
SUBJECT: 2003 Annual Commissioned Officers' Effectiveness Report (COER)**INTRODUCTION**

The 2003 Annual COER will be a Web-based electronic workflow process which can be accessed from the Division of Commissioned Personnel's (DCP) Web site at: <http://dcp.psc.gov>. In addition to this Manual Circular, 'Help' instructions and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) will also be available.

1. Definitions Used in this Manual Circular

Rating Official. The Rating Official is usually the immediate or first-line supervisor of one or more officers. The Rating Official has responsibilities for establishing performance expectations; planning and setting priorities; assigning work; administering personnel matters; and dealing effectively with officers about officer/management concerns.

Reviewing Official. In most cases, the Reviewing Official is the immediate supervisor of the officer's Rating Official. There may be exceptions in the case of officers detailed to non-Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) organizations.

Commissioned Corps Liaison. The Commissioned Corps Liaison is the person designated by the Agency/Operating Division (OPDIV)/Program to which the officer is assigned to monitor the progress of completion of the COER.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this Manual Circular is to transmit to all Public Health Service (PHS) Commissioned Corps officers and supervisors guidelines for completing the annual COER.

An annual COER, covering the period from June 1, 2002 to May 31, 2003, is required for all officers on active duty with the exception of the following:

- officers called to extended active duty after March 1, 2003;
- officers on short tours and intermittent tours as provided in INSTRUCTION 9, Subchapter CC23.5, "Short Tours of Active Duty," of the Commissioned Corps Personnel Manual (CCPM);
- participants in the Junior Commissioned Officer Student Training and Extern Program (JRCOSTEP);
- participants in the Senior Commissioned Officer Student Training and Extern Program (SRCOSTEP);
- medical students enrolled at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences;
- the Surgeon General;
- the Assistant Secretary for Health (if he/she is a commissioned officer); and
- Non-career political appointees. Non-career political appointees include, but are not limited to OPDIV Heads, the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health, and the Director of the National Cancer Institute.

The COER is very important to the career of every officer. It is the major source of information concerning each officer's performance and work record. The report also provides a vehicle to discuss an officer's performance with him/her. Such discussions provide the officer with an opportunity to assess his/her strong and weak points, and overcome perceived performance and/or attitudinal deficiencies in order to increase his/her value to the Service. Moreover, the COER is utilized by DCP as an adjunct in processing both positive and adverse actions that are initiated by program officials. Therefore, it is imperative both to the officer and to the Service that the report be candid and objective. Under-rating the officer may affect his/her career. Over-rating is of dubious benefit as it may lead to assignments and promotions for which the officer is not qualified and could compromise requests for disciplinary action.

In preparation for completing an annual COER, it is recommended that the Rating Official have a beginning of the rating year conference with the officer regarding the Rating Official's performance expectations. It is also strongly recommended that performance accomplishments and any performance issues be reviewed with the officer at a mid-year performance review conference. The purpose of these conferences is to enhance officer-Rating Official communication about performance expectations, to avoid any surprises to the officer at the end of the rating period, and to allow the officer an opportunity to improve or correct identified deficiencies.

It is the duty and responsibility of all officers being rated, Rating Officials, and Reviewing Officials to promptly complete and transmit a COER when due. Failure to transmit a properly completed COER in a timely manner is disadvantageous to the officer being evaluated. Officers without annual COERs will be adversely affected when being considered for promotion, assimilation, awards, details, special pays, and other personnel actions that depend, in part, upon demonstrated good performance. (Note: DCP is prohibited from issuing retroactive personnel orders that affect pay.) Such officers may also be subject to disciplinary action if the omission is due to their negligence. Annual COERs are required irrespective of the fact that a COER was recently submitted for some other purpose (officers who transfer after May 1, 2003, should complete an Annual COER instead of the normal transfer COER). When it is determined that an officer, a Rating Official, or a Reviewing Official has not transmitted a COER by the due dates established, follow-up action will be initiated by the Commissioned Corps Liaison. The Agency/OPDIV/Program Commissioned Corps Liaison shall also review any instances of a continuing missing COER, and the actions taken, to determine whether disciplinary action against the officer, Rating Official, or Reviewing Official is appropriate.

This Manual Circular informs officers and program officials of the SEPTEMBER 2, 2003 due date for annual COERs.

The guidelines provided in this Manual Circular supplement INSTRUCTION 1, Subchapter CC25.1, "Commissioned Officers' Effectiveness Report," of the CCPM. Descriptive examples of each question found on the COER are provided as Sample A. **PLEASE READ AND FOLLOW THESE GUIDELINES CAREFULLY. PLEASE NOTE THAT VERSIONS OF THE COER FORM DATED EARLIER THAN 5/03 WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.** The officer will go to DCP's Web site at: <http://dcp.psc.gov>, then click the 'Access 2003 Annual COER System' link, then enter his/her logon ID and password. **If you do not know your logon ID and password, contact the DCP Help Desk at 301-594-0961 or toll free at 1-877-INFO DCP, listen to the prompts, select option 1, and dial the last 5 digits of the number - 40961, or you may e-mail the Help Desk at dcp-helpdesk@psc.gov.** If you do not have Internet access, contact your Commissioned Corps Liaison for guidance.

3. Rights of Officers

Officers should have an opportunity to correct conduct and performance weaknesses with the cooperation of the Rating Official and/or Reviewing Official(s), as appropriate. When discussing an officer's performance weaknesses, the officer, Rating Official, and/or Reviewing Official(s) should agree on what corrective action steps the officer needs to take. Such a plan should establish specific performance objectives and evaluation criteria, as well as a reasonable time frame over which performance can be assessed. The officer, Rating Official, and/or Reviewing Official(s) should, whenever possible, agree to any additional training that may be necessary or helpful.

An officer may disagree with a performance rating. It is recognized that management styles can influence ratings. Individuals who review the COER (e.g., boards, reviewing officials, etc.) pay attention to comments provided by officers. These comments should detail accomplishments or assessments of strengths or weaknesses not given proper attention by the Rating Official, and/or Reviewing Official(s).

At the time during the electronic process where the officer indicates concurrence or non-concurrence, the officer will have the opportunity to indicate that he/she will submit a hard copy rebuttal to DCP within 60 days of electronic submission of the COER. *The officer's name, PHS serial number, and date of COER must be included at the top of the rebuttal.* The officer must send a copy of the rebuttal directly to DCP and to the Rating Official, Reviewing Official, and/or other program official(s) whose ratings or comments are being rebutted. Please note: The rebuttal is included in the eOPF (Electronic Official Personnel Folder) and no further action is taken. The rebuttal is NOT a substitute for a grievance.

The Privacy Act of 1974 gives individuals the right, subject to certain conditions, to gain access to records (including COERs) maintained on them.

The officer may grieve the COER under procedures provided in INSTRUCTION 5, Subchapter CC26.1, "Grievances," of the CCPM. The officer may also file an equal opportunity (EO) complaint in accordance with INSTRUCTION 6, Subchapter CC26.1, "Equal Opportunity: Discrimination Complaints Processing."

If the officer is not satisfied with the outcome of the grievance or EO process, he/she may make application to the Board for Correction of PHS Commissioned Corps Records as provided in INSTRUCTION 5, Subchapter CC29.9, "General Administration Manual Policies and Procedures for Board for Correction of PHS Commissioned Corps Records," of the CCPM. The Board for Correction of PHS Commissioned Corps Records may not consider an application until the officer has exhausted other available administrative remedies, including the grievance and EO processes. The Board for Correction of PHS Commissioned Corps Records will accept an application for consideration if there is relevant evidence that demonstrates the existence of probable material error or injustice, and the application is filed within 3 years after discovery of the alleged error or injustice.

4. Specific Instructions for Officers

- a. Before the COER is electronically forwarded to the Supervisor:

The officer will review and update contact information. Officers will initiate the COER, and transmit it electronically to the immediate supervisor NO LATER THAN JULY 11, 2003.

The officer must complete **Attachment 1 (Create using a plain text editor such as Notepad or Wordpad, use spell check, copy and paste into the space provided. However, special characters (e.g., bullets, italicized, bold, etc.) will not be recognized. You are allowed a maximum of 3,600 characters, but may not exceed 66 lines.)** This is the description of the officer's duties, accomplishments, and goals. This attachment provides the officer with the opportunity to document the major projects, activities accomplished, and their impact over the rating period that should be considered by his/her Rating Official in assessing his/her performance. This also provides the opportunity to identify future goals and training needs to accomplish those goals, which can be discussed with the Rating Official during the rating discussion. The officer should avoid using acronyms (other than organizational levels) because readers are often unfamiliar with such terminology.

The officer will identify his/her Rating Official and the Rating Official's e-mail address. **It is critical that you provide an accurate e-mail address.**

The COER is to reflect the status of the officer initiating the report as of the close of business on May 31 of the COER year.

- b. After the COER is Completed by the Rating Official:

The Rating Official will release the COER back to the officer for review and discussion. The officer must logon to review the evaluation and after discussion, the Rating Official may make modifications to the COER, if appropriate. The Rating Official then transmits the COER to the officer for his/her concurrence.

If the officer disagrees with the evaluation, the officer may provide a rebuttal. Written rebuttal to the rating will be submitted after the COER has been electronically transmitted to DCP. The officer must send a copy of the rebuttal directly to DCP and to the Rating Official, Reviewing Official, and/or other program official(s) whose ratings or comments are being rebutted. *The officer's name, PHS serial number, and date of COER must be included at the top of the rebuttal.*

- c. After the COER is Completed by the Reviewing Official:

An officer may check within a few days of the Reviewing Official's final action, to determine whether his/her COER has been received in DCP by reviewing the eOPF on DCP's Web site at: <http://dcp.psc.gov>, select 'Secure Area' and then select 'Officer & Liaison Activities', then enter your logon ID and password. If the COER is not in the eOPF, the officer should contact his/her Commissioned Corps Liaison to determine the COER's status.

5. Specific Instructions for Rating Officials/Supervisors

- a. General Instructions

The first responsibility of the Rating Official is to ensure that all officers under his/her supervision electronically transmit the COER to them NO LATER THAN JULY 11, 2003, with Attachment 1 completed. If an officer being rated delays submitting the COER after being reminded by the Rating Official, the Rating Official will initiate a COER after consultation with the Agency/OPDIV/Program Commissioned Corps Liaison. The Rating Official should provide a statement with the COER explaining that the COER is being initiated by the Rating Official and the reason for this action. The Rating Official may consider the officer's failure to provide the COER form in a timely manner in the officer's evaluation. If the officer refuses to sign the COER initiated by the Rating Official, this will be noted on the COER, and the COER, without the officer's signature, will be sent through the review process to DCP.

The Rating Official completes the following:

A detailed COER which consists of 18 elements covering abilities, motivation, interests, and other characteristics considered most pertinent to the officer's performance in the Service. The Rating Official indicates the level that most nearly describes the officer by selecting the appropriate rating, with "A" being the lowest rating and "E" being the highest rating (see Sample A of these instructions for descriptive examples of each rating for each of the 18 questions). The Rating Official should rate each item independently without reference to any other one. It is imperative both to the officer and to the PHS Commissioned Corps that the COER be candid and objective.

If the Rating Official has supervised the officer for less than 6 months, either a narrative COER or a detailed COER may be completed.

Attachment 2 (Create using a plain text editor such as Notepad or Wordpad, use spell check, copy and paste into the space provided. However, special characters (e.g., bullets, italicized, bold, etc.) will not be recognized. You are allowed a maximum of 3,600 characters, but may not exceed 66 lines.) Attachment 2 provides space for comments.

Although "E" ratings NO LONGER require individual descriptive narrative examples, individual comments ARE required for each "A" rating and a general statement about the officer's performance is required. Comments should be consistent with the rating given and not repeat the wording of the ratings. Comments should reflect accomplishments as well as level of responsibility. Please provide examples of quantitative results.

Ratings should be responsive to any information provided by an officer regarding his/her accomplishments. It is recommended that preliminary ratings be developed by Rating Officials in preparation for the performance discussion with the officer, and finalized during the performance discussion after the officer has had the opportunity to provide any additional information for the Rating Official to consider.

Rating periods may include extended periods of sick leave or intermittent episodes of sick leave. The officer should be evaluated on his/her performance when present.

For those officers being rated who are in supervisory or managerial positions, the Rating Official will include in the performance appraisal those supervisory and administrative actions which ensure equal treatment of all staff by completing Item 17, Section II. The comments for this rating should include information about the scope of the officer's efforts to support, facilitate, and enhance the Agency/OPDIV/Program's career development and advancement opportunities of minorities, women, and persons with disabilities under the officer's supervision.

Many officers are assigned to positions where a results-oriented (i.e., work plan) process is used by the program. Where such an appraisal is completed on a commissioned officer, it will likely contain helpful information. Consequently, it should be used to support the Rating Official's decision for several elements on the COER. However, the completed appraisal form may not be transmitted with the COER to DCP. Rather, it should be used by Rating Officials in preparing the narrative comments of the COER to supplement or support the quantitative ratings of the COER.

It is commissioned corps policy that an officer's evaluation be discussed with him/her in a formal manner. If an officer disagrees with the COER ratings, the officer may provide rebuttal information. If a COER is rebutted by an officer, both the officer and the Rating Official may submit to DCP within 60 days all necessary documentation and comments (i.e., more than one page is authorized in this situation). *The officer's name, PHS serial number, and date of COER must be included at the top of each document.*

Rating Officials will electronically transmit the completed COER and attachments to the next higher supervisory level (Reviewing Official) NO LATER THAN AUGUST 8, 2003.

b. Special Circumstances

- (1) Officer in Current Position/Supervised Less Than 6 Months (excludes officers called to extended active duty after March 1, 2003)

A narrative COER may be prepared when the Rating Official believes that a complete performance rating is premature or inappropriate. It is appropriate for the Rating Official to seek input in completing the COER from the officer's previous supervisor. The narrative statement should summarize the officer's performance to date. **The Rating official may select a Narrative COER, then click either "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory". He/She then provides a general summary statement of the officer's performance.**

- (2) Officer in Training Outside of the Service

A narrative COER may be prepared for officers in training outside the Service when the Rating Official believes that a complete performance rating is inappropriate. **The Rating official may select a Narrative COER, then click either "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory". He/She then provides a general summary statement of the officer's performance.**

- (3) Officers Assigned or Detailed to Non-HHS Organizations

Some officers are assigned or detailed to State, county, and local health organizations, other Federal agencies, and international organizations. The COER is used for the evaluation of all commissioned corps officers whether assigned to Agencies/OPDIVs/Programs or assigned or detailed to non-HHS organizations. If a COER Rating Official is not designated in the detail agreement, the official named in the detail agreement as the Federal Supervisor shall be the Rating Official for the COER. The HHS official designated in the personnel agreement covering the detail will function as the Reviewing Official. If no HHS official has been so designated, the next higher level supervisor over the Rating Official will serve as the Reviewing Official. The performance criteria applied in rating the officer will be specified in the assignment or detail agreement, or, if not specified, applicable Federal standards will be used. For officers detailed under "blanket" or "no-host" details (e.g., Environmental Protection Agency, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, U.S. Coast Guard, St. Elizabeths/DCMHC, U.S. Marshals Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Prisons, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, etc.), the immediate supervisor in the organization to which the officer is assigned or detailed shall be the Rating Official for the COER.

- (4) Officers Who Have Transferred During the Period of the COER

If a Rating Official has supervised an officer for a short period of time (less than 6 months), it is appropriate for the Rating Official to seek input in completing the COER from the officer's previous supervisor. If there is no former supervisor, a note to that effect should be included on the attachment to the COER.

- (5) Officers With Duty Station Separated from Rating Official

If an officer's duty station is geographically separated from the duty station of the Rating Official or if an officer is temporarily working in another program, diligence is to be exercised by the Rating Official to objectively assess performance. For example, site visits or discussions with on-site supervisors may be helpful to assess performance.

6. Specific Instructions for Reviewing Officials

Reviewing Officials must remember that the COER is an important management tool. An officer is to be objectively rated by the Rating Official, and an appropriate balance is to be provided between an officer's performance strengths and weaknesses. Reviewing Officials are also reminded that it is expected that problems and/or difficulties with an officer's performance shall be documented.

The first responsibility of Reviewing Officials is to ensure that all supervisors under their jurisdiction deliver to them, NO LATER THAN AUGUST 8, 2003, completed COERs on all officers under their purview.

Reviewing Officials will indicate agreement or disagreement with the rater's evaluation. They will not be permitted to make any changes in the letter designations or comments made by the Rating Official. Reviewing Officials may state any specific agreements or disagreements with any comments by the Rating Official. Any comments made by a Reviewing Official which might in any way be considered negative by the officer shall be discussed with the officer.

Reviewing Officials must discuss the evaluation with the officer if the officer indicates disagreement with the Reviewing Official's comments, or if the officer otherwise requests an opportunity to discuss the COER. If this is not practical, the comments will be given to the officer by his/her immediate supervisor.

After the Reviewing Official has indicated concurrence or non-concurrence, the electronically transmitted COER is due NO LATER THAN SEPTEMBER 2, 2003, to DCP.

7. Specific Instructions for Commissioned Corps Liaisons

Commissioned Corps Liaisons are responsible for tracking COER status and making follow-up inquiries on those that are not transmitted in a timely fashion.

Commissioned Corps Liaisons will have status reports and missing COER reports available to them to help them monitor the progress of the COERs of officers assigned to them.

Privacy Act Provisions

Personnel records are subject to the provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974. The applicable system of record is 09-40-0001, "PHS Commissioned Corps General Personnel Records," HHS/PSC/HRS.

SAMPLE A
DESCRIPTIVE EXAMPLES FOR QUESTIONS 1 THROUGH 18

1. Quantity of Work:
 - A. Consistently produces less than is expected.
 - B. Sometimes falls below productivity standards.
 - C. Meets standards consistently.
 - D. Usually exceeds standards of productivity.
 - E. Exceptionally productive; accomplishes far more than expected.

2. Quality of Work:
 - A. Regularly produces work which does not meet standards of quality.
 - B. Occasionally produces work which does not meet standards.
 - C. Produces work that consistently meets standards.
 - D. Produces above average work.
 - E. Consistently produces exceptional work.

3. Punctuality of Work:
 - A. Regularly misses deadlines.
 - B. Is sometimes behind schedule.
 - C. Is consistently on time with assigned work.
 - D. Can be relied upon to meet all deadlines and is sometimes ahead of schedule.
 - E. Is exceptionally prompt and usually ahead of schedule.

4. Initiative, Creativity, and Judgement:
 - A. Often fails to take obviously necessary actions or takes wrong ones.
 - B. Sometimes fails to take steps that would solve or head off usual problems.
 - C. Deals effectively with usual problems and challenges.
 - D. Moves creatively to meet program objectives and solve somewhat unusual problems.
 - E. Consistently recognizes and solves unusual problems in innovative ways.

5. Planning and Organizing:
 - A. Needs continual supervision to determine priorities, resource needs, and time to be allotted for even routine tasks.
 - B. Sometimes is lax in determining and adhering to priorities and schedules.
 - C. Sets and adheres to priorities and schedules under most circumstances.
 - D. Skilled planner and organizer. Grasps problems well and provides detailed solutions.
 - E. Exceptionally skilled in planning and organizing.

6. Ability to Analyze Problems:
 - A. Often asks questions or presents solutions that evidence a lack of understanding of routine matters.
 - B. Sometimes asks questions or presents solutions which complicate the management of routine problems.
 - C. Almost always evidences understanding of routine and many more complex matters.
 - D. Usually understands and presents good solutions to new and particularly difficult problems.
 - E. Is a person to whom other look for creative and thorough analysis of the most difficult problems.

SAMPLE A (CONT.)
DESCRIPTIVE EXAMPLES FOR QUESTIONS 1 THROUGH 18

7. Supervisory Skills:
- A. Supervision frequently causes problems which require intervention.
 - B. Supervisory decisions sometimes complicate management problems.
 - C. Handles most supervisory problems without difficulty.
 - D. Resolves supervisory problems and improves employee's performance.
 - E. Solves even difficult problems and gets the most out of all employees supervised.
 - F. Officer has no supervisory responsibility.
8. Ability to Work with Others:
- A. Is not effective when work requires cooperative efforts.
 - B. Performance is sometimes impaired if it requires working with others.
 - C. Satisfactorily achieves objectives when working with others is required.
 - D. Is able to cooperate with others in a manner that helps produce better work than any one member of the group could produce.
 - E. Works with others in ways which maximize the contributions of each person and consistently produces excellent results.
9. Ability to Express Self Verbally and in Writing:
- A. Routine material is misunderstood and fails to obtain the desired response.
 - B. Failure to communicate clearly sometimes causes problems.
 - C. Communication failures rarely cause problems.
 - D. Gets message across even when material is complex.
 - E. Expresses complex and controversial material in such a lucid and persuasive way that achievement of objectives is materially aided.
10. Professional Skills in Present Activity:
- A. Cannot be trusted in situations when professional judgement is required.
 - B. Sometimes makes professional judgements that are not supportable.
 - C. Consistently makes professional judgements that are supportable.
 - D. Is looked to by others for professional advice.
 - E. Is recognized outside his/her program as an expert.
11. Responsiveness to Supervision:
- A. Usually rejects supervisory guidance without considering its merits.
 - B. Sometimes rejects supervisory guidance without considering its merits.
 - C. Usually considers supervisory guidance carefully and is able to apply it.
 - D. Works with supervisory guidance constructively.
 - E. Seeks supervisory guidance appropriately and implements creatively.
12. Response to Crisis:
- A. Performance is ineffective in crises.
 - B. Performance is somewhat less effective in crises.
 - C. Performance is effective in crises.
 - D. Rises to the occasion in crises.
 - E. Emerges as a superior performer and leader in crises.
 - F. No observation during rating period.

SAMPLE A (CONT.)
DESCRIPTIVE EXAMPLES FOR QUESTIONS 1 THROUGH 18

13. Growth in Skills During Rating Period:
- A. Skills have deteriorated.
 - B. Has shown little, if any, growth in skills.
 - C. Has shown steady growth in skills.
 - D. Has shown much more growth in skills than most of his/her peers.
 - E. Has progressed more rapidly than most of his/her peers.
 - F. Rater has not known officer long enough to judge this ability. (Use this only if you have supervised officer less than 6 months.)
14. Commitment to Program Goals:
- A. Exclusively puts own welfare or advancement ahead of program.
 - B. Frequently puts personal concerns ahead of program.
 - C. Is generally able to balance personal and program concerns.
 - D. Has worked out a balance between personal and work responsibilities. Allows satisfactory resolution of almost all conflicts.
 - E. Integrates personal and program interests so that conflicts rarely arise.
15. Managerial Responsibility:
With respect to officer's managerial responsibilities, develops and implements systems and procedures to exercise overall management of the program. Common goals are increased efficiency, quality service, cost reduction, and timeliness of actions.
- A. Regularly fails
 - B. Occasionally fails.
 - C. Is fully satisfactory.
 - D. Usually exceeds.
 - E. Is of an exceptional nature.
 - F. Officer has no managerial responsibilities.
16. Wearing of the PHS Uniform:
- A. Never Conforms.
 - B. Wears uniform less often than required or wears uniform inappropriately.
 - C. Wears appropriate uniform as required.
 - D. Wears appropriate uniform more frequently than required.
 - E. Wears uniform daily with pride and distinction.
17. Equal Opportunity:
Supports HHS or Program Equal Opportunity (EO) program and adheres to Operating Division EO standards by taking supervisory and administrative actions which ensure equal treatment of employees. Facilitates and enhances the recruitment, career development, and advancement opportunities for minorities, women, and persons with disabilities.
- A. Regularly fails.
 - B. Occasionally fails.
 - C. Is fully satisfactory.
 - D. Usually exceeds.
 - E. Is of an exceptional nature.
 - F. Officer is neither manager nor supervisor.

SAMPLE A (CONT.)
DESCRIPTIVE EXAMPLES FOR QUESTIONS 1 THROUGH 18

18. Overall Job Performance:

This rating should *not* be an average of items above. It should reflect actual effectiveness in the job which this officer is doing. This rating should be consistent with the officer's performance under his/her work plan.

- A. Inadequate. This officer is a hindrance rather than an asset.
- B. Marginal. This officer is sometimes less effective than can be reasonably expected.
- C. Competent. This officer is fully effective in performing his/her job.
- D. Well above average. This officer has made significant contribution and has enhanced the position he/she holds.
- E. Exceptional. This officer's performance is far better than can be reasonably expected and has brought credit on the officer and the organization.

DIRECTORY OF AGENCY/OPDIV/PROGRAM COMMISSIONED CORPS LIAISONS

MAY 2003

1. **AHRQ**
CAPT Bruce Immerman, USPHS (Ret.)
Division of Human Resource Management
2101 E. Jefferson Street, Suite 601
Rockville, MD 20852
Phone: 301-594-7176
Fax: 301-594-5213
E-mail: bimmerman@ahrq.gov
2. **BOP**
Ms. Freda Muse
BOP/HOLC Building, Room 1031
320 First Street, NW
Washington, DC 20534
Phone: 202-353-4148
Fax: 202-305-7715
E-mail: fmuse@bop.gov
3. **CDC/ATSDR**
CAPT Kitty MacFarland
CDC/ATSDR Commissioned Corps
Section
4770 Buford Highway, Mail Stop K-15
Atlanta, GA 30341-3724
Phone: 770-488-1883
Fax: 770-488-1970
E-mail: kjm8@cdc.gov
4. **CMS**
Ms. Jane Leitner
CMS/Mail Stop C2-09-27
7500 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21244-1850
Phone: 410-786-1786
Fax: 410-786-9580
E-mail: jleitner@cms.hhs.gov
5. **EPA**
Ms. Esther DeLauder
U.S. EPA, Mail Code 3650
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460-0001
Phone: 202-564-0430
Fax: 202-260-0523
E-mail: delauder.esther@epa.gov
6. **FDA**
CAPT Russell Green
FDA/Parklawn Building, (HFA-407)
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 7B-44
Rockville, MD 20857-0001
Phone: 301-827-4083
Fax: 301-594-0694
E-mail: rgreen@oc.fda.gov
7. **HRSA**
HRSA/Commissioned Corps
Operations Staff, OHRD
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 13A-22
Rockville, MD 20857-0001
Phone: 301-443-2741
Fax: 301-594-6599
8. **IHS**
Mr. Rob Twitty
HQ's Commissioned Personnel Liaison
12300 Twinbrook Parkway, Suite 230
Rockville, MD 20852
Phone: 301-443-2830
Fax: 301-443-5304
E-mail: rtwitty@hqe.ihs.gov
9. **National Park Service**
Ms. Sonia Coakley
National Park Service
Public Health Program
1849 C St., NW (Room 7427)
Washington, D.C. 20240
Phone: 202-513-7215
Fax: 202-565-1115
E-mail: Sonya_Coakley@nps.gov
10. **NIH**
CAPT Kenneth Diepold, USPHS (Ret.)
NIH/Building 31, Room B2B63
31 Center Drive, MSC 2043
Bethesda, MD 20892-2043
Phone: 301-402-0261
Fax: 301-496-7146
E-mail: kd139o@nih.gov

(Continued on next page)

DIRECTORY OF AGENCY/PROGRAM COMMISSIONED CORPS LIAISONS*(continued)*

MAY 2003

11. **NOAA**
CAPT Michael Vitch
NOAA/Room 12734
1315 East West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Phone: 301-713-3440 ext. 186
Fax: 301-713-2887
E-mail: michael.vitch@NOAA.GOV
12. **OS**
LCDR Nancy Mautone-Smith
Human Resources Service, DPO-P
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 17-38
Rockville, MD 20857-0001
Phone: 301-443-1055
Fax: 301-443-2641
E-mail: nmautone@psc.gov
13. **PSC**
LCDR Nancy Mautone-Smith
Human Resources Service, DPO-P
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 17-38
Rockville, MD 20857-0001
Phone: 301-443-1055
Fax: 301-443-2641
E-mail: nmautone@psc.gov
14. **SAMHSA**
LCDR Nancy Mautone-Smith
Human Resources Service, DPO-P
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 17-38
Rockville, MD 20857-0001
Phone: 301-443-1055
Fax: 301-443-2641
E-mail: nmautone@psc.gov
15. **ST. ELIZABETHS/DCMHC**
CAPT Richard C. Smith
St. Elizabeths Center for
Mental Health Service
J. Howard Pavilion-Medical Clinic
2700 M.L. King, Jr. Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20032
Phone: 202-645-4881
16. **USCG**
CAPT Michael Adess
U.S. Coast Guard HQ
Commandant (G-WKH-3)
2100 Second Street, SW, Room 5314
Washington, DC 20593-0001
Phone: 202-267-0805
Fax: 202-267-4685
E-mail: madess@comdt.uscg.mil
17. **USDA**
CAPT Cindy Pond
Director, Commissioned Corps Operations
Food Safety and Inspection Service
1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Room 2128 South Building
Washington, DC 20250-3700
Phone: 202-720-7208
Fax: 202-720-9973
E-mail: cindy.pond@usda.gov
18. **USMS**
CAPT Maria Dinger
U.S. Marshals Service
Crystal Square 4, Room 1121
600 Army Navy Drive
Arlington, VA 22202
Phone: 202-307-9263
Fax: 202-307-5029
E-mail: maria.dinger2@usdoj.gov