

Implementation of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Improvement Act of 2000 and Projected Spending Report





Cover photo: USFWS

Introduction

This report is submitted in compliance with the directives given in the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000 (PL.106-408). The Act amended the Federal Aid in Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Acts (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq. & 16 U.S.C. 777 et seq.) providing the Secretary of the Department of the Interior guidance on how to expend administrative funds in the operation of these Federal Assistance Programs for State Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration.

As directed by this Act, the following information is included in Part A of this report to the House Committee on Resources and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works:

- 1) the steps that have been taken to comply with this Act;
- 2) a description of the extent to which compliance with this Act has required a reduction in the number of personnel assigned to administer, manage, and oversee the Federal Assistance Program for State Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration;
- 3) suggested revisions to this Act that would be desirable in order for the Secretary of the Interior to adequately administer the Program and ensure that funds provided to State agencies are properly used; and
- 4) any other information concerning the implementation of this Act that the Secretary of the Interior considers appropriate.

This report provides a snapshot of the implementation steps taken since the Act was passed roughly six months ago. The suggestions included in this report are based on our observations on the implementation of the Federal Assistance program during this short time frame.

This report also includes a Projected Spending Report for FY 2001 and FY 2002, as required by the Act. This information is presented in Part B of this report and includes:

- 1) the amounts, listed by category, that are estimated to be used for fiscal years 2001 and 2002 under section 4(a)(1) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and section 4(d)(1) of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act; and
- 2) the amounts apportioned to States for the fiscal year under section 4(a)(2) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and section 4(d)(2)(A) of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act.

The Act also requires that a Certification of Spending and Report be submitted no later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year. The annual Certification of Spending and Report for the first fiscal year completed (FY 2001) will be presented by November 30, 2001 and will include the following:

- 1) the amounts, broken down by category, that were used for the fiscal year under section 4(a)(1) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and section 4(d)(1) of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act;

- 2) the amounts apportioned to States for the fiscal year under section 4(a)(2) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and section 4(d)(2)(A) of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act;
- 3) the results of the audits performed under section 9(d) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and section 9(d) of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act;
- 4) that all amounts used for the fiscal year under section 4(a)(1) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and section 4(d)(1) of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act were necessary for expenses for administration incurred in implementation of those Acts;
- 5) that all amounts used for the fiscal year to administer those Acts by agency headquarters and by regional offices of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service were used in accordance with those Acts; and
- 6) that the Secretary of the Interior, the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs each properly discharged their duties under those Acts.

Overview

A. Implementation of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000

On July 20, 2000, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service asked The Center for Organizational Excellence (COE) to conduct a resource requirements analysis that would set the stage for current-state improvements and prepare for future challenges. The purpose of this analysis was to gain an independent evaluation of the structure, capabilities, and performance of Federal Assistance's workforce and its major work processes.

Two desired outcomes were jointly identified for the analysis:

- 1) an improved data baseline for making strategic human resource decisions; and
- 2) a foundation for systematic, sustainable process improvement.

The COE report included 17 recommendations for improvement that were provided to the Service in early October 2000. On November 1, 2000, Congress adopted the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000.

With the COE report in hand and new legislation signed into law, the Service began implementing steps to improve the administration of the Programs.

Implementation Steps

Expenses For Administration, Allocation And Apportionment Of Available Amounts

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, the administrative budget for the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration grant programs was determined as a percentage of Program funds. The authorized funding levels permitted in the Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration Acts allowed up to 6% and 8% of Program funds respectively. Accordingly, the approved administrative budget to administer the grant programs in FY 2000 was about \$32 million. The staff to administer the program was 145 FTEs.

The Act requires:

With passage of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restorations Programs Improvement Act of 2000, expenses for administration are no longer to be determined as a percentage of program funds, but rather a specific funding amount. The Secretary of the Interior may not use more than the following amounts for administration of this Act.

- \$18,000,000 for fiscal years 2001 and 2002 (\$9,000,000 per program);
- \$16,424,000 for fiscal year 2003 (\$8,212,000 per program);
- for fiscal year 2004 and each fiscal year thereafter, the preceding fiscal year's allocation plus an increase based on the Consumer Price Index; and
- \$2.1 million each fiscal year for administration of other programs and activities (*see page 21*).

Implementation:

The funding level for FY 2000 covered 145 FTEs. In implementing the changes in the funding allocations in the Act, it was evident that salary and support costs would exceed the amounts provided in the amended Acts. The fact that the Federal Assistance budget is FTE intensive prompted Federal Assistance administrators to evaluate scenarios using fewer FTEs.

In an effort to bring FTE levels in line with available the new funding allocations, the Service conducted a workforce analysis conference with all Federal Assistance regional chiefs. During the conference, a position analysis was prepared based on the seven major functions performed by staff in each Region. Estimates for FTEs for each region for each function were calculated (*see Chart 1 on page 4*). Based on these calculations it was estimated that 136 FTEs were needed for the Federal Assistance Program nationwide. This gross FTE estimate, however, did not provide enough savings to bring the Federal Assistance program within the Administration funding limits provided in

the Act. In fact, at this estimated FTE level, available funding was exceeded by \$1.4 million.

To bring projected costs within funding limits, further reduction and standardization in FTE allocations were considered along with an analysis of non-salary costs. Actual costs for non-salary items were used where they were readily available.

A hypothetical minimum FTE organization chart was produced in order to standardize the Regional Federal Assistance program organizations. This minimum organizational chart was superimposed over each Regional organization chart in order to provide management information to determine where FTE reductions were possible or necessary. Using the information from this analysis, further scenarios were generated until sufficient reductions were made to make the organizational structure and the associated costs fit the available funding, providing for 125.5 FTEs for FY 2001-2002 and 104.5 in FY 2003. The amounts shown for FY 2001-2003 were approved and distributed to the Regions by the Director in December 2000 and is summarized in the chart on the next page (*Chart 2 on page 4*). Chart 2 depicts FTE staffing and funding scenarios for Regional and Washington Offices for FY 1999-2003, bringing about a reduction of FTEs from 159 in FY 1999 to 104.5 by FY 2003.

The FY 2001 budget meets the combined \$18 million administrative funding limits for the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration grant programs mandated in the Act. In addition, the Act provides for \$900,000 to administer certain other grants programs. Of this amount, \$500,000 is distributed among the Regions and Washington Office and is included in Chart 2. The other \$400,000 is allocated to administer the National Outreach and Communications Program, but not included in the chart because this grant program is not administered by the Service's Federal Assistance Division.

Chart 1
Minimum and Maximum FTE
Distribution by Function

FTE Distribution by Function

	Edu.	Fiscal	WL	Fish	Lands	Sm. Gr.	Admin.	RO FTEs
Region 1	1.00	2.00	3.50	3.00	0.00	1.00	4.00	14.50
Region 2	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	14.00
Region 3	2.00	2.50	3.50	3.00	1.50	1.00	5.50	19.00
Region 4	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	0.00	3.00	5.00	18.50
Region 5	1.50	3.00	3.25	3.25	1.00	1.00	4.50	17.50
Region 6	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	0.50	0.50	4.00	14.50
Region 7	0.20	0.50	0.80	0.70	0.00	0.10	2.70	5.00
RO Total								103.00
	Policy	Audit	Training	Cash Mgmt	FAIMS	Grant Ops	Admin.	WO FTEs
Washington	4.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	9.00	2.50	10.50	33.00
Total FTEs								136.00

Chart 2
Budgets and FTE Levels for
FY 1999 - FY 2003
(dollars in thousands)

Category	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Approved FTE	159	145	145	125.5	104.5
	\$\$ / FTE	\$\$ / FTE	\$\$ / FTE	\$\$ / FTE	\$\$ / FTE
Regions (Allocated FTE)	9,792 / 106	9,119 / 105	8,093 / 95	8,815 / 95	7,707 / 79
Washington Office (Allocated FTE)	15,751 / 41	14,315 / 40	3,934 / 30.5	3,905 / 30.5	3,387 / 25.5
Nationwide Operations:					
Service Overhead ¹	5,856	2,659 ²	3,537	3,537	3,537
State Program Audits	2,121	2,317	2,502	1,800	1,800
Contract Audit of FA	0	0	300	300	300
SMARTLINK	134	134	134	134	134
Subtotal, Nationwide Ops	8,111	5,110	6,473	5,771	5,771
Estimated Costs	33,654	28,544	18,500	18,491	16,865
Current Funding Available	31,025	31,915	18,500³	18,500	16,924
Prior-Year Carryover	5,296	2,574	1,940	0	0
Redirected to State Apportionments		-5,500			
Total Funding Available	36,321	28,989	20,440	18,500	16,924

¹ Servicewide Overhead includes costs administered through the former General Administrative Support account (FY 1999 and 2000) and the new Cost Allocation Methodology (FY 2001 and 2002) plus Regional centralized costs. Beginning in FY 2001, both types of overhead costs are administered in compliance with the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000.

² Estimated amount for transition year between the former General Administrative Support and the new Cost Allocation Methodology.

³ Current Funding Available in FY 2001 through 2003 includes \$500,000 for administration of other programs as described on page 3.

The budget projections for FY 2003 reflect the required reduction of administrative funds to \$16.4 million in FY 2003 plus \$500,000 for other grant programs.

Period Of Availability; Apportionment of Unobligated Amounts

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, administrative funds were allocated for use within a 2 year period. Unobligated funds were either carried over for use in the succeeding year or apportioned to the States with the succeeding year's Wildlife and/or Sport Fish apportionment.

The Act requires:

Administrative funds for each fiscal year shall remain available for obligation until the end of the fiscal year. Within 60 days after the end of a fiscal year, unobligated administrative funds shall be apportioned among the States using the standard Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs apportionment formulas.

Implementation:

Cost savings of \$5.5 million generated by Federal Assistance in FY 2000 have been returned to our State partners through the apportionment process.

Puerto Rico Apportionment of Wildlife Restoration Program Hunter Education Funds

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, Puerto Rico received no hunter education apportionment funds.

The Act requires:

Puerto Rico is to receive a standard apportionment of the Wildlife Restoration Program's Hunter Education funds from any tax imposed on pistols, revolvers, bows, and arrows.

Implementation:

Puerto Rico has been included in the formula which calculates this portion of each State's wildlife restoration and hunter education apportionment.

Requirements and Restrictions Concerning Use of Amounts for Expenses for Administration.

Authorized Expenses for Administration

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Acts broadly stated that operating expenses could be incurred for the administration and execution of the programs. As a rule, the Service accounted for administrative expenses at a gross level against each grant program (Wildlife Restoration or Sport Fish Restoration) for each Fish and Wildlife Service Region. Within this structure, Regions tracked and controlled expenses in ways that met their own needs.

The Act requires:

Only expenses for administration that directly support the implementation of this Act that consist of costs in twelve (12) specified categories are allowable.

Implementation:

The 12 categories of authorized expenses for administration have been implemented into the Service budget planning process. All budget worksheets and cost estimates reflect the application of these 12 categories.

The following is a description of each category, a statement indicating how the Act changed Federal Assistance operations, and a brief explanation of Service efforts to comply with the Act.

Categories 1 and 2, Personnel Costs (full-time/ part-time) for employees who directly administer this Act.

These categories allow for payment of salaries and benefits to Federal employees who administer the Act either full time or part time. Only time spent administering the Act may be charged to Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration accounts. The Service may charge salary and benefits for part-time employees only if those employees spend at least 20 hours a week administering the Act.

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, there was no 20 hour work week minimum. Some payroll costs were paid with Federal Assistance administrative funds for people who weren't conducting work related to grant or program administration. There were few procedures in place to monitor and control the utilization of payroll funds.

Implementation:

Federal Assistance is instituting the use of daily work diaries for employees to record their work hours. This will provide for better accounting of time spent administering this Act and its numerous program components. Managers are monitoring time and attendance and certifying accuracy to ensure personnel costs in categories 1 and 2 conform to the requirements of this Act. The records generated will also provide more accurate data for future budget projections and allocation of financial resources.

Category 3, Personnel Support Costs

Personnel support costs include costs for supplies, equipment, printing Federal Register notices, contracts, shipping, communication, and equipment rentals.

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, these costs were tracked in the Federal Financial System (FFS) and, in some cases, with Regional Office budget tracking systems. However, internal control procedures to insure that funds were spent on allowable program expenses and approved at the proper level were inadequate or inconsistently followed.

Implementation:

Control procedures have been implemented and surnaming approval processes are in place. Managers are reviewing and approving acquisition requests for goods and services to ensure compliance with this Act. Careful and consistent analysis of acquisition requests and application of the guidance specified in this Act will help ensure appropriate expenditures within this category.

Category 4, Costs of Determining “Substantiality of Character and Design”
Costs related to determining substantiality of character and design are mostly salary and are associated with the receipt, review, coordination and approval determination processes. Some travel related costs may be involved for new grants, especially those involving land purchases, construction projects, or those with numerous or complex environmental or public use issues. Category 4 costs may also include staff time, travel, communication costs (phone, fax, mail, etc) to provide technical assistance to State grantees during development of grant documentation. These costs may also include participation in meetings, consultations, workgroups, etc.

Grants that are substantial in character and design meet guidelines found in 50 CFR Part 80. To implement this, Service grant managers are responsible to ensure that grants submitted:

- identify and describe a need within the purposes of the relevant Act to be utilized;
- identify the objectives to be accomplished based on the stated need;
- utilize accepted fish and wildlife conservation and management principles, sound design, and appropriate procedures; and
- will yield benefits which are pertinent to the identified need at a level commensurate with project costs.

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, costs associated with these job functions comprised a significant portion of Service grant managers’ responsibilities.

Implementation:

The costs of determining substantiality in character and design are not tracked. Costs are tracked by budget object class and program. Therefore costs for determining substantiality in character and design are included in categories:



USFWS

1 and 2, personnel; 3, personnel support; 5, overhead; 8, training; and 9 and 10, travel for each program.

Category 5, Overhead Costs

Overhead costs includes the costs of general administrative services provided broadly to the Service as a whole. Examples are leases for office space, the Health Unit, local telephone service, the Office of Diversity and Civil Rights, Personnel, Budget, and Finance.

Overhead costs, including the costs of general administrative services, must be directly attributable to administration of this Act and be:

- based on actual costs determined by the approved direct cost allocation methodology; and
- in the case of costs that are not determined by a direct cost allocation methodology, an amount per FTE authorized under categories (1) and (2) that does not exceed the amount charged for costs per FTE for any other division of the Service.

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, the Service developed and used a methodology for distributing overhead costs to Service organizations such as the Federal Assistance Program. This methodology for cost distribution was embodied in the General Administrative Support (GAS) account and resulted in the Federal Assistance programs paying more than the cost of the services actually received. The Service established a committee to reevaluate the GAS financial model. Through the efforts of this committee the Service transitioned to a Cost Allocation Methodology (CAM) in FY2000. While CAM was not formally implemented in that year, the Service implemented its principles. The result was a reduction in charges to the Federal Assistance Program from \$5.2 million in FY 1999 to \$2.3 million in FY 2000, for a savings of \$2.9 million.

Implementation:

In FY 2001 the Service replaced its General Administrative Services (GAS) overhead calculation method with a new cost allocation methodology (CAM). This shift to CAM resulted in a \$2.9 million savings in overhead costs for FY 2000 which was redirected to the States through the apportionment process. This new methodology complies with the Act.

Category 6, State Fish and Wildlife Agency Audits

Costs in this category include contract costs for audit agency staff (travel, salaries, training, etc.) as well as Service

staff costs which relate to assisting in the training and orientation of auditors, document preparation, report reviews, negotiations with State staff concerning development of corrective action plans, etc.

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, the Service was in the 4th year of a 5 year cycle of audits of States using Federal Aid in Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration program grant funding. These audits are being performed by the Defense Contract Audit Authority (DCAA). States are being audited on



compliance issues, assent legislation requirements, and spending and cost accounting issues.

Implementation:

The Service plans to continue to use administrative funds to audit State wildlife and sport fish grant activities. However, the Service expects to reduce the audit costs to more efficiently use Federal Assistance administrative funds. This will be accomplished by reducing the scope of the audits, relying on information gathered from previous audits, utilizing lessons learned from the first series of audits and implementing new audit procedures within the Federal Assistance program.

Category 7, Audits of Service Expenses for Administration of this Act

Audit of Service administration expenses is accomplished by an independent, non-Service entity with the goals of determining Service compliance with the Improvement Act and to identify opportunities for improvement of administrative operations. The Act requires an audit every 2 years.

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, there was no requirement for Federal Assistance or the Service to obtain outside review of its expenses for administration and execution of the Restoration Acts. However, the Service contracted an independent, commercial auditing firm to conduct an audit of its FY 1999 and 2000 administrative operations. The final report from this audit is expected to be available near the end of August 2001.

Implementation:

The Service contracted with Walker and Company, LLP, to examine use of administrative funds associated with the various Acts. The auditor provided the Service with a draft report for FY 1999 on February 23, 2001, and is in the process of auditing FY 2000. In the recently submitted FY 1999 report, 12 recommendations were made. During the

past year the Service has instituted procedures, policies and practices to address the report recommendations. The Service expects the FY 2000 report by August 2001. The Service is currently working with the Department of the Interior to negotiate a contract with an independent auditor to conduct audits for FY 2001 and FY 2002.

Category 8, Training

Costs in this category include tuition, materials, course fees, facility and equipment rental, and travel to participate in or present training which improves the knowledge, efficiency, and abilities of Federal and State staff to administer the Federal Assistance program grants. Travel costs for State staff are not paid with Federal Assistance administrative funds.

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, training costs, including travel in some cases, were paid for Federal and State staff to attend a variety of courses and workshops. These training events involved the development of biological/technical knowledge and skill in fish and wildlife resource management, public involvement principles and methods, human dimension issues, project management, grant management, and fiscal management.

Implementation:

The Service now pays only for training that directly relates to improving the knowledge, efficiency, and abilities of Federal and State staff to administer the Federal Assistance grants.



USFWS

Category 9 (Travel Within the 50 States, 6 territories, and Canada) and Category 10 (International Travel)

Costs in these categories include expenses for commercial carriers, public transportation, lodging, meals, approved incidental travel expenses, etc.

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, travel expenses could be incurred for the administration and execution of the Restoration Acts. Other controlling guidance and requirements were provided by the Federal Travel Regulations, Department and Service manuals, and various policy statements. However, the Service did not have sufficient procedures in place or adequate management controls

to ensure all pertinent guidelines and requirements for Federal-Assistance-supported travel were followed. As a result, some travel was inappropriately charged to Federal Assistance accounts and complete records of approvals and statements of purpose were not maintained.

Implementation:

The Service has instituted processes and procedures to ensure compliance with the Act. Travel authorizations are now reviewed by program managers to ensure that the purpose of each trip is consistent with the provisions of the Act. Category 9 (US, Territories, and Canada) travel is reviewed and approved by the appropriate Regional Federal Assistance Division

Chief or the Chief of Federal Assistance in the Washington, DC Office. Category 10 (international) travel proposed by the Service is forwarded to the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks for final approval. Since inception of the Improvement Act, no international travel proposals have been approved for forwarding to the Assistant Secretary. Requests for travel authorization are evaluated based on the requirements of this Act. Only travel for purposes directly related to administration of Federal Assistance grant programs or projects is authorized.

Currently no Federal Assistance funds are budgeted for travel outside the United States for FY 2001. However, if such travel is necessary it will be approved pursuant to the Act with the signature of the Assistant Secretary of Parks, Fish and Wildlife as required in the Act.

Category 11, Relocation Costs

Costs in this category include travel, moving, and relocation expenses for employees and their immediate family when the employee is re-assigned or accepts a position outside of their local commuting area.

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, federal employees who received reimbursements for relocation expenses signed a written agreement to continue government service for at least one year after their relocation. The Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000 requires that Federal Assistance employees who receive reimbursement for relocation work within the Federal Assistance Program for at least one year after their relocation.

Implementation:

Only relocation expenses for personnel who will administer this Act on a full-time basis for at least 1 year after relocation, as certified by the Director at the time at which the relocation expenses are incurred, are permitted under the Act. Relocation costs are anticipated in FY



USFWS

2001 as the Service continues to implement the Act. Federal Assistance managers review relocation authorizations for compliance with this provision of the Act prior to approving the relocation.

Category 12, Costs to audit, evaluate, approve, disapprove, and advise concerning: submission of plans and projects; hunter education enhancement program grant funds; and multistate conservation grant program funds. Costs for this category are similar to Category 4, Costs to Determine Substantiality of Character and Design and overlap with Category 6, State Fish and Wildlife Agency Audits, Category 8, Training, and Categories 9 and 10, Travel.

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, (1) hunter education enhancement program funds (**Section 10**) did not exist, (2) administrative costs for a National Administrative Grants Program were charged to Wildlife Restoration and Sport Fish Restoration administrative funds respectively. The Multistate Conservation Grant Program replaced the National Administrative Grants Program.

Implementation:

Steps taken to implement cost tracking for hunter education enhancement program grant funds include:

- Past year, FY 2000, levels of expenditures on hunter education projects were noted Nationwide allowing an obligation/expenditure comparison on future-year management reports.
- Hunter education enhancement funds have been assigned a unique accounting code to enable tracking of individual expenditure levels on State projects.
- The Federal Aid Information Management System (FAIMS) was modified to allow tracking of enhanced hunter education program (Section 10) accomplishments.



USFWS

©Photodisc

Steps taken to implement cost tracking for multistate conservation program grant funds include:

- Separate cost accounting codes to track the multi-state grant costs have been created to allow charging of these costs to the Wildlife Restoration or Sport Fish Restoration program as is appropriate.

Reporting Of Other Uses

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, there was no provision to submit proposals to Congress for special use of administrative funds.

The Act requires:

If the Secretary of the Interior determines that administrative funds should be used for an expense other than one described in this Act, the Secretary:

- shall submit a report describing the expense and the amount; and

- may use available amounts beginning 30 days after the date this report is submitted.

For any fiscal year, the Secretary of the Interior may use a maximum of \$25,000 from each restoration grant program.

Implementation:

Prior to incurring costs, regional and Washington office managers identify program needs and submit proposals for costs which are included within the 12 spending categories allowed. The Federal Assistance Division Chief evaluates these proposals individually and identifies any items which do not fit within the 12 categories. The items which are not included in one of the allowable cost categories are forwarded to the Service Director for submission to the Secretary for final approval and submission in the Secretary's report to the House and Senate Committees as required by the Act. No request for special use of administrative funds has been made.

Restriction On Use To Supplement General Appropriations

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, there was no procedure in place to ensure the Service did not use Wildlife and Sport Fish funds to supplement other appropriations.

The Act Requires:

The Secretary of the Interior shall not use Federal Assistance administrative funds to supplement the funding of any function for which general appropriations are made.

Implementation:

Federal Assistance has identified areas where Federal Assistance administration funds have been used for other programs. The Service is working with other Service fund managers to establish cost estimates or actual expense data quantifying reimbursement of costs incurred to be paid to Federal Assistance from the other programs' general appropriations. In a January 12, 2001 memorandum, the



Director provided Regional Directors a set of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) concerning the use of Federal Assistance administrative funds. Question #13 in those FAQs offers guidance on the use of administrative funds for Section 6 endangered species grants. These grants, and funds to administer them, are authorized under the general appropriations of the Service. The answer for Question #13 of the FAQ's states that "All charges to Federal Assistance for administration of Section 6 must be fully reimbursed within the same fiscal year." Section 6 managers have agreed to reimburse Federal Assistance for costs incurred

Audit Requirement

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, there was no requirement to audit the use of Federal Assistance administration funds. However, the Service worked with the Office of the Inspector General (IG) prior to the Act to obtain a financial audit of its obligations and expenditures. On March 30, 2000, the Service contracted with Walker and Company, LLP, to examine administration of the Wildlife and Sport Fish programs for Fiscal Years 1999 and 2000. In its FY 1999 draft report, Walker made recommendations. Federal Assistance implemented procedures, policies, and practices to address the report recommendations. The FY 2000 report is expected in August 2001, and it will incorporate the FY 1999 report.

The Act Requires:

The Inspector General of the Department of the Interior shall arrange for biennial audits of obligations and expenditures for administering this Act. Audit contracts will be awarded under competitive procedures.

Implementation:

On March 30, 2000, the Service contracted with Walker and Company, LLP, to examine administration of the various Acts. Walker provided the Service with a report for FY 1999 and is in the process of auditing FY 2000. In the FY 1999 report,

Walker made recommendations. Federal Assistance implemented procedures, policies and practices to address report recommendations. The FY 2000 report is expected in August 2001.

The Service has initiated discussions with the Interior Inspector General (IG) to contract audit services for the FY 2001 and FY 2002 audit cycle. The Service anticipates the IG will award this contract in FY 2002.

Firearm And Bow Hunter Education And Safety Program Grants

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, the States received an apportionment of Section 4(c) funds which could be used to fund hunter education programs, including the building and maintenance of shooting ranges. However, the States could also elect to use these funds for wildlife restoration purposes rather than for hunter education programs.

The Act Requires:

This Act sets aside \$7,500,000 of Wildlife Restoration funds for hunter education and shooting range construction in FY 2001 and FY 2002 and \$8 million thereafter. These funds are available for use during the fiscal year they are apportioned. Unused funds at the end of the fiscal year will be reappportioned in the next apportionment cycle to States who have used all of their Section 4(c) funds for hunter education programs. The Act restricts the use of these funds to hunter education, interstate shooting range programs, and construction or development of shooting and archery ranges until the State spends an amount equal to their regular hunter education apportionment.

Implementation:

Procedures have been established to administer the new Firearm and Bow Hunter Education Safety Program Grants. Reporting/tracking codes have been established in the Federal Aid Information Management System (FAIMS) to allow for grant tracking, application, processing, documentation, accounting, cost reconciliation, and accomplishment reporting. Guidelines for administering these funds were distributed on March 12, 2001, with the apportionment letter to State grantees.



Dean Biggens/USFWS

Multistate Conservation Grant Program

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, the Service provided administrative funds from the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration funds respectively to fund a National Administrative Grants program. Grants from this program were provided to States, local governments, charitable and educational institutions, or other authorized recipients. This program was similar to and has been replaced by the new Multistate Conservation Grants Program.

The Act Requires:

This Act annually sets aside \$3,000,000 each from Wildlife Restoration and Sport Fish Restoration funds for a new Multistate Conservation Grant Program, totaling \$6,000,000.

Implementation:

The Service has implemented the Multistate Conservation Grant Program. In cooperation with the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (IAFWA) the Service established an interim procedure for FY 2001 for handling multistate grants. Working with the IAFWA the Service is developing final procedures to implement this Program for FY 2002 and beyond. The Service received and approved a priority list of 14 grants from the IAFWA as authorized in the Act. The Service funded grants totaling \$5,691,353 for FY 2001. The Division is developing a policy and procedures manual for the Multistate Conservation Grants Program, which is to be finished by December 2001.

Expenses For Administration Of Certain Programs (Sport Fish Restoration Funds Only)

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, a portion of the funds authorized for administering the Sport Fish Restoration Act were used to fund administrative costs of the Coastal Wetlands, Clean Vessel, Boating Infrastructure, and the National Outreach and Communications programs. These



USFWS

special programs received no additional administrative funding.

The Act requires:

For each fiscal year, the Secretary of the Interior may use a maximum of \$900,000 to administer the following programs:

- Coastal Wetlands Program;
- Clean Vessel Program;
- Boating Infrastructure Program; and
- National Outreach and Communications Program.

Implementation:

Funds to administer these programs in FY 2001 have been placed in a single account. The \$900,000 is allocated to the Regions and Washington Office based on the projected needs of the grant programs. Federal Assistance is utilizing an expanded time accounting report form (daily diary) to collect accurate data from its employees to determine how much time is spent working on the various programs of the

Division. With the data from these reports, a more accurate cost estimate of administering these grant programs can be determined. Data collected during the remainder of FY 2001, coupled with new budget estimating approaches, should improve the cost estimates for FY 2002. The first full year's payroll costs using the daily diary will be available at the end of FY 2002. Administrative funding level estimates for FY 2003 will be based on more accurate costs for administering these special programs.

Funding For Other Activities

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, three marine fisheries commissions and the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council were funded from the 6-percent authorization for administration contained in the Sport Fish Restoration Act. The fisheries commissions were funded for \$150,000 to \$200,000 each, except the Great Lakes

Fisheries Commission, which did not request any funding. The Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council had an annual budget of approximately \$400,000.

The Act Requires:

\$200,000 shall be made available for each of the following Commissions:

- Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission;
- Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission;
- Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission; and
- Great Lakes Fisheries Commission.

In addition, \$400,000 shall be made available for the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council.

Implementation:

Funds have been allocated and made available as the Act requires.

Wildlife And Sport Fish Restoration Programs

Designation Of Programs

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, the wildlife and sport fish restoration programs administered by the Service's Federal Aid Division were known as the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act.

The Act Requires:

The Programs established under this Act shall be known as the Federal Assistance Program for State Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration.

Implementation:

The Service refers to actions called for in the Act as improvements to the Federal Assistance Program for State Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration.

Assistant Director For Wildlife And Sport Fish Restoration Programs

Prior to the Wildlife and Sport Fish

Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, responsibility for the administration, management, and oversight of the Service's Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration programs was assigned to the Assistant Director for External Affairs.

The Act requires:

The position of Assistant Director for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs shall be established in the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. This Assistant Director will be responsible for the administration, management, and oversight of the Federal Assistance Program for State Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration.

Implementation:

During July 2000 a new position, Assistant Director for Migratory Birds and State Programs, was established. This position is responsible for the administration, management, and oversight of the Federal Assistance Program for State Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration.

Reports And Certifications Implementation Report

This Act requires:

In conjunction with the Department of the Interior FY 2002 budget request, the Secretary is required to submit a report on the steps that have been taken to comply with this Act.

Implementation:

Part A of this report, Implementation of The Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, is submitted in compliance with the directives given in the Act.

Description of Personnel Reductions

To date, compliance with the Act has not required a reduction in personnel beyond the reductions achieved through normal attrition. This is largely because a hiring freeze was instituted for Federal Assistance from November, 1999 through November, 2000.

In FY 2000, Federal Assistance was authorized 145 FTE. In FY 2001, with \$18



© Photodisc

million authorized for administration of the Act, Federal assistance allocated 125.5 FTE to its Regional offices and the Washington office. However, for FY 2003, the Act requires a reduction in combined Wildlife and Sport Fish administration funding to \$16.4 million. This decrease, coupled with the effect of uncontrollable pay adjustments, means the programs will only be able to support approximately 104 FTE and associated costs for FY 2003.

Suggested Revisions

Funding

Based on the analysis above the Service has concern about its ability to administer the Acts. Funding increases would allow for adequate organizational structure/staffing to deliver the services required to efficiently and effectively administer the grant programs directed by this Act.

The following revision is suggested: Eliminate the provision in the Act that reduces funding to \$16.4 million in FY 2003.

Administration of Certain Programs

The Service received \$900,000 earmarked to administer the following other grant programs: Coastal Wetlands Program, Clean Vessel Program, the Boating Infrastructure Program, and the National Outreach and Communications Program. The cost of administering these Programs in FY 2000 was \$1.41 million. The estimated cost of administering these Programs in FY 2001 is \$1.46 million, and FY 2002 is \$1.51 million. (Estimates are adjusted for Congressionally approved Federal government-wide pay adjustments, not CPI's.) This leaves a shortfall of \$610,000 in FY 2002.

During the last 2 years, hiring freezes prompted by the uncertainty of future funding levels have left staff vacancies unfilled. These vacancies generated temporary reductions in administrative expenses and resulted in a FY 2000 budget of approximately \$900,000. These vacant positions, while effecting budget savings lowered effectiveness in administering the grant programs. For instance, the Boating Infrastructure Grant Program is just now getting started, even though it was authorized to begin in FY 2000. In addition, payroll costs for fiscal and other basic administrative services are driving total costs higher than the annual authorization of \$900,000. As mentioned earlier in this report, the Division of Federal Assistance is instituting a daily diary for its employees to record how much time they spend working on the various programs of the Division. This more complete reporting of time and activity will provide better estimates of real costs. Data collected during the remainder of FY 2001, coupled with new budget estimating approaches, should improve the cost estimates for FY 2002. The first full year's payroll costs using the daily diary will be available at the end of FY 2002.



Administrative funding level estimates for FY 2003 will be based on more accurate costs for administering these special programs. Federal Assistance estimates real costs will be significantly above the \$900,000 level.

The following revision is suggested:

Adjust administrative funding levels to reflect true administrative costs based on accurate estimates derived from data collected from Federal Assistance employee daily diary.

Multistate Conservation Grant Programs

The Act authorizes \$6 million annually for Multistate Conservation Grant Programs (\$3 million each under the Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration Programs). The grants are for projects that benefit 26 or more States, a majority of States in a Service Region, or a regional association of State fish and game departments. It also provides funding to the Service for the National Survey of Fishing, Hunting and Wildlife-Associated Recreation as a grant project.

The Act does not specifically include:

- Authority for funding through contracts, interagency agreements, and other methods; and
- Adjustments for Congressionally approved Federal government-wide pay adjustments, CPI, or other uncontrollable cost increases.

The following revisions are suggested:

- 1) Authorize the Secretary a broader range of authorities for funding mechanisms for multistate projects, including contracts, interagency agreements, and other methods, as well as grants that are appropriate for funding approved projects.
- 2) Provide for uncontrollable cost increases in FY 2003 and beyond. These increases are caused by Congressionally approved Federal government-wide pay adjustments.



USFWS

USFWS

Sport Fish Restoration Program Reverted Funds

The Act no longer allows the reversion of Sport Fish Restoration funds to support the Service's fisheries research efforts. However, the Act failed to amend all pertinent sections. Therefore, if it was the intent of the Act to eliminate the authorization for the Secretary to direct reverted apportionments to the fish research programs of the Service, changes in the language are needed.

The following revision is suggested:

Revise pertinent sections of the Act so that the Act is consistent and reflects the intent of Congress to prohibit the use of reverted Sport Fish funds for the Service's Fisheries research programs.

Hunter Education Funds

The Act provides earmarked funding for enhancing hunter education and shooting range programs. How States will integrate these funds into their existing hunter education program is unknown at this time. A number of implementation strategies may be used. The Service will report on the status of the actual use of these funds with the submission of the FY 2003 budget.

Authorized Expenses For Administration (Categories 1, 2, and 3)

In the sections of the Act which authorizes expenses for administration, the following words are used: "personnel cost of employees who directly administer this Act on a full-time basis." We interpret this language to include many activities that are beneficial to the administration of the program. Such activities include membership on committees, teams and working groups, professional development, and outreach.

The Service has a philosophy that encourages teamwork, partnering, and involvement for its employees for work and off-duty activities. These activities include such things as: Scientist in the Schools Program, serving on regional teams like the Lake Champlain Fisheries Committee for New York and Vermont,

and participating in wetland "adoption" projects, bond drives, and the Combined Federal Campaign. These kinds of activities require employee planning and involvement and build a sense of Service identity.

Many Federal Assistance employees are members of professional organizations like the American Fisheries Society and The Wildlife Society. The Service has encouraged participation in professional societies as a means to interact with peers, to stay informed on Regional and National events, and to build trust and confidence among the Service, Federal Assistance staff, and State peers. If Federal Assistance staff are not able to participate in these professional growth and networking events as part of their duties under the Federal Assistance program, their professional growth and standing in the Service and conservation communities

will be limited. This situation will hurt the administration of the program and the career development of Federal Assistance staff.

In some instances, training to develop biological, technological or administrative knowledge and skills may not "directly" contribute to the administration of the Act. However, it helps equip Federal Assistance staff to make determinations relating to substantiality in character and design of grant proposals, provide assessments of grantee work accomplished, and enable staff to offer more meaningful technical support. An example of this training is the Service Impact Training. Its goal is to improve the knowledge, skill and ability of Service employees to work together by understanding how they and other people approach tasks. Other useful training, that updates the knowledge, skills, and abilities



of Federal Assistance grant managers might not be considered to “directly support implementation” of the Act, but would still contribute to more informed decisions and application of management processes.

Service employees, including Federal Assistance staff, routinely speak to school, hunting, angling, and civic groups about wildlife conservation, Service employment opportunities, wildlife and sport fish restoration efforts, and Federal Assistance grant programs to name a few.

The following revision is suggested:

Clarify the language, if the activities such as memberships on committees, teams, and working groups, professional development and outreach are not to be included in the definition of “personnel costs” under the Act.

Part-time Employees

The Act states that personnel costs for employees who administer this Act on a part-time basis for at least 20 hours a week

is allowable. Federal employees have many alternate work schedules available to them. For example, two employees work exclusively for Federal Assistance, but share one job. One works 16 hours each week and the other works 24 hours. The Service will continue to use administrative funds for their salaries and other costs since their time is documented exclusively on grant administration duties. The Service also supports the Student Cooperative Education Program (SCEP). These are typically summer, part-time employees. Costs allowable under the 12 categories are paid for students who work for Federal Assistance under SCEP even though they may work less than 20 hours each week.

Staff who work 100% of the time for Federal Assistance in grant related activities, but who work less than 20 hours per week are still considered “full-time” Federal Assistance employees. All of their time is spent doing Federal Assistance work. The fact that they are part time Federal employees does not effect the

intent of this Act that only costs approved in this Act be paid for with administrative funds.

Lifting the restriction that all employees paid with Federal Assistance administrative funds must be at least half time employees would provide opportunity to hire seasonal staff for some special tasks that support Federal Assistance administration.

The following revision is suggested:

Revise Category 2 to read as follows: “personnel costs of employees who directly administer this Act on a part-time basis ~~for at least 20 hours each week~~, not to exceed the portion of those costs incurred with respect to the work hours of the employee during which the employee directly administers this Act, as those hours are certified by the supervisor of the employee”;

Other Information

The overall impacts of implementing this Act are yet to be seen.

The numerous reviews of Service administration of the Federal Assistance grant programs have caused the Service to focus greater attention on the management issues impacting these programs. Significant effort has been directed toward improving the Federal Assistance Program as directed in this Act.

The implementation of this Act has institutionalized management controls and focused Service leadership on important Federal Assistance administration issues.

Communication about the Federal Assistance Programs among the Service Directorate, State partners, NGOs, and Federal Assistance administrators has improved and expanded.

Attention has been given to the administrative needs of the Federal Assistance Program by highest levels of Service management. There is improved awareness and involvement of Regional



USFWS

Office management in Federal Assistance issues.

The General Administrative Services (GAS) overhead calculation method was replaced by a new Cost Allocation Methodology (CAM). This change resulted in a net savings after implementation of approximately \$3.0 million. These funds were re-allocated to the States in their FY 2000 apportionment.

Due to numerous management actions (hiring freeze, reduction in Management Assistance Team expenses, adoption of CAM) which resulted in savings in FY 2000 an additional \$2.5 million was apportioned to the States in FY 2001.

More effective approaches/processes have been established or initiated, including:

- Material weaknesses/corrective actions as identified by Federal Aid Process Improvement Teams are being implemented and tracked by the Department of the Interior.

- Recommendations from the State/Federal FAIMS review team have been implemented.
- Recommendations made by the Federal/State Federal Aid Review Team have been addressed.
- The Service financial system and FAIMS interface was implemented in August 2000.
- FAIMS support costs will be reduced by approximately 50 percent by allowing the Oracle support contract to expire in March 2001.
- A more responsive and involved Washington & Regional Office leadership team is in place.
- Budget and functional analyses have been accomplished.
- Federal Assistance Offices have been funded and reorganized along functional lines as suggested in the COE recommendations. Standard position descriptions are being developed.

- Federal Assistance policy documents are being reviewed and re-written in plain English to reflect recent changes. Two chapters have been reissued and twelve chapters are in the approval process with publication expected during FY 2001. The remaining 11 chapters will be re-written during FY 2001 and FY 2002.
- Apportionments for the new hunter education enhancement funds have been calculated and distributed.

As evidenced above, the Service has made significant progress in implementing the Act and redefining the Federal Assistance Program for Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration. While the Service faces significant management challenges to fully implement the Act, the suggested revisions will help us meet these management challenges.

B. Projected Spending Report for FY 2001 and FY 2002 for the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs

In conjunction with the Department of the Interior FY 2002 budget request, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary is required to submit a report detailing by category, the intended uses of administrative funds for the fiscal year.

The projected spending report for the FY 2001 and FY 2002 budget request is detailed in the following charts:

- 1) Division of Federal Assistance FY 2001 and 2002 Projected Spending Report by Administration Category;
- 2) Allocations for Certain Programs and Other Activities;
- 3) Allocations for Multistate Conservation Grants.

Division of Federal Assistance FY 2001 and 2002 Projected Spending Report by Administration Category (dollars in thousands)

		FY 2001	FY 2002
FTE ALLOCATION		125.5	125.5
No.	Description of Category	Amount	Amount
1	Personnel - Full Time	8,547	9,490
2	Personnel - Part Time 20 Hours or More	621	621
3	Support for Personnel	2,131	1,922
4	Determination of Substantiality of Plans & Projects ¹	—	—
5	Service Overhead	3,537	3,537
6	Audits of States	2,502	1,800
7	Audit of FA Administration Expenditures	300	300
8	Training of Federal & State Personnel	189	157
9	Travel in U.S., Territories, Canada	673	673
10	Foreign Travel	0	0
11	Relocation (PCS Moves)	0	0
12	Audit, Evaluate, Approve, etc., Grants ¹	—	—
Total Estimated Costs		18,500	18,500
Budget Authority (\$9M from WR and \$9M from SFR + \$500K from SFR for other SFR grant programs ²)		18,500	18,500

¹ Costs for categories 4 and 12 are included in the other categories above.

² The \$500,000 is allocated here as described on page 3 of this report. It is also included in "Other Grant Programs" in the following table.

Allocations for Certain Programs and Other Activities
(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2001	FY 2002
Fish Commissions	800	800
Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council	400	400
Other Grant Programs		
(Includes \$500,000 in Projected Spending Report)	900	900
Total - Other Allocations	2,100	2,100
Allocation for Multistate Conservation Grants	6,000	6,000

The FY 2001 final apportionments for wildlife and sport fish restoration are shown on the following charts:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Final Apportionment of Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Funds for Fiscal Year 2001

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Final Apportionment of Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Funds for Fiscal Year 2001

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Final Apportionment of
Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Funds for Fiscal Year 2001
(in dollars)**

	FY 2001 Apportionment	Hunter Education Funds *	New Hunter Education Funds **	Total
ALABAMA	2,779,309	653,400	169,260	3,601,969
ALASKA	8,386,595	289,525	75,000	8,751,120
ARIZONA	3,983,886	753,830	195,276	4,932,992
ARKANSAS	3,549,300	289,525	75,000	3,913,825
CALIFORNIA	5,767,640	868,574	225,000	6,861,214
COLORADO	4,411,976	631,973	163,710	5,207,659
CONNECTICUT	838,659	500,370	129,619	1,468,648
DELAWARE	838,659	289,525	75,000	1,203,184
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	0	0	0	0
FLORIDA	2,552,777	868,574	225,000	3,646,351
GEORGIA	3,280,320	868,574	225,000	4,373,894
HAWAII	838,659	289,525	75,000	1,203,184
IDAHO	3,481,623	289,525	75,000	3,846,148
ILLINOIS	3,082,579	868,574	225,000	4,176,153
INDIANA	2,511,449	868,574	225,000	3,605,023
IOWA	2,901,376	429,956	111,378	3,442,710
KANSAS	3,228,642	289,525	75,000	3,593,167
KENTUCKY	2,525,412	593,846	153,833	3,273,091
LOUISIANA	2,741,400	656,614	170,093	3,568,107
MAINE	1,986,047	289,525	75,000	2,350,572
MARYLAND	992,233	778,198	201,588	1,972,019
MASSACHUSETTS	838,659	868,574	225,000	1,932,233
MICHIGAN	6,355,466	868,574	225,000	7,449,040
MINNESOTA	5,187,074	722,806	187,240	6,097,120
MISSISSIPPI	2,553,901	417,957	108,270	3,080,128
MISSOURI	4,457,817	822,089	212,958	5,492,864
MONTANA	5,291,432	289,525	75,000	5,655,957
NEBRASKA	2,980,497	289,525	75,000	3,345,022
NEVADA	3,180,349	289,525	75,000	3,544,874
NEW HAMPSHIRE	838,659	289,525	75,000	1,203,184
NEW JERSEY	838,659	868,574	225,000	1,932,233
NEW MEXICO	3,685,699	289,525	75,000	4,050,224
NEW YORK	4,959,776	868,574	225,000	6,053,350
NORTH CAROLINA	3,530,802	868,574	225,000	4,624,376
NORTH DAKOTA	2,471,421	289,525	75,000	2,835,946
OHIO	3,790,846	868,574	225,000	4,884,420
OKLAHOMA	3,379,639	506,995	131,335	4,017,969
OREGON	4,189,010	502,697	130,221	4,821,928
PENNSYLVANIA	6,779,250	868,574	225,000	7,872,824
RHODE ISLAND	838,659	289,525	75,000	1,203,184
SOUTH CAROLINA	2,199,105	589,474	152,701	2,941,280
SOUTH DAKOTA	3,085,595	289,525	75,000	3,450,120
TENNESSEE	4,313,284	835,911	216,538	5,365,733
TEXAS	8,386,595	868,574	225,000	9,480,169
UTAH	3,244,028	289,525	75,000	3,608,553
VERMONT	838,659	289,525	75,000	1,203,184
VIRGINIA	2,730,331	868,574	225,000	3,823,905
WASHINGTON	3,286,772	866,007	224,334	4,377,113
WEST VIRGINIA	2,102,463	289,525	75,000	2,466,988
WISCONSIN	5,508,198	788,070	204,146	6,500,414
WYOMING	3,253,840	289,525	75,000	3,618,365
PUERTO RICO	838,659	48,254	12,500	899,413
GUAM	279,553	48,254	12,500	340,307
VIRGIN ISLANDS	279,553	48,254	12,500	340,307
AMERICAN SAMOA	279,553	48,254	12,500	340,307
N. MARIANA ISLANDS	279,553	48,254	12,500	340,307
Total	167,731,897	28,952,474	7,500,000	204,184,371

* Apportioned according to 16 U.S.C. 669c(c) using new Bureau of Census population figures.

** Apportioned according to 16 U.S.C. 669h-1(a)(1) using new Bureau of Census population figures.

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Final Apportionment
of Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Funds for Fiscal Year 2001
(in dollars)**

State Name	FY 2001 Apportionment
ALABAMA	3,578,395
ALASKA	12,042,643
ARIZONA	5,104,112
ARKANSAS	4,608,841
CALIFORNIA	12,042,643
COLORADO	6,076,753
CONNECTICUT	2,408,529
DELAWARE	2,408,529
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	802,843
FLORIDA	6,786,688
GEORGIA	4,430,864
HAWAII	2,408,529
IDAHO	4,184,546
ILLINOIS	4,846,195
INDIANA	3,640,742
IOWA	3,235,203
KANSAS	3,583,933
KENTUCKY	3,544,162
LOUISIANA	4,161,257
MAINE	2,408,529
MARYLAND	2,408,529
MASSACHUSETTS	2,408,529
MICHIGAN	8,295,510
MINNESOTA	9,006,160
MISSISSIPPI	3,107,013
MISSOURI	5,790,174
MONTANA	5,582,909
NEBRASKA	3,000,164
NEVADA	3,727,333
NEW HAMPSHIRE	2,408,529
NEW JERSEY	2,408,529
NEW MEXICO	4,253,966
NEW YORK	5,984,692
NORTH CAROLINA	4,213,868
NORTH DAKOTA	2,570,530
OHIO	6,236,489
OKLAHOMA	4,642,549
OREGON	5,427,038
PENNSYLVANIA	5,948,640
RHODE ISLAND	2,408,529
SOUTH CAROLINA	3,023,568
SOUTH DAKOTA	3,129,186
TENNESSEE	5,487,737
TEXAS	12,042,643
UTAH	4,252,849
VERMONT	2,408,529
VIRGINIA	3,853,428
WASHINGTON	4,883,821
WEST VIRGINIA	2,408,529
WISCONSIN	7,679,996
WYOMING	3,929,060
PUERTO RICO	2,408,529
GUAM	802,843
VIRGIN ISLANDS	802,843
AMERICAN SAMOA	802,843
N. MARIANA ISLANDS	802,843
Total	240,852,863

U.S. Department of the Interior
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Division of Federal Aid

<http://www.fws.gov>
August 2001

