

**ACQUISITION REDESIGN
REPORT AMENDMENT**

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & CLARIFICATION FOR:

- **IMPREST** **1-3**
- **USE OF NEW/EXISTING TOOLS** **3-5**
- **PRODUCTION RATIOS/\$100,000 AUTHORITY DELEGATION TO STATES** **5-8**
- **ACQUISITION WORKLOAD/STAFFING GUIDELINE** **9-15**
- **PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT** **17**

USE OF VISA CARD WITH ATM CAPABILITY FOR IMPREST

Summary of Comments Received:

The report recommends the use of a VISA card with ATM cash withdrawal capability to replenish the petty cash fund, currently called Imprest. Use of the VISA card in this manner would save paperwork and time currently expended to request reimbursement from Treasury in the form of a paper check. Of those states who commented on this item, all have concurred with this recommendation.

There were some concerns, however. A few offices have raised the issue of safety when the imprest cashier goes to the bank to obtain cash. Some towns and cities have experienced an increase in robberies at banks. Another concern was the need to "stop inside the bank to obtain the correct mix of currency and coin denominations." Another office asked what the petty cash "level will be, how often the imprest fund cashier will be allowed to replenish the fund, and paperwork requirements?" Similarly, one office questioned whether the limit on daily withdrawals would meet their needs. A suggestion was also made to consider increasing the current \$500 limit for imprest transactions now that all employees have been given procurement authority up to the micro-purchase level.

Clarification on Use of VISA Card with ATM Capability:

SAFETY: Unfortunately, there is no sure solution to this issue. However, safety has always been a concern with the Imprest fund since the cashier must go to the bank to cash the Treasury check. Use of an ATM to obtain a cash withdrawal will necessitate a similar level of caution. Some banks have an ATM inside the bank itself, which adds a measure of safety. No matter where the ATM is located, though, basic ATM safety rules need to be in mind.

A cashier with this type of card will also be able to walk up to the teller and request an advance off the VISA. This would be much like presenting a paper check made out to "cash". The bank would swipe the card, charge the requested amount, and - as long as the transaction clears - would give the cardholder the precise dollar amount requested.

CORRECT MIX OF CURRENCY/LIMIT ON DAILY WITHDRAWALS: As mentioned above, a cashier would need to do a teller transaction to get precise dollar/coin amounts. These teller transactions are not subject to the ATM withdrawal restrictions (commonly \$200 maximum or more per day), so the cardholder could withdraw larger amounts from the teller than the ATM.

As for the limit on daily withdrawals from an ATM, the actual limit would depend on both the ATM used and the limits on the VISA card itself. Each bank card company determines the daily cash withdrawal limits on their cards, so this would be one item to negotiate with Rocky Mountain Bank. Similarly, each bank determines the daily ATM transaction limits for their machines. Therefore, a cardholder may only be able to withdraw, for example, \$300 from an ATM if that is what the ATM's maximum withdrawal limit is.

PETTY CASH LEVEL/REPLENISHMENT: Basically, offices ought to maintain petty cash levels commensurate to their needs. In determining the best level, factors such as the decreased need for imprest due to employees having their own VISAs and the faster replenishment process via ATM, should be considered. Factors such as these may indicate less of a need to maintain large amounts of money in petty cash.

Currently under the Imprest system, each office is authorized specific imprest fund amounts. Under the VISA/ATM system, the specific maximum office authorization may depend on what is negotiated with Rocky Mountain Bank. One possibility is to set a maximum amount available for cash withdrawals per month.

Essentially, replenishment could happen on a daily basis if necessary. To be efficient, however, it makes more sense to only make, for example, one ATM withdrawal per week. Use of the ATM withdrawal offers more flexibility in getting cash in hand when it is needed. Therefore, if a sudden need arises for cash, the cashier would easily be able to obtain it.

PAPERWORK REQUIREMENTS: The requirements would be the same as for VISA purchases. Cardholders are required to keep the original VISA slip to document the purchase. Similarly, petty cash cashiers would need to keep the ATM slips from each withdrawal. These slips would be reconciled with the statement each month.

INCREASING MAXIMUM IMPREST AMOUNT: The current limit of \$500 for imprest transactions is imposed by Treasury and we are subject to it at this time since the cash is obtained from them. However, bank money, not Treasury's, would be used in the case of VISA cards with ATM withdrawal capability. There are no restrictions that would apply beyond those for maximum ATM withdrawal amounts as discussed earlier. The advent of the ATM withdrawal system will offer an opportunity to reconsider the \$500 limit. Once we have this capability, internal procedures and controls will be initiated to replace the Treasury regulations.

USE OF SINGLE DEFAULT COST CODE FOR VISA CARDS USED FOR PETTY CASH:

The team recommended the use of one fixed cost code for the VISA cards with ATM capability used to replenish the petty cash fund. This should simplify the coding and payment process which is quite time consuming in the current system. Of those states who specifically commented on this item, four states did not concur, one office concurred and another noted that this idea is not new for them since the majority of their purchases are made from very specific funds.

There were many concerns raised with this recommendation, most of them questioning the idea of having one code. One office was concerned that a high number of small cash purchases for a variety of programs may be paid out of the fixed cost code and "could easily amount to a considerable amount of money in the aggregate." Similarly, another office felt that an earmarked fund for cash purchases would make those purchases seem like "freebies" and that "a predetermined cost code would not reflect the current emphasis on accurate cost coding". Questions were also raised about whether such purchases would be have a budget object classification of 26-9Z (miscellaneous supplies), and how that might result in inaccurate coding.

Clarification on Use of Predetermined Cost Code for Cash Transactions:

Due to the electronic interface being set up between Rocky Mountain Bank Card System (RMBCS) and the Federal Financial System (FFS), (see IM BC-96-055 dated September 20, 1996), all VISA cards must have a default cost code associated to it. The interface's system structure at this time will not allow more than one code. Purchases that must be charged to a code other than the default code can be changed via Remote Data Entry (RDE) in one of the FFS tables, so exception cost coding will be possible.

Providing an exception cost code can be done at any time via RDE - there would be no "windows" such as in the payroll system, when these changes must be completed in, other than to be sure that exception coding is done timely by the end of the fiscal year. The RDE person would simply identify the proper code and dollar amount for the excepted item. It is anticipated that the use of a default code will significantly reduce the time spent in RDE since only exceptions to a card's default code will be entered and can be done lump sum rather than line by line.

As with all other VISA cards, the VISA used for petty cash must also have one default cost code. It is recognized that cash purchases are typically made against a variety of fund codes which would make it difficult to determine the one default code for all purchases. However, since the interface will not allow more than one, one will need to be chosen. In the recent memos from the Business Center about the FFS/RMBCS interface, it has been recommended that where a card is used for items coming from several charge accounts, the one charged most often shall be designated as the default cost code. Once the VISA statement arrives, any or all the charges may have the charge code changed from the default to an exception code.

This issue may be alleviated by the fact that all employees are eligible to obtain a VISA card. Therefore, as more employees obtain their own VISAs for specific program use, the number of codes a procurement

and/or petty cash VISA would have to charge against should decrease significantly. In addition, procurement and petty cash needs for "imprest-type" items should also decrease once a check writing system is developed for the field.

As for budget object class (BOC) codes, the default cost code identified for each VISA card will include a BOC. Therefore, if a cardholder's purchase does not properly match the default code, including BOC, exception coding must be done. For example, if a cardholder's default code is 1150-04/26-9Z, a 1150-04 purchase that is actually 26-2A (books) will need to have exception coding done to charge the purchase to 1150-04/26-2A and not the default of 1150-04/26-9Z. The proper budget object classification is needed for all purchases. The object class handbook lists and defines all the classifications and is available on the Internet at <http://web.blm.gov/internal/wo-800/objcls1.html>.

NEW AND EXISTING GOVERNMENT-WIDE PROCUREMENT TOOLS

Summary of Comments:

The report recommends providing guidance and training to Bureau procurement staff through various media to support new and previously available procurement tools. Each of these tools, when used in the appropriate circumstance, will increase efficiency and better satisfy customer needs.

One comment questioned the stated 25% savings in both cost and processing time of commercial items, due to the very limited number of commodities or services that meet the definition of commercial item. One comment reminded us that most mom and pop businesses do not have internet capability. Another stated that we should say intranet, rather than internet. A concern was stated that oral presentations should be limited to special circumstances. Two offices indicated that they already use indefinite delivery type contracts, therefore, no additional savings will result. A suggestion that we have a central clearing house to screen all acquisitions so consolidations/indefinite delivery type contracts can be identified. One office indicated that state and district offices should be able to directly place orders against indefinite delivery type contracts. Two offices also indicated that they already use past performance in evaluation of offers, therefore, no additional savings will result. Also, even though quality may increase, no significant reduction in administration workload would result. One office indicated that they are sponsoring a specification writing course to assist their customers in specification writing, including performance work statements, and to reduce procurement staff time in assisting writers one-on-one. Offices questioned what the exception basis would be for use of the DI-1886. Overall, offices expressed concern that training and guidance are the keys to successful use of these tools and others as they become available. One office expressed concern that they have no information on the BLM Advance Purchasing Seminar training opportunity.

Clarification Response

Although some offices may be using many of the procurement tools, some offices are not using any due to lack of BLM implementation. Each tool has special considerations to be examined prior to use, with the contracting officer being able to select the appropriate method of procurement based on the need.

The 25% savings stated relative to commercial item buys refers to processing time with some savings in cost also being realized due to the buying of commercially standardized supplies or services. It was the intent of Congress to define the term "commercial items" very broadly so that most commodities and services could apply.

The internet can be used in conjunction with other procurement methods, so as not to eliminate the mom and pop businesses. However, computer use is growing in the private sector and it is very easy to establish a home page. The future use of the internet is unimaginable. The use of the intranet is also very important to internal communications, however, the internet may be used to compete, order, and make payment of many items. Congress made electronic contracting the preferred method of doing business for transactions in excess of \$2500, so doing business electronically with the Government will eventually become the norm rather than the exception.

The expanded use of indefinite delivery type contracts will need to be identified in the acquisition planning phase. Responsibility for identifying the needs that would fit these circumstances will need to be determined, i.e., procurement analysts at the annual workshop. Although some offices are using them now, all Bureau offices do not have access to placing orders against them as they are limited to geographic coverage or specific ordering office. BLM has many needs that are similar among states or offices, even interagency. With the identification of these needs, indefinite quantity contracts could be established and any office could place an order against them. Expanded use of indefinite quantity type contracts would result in savings Bureau-wide.

Use of past performance evaluation and best value techniques in simplified acquisitions have not been previously used to much extent. Competitive acquisitions generally were awarded to low price, with no other factors being considered. Many awards were made to known poor performers requiring significant time for contract administration duties. Guidelines have been developed for use in simplified acquisitions and contracting and will not only result in a higher quality product or service, but will also result in less contract administration.

Even though performance-based work statements have been used by some offices, it is definitely new to many offices, both procurement and resource personnel alike. The idea of describing what needs to be done with performance measures and a quality assurance plan rather than work processes or methods requires change to our way of thinking. A performance-based work statements course is an excellent way to teach this concept. It will not only reduce the burden on procurement staff, but will introduce new ideas and concepts from training specialists.

The Acquisition Screening and Review form, DI-1886, is currently required for all acquisitions estimated to exceed the SAT. It is used to document reasons for not accepting BUDS recommendations to set aside a contract for small business and/or small disadvantaged business, or to reserve it for the 8(a) program. Since most of these acquisitions are set-aside for small business or fall under the Small Business Competitiveness Demonstration Program, it was recommended that form be used when one of these conditions did not exist.

The BLM Advanced Purchasing Seminar is the current NTC course name for the previously offered Advanced Purchasing course. As a result of a Bureau Procurement Training Improvement Team recommendation, the course has been restructured to cover a different subject(s) every other year. This will facilitate providing similar training to each member of the procurement staff, since warrant maintenance is required every other year. The intended audience is simplified acquisition procurement staff, however, others may benefit by realizing what is offered to this audience. Every other year, Procurement Analysts will be contacted to provide subject matter content for the next two-year course. Training is comprised of off-the-shelf modules combined to form a course specific to our needs. NTC provides course information in their course catalog.

The team agrees that training and guidance are keys to a successful procurement workforce. Some Procurement Analysts may be able to provide some training, however, this is not the case Bureau-wide. The recommended NTC position would develop and coordinate needed training and policy dissemination and ensure consistency Bureau-wide. A variety of training methods are available to us, including satellite, video, CDROM, self-study, intranet, and formal courses.

PROCUREMENT DECISION GUIDE FOR MANAGERS

The primary comment was that the Decision Guide not be restricted to only managers, but be available to all customers. The team agrees. The report has been modified.

PRODUCTION RATIOS:

Summary of Comments Received:

The ratios were the lightning rod for many concerns and comments. Many believed that the ratios should

not be higher than the ratios in the fiscal year 1995 Acquisition Streamlining Report to the Director. The main reason given for not increasing the ratios was that most of the simple procurements less than \$2,500 are being done by nonprocurement personnel using the "VISA" purchase card. That leaves the more complex transactions in excess of \$2,500 to be acquired by procurement personnel. These transactions either require competition, are nonrepetitive, or are from required sources. Although there did not appear to be widespread opposition to the contract and agreement ratios, many felt that doubling the ratio from 750 to 1500 for simplified acquisitions less than \$25,000 was unreasonable. One comment stated that Information Technology requirements over \$1 million should have a different ratio than the others. There was a suggestion that a complexity matrix be built to more precisely determine workload. One office suggested alternative ratios based on its experience.

Some were concerned with the suggestion in the last full paragraph of the report that "management should consolidate procurement work into full-time positions in 'central' or 'zoned' locations."

Many asked for a definition of "pure procurement" workload upon which the ratios were based. They felt that the ratios did not include the effort in training and helping requisitioners to define their requirements, administering the orders, and collateral duties such as receiving, payments, and fire support. One large office felt that the ratio must also include payment workload. They believed that in the future, all payments should be accomplished by the Contracting Officer to streamline the process. The office stated: "The purchase card is the key reason this office reduced from 3 purchasing agents to one, and this employee now accomplishes the payment/receiving work that 2 individuals (1 in Budget and 1 in Offices Services) previously performed. It is illogical to increase the transaction workload while the complexity per action is significantly increased." Several also felt that doing "pure procurement" is not reflective of the real world and that collateral duties must be considered. One office felt that it was important for the acquisition staff to have the same opportunities as everyone else to share the burden for supporting other programs which are not of an ongoing nature (i.e. Safety Committee, Human Resources Development Committee, Combined Federal Campaign).

Even with the best definitions, several stated that complexities may vary widely from action to action. They felt that there is too much emphasis on quantity and not enough emphasis on quality. Many stated that all workload should be included, not just the workload that is reported into the Interior Procurement Data System.

Clarification of Production Ratios:

The production ratios are intended as a general **guideline** to measure **future** workload **after** procurement personnel are trained to use the new and existing tools mentioned in the report. The ratios were not intended to inhibit the flexibility of line managers to manage their work force. There were neither recommendations nor decisions relative to these ratios in the report.

In a telephone/video conference with State Procurement Analysts on October 3, 1996, there was concern that not all workload was considered. This resulted in a much lower number of acquisition operational personnel in the report who are needed to support the alternative delegations of authority. The team agrees. The team only considered the workload that was reported as individual actions in the Interior Procurement Data System. Therefore, the following workload was collected manually from the States by memorandum dated October 4, 1996.

- Construction and Service Contracts less than \$25,000 that were reported on the SF-281 (not the SF 279)
- Purchase Card transactions made by procurement personnel
- Interagency Agreements
- Law Enforcement Agreements
- Special Purpose Space Leases
- Emergency Fire Equipment Rental Agreements
- GSA FEDSTRIP orders, and
- Imprest

The Deputy State Directors also requested a breakout by State of the fiscal year (FY) 1995 and FY 1996 acquisition workload and work force data based on the new ratios. That data is attached. Please note that seven (7) States and offices are already achieving or are close to achieving the new production ratios even though many of the new tools have not been implemented. Also, note the fluctuations in workload and personnel needs from FY 1995 to FY 1996.

The ratios are based on the number of transactions including deliver orders, task orders, and modifications. The ratios are intended to be an average of the complexities involved in the processes including requirements development, protests, claims, contract administration, etc. The team agrees that the ratios are not precise. General workload measures for acquisition personnel date back to 1980's in the President's Council on Management Improvement's Report. As a result of that report, the Bureau had been using ratios of 1,000 simplified transactions per purchasing agent and 30 contract actions per contract specialist as a general guideline. More precise workload measures were attempted by the Department of the Interior in the late 1980's. The measures involved a matrix of 22 types of procurement transactions and 108 complexity factors. After pilot testing the matrix in a few Bureaus, gathering workload data for all procurement offices in the Department, and paying thousands of dollars for a contractor to key the data, the project was canceled. No reason was given for the cancellation. The 1995 Acquisition Streamlining report to the Director updated the ratios that were in the President's Council on Management Improvement based on the team experience and judgement **at that point in time** (i.e. the end of FY 1994).

These new ratios are intended to be based on:

1) *future work processes using new tools as they become available* resulting from acquisition reform legislation such as the Federal Acquisition Computer Network (FACNET) and the internet, commercial item buys and the other tools mentioned in this report

2) *using the most efficient existing processes first* and minimizing inefficient processes such as written purchase orders.

3) *acquisition personnel being used full time for acquisition transactions.* (1102 series personnel must be classified as specialists because of the professional certification requirements in the Federal Acquisition Reform Act, but not 1105 and 1106 series personnel.)

An example of a future work process is electronic acquisitions. Electronic acquisitions should increase operational efficiency, and reduce burden on suppliers and customers.

The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (FASA) made FACNET, i.e., electronic data interchange (EDI), the preferred method for acquisitions between \$2,500 and \$100,000. FASA tied raising the simplified acquisition threshold from \$50,000 to \$100,000 to the use of FACNET. Unfortunately, the design to pass requests for quotations through Department of Defense Value Added Networks (VANs) was included in the legislation. The result appears to be that it has become expensive and time consuming to small businesses to transact in this manner because the process is non-existent in private sector. The private sector's practice of "electronic commerce" is to process orders and payments with their trading partners electronically to increase operational efficiency, not requests for quotes. Also, FASA was enacted before the internet became a widespread tool. Therefore, the Federal Acquisition Reform Act postponed the tie to FACNET until end of 1999. If offices have not processed at least 75% of their transactions via FACNET by that date, the simplified acquisition threshold will revert back to \$50,000. The challenge is to work to get all electronic transactions, including those processed via the internet, counted rather than only requests for quotes processed through EDI so that offices can keep a \$100,000 simplified acquisition threshold. This will allow them to continue do acquisitions between \$50,000 and \$100,000 using simplified procedures.

Even though competition is required for many transactions in excess of \$2,500, many transactions are orders against existing supply sources such as GSA. You will be able to compare prices in GSA's Advantage System over the internet and pay with your VISA purchase cards. Many open market vendors are establishing home pages to market their products so that you can shop electronically and pay with your VISA purchase card. The Department of Commerce is setting up a WEB server for agencies to post

Commerce Business Daily announcements. Some agencies, like NASA are transacting with their business partners over the internet and posting their solicitations on their home pages. Others are considering posting their requirements on internet news servers so that they can be easily located by a maximum number of suppliers. For transactions that cannot be made electronically, more efficient methods are oral orders or VISA purchase card orders rather than a written purchase order. This is just one example of a significant new tool that when used to the maximum can significantly increase the amount of workload we can manage.

Use of the other tools described in this report can also increase operational efficiency and improve the quality of the acquisition of goods and services.

The team mentioned that efficiencies could occur by procurement people doing "pure procurement" without other support service duties. The team does not believe that a shift in work load would occur. In the team's judgment, greater procurement workload could be done more efficiently through experience using the most efficient tools which become available to them such as electronic commerce, the internet, VISA checks, etc.

The BLM's acquisition community can either:

- 1) accept the acquisition redesign team's ratios with these clarifications and additional data,
- 2) collaborate and agree on new production ratios in its workshop next spring, or
- 3) defer the development of new ratios for about 12 to 18 months after it has training and experience using these tools.

The ratios will need to be continually adjusted as work processes change. However, it is most important to put all available tools into the hands of our procurement staff and employees and train them as quickly as possible. There are still efficiencies that can be obtained now by maximizing use of the most efficient work processes.

RECOMMENDED \$100,000 DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO THE STATES:

Summary of Comments Received: Oregon, Montana, Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming and NIFC concurred with the recommended delegation of \$100,000 to the States. California opposed. BC-660 questioned the rationale. Other offices did not comment.

Response: Although all States and offices did not concur, the team recommends that \$100,000 be delegated to States that have Procurement Analysts. This will provide States that opportunity to increase efficiency as they are trained the tools mentioned in this report. The delegation also aligns the processes with expertise; e.g., simplified acquisitions in the States and formal contracting in the Business Center. However, if States or offices determine that they wish to have another State or office provide service for them, they may do so. The shift in simplified acquisition workload from NBC to the States would occur over the next two to three years. Oregon's procurement authority will remain the same; i.e. unlimited procurement authority except for information technology procurements which are limited to the simplified acquisition threshold. Except for the administration of recently awarded wild horse and burro adoption center contracts, the Eastern States and Washington Offices will obtain contract assistance from the National Business Center.

**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
REPORT ON
FISCAL YEAR 1995/1996 ACQUISITION WORKLOAD AND
STAFFING GUIDELINES**

In the following tables, the total FTE staffing level excludes 18 Bureau Procurement Analysts¹ who perform management (versus operational) responsibilities and 5 procurement personnel in the BLM Helium Office. The BLM Helium Office is excluded from this report.

ATTACHMENTS:

FISCAL YEAR 1996 WORKLOAD TABLE SUMMARY - PURE PROCUREMENT - This table contains a summary of Bureau-wide workload data, including procurement-related supplemental data submitted by the States. It does not include workload data that can be accomplished other than the procurement workforce (e.g., GSA FEDSTRIP, Imprest, Government Bills of Lading (GBLs), Government Printing Orders (GPO), and Training Orders.) The total staffing needed (102.0 FTE) is based on the assumption that training will be provided, and implementation and maximum use will occur for the new and existing tools listed in the report.

FISCAL YEAR 1995/1996 WORKLOAD TABLE SUMMARY - STATUS QUO WORKLOAD - These tables contain a summary of Bureau-wide workload data, including all supplemental data submitted by the States. (See supplemental worksheets below.) The total staffing needed (111.7 total) is based on training being provided and implementation and maximum use of the new and existing tools listed in the report.

FISCAL YEAR 1995/1996 SUPPLEMENTAL WORKSHEETS - Contains additional workload data not reported in the IPDS. Additional workload data is included in the summary workload table. All States responded with the exception of California. Dollar amounts are reported in thousands.

Footnotes:

SIMPLIFIED PURCHASES - Includes: IPDS data from the SF281 report; Purchase Card transactions; GSA Fedstrip; Imprest Fund; GPO; GBL's; Emergency Equipment Rental Agreements; and Training Orders. Construction and Service Contracts less than \$25,000 are included in the next category.

CONSTRUCTION/SERVICES - Includes: IPDS data from SF279 and SF281 Report; and Special Purpose Space Lease awards.

AGREEMENTS - Includes: Assistance Agreements; Inter/Intra-Agency Agreements; and Law Enforcement Agreements

¹ Procurement Analysts - One Analyst from each State Office (excluding Arizona), one Analyst from the National Interagency Fire Center, three Analysts from the National Business Center, and three Analysts from the Washington Office.

**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
FISCAL YEAR 1996 ACQUISITION WORKLOAD TABLE
SUMMARY - PURE PROCUREMENT**

STAFFING LEVEL (11/96 PAYPERS)					WORKLOAD AND RECOMMENDED STAFFING GUIDELINES											
STATE	TTL FTE	TTL 1102	TTL 1105	TTL 1106	CONSTR SERVICES	RATIO 1:90	CONTR >\$25K <\$100K	RATIO 1:60	CONTR >\$100K	RATIO 1:25	SIMPLI PURCH	RATIO 1:1500	AGRMTS.	RATIO 1:60	FTE NEEDED	DIFFERENCE [+/-]
AK	6	5	1	0	60	0.7	6	0.1	0	0	3422	2.3	105	1.8	4.8	1.2
AZ	7	2	5	0	82	0.9	1	0.0	0	0.0	6516	4.3	4	0.1	5.3	1.7
BC	21	16	0	5	1037	11.5	276	4.6	218	8.7	910	0.6	1	0.0	25.5	-4.5
CA	9	4	5	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5706	3.8	42	0.7	4.5	4.5
CO	7	5	1	1	75	0.8	3	0.1	0	0.0	5958	4.0	43	0.7	5.6	1.4
ES	3	0	3	0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	483	0.3	3	0.1	0.4	2.6
ID	7	1	5	1	78	0.9	17	0.3	1	0.0	3330	2.2	90	1.5	4.9	2.1
MT	7	1	5	1	56	0.6	8	0.1	0	0.0	2969	2.0	53	0.9	3.6	3.4
NV	7	1	6	0	17	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	7028	4.7	11	0.2	5.1	1.9
NM	5	1	4	0	222	2.5	1	0.0	0	0.0	1232	0.8	12	0.2	3.5	1.5
OR	34	21	8	5	396	4.4	96	1.6	77	3.1	24503	16.3	71	1.2	26.6	7.4
RP	3	1	1	1	27	0.3	7	0.1	1	0.0	1203	0.8	16	0.3	1.5	1.5
UT	7	5	2	0	78	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	4675	3.1	35	0.6	4.6	2.4
WO	2	2	0	0	13	0.1	7	0.1	5	0.2	827	0.6	77	1.3	2.3	-0.3
WY	8	2	5	1	12	0.1	1	0.0	0	0.0	4616	3.1	39	0.7	3.9	4.1
BUR	133	67	51	15	2154	23.9	423	7.1	302	12.1	73378	48.9	602	10.0	102.0	31.0

**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
FISCAL YEAR 1995 ACQUISITION WORKLOAD TABLE
SUMMARY**

STAFFING LEVEL (2/96 PAYPERS)					WORKLOAD AND RECOMMENDED STAFFING GUIDELINES											
STATE	TTL FTE	TTL 1102	TTL 1105	TTL 1106	CONSTR SERVICES	RATIO 1:90	CONTR >\$25K <\$100K	RATIO 1:60	CONTR >\$100K	RATIO 1:25	SIMPLI PURCH	RATIO 1:1500	AGRMNTS	RATIO 1:60	TTL FTE NEEDED	DIFFERENCE [+/-]
AK	8	4	1	3	53	0.6	2	0.0	0	0.0	7678	5.1	170	2.8	8.6	-0.6
AZ	6	1	5	0	117	1.3	7	0.1	0	0.0	7561	5.0	6	0.1	6.6	-0.6
BC	22	17	0	5	684	7.6	263	4.4	185	7.4	1145	0.8	1	0.0	20.2	1.8
CA	12	5	7	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8787	5.9	56	0.9	6.8	5.2
CO	7	5	1	1	88	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4810	3.2	106	1.8	6.0	1.0
ES	3	0	3	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2409	1.6	4	0.1	1.7	1.3
ID	6	1	5	0	109	1.2	9	0.2	0	0.0	8234	5.5	125	2.1	8.9	-2.9
MT	7	1	6	0	62	0.7	3	0.1	0	0.0	3522	2.3	52	0.9	4.0	3.0
NV	9	2	7	0	20	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	8407	5.6	30	0.5	6.3	2.7
NM	6	2	4	0	236	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2879	1.9	21	0.4	4.9	1.1
OR	35	20	9	6	347	3.9	140	2.3	77	3.1	14427	9.6	45	0.8	19.6	15.4
RP*	3	1	1	1	44	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.0	4654	3.1	41	0.7	4.3	-1.3
UT	8	5	2	1	98	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	6210	4.1	33	0.6	5.8	2.2
WO	4	2	1	1	11	0.1	8	0.1	5	0.2	1555	1.0	41	0.7	2.2	1.8
WY	7	2	4	1	46	0.5	2	0.0	0	0.0	5270	3.5	38	0.6	4.7	2.3
BUR:	143	68	56	19	1915	21.3	434	7.2	268	10.7	87548	58.4	769	12.8	110.4	32.6

**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
FISCAL YEAR 1995 ACQUISITION WORKLOAD TABLE
[SUPPLEMENTAL WORKLOAD]
WORKSHEET 1**

	CONSTR/SVC		PURCH CARD		INTERAGENCY AGRMTS		LAW ENF. AGRMTS		GSA FEDSTRIPS	
State	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)
AK	23	37	993	812	133	\$1,578	Comb		32	\$20
AZ	112	\$405	586	\$307	0	\$0	0	\$0	267	\$35
BC	0	\$0	290	\$175	\$1	\$10	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CA	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CO	45	\$264	1415	\$742	30	\$375	3	\$2	16	\$11
ES	0	\$0	302	\$0	1	\$0	0	\$0	68	\$0
ID	41	\$450	1237	\$391	21	\$555	Comb	\$0	150	\$33
MT	10	\$89	570	\$187	18	\$480	comb	\$0	150	\$60
NV	19	\$40	133	\$63	8	\$195	comb	\$0	64	\$191
NM	232	\$525	1326	\$573	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
OR	4	\$29	260	\$88	3	\$27	Comb	\$0	8	\$8
RP	2	\$14	362	\$166	14	\$1,660	0	\$0	380	\$489
UT	94	\$796	992	\$220	18	\$308	5	\$64	104	\$96
WO	0	\$0	451	\$280	16	\$2,235	0	\$0	9	\$18
WY	0	\$0	1353	\$673	18	\$224	0	\$0	68	\$37
BUR	582	\$2,649	10270	\$4,677	281	\$7,647	8	\$66	1316	\$998

**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
FISCAL YEAR 1995 WORKLOAD TABLE
[SUPPLEMENTAL WORKLOAD]
WORKSHEET 2**

State	EMERG. EQPT. RENTAL AGRMT		SPACE LEASES		IMPREST FUND		GPO		GBL		TRAINING ORDER	
	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)
AK	40	\$90	22	\$138	2646	\$148	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
AZ	495	\$532	0	\$0	2020	\$102	0	\$0	0	0	32	\$9
BC	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11	\$75	\$0	\$0
CA	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CO	1	\$0	\$2	\$4	23	\$4	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
ES	0	\$0	0	\$0	802	\$0	30	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
ID	308	\$101	9	\$30	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
MT	55	\$0	16	\$30	279	\$28	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
NV	25	\$392	1	\$3	890	\$65	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
NM	0	\$0	4	\$41	467	\$43	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
OR	1	\$0	0	\$0	457	\$36	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
RP	13	\$0	0	\$0	461	\$41	207	\$166	0	\$0	0	\$0
UT	58	\$455	4	\$1	2179	\$127	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
WO		\$0	0	\$0	49	\$61	0	\$0	17	\$164	0	\$0
WY	42	\$232	9	\$25	1313	\$91	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
BUR	1038	\$1,802	67	\$272	11586	\$746	237	\$166	28	\$239	32	\$9

**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
FISCAL YEAR 1996 ACQUISITION WORKLOAD TABLE
SUMMARY**

STAFFING LEVEL (11/96 PYPERS)					WORKLOAD AND RECOMMENDED STAFFING GUIDELINES											
STATE	TTL FTE	TTL 1102	TTL 1105	TTL 1106	CONSTR SERVICES	RATIO 1:90	CONTR >\$25K <\$100K	RATIO 1:60	CONTR >\$100K	RATIO 125	SIMPLI PURCH	RATIO 1:1500	AGRMTS	RATIO 1:60	FTE NEEDED	DIFFERENCE [+/-]
AK	6	5	1	0	60	0.7	6	0.1	0	0.0	6503	4.3	105	1.8	6.9	-0.9
AZ	7	2	5	0	82	0.9	1	0.0	0	0.0	9151	6.1	4	0.1	7.1	-0.1
BC	21	16	0	5	1037	11.5	276	4.6	218	8.7	911	0.6	1	0.0	25.5	-4.5
CA	9	4	5	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5706	3.8	42	0.7	4.5	4.5
CO	7	5	1	1	75	0.8	3	0.1	0	0.0	6928	4.6	43	0.7	6.2	0.8
ES	3	0	3	0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1336	0.9	3	0.1	1.0	2.0
ID	7	1	5	1	78	0.9	17	0.3	1	0.0	3450	2.3	90	1.5	5.0	2.0
MT	7	1	5	1	56	0.6	8	0.1	0	0.0	3153	2.1	53	0.9	3.7	3.3
NV	7	1	6	0	17	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	8047	5.4	11	0.2	5.7	1.3
NM	5	1	4	0	222	2.5	1	0.0	0	0.0	1427	1.0	12	0.2	3.6	1.4
OR	34	21	8	5	396	4.4	96	1.6	77	3.1	25086	16.7	71	1.2	27.0	7.0
RP	3	1	1	1	27	0.3	7	0.1	1	0.0	2665	1.8	16	0.3	2.5	0.5
UT	7	5	2	0	78	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	6652	4.4	35	0.6	5.9	1.1
WO	2	2	0	0	13	0.1	7	0.1	5	0.2	854	0.6	77	1.3	2.3	-0.3
WY	8	2	5	1	12	0.1	1	0.0	0	0.0	6038	4.0	39	0.7	4.8	3.2
BUR:	133	67	51	15	2154	23.9	423	7.1	302	12.1	87907	58.6	602	10.0	111.7	21.3

**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
FISCAL YEAR 1996 ACQUISITION WORKLOAD TABLE
[SUPPLEMENTAL WORKLOAD]
WORKSHEET 1**

STATE	CONSTR/SVC		PURCH CARD		INTERAGENCY AGRMTS		LAW ENF. AGRMTS		GSA FEDSTRIP	
	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)
AK	23	\$20	1459	\$654	68	\$1,607	Comb		199	\$129
AZ	76	\$445	487	\$312	0	\$0	0	\$0	242	\$45
BC	0	\$0	194	\$675	1	\$5	0	\$0	0	\$0
CA	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CO	40	\$324	1959	\$1,534	6	\$112	1	\$1	14	\$14
ES	0	\$0	305	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	68	\$0
ID	39	\$435	1087	\$459	14	\$168	Comb		120	\$41
MT	17	\$157	460	\$193	21	\$158	comb		N/A	\$17
NV	15	\$33	174	\$119	1	\$2	0	\$0	55	\$116
NM	199	\$637	892	\$453	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
OR	3	\$18	475	\$257	2	\$29	Comb		9	\$12
RP	7	\$49	214	\$212	16	\$517	0	\$0	239	\$411
UT	75	\$748	1440	\$322	25	\$285	4	\$63	104	\$100
WO	0	\$0	396	\$412	16	\$1,286	0	\$0	3	\$3
WY	0	\$0	1551	\$944	14	\$142	0	\$0	146	\$22
BUR:	494	\$2,866	11093	\$6,546	184	\$4,311	5	\$64	1199	\$910

**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
FISCAL YEAR 1996 ACQUISITION WORKLOAD TABLE
[SUPPLEMENTAL WORKLOAD]
WORKSHEET 2**

STATE	EMERG. RENT AGRMT		SPACE LEASE		IMPREST FUND		GPO PRINT		GBL		TRAINING ORDER	
	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)	#ACT	\$AMT (\$000)
AK	6	\$2	28	\$186	2882	\$177	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
AZ	225	\$516	0	\$0	2373	\$113	0	\$0	0	\$0	20	\$3
BC	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	1	\$8	0	\$0
CA	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
CO	99	\$172	4	\$6	956	\$84	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
ES	0	\$0	1	\$0	749	\$0	36	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
ID	268	\$399	10	\$31	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
MT	105	\$0	20	\$27	184	\$16	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
NV	44	\$260	2	\$8	964	\$71	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
NM	15	\$53	4	\$18	195	\$17	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
OR	27	\$84	0	\$0	574	\$57	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
RP	0	\$0	0	\$0	1050	\$42	173	\$138	0	\$0	0	\$0
UT	50	\$83	3	\$2	1873	\$136	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
WO	0	\$0	0	\$0	14	\$29	0	\$0	10	\$94	0	\$0
WY	98	\$544	7	\$18	1276	\$91	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
BUR:	937	\$2,113	79	\$296	13090	\$833	209	\$138	11	\$102	20	\$3

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT RESPONSE

The inclusion and implementation of performance measures into the bureau's everyday work is mandated by the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993 which requires each agency to submit a strategic plan for program activities covering at least a five year period. These plans are to be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget(OMB) and the Congress by September 30, 1997, be updated every three years, and include a mission statement, general and outcome related goals and objectives for the major functions and operations of the agency, descriptions of how the goals and objectives will be achieved, identification of key external factors that could affect achievement of the goals and objectives, and an explanation of how the agency has used and will continue to use program evaluations to establish or revise goals.

The GPRA provides Congress and executive agencies with a major tool to orient policy making, legislative and program development, budgeting, and oversight toward improving government performance. GPRA is not simply about measurement. It is about shifting the culture of government beyond a preoccupation with inputs, such as dollars and numbers of employees, to include a proper concern with results, whether defined as outputs or outcomes. GPRA will require agencies of the federal government to establish long-range strategic plans that define their missions and general long-term goals, annual performance plans with specific performance targets for each year, and annual performance reports that compare actual performance with the targets.

Consequently, the Department of the Interior staffers served on the FY 1996 President's Management Council Task Force that developed government-wide acquisition performance measures in conformance with the GPRA requirements. The Bureau of Land Management(BLM) was one of the "pilot" agencies with representation on the task force. The task force devised a menu of measures that BLM will use to evaluate progress in improving performance relating to quality, timeliness, productivity, and price in order to achieve an efficient procurement system. The recommendations of the workgroup were accepted by the Department's acquisition community and the BLM will do a pilot test in FY 1997. A Quality in Contracting(QUIC) Guidebook which details the implementation plan and explains the 12 performance measurement categories was developed. Copies will be sent to BLM employees by December 1996 with in-depth information on its purpose, use, and implementation.

The QUIC program is an integrated, three-module system (survey module, process data module, and quality review module) of performance measurement which balances subjective self-assessment survey data with objective performance data and validation by flexible quality review and assessment techniques. The program replaces the traditional Departmental Functional Review system and the BLM (and other bureaus) are no longer required to conduct Acquisition Management Reviews, although there is complete flexibility to custom tailor a review strategy as deemed necessary. QUIC will be piloted, by the BLM, at the National Business Center. Other states will be able to participate in they so desire. The pilot must be completed by June 1997 to include results and lessons learned in the Alternative Management Control Review report.