FY98 -GP-Pueblo Dam Modification (VE)(9/97)	In-House-TSC	\$20,000			Constructio		\$8,830,500	08/13/98
25. FY97-PN-Tieton Dam Spillway Conc Repairs (VE)(10/97)	In-House-PN		\$216,000		Constructio		\$2,264,000	06/23/98
26. FY97-UC-Jordanelle Gate Chamber Mod (VE)(10/87)	Mod I Class	(\$20,000)	(\$5,462,000)		Constructio			
27. FY97-PN-230-KV Power Distribution Sys (VE)(12/93)	In-House-TSC	(\$18,600)			Constructio			
28. FY97-MP-Bradbury Dam Mod, Stage I (VE)(12/95)	In-House-TSC		(\$497,500)		Constructio			
29. FY98-MP-Newman Canal and J Lateral (VE)(1/97)	In-House-TSC	(\$25,000)			Constructio			
30. FY96-MP-Marble Bluff Dam Facilities Mods (VE)(4/96)	In-House-TSC	(\$25,000)	(\$100,000)		Constructio			
31.FY96(cost);FY98(savings)-GP-MW Echo Point (VE)(12/95)	In-House-GP	\$32,000	(\$44,600)		Constructio			
32.Part III Line 4b, FY98 VPSA reduced by \$81,943.								
33.FY96- GP-Willow Creek Dam Mod (VP)(9/96)	In-House-TSC			\$14,200	Constructio			

*See Part II Instructions on pages 7 and 8 for details on table entries. (Unless otherwise noted, the steps taken to validate the reported cost savings are described in Part I.C preceding.)

<u>Description of Quality or other Non-Quantifiable Improvements of Note:</u>		
Item #	PROJECT TITLE	DESCRIPTION NOTE
	General notation	Studied Projects that had benefits that were difficult to quantify or provided nonmonetary benefits are described below.
1.	GP-Lake Meridith Salinity Control	The VE study will save money and produced a better product but it doesn't appear that federal money will be saved.
6.	GP-MW, Phase IV White Water	A final determination has not been made on the accepted savings for some of the proposals. The lessons learned in many MW (Mni Wiconi) VE studies were used to design several projects that were not studied.
12.	PN-Grand Coulee Dam PP	Adoption of value study proposals to let industry make Request For Proposal to increase efficiency, then contract for production of models to test efficiency, leading to award to produce prototype of most cost/efficient model for supply and installation has reduced the original estimated cost from \$90.5 million to only \$42.5 million. The projected 3per cent increase in runner efficiency will add an estimated \$7 million/yr in power revenue to government based on current BPA rates, with less maintenance & operating costs.
17.	RSC-Building 67 Space Reduction	Align supporting and compatible organizations to adjoining or closer proximity in Building 67.
19.	RSC-Information Technology	Increased customer involvement by requiring future Business Concept/Decision Documents (BC/DD) to identify all customers contacted in the preparation of the document and their relationship to the proposed system/project to ensure those impacted by the action were consulted in the development of the BC/DD. Increased scrutiny over the Reclamation-wide WCF activities as well as the assessments to control costs.
20.	RSC-Denver Office Data Comm	Of the 21 proposals made by the study, eight have been or are being implemented. The proposals made by the study have organizational benefits, such as: (1) assures a system with an "open architecture" that is not limited by proprietary solutions, (2) ties the system configuration more closely to the needs identified by the customer base, (3) immediately upgrades the system switches, server connections and ethernet hubs to increase the speed of the system, (4) formed the basis for a formalized service agreement between the customers and the service providers, and (5) increased system capacity.
21.	RSC-PC/LAN Support	Of the 37 proposals made by the study, 24 were accepted for implementation, and of these 16 were implemented by July 1999. The benefits of the study were: (1) improved relationship between customers and providers (based on a dramatic reduction in complaints), (2) a clear and viable service agreement, (3) planned standardization of software and most computers to simplify maintenance and service, (4) improved communications between users and providers.
22.	RSC-Comprehensive Fac. Review	Of the five proposals made by the study, four were accepted for implementation. Immediate action was taken to modify the CFR format to improve clarity and reduce redundancy (American Falls CFR). The three remaining proposals are being reviewed to determine the best method of implementation. Proposal 3, Institute an Active Records Management Process, is the subject of a separate value study, currently underway.
23.	RSC-RSC Information Tech Plan	The VE Presentation Report became the foundation document for the Reclamation Service Center's Information Technology Strategic Plan. All five proposals were adopted and incorporated in the nine plan strategies. The benefits of the study were: (1) identified specific action items for the next three years, (2) developed an innovative process for considering new information technology initiatives, (3) created a graphic strategic planning model of the interactions in the Information Technology system, and (4) developed a process for translating business practices into viable Information Technology initiatives.
24.	GP-Pueblo Dam Modification	The implementation cost of \$20,000 was overlooked in the FY98 report. Adjustment made to FY98 Summary in Part III.
25.	PN-Tieton Dam Spillway	Additional savings of \$216,000 from Mod 4 of 4/99 (incorporated VE suggestions to use shotcrete resulting in lower unit costs and reduced concrete section). Adjustment made to FY98 Summary Part III.
26.	UC-Jordanelle Gate Chamber Mod	The costs and savings from a 1987 study were mistakenly reported as a 1997 study. Adjustment made to FY97 Summary in Part III.
27.	UC-230-KV Power Distribution Sys	The costs for this study were reported in both FY97 and FY98. Adjustment made to FY97 Summary in Part III.
28.	MP-Bradbury Dam Modification	The savings from a proposal to modify the spillway was double-counted. Adjustment made to FY97 Summary in Part III.
29.	MP-Newman Canal and J Lateral	The cost of the study was reported in both FY97 and FY98. Adjustment made to FY98 Summary in Part III.
30.	MP-Marble Bluff Dan Fish Pass	The costs and savings were reported in both FY96 and FY97. Adjustment made to FY96 Summary in Part III.
31.	GP-MW Echo Point Intake	The cost of the study was not reported in FY96. Adjustment made to FY96 in Part III. The savings were overstated in the FY98 report. Adjustment made to FY98 in Part III.
32.	Part III, Line 4b, FY98 VPSA	The line 4b entry was incorrect. Adjustment made in Part III.
33.	GP-Willow Creek Dam Mod	The avoidance was not reported in FY96. Adjustment made in Part III.

PART III. (SUMMARY OF ALL APPORTIONED SAVINGS FOR RECLAMATION)

This part provides summary data for all projects in the reporting and 4 preceding fiscal years based on detailed project data in Part II. Note that all savings are claimed in the year of contract award.

SUMMARY OF ALL APPORTIONED SAVINGS FOR RECLAMATION (Note: All savings are claimed in the year of award.)						
Category (Note: Figures in BOLD indicate adjusted entries)	FY1995 Report	FY1996 Report	FY1997 Report	FY1998 Report	Current FY1999	1995-1999 Cumulative
1. Cost Savings (including VECP savings)	\$6,881,100	\$13,225,302	\$7,621,968	\$4,625,600	\$9,657,913	\$42,011,883
2. Cost Avoidance	\$4,254,500	\$6,866,035	\$500,000	\$130,000	\$47,927,000	\$59,677,535
3. Dollar Share of Savings Provided to Contractors	\$297,900	\$49,265	\$0	\$453,800	\$42,470	\$843,435
4.a Expenses Attributed to Value Studies of These Projects	\$554,739	\$506,032	\$667,300	\$91,000	\$441,120	\$2,260,191
4.b Costs Attributed to the Operation of Value Program (Program + VECP processing costs)	\$429,461	\$576,000	\$512,230	\$473,390	\$407,701	\$2,398,782
4.c Total Expenses (4a - Value Studies + 4b - Program & VECP processing costs)	\$984,200	\$1,082,032	\$1,179,530	\$564,390	\$848,821	\$4,658,973
5. Return on Investment (ROI) = (Line 1 + Line 2 divided by Line 4c)	11.3	18.6	6.9	8.4	67.8	21.8

PART IV. (INTERIOR SPECIFIC REPORTING PORTION FOR THE REPORTING YEAR 1999)

A. ADMINISTRATION (Training) - Indicate the number of Reclamation personnel:		
Total Permanent FTE in Reclamation @ Year-End	Trained This Fiscal Year (1999)	
	SAVE Certified Module I or II	All Other Value Training
5,601	2	4

B. ADMINISTRATION (Staffing) - Identify the number of Reclamation staff personnel assigned to support the Value Engineering Program			
Value Engineering Staff	Number of Professional Staff - Staff Cost	Number of Technical Staff - Staff Cost	Number of Clerical Staff - Staff Cost
Full Time	3 - \$157,264 (1.3 FTE)	1 - \$69,222 (0.75 FTE)	0 - \$0 (0.0 FTE)
Part Time	9 - \$119,236 (0.99 FTE)	0 - \$0 (0.0 FTE)	1 - \$600 (0.01 FTE)

NOTE: Non-Labor costs of \$58,655 are not shown in B. Administration (above), but are included with staff costs and VECP costs in Part III, line 4b.

Project Category	Subject and Available		Studied	Formally Waived	Not Studied & Unaddressed	Percent Studied	Percent Waived	Percent Unaddressed
	In House	Contract						

C. NUMBER OF PROJECTS SUBJECT TO STUDY (AWARDED IN THE REPORTING FISCAL YEAR)
(For the reporting year, identify the number of Reclamation projects subject to study under 369-DM-1)

1. In the range of \$500,000 to \$1,000,000	9	0	3	2	4	33	22	45
2. Over the threshold of \$1,000,000 (PL 104-106).	27	0	8	7	12	30	26	44
3. Nonconstruction procurement over \$1,000,000.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

D. VALUE OF PROJECTS SUBJECT TO STUDY (AWARDED IN THE REPORTING FISCAL YEAR)
(For the reporting year, identify the dollar amount of Reclamation projects subject to study under 369-DM-1)

1. In the range of \$500,000 to \$1,000,000.	\$6,113,301	\$0	\$1,630,460	\$1,610,776	\$2,875,065	27	26	47
2. Over the threshold of \$1,000,000 (PL 104-106).	\$132,994,911	\$0	\$91,012,591	\$11,366,963	\$30,615,357	68	9	23
3. Nonconstruction Procurement over \$1,000,000.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0	0

E. VALUE ENGINEERING STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS (Identify the number and acceptance of Reclamation Study Proposals for the projects awarded in the reporting fiscal year.)

Studies Completed (Total Proposals)		Proposals Fully Accepted		Proposals Partially Accepted		Proposals Withddrawn/Eliminated		Proposals Rejected	
In House	By Contract	In House	By Contract	In House	By Contract	In House	By Contract	In House	By Contract
17 (149)	0 (0)	46	0	29	0	22	0	52	

F. VALUE ENGINEERING CHANGE PROPOSALS (Indicate the number of Reclamation Value Engineering Change Proposals (VECP) accepted for projects active in the reporting fiscal year.)

Contract Size	Number of Active Contracts	Number of VECP's Submitted	Number of VECP's Accepted	Number of VECP' s Rejected	Number of VECP's Withdrawn
\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	21	2	2	0	0
Over \$1,000,000	23	1	1	0	0

G. Of the Value Studies performed for projects awarded this year, how many studies were performed on Operations and Maintenance projects?	0
Of the Value Studies performed for projects awarded this year, how many were performed during the project's planning stage?	2
Of the Value Studies performed for projects awarded this year, how many studies were performed on Grant projects?	3

H. RECOGNITION (Indicate the number, type and amount of awards given by Reclamation for outstanding work in the field of Value Engineering)				
Number of Awards Issued	Number of Awards by Type		Amount of Awards by Type	
	Special Act	Monetary	Per Team	Individual
1	0	1 (\$500)	\$0	\$500

Directions for Completing the Annual Value Engineering Program Report

Part I, Header Lines:

Fiscal Year: Enter the Fiscal Year covered by this report.

Senior Official: Enter the name, title, address, fax number, phone number, and E-mail address of the official responsible for your program.

Technical Contact: Enter the name, title, address, fax number, phone number and E-mail address, of the Value Program Coordinator.

Program VE Expenditures: Identify the total (studies, program & VECP processing costs) amount spent on VE for the fiscal year. Verify that this number agrees with the "Total Expenses" reported in Part III, Item 4.c.

Savings Provided to Contractors: Identify the total amount paid to contractors under the VECP program for the fiscal year. Verify that this number agrees with the "Dollar Share of Savings Provided to Contractors" reported in Part III, Item 3.

Dollar Thresholds for each Value Program (VE) category: This information is already entered on the form.

Part I, Section A:

Summary of Cost Savings and Avoidances: Enter the summary totals from Part I, Section B below. (Note: This figure should include the VECP savings.)

Part I, Section B:

Cost Savings and Avoidances by Category: Based on the information provided in Part II, enter the initial and life-cycle savings and avoidances for those projects awarded in the reporting fiscal year in the appropriate categories. Enter the Totals and Grand Totals as required. (This data includes VECP savings)

Part I, Section C:

Validation of Savings, Avoidance and Project Data: This information is already entered on the form.

PART II is the heart of the annual report and should be the first thing filled in!

Part II:

Value Program Project Description: Report each project awarded in the reporting fiscal year where the award amount exceeded \$500,000. Complete the table to identify the studies, waivers and VECP's for each project. Note that no cost should be entered for processing waivers. Note that we claim all savings in the year of project award and do not prorate the project savings (construction or life-cycle) over the life of the project, even though this is permitted under the current DOI guidance. Where there were quality or other non-quantifiable improvements these should be identified in the paragraph following the table by Project title. Please make sure that the project titles match if there are both monetary savings or avoidances and quality/non-quantifiable improvements. The following information and sample table is provided below for guidance:

"Region/Project Title/Description (VE) for Value Engineering Study, (VA) for Value Analysis Study, (VP) for Value Planning Study, and the Month and Year of study" is used to clearly identify the project studied or for which a VECP(s) or waiver was approved. Include a sequential item number, region, project title, type of study, and date (month/year) of study or VECP.

"In House or Contract" identifies whether the value study was performed in house or under a contract and this will determine under which category the savings/avoidance is reported in Parts I. If the study is an in-house study please identify if it was done by the Region (MP, PN, UC, LC, GP,) or by the Technical Service Center (TSC).

"Value Study or VECP Processing Cost" enter the cost of the study or the Government in-house cost of processing the VECP. Study costs are totaled and reported in Part III, Line 4a. VECP Processing costs are totaled and added to the Value Program Costs in Part III, Line 4b.

"Cost Savings" report the cost savings accepted by the accountability reports. Total the savings and report them, by category, in Part I.B. These savings will be totaled and combined in the summary figures in Part I.A and in Part III, Line 1.

"Cost Savings For VECP's" report the Actual Government Savings (Contract Price Reduction minus the Unreimbursed Government Evaluation Costs. See page 5 of the Value Engineering Change Proposal Form available on the INTERNET from the templates section of the appendices on the Reclamation VE Homepage. These savings are included in the cost savings totals in Part I. A and in Part III, Line 1.

"Cost Avoidance" report the cost avoidance accepted by the accountability report. **(Note that cost reductions accepted on Value Planning Studies are "Avoidances", while cost reductions from Value Engineering and Value Analysis Studies are "Savings.")** Total the avoidances and report them in Part I.B by category. These will be totaled and combined in the summary figures in Part I.A and in Part III, Line 2.

"Type of Project" enter the type of project based on the categories listed in Part I.B as "Acquisition", "Administration", "Construction", "Operations & Maintenance", or "Grants & Loans".

“VECP Savings To Contractor” report the cost savings allocated to the Contractor from accepted Value Engineering Change Proposal(s). VECP savings to Contractors should equal 55% of the Gross Savings minus both contractor development and implementation costs, and the Government implementation cost. See page 3 of the Value Engineering Change Proposal Form available on the INTERNET from the templates section of the appendices in the Reclamation VE Homepage. Total these savings and report them in Part I, under “Dollar Share of Savings Provided to Contractors”, and in Part III, Line 3.

“Award Amount and Award Date” report the amount & date of the contract award. Award amounts are used to report the value of project awards in Part IV.C&D.

SAMPLE TABLE								
Region/Project Title/Description; Type of Study and Month and Year of Study	In House or Contract	Value Study or VECP Processing Cost	Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Type of Project	VECP Savings To Contractor	Award Amount	Award Date
1. MP-Stony Creek Siphon (VE)(11/97)	In-House-TSC	\$20,000	\$2,350,096	\$0	Construction		\$3,616	05/07/98
2. MP-No Hands Bridge (VECP-No. 1)	In-House-MP	\$700	\$1,196	\$0	Construction	\$2,310		
3. MP-Folsom Spillway Gate Automation (8/95)	Waiver-MP	\$0	\$0	\$0	Construction	\$0	\$1,249,000	4/7/98
4. GP/Estes/Marys Lake Transformer Replacements (VP) 12/96	In-House-TSC	\$15,000	\$0	\$500	Construction	\$0	\$368,240	10/03/97

Part III:

Summary of all Apportioned Savings for Reclamation: Complete the table. Make sure that the information entered matches the corresponding entries in Parts I and II. Note that the VECP processing costs are separated from the study costs and added to the Value Program cost on Line 4.b.

Line 1. “Cost Savings” enter the total of all savings and VECP savings identified in Part II.

Line 2. “Cost Avoidance” enter the total of all avoidances identified in Part II.

Line 3. “Dollar Share of Savings Provided to Contractors” enter the total of all “VECP Savings to Contractor” from Part II. Note that this number should match the entry in Part I.

Line 4.a “Expenses Attributed to Value Studies” enter the total of all Value Study Costs only from the column “Value Study or VECP Processing Cost” in Part II.

Line 4.b “Cost Attributed to the Operation of the Value Program” enter the total of all VECP processing costs from the column “Value Study or VECP Processing Cost” in Part II and all Value Program costs other than study costs. Note that the cost of the Value Program includes all costs (Labor and non-Labor) attributed to running the program. The labor cost should include the load (e.g. benefits, etc.).

Line 4.c “Total Expenses” enter the total of Lines 4.a and 4.b.

Line 5. “Return on Investment” enter the sum of Lines 1 and 2 divided by Line 4.c.

NOTE: If you amend any of the previous years figures, please put an * by the figure and a footnote to indicate the amount of the amendment, what study it covered, and the dated you amended the figures.

Part IV:

Interior Specific Reporting Portion For The Fiscal Year

Part IV, Section A:

Administration (Training): Under “Total Personnel” enter the Full Time Equivalent number of positions filled as of the last day of the reporting year. Under “SAVE Certified Module I or II” enter the number of staff trained in SAVE certified courses. Under “Other Value Training” enter the number of staff trained in seminars, SAVE conferences or other value method training. Note that if a staff member attends two value courses in the year, they are counted twice (once for each course).

- Part IV, Section B: **Administration (Staffing):** Complete the table based on the number of positions filled, in each category, as of the last day of the reporting year. Indicate the number of people in VE positions and their total staff cost, including the load (e.g., benefits, etc.). For Part Time staff, follow the number of people and cost by the total Full Time Equivalent (FTE) of those positions in parentheses. (Example: 1 - \$35,000 [0.5FTE]). Separately identify non-labor costs that will be included in the total program expenses in Part III, Lines 4b and 4c.
- Part IV, Section C: **Number of Projects Subject To Study:** Complete the table based on the number of contracts awarded in each category for the reporting fiscal year. Note that this number should equal the total number of the projects listed in Part II, although there may have been projects that were “Not Studied or Unaddressed.”
- Part IV, Section D: **Value of Projects Subject To Study:** Complete the table based on the value of contracts awarded in each category for the reporting fiscal year. Note that the projects listed in Part II, include all project contracts awarded in the fiscal year, although there may have been projects that were “Not Studied or Unaddressed”.
- Part IV, Section E: **Value Engineering Study Recommendations:** Complete the table **based only on the value studies which were performed for projects awarded in the fiscal year.** Note that the “Fully Accepted” and “Partially Accepted” proposals should be the same proposals used to develop the savings and avoidance costs reported in Parts I, II and III. Proposals that are “Eliminated” or “Withdrawn” are reported in the appropriate column separately from the “Rejected” proposals.
- Part IV, Section F: **Value Engineering Change Proposals:** Report all contracts that were active during the reporting fiscal year, include both projects awarded in the fiscal year and projects awarded in prior years but which were still active in the reporting fiscal year. Complete the table based on those Value Engineering Change Proposal (VECP) actions awarded on contracts that were active in the reporting year. Note that the number of “Accepted” VECP’s should be based on the same VECP’s used to determine the “Dollar Savings Provided to Contractors” reported in Part I, Part II, and Part III, Line 3.
- Part IV, Section G: **Specialty Questions:** Answer each of the questions **based only on the value studies which were performed on projects awarded in the reporting fiscal year.** Note that the “Operations & Maintenance” and “Grants & Loans” projects should be the same projects reported in Part I.B.
- Part IV, Section H: **Recognition:** Complete the table with the information requested. Note that the total number of awards should equal the sum of the “Special Act” and “Monetary” awards. For “Monetary” awards, report the total value of all monetary awards in parentheses following the number of awards. The total value of the “Team” and “Individual” awards must equal the value of “Monetary” awards reported in the preceding block.