

-----Original Message-----

From: Stokes, Debra J HQ02

Sent: Thursday, September 05, 2013 3:30 PM

To: DLL-MSC-OPERATIONS CHIEFS; DLL-DISTRICT-OPERATIONS CHIEFS; CDL-NRM-MSC; CDL-NRM-DISTRICTS; CDL-Operations-Project-Managers; DLL-CECW-CO-N

Cc: Bridon, Benjamin A HQ02; Baumgard, Kevin L MVP; Boyd, Milt HQ02; Crispin, Samuel E HQ02; Derby, John E NWS; Grundhoffer, Timothy M MVP; Johnson, Duane SPK; Kidby, Michael F HQ02; Logan, Stephen F SAM; Mangum, Jeffrey C NAE; Nichol, John H LRH; Rea, Kimberly G MVS; Tennery, John SWT; Austin, Stephen B HQ02; Coho, John W HQ02; Coulombe, Mary J HQ02; Jones, Samantha; Persio, Peppino J HQ02; Toplisek, Timothy HQ

Subject: Signs Standards and AR 190-13 Conflict - resolved (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

All - I am forwarding the email from the Corps Chief of Security and Law Enforcement that states the current USACE "Notice to Visitors" (REG-09) sign in the Sign Standards Program satisfies the AR 190-13 requirement for restricted area signage.

ER 1130-2-500 will be updated accordingly in conjunction with the ongoing approval process for the revised Sign Standards Manual.

We appreciate COL Bridon and the Security team's assistance in this matter.

Please forward this information as appropriate.

Debra

Debra J. Stokes, CPRP

Sign Standards Program Proponent

US Army Corps of Engineers

Washington, DC 20314

202-761-1944

-----Original Message-----

From: Bridon, Benjamin A HQ02
Sent: Tuesday, September 03, 2013 4:13 PM
To: DLL-HQ-DIV-SEC-MGR
Cc: DLL-HQ-CECO-PMO; Stokes, Debra J HQ02
Subject: RE: Conflicting Signs Standards

Ladies and Gentlemen,

After reviewing the language in both AR 190-13 and ER 1130-2-500, we do not require an ETP for Restricted Area signage. This determination is supported by OPMG. There is no specific language that requires Figure 6-1 in AR 190-13 to be posted at operational areas of civil works sites and like projects. There is a requirement to post signs or notices (paragraph 6-6a) that identify sites as restricted areas. The current USACE Notice to Visitors satisfies this requirement. As such, security assessments (physical security inspections/surveys, vulnerability assessments, etc.) should no longer recommend blanket use of Figure 6-1 in AR 190-13. This sign will be appropriate in some, but not all, cases.

The current USACE policy language in ER 1130-2-500 must still be updated. OPD will continue to work with USACE's Directorate of Civil Works (Operations) and USACE's National Sign Standards Program to accomplish this.

I ask again that you forward this to your subordinate-level security personnel, as well as any MSC-level personnel I may have left off the distribution.

Ms Stokes, could you please forward this to the Signs Standards and CW-Operations personnel?

Thanks,

v/r,
Ben Bridon
CPT(P), MP
Chief, Security & Law Enforcement
US Army Corps of Engineers
441 G St, NW
Washington D.C.
Office: 202-761-1572