

# **American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009**

## **United States Fish and Wildlife Service Program Plan**



**April 24, 2009**



## Table of Contents

<b>1.0</b>	<b><i>Recovery Act Implementation at the Department of the Interior</i></b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background .....	1
1.2	Project Selection .....	1
1.3	Implementation of Recovery Act.....	4
<b>2.0</b>	<b><i>Recovery Act Implementation at FWS</i></b> .....	<b>8</b>
2.1	Overview.....	8
2.2	Bureau Accountable Official .....	9
2.3	Governance Structure .....	9
2.4	Funding Categories .....	13
2.5	Process for Allocating Among Categories and Selecting Projects .....	15
<b>3.0</b>	<b><i>Deferred Maintenance</i></b> .....	<b>20</b>
3.1	Program Managers.....	20
3.2	Objectives .....	20
3.3	Major Activities .....	20
3.4	Project Selection Criteria.....	21
3.5	Financial Award Characteristics .....	21
3.6	Performance Measures.....	21
3.7	Project Milestones and Completion Forecast.....	22
3.8	Cost Implications .....	23
<b>4.0</b>	<b><i>Habitat Restoration</i></b> .....	<b>24</b>
4.1	Program Managers.....	24
4.2	Objectives .....	24
4.3	Major Activities .....	25
4.4	Project Selection Criteria.....	25
4.5	Financial Award Characteristics .....	29
4.6	Performance Measures.....	30
4.7	Project Milestones and Completion Forecast.....	30
4.8	Cost Implications .....	31
<b>5.0</b>	<b><i>Capital Improvements</i></b> .....	<b>32</b>
5.1	Program Managers.....	32
5.2	Objectives .....	32
5.3	Major Activities .....	32



5.4	Project Selection Criteria.....	33
5.5	Financial Award Characteristics .....	33
5.6	Performance Measures.....	33
5.7	Project Milestones and Completion Forecast.....	34
5.8	Cost Implications .....	35
6.0	<i>Construction</i> .....	37
6.1	Program Managers.....	37
6.2	Objectives .....	37
6.3	Major Activities .....	37
6.4	Project Selection Criteria.....	38
6.5	Financial Award Characteristics .....	38
6.6	Performance Measures.....	38
6.7	Project Milestones and Completion Forecast.....	38
6.8	Cost Implications .....	42
7.0	<i>Reconstruction/Repair</i> .....	43
7.1	Program Managers.....	43
7.2	Objectives .....	43
7.3	Major Activities .....	43
7.4	Project Selection Criteria.....	44
7.5	Financial Award Characteristics .....	44
7.6	Performance Measures.....	44
7.7	Project Milestones and Completion Forecast.....	45
7.8	Cost Implications .....	46
8.0	<i>Energy Efficiency Retrofits</i> .....	47
8.1	Program Managers.....	47
8.2	Objectives .....	47
8.3	Major Activities .....	47
8.4	Project Selection Criteria.....	48
8.5	Financial Award Characteristics .....	48
8.6	Performance Measures.....	48
8.7	Project Milestones and Completion Forecast.....	49
8.8	Cost Implications .....	50
9.0	<i>Crosscutting Analysis</i> .....	51
9.1	Impact of Recovery Act Funding on the Service’s 5-Year Plans .....	51



9.2	Crosscutting Initiatives .....	52
10.0	<i>Other Related Costs</i> .....	54
10.1	Administrative Costs .....	54



## 1.0 Recovery Act Implementation at the Department of the Interior

### 1.1 Background

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (the Recovery Act) is an unprecedented investment in our country's future. Funding is to support job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization.

President Obama has set out specific goals in implementing the Recovery Act, including:

- Create or save more than 3.5 million jobs government-wide over the next two years;
- Revive the renewable energy industry and provide the capital over the next three years to eventually double domestic renewable energy capacity;
- As part of the \$150 billion investment in new infrastructure, enact the largest increase in funding of our nation's roads, bridges, and mass transit systems since the creation of the national highway system in the 1950's; and
- Require unprecedented levels of transparency, oversight, and accountability.

The Department of the Interior will play an important role in this effort. Investments will focus on job creation, infrastructure needs, and creating lasting value. The opportunity provided by the Act will:

- Accelerate a move toward a clean energy economy;
- Provide jobs that build employable skills and develop an appreciation for environmental stewardship in young adults; and
- Preserve and restore the nation's iconic and treasured structures, landscapes, and cultural resources.

### 1.2 Project Selection

#### 1.2.1 Criteria

In recognition of the urgency to select and execute projects expeditiously, the Department established unified priorities and formulated guidance to lead the bureaus in the project selection process. The guidance prescribed that the following framework be used to assess a project's suitability for Recovery Act funding:

- **Expediency of implementation.** The ability to execute a project within the legislated timeframe was an important practical consideration – can the project be responsibly executed within the time limitations of the Recovery Act? With a few exceptions, Recovery Act funds are available for obligation through September 30, 2010. In addition,



Section 1602 of the Act reads “...recipients shall give preference to activities that can be started and completed expeditiously, including a goal of using at least 50 percent of the funds for activities that can be initiated no later than 120 days after the date of enactment.” The Department’s concern was two-fold: 1) the purpose of the Recovery Act is to get funds out to stimulate the economy quickly; and 2) if funds are committed to a project that experiences a delay beyond September 30, 2009, the funds are no longer available for that project or any other bureau requirement. This criteria was a limiting factor that impacted other agency priorities considered during the selection process including meritorious projects that were not far enough along with design or permitting to be obligated by September 30, 2010.

- **Addresses high priority mission needs.** Does the project target the bureau’s highest priorities within the categories specified in the legislation? Has the project been evaluated through established procedures to address high priority needs? Are public lands, parks, refuges and resources renewed as a result of the project? With respect to deferred maintenance and line item construction, is the ranking consistent with existing priorities and processes?
- **Job creation potential.** Pursuant to the primary goal of the Recovery Act, what is the potential of the project to quickly create jobs and stimulate local economies?
- **Merit-based.** Was the project selected using merit-based and transparent criteria? Are competitive awards used to the maximum extent possible? Do the criteria incorporate existing prioritization processes?
- **Long-term value.** To what extent does the project create long-term value for the American public through improved energy independence, restoration of treasured landscapes or other lasting benefits?
- **Energy objectives.** For proposed construction or deferred maintenance projects, do they incorporate energy efficient and renewable energy technologies? Do they have a component that will further clean energy and independence goals?
- **Opportunities for youth.** Does the project engage young adults and instill education about our public lands and cultural resources?
- **Future cost avoidance.** Does the project create new operational requirements in future years? Or, conversely, will the project decrease operating costs through energy improvements or disposal of unneeded and costly assets?

### 1.2.2 Priorities

Within the Executive Summary of each bureau recovery implementation plan is a discussion of the bureau’s process for allocating priorities among the funding categories. The following principles are common among the bureau’s initial allocation processes: response to the direction



provided by Congress in the statute and accompanying report, and preliminary assessments of programmatic requirements and capability to effectively use additional funding. Once targets for the funding categories were determined, project selection within the category was accomplished through a combination of consideration of merit-based criteria – using established processes where possible – project readiness, and additional benefits – such as operating cost reductions.

The primary established process for the prioritization and allocation of resources has been the Department's 5-Year planning process. The Department has a standard capital asset planning process, for which the bureaus develop 5-Year plans identifying deferred maintenance and construction needs. The 5-Year Deferred Maintenance (DM) and Capital Improvement Planning process is the backbone of the asset management plans which are used to formulate the Department's budget requests. The plans are developed, and updated, on an annual basis at the bureau level using uniform criteria to rank both DM and Capital Improvement Projects. Categories for ranking projects include Critical Health Safety, Critical Resource Protection, Energy, Critical Mission, Code Compliance, and Other Deferred Maintenance.

The categories used in the rating process are weighted so that projects that address critical health and safety needs will receive the highest score. The final score of a project also takes into account the asset priority for the project. The Department's goal in the 5-year planning process is to focus its limited resources on projects that are both mission critical and in the most need of repair/replacement.

The 5-year planning process is an established Departmental prioritization methodology used only in the development of construction and deferred maintenance requirements. There is no similar process for other program areas receiving Recovery Act funding such as habitat restoration or energy improvements. For those program areas, the bureau's specific evaluation process is described within the details of their program plan.

To the extent practicable, Recovery Act projects in deferred maintenance and construction were drawn from the 5-Year lists. Each bureau's detailed Recovery Act plan indicates the extent to which selected projects were derived from existing capital plans and provides the rationale for any exceptions.

There are legitimate reasons why a Recovery Act deferred maintenance or construction project might not come from a 5-Year Plan. In many cases, it reflects timing. The Recovery Act requires the obligation of funds by September 20, 2010. Projects involving complicated procurements, significant environmental considerations, or with considerable planning and design components, may not be good Recovery Act investments because of the need to obligate project funds quickly. Additionally, Secretary Salazar has challenged each bureau to select projects that can also be completed within the timeframe of the Recovery Act in order to maximize the beneficial impact to the economy further refining the list of eligible projects.

The scope of the 5-Year plans is also limited. Each 5-Year Plan assumes a five year funding level consistent with prior appropriations. For some bureaus, the Recovery Act funding exceeds the total amounts assumed in the 5-Year Plans. In addition, two years of the available 5-Year Plans will be addressed through the regular FY 2009 and FY 2010 appropriation processes. In



cases where the 5-Year Plan has been exhausted, the bureau has selected Recovery Act projects from other existing capital planning lists.

### **1.2.3 Contingency Projects**

As part of the Department's internal process, each bureau has identified a list of eligible projects for Secretarial approval estimated to cost an amount larger than the amount of available Recovery Act funding. Getting advance approval for a larger universe of eligible projects will expedite the deployment of alternate projects should a Recovery Act project experience delays in execution. These projects are referred to as identified contingency and are included in the funding table of each bureau's detailed Recovery Act Plan.

## **1.3 Implementation of Recovery Act**

### **1.3.1 Monitoring and Evaluation**

The establishment of meaningful and measurable outcomes is an important component of Interior's Recovery Act reporting. Performance monitoring and oversight efforts are designed to ensure that the Department meets the accountability objectives of the Recovery Act.

These efforts include tracking the progress of key goals. The Department is defining a suite of performance measurements to monitor progress made in accomplishing stated work goals and to ensure financial and procurement practices are executed responsibly. In addition, the Department's Recovery Act Coordinator is collaborating with senior Departmental officials, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Office of Inspector General to ensure oversight of the program from the first phase of project selection, through implementation and execution. The Coordinator, with the assistance of the Recovery Act Board, will evaluate processes to ensure that adequate mechanisms are in place and identify and share best practices to promote:

- Maximized use of competitive awards
- Timely and transparent award of dollars
- Timely and appropriate expenditure of dollars
- Verification and timely completion of planned work
- Minimized cost overruns
- Minimized improper payments

Measurement and reporting is a crucial component of Interior's oversight strategy. The information received from bureaus and partners will serve as an indicator of progress enabling the Department's governance entities to manage risk and ensure successful implementation of the Recovery Act. Department-wide, consistent guidance will guide efforts in this regard, including for example, development of a risk management program.





### **1.3.2 Accountability and Transparency**

The President and Congress have made it clear that the Act must be carried out with unparalleled levels of accountability and transparency. The President's commitment to manage these investments transparently will be met through Agency reporting on performance metrics and the execution of the funds on [recovery.gov](http://recovery.gov). Reporting requirements related to major contract actions and financial status, including obligations and outlays, are being instituted. Periodic reviews of implementation progress at both the bureau and Departmental levels will identify the need to realign resources to expedite projects, to modify project plans or to select contingency projects to ensure funds are obligated within the time limitation. The selection of contingency projects will be included as part of regular reporting through [recovery.gov](http://recovery.gov).

The Recovery Coordinator will oversee bureau implementation to ensure projects address the Department's high priority goals and objectives, while also working to ensure that department-wide performance objectives, including timeliness and cost and risk management are met throughout the process.

The Office of Inspector General will be working closely with the Department from the start to review and propose effective processes to manage risks, monitor progress and to improve overall performance and accountability.

As part of routine reporting, the Department is also carefully tracking all projects subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). During the project selection phase the Department identified which projects had already completed NEPA planning, which are in progress, and which ones still need to begin the NEPA process. The Department will track the status of all NEPA compliance activities associated with projects or activities and report quarterly to the Council on Environmental Quality.

### **1.3.3 Administration**

The Department's oversight and administration is led by the Secretary with leadership by the Recovery Act Coordinator. He utilizes an Executive Board and Department-wide Task Force to assist. The Executive Board is the entity responsible for ensuring compliance with the Recovery Act execution reporting, and audit requirements. The Board will be convened once project decisions are made and plans are finalized. The Board consists of nine members, and is chaired by the Department's Chief of Staff. The other board members are the Recovery Act Coordinator, Solicitor, Inspector General, and the four programmatic Assistant Secretaries within Interior and the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget.

The Recovery Act Task Force ensures consistent implementation of the Recovery Act, promotes collaboration and sharing of skills and best practices among bureaus, develops implementation guidance, oversees the process for completion of Recovery Act plans and project lists, and develops the infrastructure needed for on-going monitoring of progress and performance. It is co-chaired by the Recovery Act Coordinator and the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, and is responsible for implementation of the Recovery Act. The Task Force has representatives from each bureau, as well as all the functional areas across the Department.



There are workgroups reporting to the Task Force that are developing processes and guidance on reporting, performance, communications, project approval, administration, risk management, acquisitions, and youth involvement. As implementation progresses, workgroups will be disbanded and others may be established.

In addition to these Departmental groups, each bureau has established its own governance structure. Bureau task forces and boards will ensure that programs execute projects effectively and meet the accountability and transparency objectives of the Act. A Recovery Act coordinator has been designated for each bureau.

The bureau task forces have responsibilities from the development of project lists through completion. They develop the project lists, establish the necessary controls, and develop tracking mechanisms to ensure they are managing schedules and performance, and meeting the reporting requirements. The task forces meet regularly to ensure proper oversight. Each bureau has developed a leadership structure to manage the Recovery Act implementation. Responsibility for key components, such as reporting and oversight, has been delegated to the bureaus' senior management officials. The bureaus will also use staff in the field to provide direct oversight and leadership and provide reports to their executive leadership.

#### **1.3.4 Barriers to Effective Implementation**

The volume of funding provided in the Recovery Act and the contracts that will be awarded to execute these resources will challenge Interior's current procurement processing capacity. Interior's FY 2009 appropriation was \$11.3 billion. The Recovery Act supplements this request by \$3 billion. Interior has taken a common-sense approach to best utilize existing resources to implement the Recovery Act. However, the investment required to handle the increase in funding will strain Interior's on-board resources. While the Act authorizes the set-aside of monetary resources to alleviate the administrative burden (e.g., hiring additional contracts staff), the real management issue is ensuring that procurement resources, no matter how plentiful, are knowledgeable and responsible. The Department plans to meet these resource challenges by sharing staff and expertise across bureaus, hiring term and temporary staff, and reemploying knowledgeable annuitants.

In addition to expanding resources to implement the Recovery Act, Interior is also working to streamline business processes to help alleviate resource challenges. The bureaus are encouraged to make use of techniques such as the grouping of like work orders into a single project to reduce acquisition time. Another example that is currently under consideration is the consolidation of procurement functions related to the Recovery Act. This strategy would relieve seasoned acquisition staff of their routine duties to have them focus on Recovery Act procurements. The regular duties would be assumed by alternative DOI acquisition staff. Concentrating Recovery Act procurement expertise would result in processing efficiencies and expedite the use of funds.

There are external considerations which may also pose barriers to the effective implementation of Recovery Act projects. The Department's ability to execute selected projects is dependent on the availability of qualified contractors. The supply of contractors able to meet an aggressive



project schedule may get smaller as more Recovery Act projects are advertised and projects start to compete for resources. Delays or increased costs could be experienced in areas with a small indigenous workforce where several projects are proposed and resources are only available from a greater distance.

Although the initial project selection process considered potential risks to the timely obligation of funds, projects may experience unforeseen delays in achieving key project milestones such as design or permitting. The Department has developed a contingency list of approved projects to address this situation, however, the process to recognize and terminate a selected project will delay implementation of the contingency project. As implementation moves closer to the September 30, 2010 expiration date for unobligated funds, contingency projects are more likely to be selected for expediency rather than for other considerations.

Another factor in the execution of the Department's Recovery projects will be unforeseen requirements of critical mission activities. One bureau in particular, the Bureau of Land Management, has indicated that a high fire season could significantly delay their ability to execute Recovery projects. During a fire, most of BLM's federal staff in the regions are also trained firefighters and when called to duty, non-essential duties take a second priority.

To the extent possible, Interior has taken steps to address these considerations to get the work of the Recovery Act done. Interior's governance bodies, such as the Recovery Act Task Force and the subsidiary acquisition workgroup, will handle resource issues raised by its members and the bureaus to ensure adequate staffing and contingency planning for the Recovery Act implementation.



## **2.0 Recovery Act Implementation at FWS**

### **2.1 Overview**

The \$280 million in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) funding for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) provides an unprecedented opportunity for the Service to quickly address numerous deferred maintenance, construction, and habitat priorities while supporting the creation of jobs and helping to stimulate the economy. Service leadership and staff are acutely aware of the importance of this effort and will work diligently to achieve a successful implementation of all Recovery Act projects in a timely, transparent and accountable manner.

From initial project category identification through final project selection, the Service has focused on identifying projects which will quickly create jobs, provide lasting value for the American people and address mission needs. Approximately 839 projects have been identified for funding. Work will focus on repairing, replacing and enhancing infrastructure at Refuges and Hatcheries, the National Conservation and Training Center and restoring habitat both on and off Service lands. The Recovery Act investments will not only create jobs in the short-term through material purchases, construction contracts, habitat restoration contracts, and other on-the-ground projects, but will also provide long-term economic benefits by investing in local communities.

The project list which supports this plan includes the 839 “in-target” projects referenced above. These projects are the basis for the numbers, values and analysis provided in this Plan. Additional “contingency” projects are also included and clearly identified on the Service’s project list. In the event that an in-target project or group of projects become impossible or impractical to complete consistent with the expectations of the Recovery Act, projects from the contingency list will be substituted. To the extent contingency projects are funded, they will be done within the same appropriation as the projects they are replacing.

The proposed projects will enhance the Service’s ability to achieve its mission, enhance the visitor experience at our public lands on National Wildlife Refuges and National Fish Hatcheries, and enable the Service to work with partners, including the States, to build long-term programs that benefit ecotourism, outdoor recreation, local job creation and youth employment. The Service’s Recovery program addresses programs that support these mission needs and funds ongoing, existing programs that have an existing infrastructure for effective delivery and are based on existing program priorities and address important strategic goals.

The Service has established a governance structure for Recovery Act implementation which builds on the existing organizational structure and provides clear roles, responsibilities and guidance to all levels of the organization. The necessary steps are being taken to ensure resources are in place to address the anticipated increase in workload and support the efficient distribution and tracking of funds, posting of solicitations, evaluation of bids/proposals, issuance of awards, and management of projects. Existing systems and processes are being enhanced as appropriate to fully support the need for transparency and accountability.



With this plan, the Service has laid out an approach to ensure successful implementation of the Recovery Act and looks forward to contributing to the economic recovery and reinvestment in America.

## **2.2 Bureau Accountable Official**

Rowan Gould, Deputy Director (Acting Director) of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, 202-208-4545

## **2.3 Governance Structure**

The major components of the Service's Recovery Act governance structure are as follows:

- Deputy Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- FWS Investment Review Board
- FWS Recovery Act Implementation Team
- Regional Directors and Director of the National Conservation Training Center

### **2.3.1 Deputy Director (Acting Director) of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**

#### *2.3.1.1 Purpose and Role*

With respect to the Recovery Act implementation, the Deputy Director has responsibility for ensuring the Service's projects align with its mission areas and achieve the goals of the Recovery Act (e.g., preserve and create jobs and promote economic recovery). The Deputy Director, as the Service's Senior Asset Manager, sets the tone for all Recovery Act activities and provides final approval of the projects, after they have been thoroughly reviewed and vetted by the Service's Investment Review Board.

The Deputy Director has ultimate responsibility for the successful implementation of Recovery Act requirements and the effective stewardship of the Service's Recovery Act funding.

#### *2.3.1.2 Processes for Reviewing Progress and Monitoring Performance*

The Deputy Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has established a governance structure that will ensure compliance with OMB and Department of the Interior requirements. The Deputy Director will receive regular reports on the Service's Recovery Act progress and project performance, and address issues with the responsible Assistant Director or Regional Director.

### **2.3.2 FWS Investment Review Board**

#### *2.3.2.1 Purpose and Role*

The Service's Investment Review Board is a five member body responsible for establishing uniform criteria for and overseeing the Service's Recovery Act project selection and prioritization process. Investment Review Board membership is comprised of Assistant Directors



with asset management responsibility. The Investment Review Board is not an approval authority; it makes project selection recommendations to the Deputy Director (the Service's Senior Asset Manager) for final approval.

#### 2.3.2.2 *Members*

- Assistant Director, National Wildlife Refuge System
- Assistant Director, Fisheries and Habitat Conservation
- Assistant Director, Migratory Birds
- Assistant Director, Endangered Species
- Assistant Director, Business Management and Operations
- Assistant Director, External Affairs
- Chief, Office of Law Enforcement

### 2.3.3 **FWS Recovery Act Implementation Oversight Workgroup**

#### 2.3.3.1 *Purpose and Role*

The FWS Recovery Act Implementation Oversight Workgroup (Workgroup) is responsible for developing FWS-specific Recovery Act guidance and ensuring compliance with Recovery Act requirements. The Assistant Directors for Business Management and Operations, External Affairs, the National Wildlife Refuge System, Fisheries and Habitat Conservation, and Budget, Planning and Human Capital have appointed key staff to participate on the Workgroup. Teams have been established within the Workgroup to develop FWS specific guidance in the following topics areas: project approval, finance and budget execution, acquisition/contracting, risk management/internal control, communications, and reporting.

#### 2.3.3.2 *Members*

- Deputy Assistant Director, Business Management and Operations
- Deputy Assistant Director, Fisheries and Habitat Conservation
- Deputy Assistant Director, External Affairs
- Chief Division of Information Technology and Management, National Wildlife Refuge System
- Chief, Division of Contracting and Facilities Management
- Chief, Division of Engineering
- Chief, Division of Finance
- Chief, Division of Budget
- Chief, Division of Cost and Performance Management
- Chief, Division of Policy and Directives Management





### 2.3.3.3 *Processes for Reviewing Progress and Monitoring Performance*

The Workgroup will interpret and “step down” the government-wide Recovery Act implementation guidance from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Department’s own Recovery Act guidance into FWS specific guidance that will accompany a project allocation memorandum to the Service’s Regional Directors and the Director of the National Conservation Training Center. The Workgroup and its teams meet on a weekly basis to coordinate the Service’s Recovery Act activities and prepare guidance.

The Service will utilize an existing system, Enterprise Planning (EP), for the centralized tracking and reporting of Recovery Act progress and performance. The Workgroup is establishing uniform data collection templates, reporting procedures, as well as quality assurance and quality control mechanisms. The Workgroup is also establishing a process for generating executive-level progress reports for submission to the Service’s Deputy Director on a regular basis.

In addition, the Service’s Implementation Oversight Workgroup has taken important steps to identify and mitigate risk prior to Recovery Act project implementation, and is in the process of implementing a robust monitoring system to ensure the Service’s projects are executed as planned.

The Implementation Oversight Workgroup has completed a risk assessment of the Service’s Recovery Act program using the framework provided by the Department of the Interior. In doing so, the Service identified risks and the controls in place to adequately mitigate each risk. The Implementation Oversight Workgroup considered the following questions when performing its Recovery Act risk assessment:

- Are project objectives clear and do they meet the Secretaries goals for the Recovery Act?
- Are there sufficient personnel available for overseeing and implementing projects?
- Which programs/projects are the highest profile?
- What measures are in place to ensure projects are completed on time and on budget?
- Are existing internal controls sufficient to mitigate the risk of waste, fraud, and abuse?
- Are existing resources (e.g., systems, staff, procedures, etc...) sufficient to achieve program objectives and meet Recovery Act reporting requirements?
- Is the Recovery Act governance structure sufficient to achieve program objectives?
- Are there tools to evaluate if there are performance challenges with potential funding recipients?
- Are there triggering events identified for implementing contingency projects when current projects are stalled?

The Implementation Oversight Workgroup will periodically test whether the controls it has identified are designed properly and operating as intended. If a control is determined to be ineffective, the Implementation Oversight Workgroup will notify the appropriate Service personnel to take corrective action (i.e., strengthen/redesign the control or implement a new control).



In addition, the Service has begun to develop a process for collecting and monitoring the following information on each Recovery Act project:

- Project name
- Accountable official
- Scope of work
- Baseline performance measures
- Compliance status
- Planning status
- Estimated obligation date
- Original cost estimate
- Revised cost estimate (to be updated each time the estimate changes)
- Obligation amount
- Obligation date
- Estimated completion date
- Project status
- Completion report
- Resulting change in baseline performance

This information will enable Service project managers and the Implementation Oversight Workgroup to effectively monitor the implementation of the Recovery Act. If in-target projects face delays or other problems, the Service will be able to identify the problem and quickly select a replacement project from the Service's list of Recovery Act contingency projects, if necessary. This information will also enable the Service to report on the results of the Recovery Act program as projects are completed.

### **2.3.4 Regional Directors and Director of the National Conservation Training Center**

#### *2.3.4.1 Purpose and Role*

The Regional Directors and Director - National Conservation Training Center are responsible for executing the Service's Recovery Act projects consistent with the implementation guidance. The Service's Recovery Act implementation guidance will provide specific requirements in the following areas: monitoring project performance (i.e., budget, schedule, and cost); monitoring contractor performance; compiling regular accomplishment/status reports; ensuring project risks are appropriately identified and mitigated; as well as implementing sound internal controls and monitoring their operating effectiveness. The Service's Recovery Act guidance will be consistent with the government-wide Office of Management and Budget Recovery Act guidance.

#### *2.3.4.2 Processes for Reviewing Progress and Monitoring Performance*

The Regional Directors and Director of the National Conservation Training Center will follow the Service's Recovery Act guidance while tailoring an approach to fit their particular projects and personnel. Within 30 days of the finalization of the Service's Recovery Act project lists each





region will establish a project implementation team to oversee and monitor the implementation, progress, and results of Recovery Act projects. Each team will include key staff from the contracting, engineering, budget/finance, external affairs and program offices.

## 2.4 Funding Categories

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 provides \$280 million in funding for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in two separate appropriations: \$165 million for Resource Management projects and \$115 million for Construction projects. The Bill and conference report language state the following:

- Bill language - Resource Management: *“...for deferred maintenance, construction, and capital improvement projects on national wildlife refuges and national fish hatcheries and or high priority habitat restoration projects. \$165,000,000.”*
- Conference report language – Resource Management: *“The conference agreement provides flexibility to the agency in determining the allocation of this funding among various program activities and sub-activities. The conferees encourage that selection of individual projects be based on a prioritization process which weighs the capacity of proposals to create the largest number of jobs in the shortest period of time and which create lasting value for the American public. While maximizing jobs, the Service should consider priority critical deferred maintenance and capital improvement projects, trail maintenance, and habitat restoration on National Wildlife Refuges, National Fish Hatcheries, and other Service properties.”*
- Bill language – Construction: *“...for construction, reconstruction, and repair of roads, bridges, property, and facilities and for energy efficient retrofits of existing facilities, \$115,000,000.”*
- Conference Report language – Construction: *“The conference agreement provides flexibility to the agency in determining the allocation of this funding among various program activities and sub-activities. The conferees encourage that selection of individual projects be based on a prioritization process which weighs the capacity of proposals to create the largest number of jobs in the shortest period of time and which create lasting value for the American public. While maximizing job creation, the Service should consider priority construction, reconstruction and repair, critical deferred maintenance and capital improvement projects, road maintenance, energy conservation projects and habitat restoration on National Wildlife Refuges, National Fish Hatcheries and other Service properties.”*

Consistent with the categories of projects specified in the Recovery Act, the Service will fund 839 projects in the following categories:

### 2.4.1 Resource Management

- 1) Deferred Maintenance - \$105.0 million, 531 projects: The objective of the Service’s Recovery Act deferred maintenance projects are to invest in priority critical repair, rehabilitation and maintenance projects that will restore or extend the life of critical



facilities at Service properties across the country. This Plan devotes a significant portion of the available funding to address the deferred maintenance needs at Service facilities and includes some energy efficiency retrofits. The priorities for these projects are based on existing merit-based processes including the Service's 5-Year Plans for deferred maintenance and construction.

- 2) Habitat Restoration - \$40.1 million, 173 projects: Habitat restoration projects are included in this plan to allow restoration of fish and wildlife habitats on National Wildlife Refuges as well as on private lands through a variety of partnership opportunities. These projects are ideal for purposes of the Recovery Act as they support key mission goals for wildlife habitat conservation and partnerships, can quickly be put in place over a wide geographic area, provide employment for local contractors, and result in lasting benefits to the American public by conserving and enriching our fish and wildlife treasures. These projects will also provide high school and college age youth with short-term employment opportunities working on units of the National Wildlife Refuge System. The priorities for these projects are based on existing strategic plans and merit-based processes.
- 3) Capital Improvements - \$11.6 million, 22 projects: Capital Improvements include the construction, installation, or assembly of a new asset, or the alteration, expansion, or extension of an existing asset to accommodate a change of function or unmet programmatic needs, or to incorporate new technology. Resource management capital improvements in this Plan focus on improving buildings, fish hatchery water management facilities, and energy savings. The priorities for these projects are based on existing merit-based processes.
- 4) Administration - \$8.3 million: The Service is authorized to spend a maximum of five percent of the Resource Management appropriation (i.e., \$8.3 million) to administer the Recovery Act Resource Management program. Administration includes contracting support, project tracking, accounting, reporting, management, and communication.

#### **2.4.2 Construction**

- 5) Construction (Capital Improvements) - \$57.5 million, 20 projects: Capital Improvements include the construction, installation, or assembly of new assets such as visitor centers, combination headquarters/visitor centers, or administrative facilities, as well as the alteration of existing asset to include renewable energy systems. Site adaptable standardized floorplans in the headquarters/visitor centers will be used to reduce both overall design cost and project duration on all the headquarters and visitor center projects. These projects support key mission goals for the Refuge System. The priorities for these projects are based on existing merit-based processes.
- 6) Reconstruction/Repair (Deferred Maintenance) - \$43.4 million, 66 projects: Deferred maintenance is operating or cyclic maintenance that was not performed when it should have been or when it was scheduled and, which therefore, was put off or delayed for a future period. This Plan devotes a significant portion of the available funding to address



the deferred maintenance needs at Service facilities and includes some energy efficiency retrofits. The priorities for these projects are based on existing merit-based processes.

- 7) Energy Efficiency Retrofits - \$8.4 million, 27 projects: Energy efficiency retrofit projects implement life-cycle cost effective energy conservation measures, energy reduction strategies, and water conservation technologies, and install renewable energy systems to meet mandated energy and water reduction goals while reducing operational costs at Service field stations and facilities. The priorities for these projects are based on existing merit-based processes with consideration of potential energy savings.
- 8) Administration - \$5.8 million: The Service is authorized to spend a maximum of five percent of the Construction appropriation (i.e., \$5.8 million) to administer the Recovery Act Construction program. Administration includes contracting support, project tracking, accounting, reporting, management, and communication.

An overview of the Service’s Recovery Act project funding categories is presented below in Table 2.3.2a.

Project Funding Category	In-Target Funding Amount	# of In-Target Projects Per Category	Contingency Funding Amount	Contingency # of Projects Per Category
<b>Resource Management</b>				
Deferred Maintenance (DM)	\$105,049,000	531	\$7,590,700	35
Habitat Restoration (HR)	\$40,067,000	173	\$37,506,000	131
Capital Improvements (CI)	\$11,634,000	22	\$8,722,000	17
Administrative Support	\$8,250,000	N/A	N/A	N/A
Subtotal	\$165,000,000	726	\$53,818,700	183
<b>Construction</b>				
Construction (CI)	\$57,487,000	20	\$105,550,000	17
Reconstruction/Repair (DM)	\$43,381,000	66	\$9,096,000	9
Energy Efficiency Retrofits (ER)	\$8,382,000	27	\$2,884,500	16
Administrative Support	\$5,750,000	N/A	N/A	N/A
Subtotal	\$115,000,000	113	\$117,530,500	42
<b>Project Totals</b>	<b>\$280,000,000</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>\$171,349,200</b>	<b>225</b>

*Table 2.3.2a – Overview of FWS Recovery Act Project Funding Categories*

## 2.5 Process for Allocating Among Categories and Selecting Projects

The Recovery Act provided direction to the Service in language that identified project categories. With an existing robust system for facilities project planning and prioritization based on mission needs and condition, the Service used existing plans and processes as much as possible to focus on each category in the legislation and determine how the funds should be used to respond to the intent of the Congress and advance program goals. The Service determined funding levels for individual categories based on a combination of: projects that would address longstanding mission needs; support existing national, merit-based priorities; and that would not generate future year operation and maintenance costs or could reduce future year costs.



### **2.5.1 Merit-Based Selection Criteria for Deferred Maintenance, Capital Improvement, Construction, Reconstruction and Repair, and Energy Efficiency Retrofit Projects**

All deferred maintenance, capital improvement, construction, reconstruction and repair, and energy efficiency retrofit projects were selected in part using a merit-based approach. To meet this requirement for facilities, the Service focused its Recovery Act project search on its 5-Year Plans for deferred maintenance and construction. To be considered for funding under this process, projects are reviewed and scored using merit-based criteria defined in the Department of the Interior's Budget Guidance, Attachment G, as described below. Since habitat restoration projects are not typically captured in the Service's 5-Year Plans for deferred maintenance and construction, the Service utilized a different selection approach for this category of projects, as described below.

The Department of the Interior's 5-Year Deferred Maintenance and Capital Improvement Planning process is the backbone of the DOI Asset Management Plan and Bureau Asset Management Plans. The 5-Year Plans are developed and updated on an annual basis at the bureau level using a uniform, Department-wide process for ranking both deferred maintenance and capital improvement projects. Project ranking categories include Critical Health Safety, Critical Resource Protection, Energy, Critical Mission, Code Compliance, and Other Deferred Maintenance.

The categories used in the ranking process are weighted so that projects that will address critical health and safety needs receive the highest score. A project's final score also takes into account its asset priority index. The asset priority index (API) is a measure of the importance of a constructed asset to the mission of the installation where the asset is located. The numeric range is from 1 (little or no importance) to 100 (mission critical with no substitutes). The goal of the 5-Year planning process is to focus the Service's limited resources on projects that are both mission critical and in the most need of repair or replacement.

Projects are submitted by the Regions through the Service Asset Maintenance Management System (SAMMS). Project scoring is reviewed by asset management specialists in the Washington Office and 5-Year Plans are developed for Refuge Deferred Maintenance, Hatchery Deferred Maintenance and Service-wide Construction. Deferred maintenance plans are program specific, so senior program managers in each program make the final determination on the composition of the 5-Year Plans considering DOI scoring, regional priorities and allocation amounts. Consistent with OMB's Capital Planning and Investment Control guidance, the Service's Construction Investment Review Board (IRB) evaluates proposed construction projects and determines the composition of the 5-Year Construction Plan based on DOI score, regional recommendations and overall Service priorities.

All eligible projects are scored according to the Department of the Interior's priority system (Department of the Interior's Budget Guidance, Attachment G) that gives the highest scores, and paramount consideration for funding, to those projects that will correct critical health and safety problems, especially if the project involves the repair of a facility for which corrective maintenance has been deferred. The following are the weighted ranking criteria in priority order:



1. Critical Health and Safety Deferred Maintenance – A facility deferred maintenance need that poses a serious threat to public or employee safety or health.
2. Critical Health and Safety Capital Improvement – A condition that poses a serious threat to public or employee safety or health and can only be reasonably abated by the construction of some capital improvement.
3. Renewable Energy Capital Improvement in which there will be an energy savings of >20 kW – Projects installing renewable energy sources with a total size of more than 20 kilowatts.
4. Energy Efficiency Sustainable Buildings Capital Improvement – Reducing energy needs through efficiency measures reduces the overall park energy usage, thus reducing the operational cost of the capitol improvement.
5. Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance – A facility deferred maintenance need that poses a serious threat to natural or cultural resources.
6. Renewable Energy Capital Improvement, in which there will be an energy savings of 5.1-20 kW – Projects installing renewable energy sources with a total size of 5.1 – 20 kilowatts.
7. Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement – A condition that poses a serious threat to natural or cultural resources.
8. Renewable Energy Capital Improvement, in which there were an energy savings of 5kW or less - Projects installing renewable energy sources with a total size of 5 kilowatts or less.
9. Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance – A facility deferred maintenance need that poses a serious threat to a Bureau’s ability to carry out its assigned mission.
10. Other Deferred Maintenance – A facility deferred maintenance need that will improve public or employee safety, health, or accessibility: complete unmet programmatic needs and mandated programs; protection of natural or cultural resources or to a Bureau’s ability to carry out its assigned mission.
11. Code Compliance Capital Improvement – A facility capital improvement need that will meet compliance with codes, standards, and laws.
12. Other Capital Improvements – Other capital improvement is the construction of a new facility or the expansion or rehabilitation of an existing facility to accommodate a change of function or new mission requirements.

Based on the weighting factors accompanying each category listed above, projects are scored with a weighted score not to exceed 1,000 points. This score is referred to as the DOI Score.

## **2.5.2 Merit-Based Selection Criteria for Habitat Restoration Projects**

Habitat restoration projects are not captured in the Service’s 5-Year planning process for deferred maintenance and construction. Off-refuge habitat projects for the Partners for Fish and Wildlife and the Coastal Program were selected based on their relationship to goals in existing 5-Year Strategic Plans and annual habitat restoration and protection goals for each geographic area. High priority National Fish Passage Program and National Fish Habitat Action Plan projects



were selected from an inventory of projects maintained in the Fisheries Operational Needs (FONS) Module of the Fisheries Information System (FIS). Important refuge habitat restoration projects were selected from the Service Asset Maintenance Management System (SAMMS) or the Refuge Operating Needs System (RONS) and prioritized based on the value and amount of habitat restored/enhanced. Additional information on the selection process for habitat restoration projects is provided in Section 4.4.

### **2.5.3 Additional Recovery Act Selection Criteria**

Not all projects identified in 5-Year Deferred Maintenance and Capital Improvement Plans or otherwise identified by the Service meet the Recovery Act goal for quick job creation. Therefore, the Service used the additional evaluation criteria to identify projects capable of meeting Recovery Act goals such as:

- Can the project be initiated quickly? The goal is to start at least 50% of the projects within 120 days of bill passage, and all funding must be obligated by September 30, 2010.
- Avoid projects that involve lengthy planning, permitting or consultation requirements.
- Projects should create jobs through contracts and not have a significant in-house labor component.
- Consider ability to group similar projects and utilize existing contracts to expedite the obligation of funds.
- Consider regional contracting and project management capacity when selecting projects for funding. Regional Directors will be held accountable for completing projects within the allowable time frames.

Application of these criteria resulted in the selection of 839 projects most capable of contributing to the Service's achievement of Recovery Act goals for quick job creation. The Service's project-by-project evaluation has determined that all selected projects, including those with a permitting, planning or design phase, will meet the requirement for full obligation of funding by September 30, 2010. For projects requiring permits, the process has already been initiated and will be completed prior to contract award.

Once all possible Recovery Act projects were identified by Service units and forwarded to the investment Review Board by the Regional Directors, the board made project selection recommendations to the Deputy Director. The selections were partly based on a review of the DOI score if the project addressed construction or deferred maintenance, or other rating or recommendation from the region for habitat conservation projects. After reviewing the DOI score, the projects were then evaluated to determine which projects were most consistent with the following Recovery Act goals:

- Preserving and creating jobs
- Assisting those most impacted by the recession
- Providing investments needed to increase economic efficiency by spurring technological advances in science and health





- Investing in transportation, environmental protection, and other infrastructure that will provide long-term economic benefits
- Stabilizing State and local government budgets, in order to minimize and avoid reductions in essential services and counter productive state and local tax increases
- Increasing domestic renewable energy capacity
- Investing in new infrastructure such as roads and bridges
- Requiring unprecedented levels of transparency, oversight, and accountability

More specifically, the Service applied the following Recovery Act “primary selection criteria” to screen out ineligible projects:

- Project is a high priority mission need
- Project creates or supports jobs
- Project funds can be obligated and the project can be underway by September 30, 2010

The Service then applied the following “secondary selection factors” at the national level to arrive at a final list of eligible projects:

- Planning is complete or substantially complete
- Environmental compliance is complete or substantially complete
- The project has been reviewed and approved by the Service’s Investment Review Board
- The project has a renewable energy, energy efficiency, or green building component that will reduce the carbon footprint, reduce energy consumption, or otherwise improve sustainability of the facility
- The project will reduce operating costs
- The project will help to resolve an emerging or long standing problem for which funding has not otherwise been available

Through its project selection process the Service ensured that all project categories identified in the Recovery Act language were adequately represented, that projects were geographically dispersed and that all projects could be completed within the available regional contracting capacity. These considerations, in addition to the requirements for quick obligation of funding, meant that not in all instances were projects selected strictly based on merit-based scores.



### 3.0 Deferred Maintenance

Program	Funding Amount	# of Projects Per Category
Deferred Maintenance	\$105,049,000	531

Table 3a – Overview of Deferred Maintenance Project Funding

#### 3.1 Program Managers

Greg Siekaniec, Assistant Director, National Wildlife Refuge System, 202-208-5333, and Gary Frazer, Assistant Director, Fisheries and Habitat Conservation, 202-208-6394

#### 3.2 Objectives

Deferred maintenance projects are needed to improve stewardship of mission critical and mission dependent constructed assets and to improve the Service’s Facility Condition Index (FCI). FCI is a general measure of a constructed asset’s condition at a specific point in time. FCI is calculated as the ratio of the asset’s repair needs to its Current Replacement Value (CRV).

$$FCI = (1 - \$\text{repair needs}/\$CRV) \times 100$$

Repair needs represent the amount of funding needed to ensure a constructed asset is restored to a condition substantially equivalent to the originally intended and designed capacity, efficiency, or capability. CRV is the cost of replacing the constructed asset at today’s standards.

In addition to improving the Service’s FCI, many Recovery Act deferred maintenance projects will help the Service reduce operations and maintenance costs, increase energy efficiency, and increase the use of renewable energy technologies. The Service has targeted deferred maintenance projects that can be initiated quickly, will create jobs, will not have a significant in-house labor component, and will not exceed available contracting support capacity.

#### 3.3 Major Activities

The Service’s long-standing prioritization process for deferred maintenance projects maximizes the benefits of the Recovery Act by selecting projects, which are scored based on the Department’s prioritization process described in Section 2.5 of this Plan. An inventory of ongoing deferred maintenance requirements is maintained in the Service Asset Maintenance Management System (SAMMS) database. The Service will use Recovery Act funds to perform the following types of activities:

- Mission critical water management assets – rehabilitating/repairing effluent treatment systems; wells and pumps; raceway walls, floors and electrical systems; water supply lines; aeration/degassing towers; fish production pond liners and valves; water alarm systems; water control structures; spillways; inlets and outlets; levees and wetland





management impoundments; as well as enhancing energy efficiency of water pumping systems.

- **Buildings** – correcting seismic deficiencies; making safety improvements; upgrading electrical systems; replacing roofs and doors; making flood repairs; replacing quarters, maintenance buildings, and office/visitor centers; as well as enhancing energy efficiency at Service facilities.
- **Roads and Bridges** – replacing bridges; repairing roads.
- **Other assets** – removing and disposing of unnecessary and hazardous assets as identified in the Service’s Asset Management Plans; installing/repairing/replacing fences; correcting safety deficiencies; constructing new septic systems to meet code requirements; and replacing stand-by generators.

### 3.4 Project Selection Criteria

The Service selected all Recovery Act deferred maintenance projects from its merit-based 5-Year Deferred Maintenance and/or Construction Plans based on their ability to address Recovery Act goals and the Service’s mission needs. A description of the Service’s Recovery Act project selection criteria and process can be found in Section 2.4 of this Plan.

### 3.5 Financial Award Characteristics

Type of Award	# of Deferred Maintenance Projects	\$ Value of Deferred Maintenance Projects	Targeted Type of Recipients	Award Selection Criteria
Contracts	531	\$105,049,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A&amp;E firms</li> <li>• Construction companies</li> </ul>	Methods available: open market competition; orders using competed Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ); competed GSA schedule order and other. Criteria for evaluation will be based on statement of work, successful record of past performance, and indicated ability to meet cost and schedule milestones.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>\$105,049,000</b>		

*Table 3.5a – Characteristics of Deferred Maintenance Awards*

### 3.6 Performance Measures

The Fish and Wildlife Service has developed performance measures to monitor the impact of its Recovery Act investments on mission and programmatic goals and objectives. These performance measures can be found on Recovery.Gov.



### 3.7 Project Milestones and Completion Forecast

Deferred Maintenance Project Category	Category Description	Funding Amount	# of Projects
Water Management Assets	Projects where the Service will rehabilitate/repair effluent treatment systems; wells and pumps; raceway walls, floors and electrical systems; water supply lines; aeration/degassing towers; fish production pond liners and valves; water alarm systems; water control structures; spillways; inlets and outlets; levees and wetland management impoundments; as well as enhance energy efficiency of water pumping systems.	\$51,162,500	211
Buildings	Projects where the Service will correct seismic deficiencies; make safety improvements; upgrade electrical systems; replace roofs and doors; make flood repairs; replace quarters, maintenance buildings, and office/visitor centers; as well as enhance energy efficiency at Service facilities.	\$36,922,000	203
Roads & Bridges	Projects where the Service will replace bridges and repair roads.	\$6,839,000	37
Other Assets	Projects where the Service will remove and dispose of unnecessary and hazardous assets as identified in the Service's Asset Management Plans; install/repair/replace fences; correct safety deficiencies; construct new septic systems to meet code requirements; and replace stand-by generators.	\$10,125,500	80
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$105,049,000</b>	<b>531</b>

*Table 3.7a – Categories of Deferred Maintenance Projects*

Quarter	# of Water Management Assets Projects Completed	# of Buildings Projects Completed	# of Roads & Bridges Projects Completed	# of Other Assets Projects Completed	# of Deferred Maintenance Projects Completed Per Quarter	Cumulative % of Deferred Maintenance Projects Completed
FY 2009 Q4	55	34	4	5	98	18%
FY 2010 Q1	51	36	0	1	88	35%
FY 2010 Q2	1	0	0	0	1	35%
FY 2010 Q3	48	35	9	26	118	57%
FY 2010 Q4	0	0	0	0	0	57%
FY 2011 Q1	51	83	24	47	205	96%
FY 2011 Q2	5	15	0	1	21	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>531</b>	

*Table 3.7b – Deferred Maintenance Project Completion Forecast by Category*

The project completion estimates in Table 3.7b are based on the assumption that the Service's list of Recovery Act projects will be approved and funds released to the Service no later than May 1, 2009. Estimates will be revised on a day-for-day basis based on the actual approval date.



### 3.7.1 Deferred Maintenance Project Milestones

Project Milestones	Average Length to Complete from Project Initiation
Planning and Design	3 months
Contract Award / Obligation of Funds	5 months
Project Completion	15 months

Table 3.7.1a – Milestones for all Categories of Deferred Maintenance Projects

The milestones presented in Table 3.7.1a are averages for Recovery Act deferred maintenance projects. Project durations and milestones have been expedited to help contribute as quickly as possible to the Recovery Act goals of job creation and economic stabilization. The Service intends to use standard design concepts, to the extent practicable, to enhance project efficiency and reduce schedule variability.

### 3.8 Cost Implications

Proposed projects impact a wide variety of operating situations. We anticipate cost savings at some facilities where projects include energy efficiency upgrades, eliminating deferred maintenance projects, and Facility Condition Index improvements. In many situations, annual operating and maintenance costs will be shifted from taking care of partially functioning assets to taking care of assets that are fully functional with no net change in operating costs. Projects that improve effluent treatment at fish hatcheries may result in additional energy costs at the facility, but will improve the quality of effluent that is being discharged from those facilities. Projects that rehabilitate pond liners, kettles and valves, water supply lines, and hatchery raceways will improve the condition of those assets, but should not change the operating costs of those assets. When considered as a group, these projects will improve functionality and reliability of use of these assets with slight annual operating cost reductions.

A preliminary assessment of Recovery Act projects indicates the Service will achieve an estimated annual energy savings of nearly 22.5 million kilowatt hours (76.77 billion BTU) and an annual operational savings of \$2.9 million. Approximately 5.5 million kilowatt hours (18.77 billion BTU) and \$713,000 of the savings will be attributable to deferred maintenance projects. These savings are a conservative estimate and are likely to change as Recovery Act projects are adjusted over the next eighteen months.

To estimate Recovery Act energy savings, the Service segregated energy-related projects into three tiers (refer to Section 9.2.1 of this Plan for a detailed description of each tier). Equivalent kilowatts were computed based on a conversion of \$17,000, \$15,000 and \$10,000 for each tier of projects (i.e., Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3). Kilowatts saved were converted to kilowatt hours using a conversion factor of 1,800. Annual energy savings were converted based on \$0.13 per kilowatt hour.



## 4.0 Habitat Restoration

Program	Funding Amount	# of Projects Per Category
Habitat Restoration	\$40,067,000	173

*Table 4a – Overview of Habitat Restoration Funding*

### 4.1 Program Managers

Greg Siekaniec, Assistant Director, National Wildlife Refuge System, 202-208-5333, and Gary Frazer, Assistant Director, Fisheries and Habitat Conservation, 202-208-6394

### 4.2 Objectives

Habitat restoration projects provide benefits to Federal Trust Species and multitudes of other fish and wildlife species all of which have potential value to eco-tourism, hunting, fishing, and bird watching. Habitat restoration projects also provide a wide array of ecosystem services of importance to the public by improving the functioning of wetlands, drainage, and elimination of invasive species.

Habitat restoration projects employ local services such as equipment operators and material suppliers. As documented in the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Act (16 USC 3771, pg. 2) approximately 60 percent of fish and wildlife in the United States are on private land thus it is imperative to facilitate private landowner-centered and results-oriented efforts that promote efficient and innovative ways to protect and enhance the nation’s natural resources. Funds invested in habitat conservation projects on private land typically are matched at least by a 1:1 ratio and many times much greater.

Healthy aquatic habitats are a vital component for our nation’s aquatic species to maintain or establish populations at a level sufficient to withstand increased pressures. The Service’s habitat programs work with private entities to restore and enhance aquatic habitats across the landscape. The Service will use Recovery Act funding to hire local contractors, engineers, and laborers for these projects. The long-term economic benefits of these projects include: enhancing water quality; restoring healthy and intact ecosystems for resident and migratory aquatic species dependant upon them; and providing enhanced water-based outdoor recreational opportunities and industries (e.g., community-based, local sport fishing and water sports outfitters, suppliers, and guides).

Recreational fishing and boating is a \$45 billion industry. The industry drives a host of economic engines with its fishing guides, specialty shops, and boating suppliers and makers. To maintain or increase this industry’s value and the value to the American people, aquatic populations must remain intact or improve beyond current levels. This becomes increasingly difficult with pressures from climate change and human development.



Habitat restoration in the National Wildlife Refuge System is an essential component of wildlife and habitat management within this 96 million acre conservation lands system that is managed through approximately 550 refuges dispersed throughout the country. About 5 million acres of refuge habitats are restored or managed every year. Activities are geared to providing habitats conducive to restoring or sustaining the nation's fish, wildlife, and plants for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans. An extensive infrastructure of dikes, impoundments, and water control structures is maintained as a portion of this effort. Many habitat restoration or management activities are suitable for contracting with local businesses or individuals.

As part of its focus on habitat restoration and consistent with Title VII, Section 702 of the Recovery Act the Service intends to "utilize, where practicable, the Public Lands Corps, Youth Conservation Corps, Student Conservation Association, Job Corps and other related partnerships with Federal, State, local, tribal or other non-profit groups that serve young adults." The Service will provide short-term employment opportunities to as many as 500 high school and college age youth supporting habitat restoration and other work on National Wildlife Refuges.

### **4.3 Major Activities**

The Service will use Recovery Act funds to perform the following types of activities:

- Restoring upland habitats, including native grasslands and forests, using various habitat restoration techniques
- Restoring wetland habitats, including coastal and inland wetlands, using various habitat restoration techniques
- Rehabilitating or constructing infrastructure needed to effectively manage water levels in wetland impoundments
- Restoring riparian and stream habitats
- Removing and controlling invasive species
- Removing barriers for aquatic organism passage
- Removing and/or retrofitting dams for aquatic organism passage
- Stabilizing stream banks to reduce sedimentation into water systems
- Replacing culverts to provide aquatic organism passage
- Placing in-stream structures to improve aquatic habitat quality

### **4.4 Project Selection Criteria**

Habitat restoration projects are not captured in the Service's 5-Year planning process for deferred maintenance and construction. Each program (i.e., Coastal, Partners, Fish Passage, Fish Habitat, and Refuges) used its existing, longstanding and accepted project identification process to identify potential Recovery Act projects. A summary of the criteria and processes used for each category of habitat restoration projects is provided below. Projects that had been identified previously using these existing processes were individually assessed by field managers familiar with the project details to determine if the projects could be obligated by September 30, 2010, and if the projects would create private sector jobs (i.e., require a contract, grant, or agreement).



These determinations were reviewed and verified by program managers in both the regional and Washington Offices.

#### **4.4.1 Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Project Selection Criteria**

Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program (PFW) field biologists work with a wide variety of partners on a voluntary basis to implement high quality projects at the local level on private lands. Each field biologist is responsible for implementing local PFW Program delivery to capitalize on the unique needs of the landscape and landowners to best implement the PFW Regional 5-Year Strategic Plan in their work area. Priority projects are identified by looking at a number of project characteristics including:

- Projects must address priority wetland, upland, or riparian habitats
- Projects must provide direct benefits to trust-species (i.e., migratory birds, threatened and endangered species, inter-jurisdictional fish, certain marine mammals, and species of international concern)
- Preference is given to projects with multi-species benefits, including Threatened and Endangered (T & E) species
- Preference is given to projects within geographic focus areas identified in 5-Year Strategic Plan
- Preference is given to projects that enhance Service fee-title or easement interests
- Preference is given to projects that complement other federal, state, and local habitat conservation efforts
- Preference is given to projects with the highest cost-benefit ratio (acres/dollar)
- Preference is given to projects that protect habitats at the highest risk
- Partnership potential is high (goal is at least 1:1 in terms of funding contributions)

The highest ranking projects address the majority of these criteria and meet the intent of the Recovery Act.

#### **4.4.2 Coastal Program Project Selection Criteria**

Coastal Program (CP) field biologists work with a wide variety of partners on a voluntary basis to implement high quality projects at the local level on both public and private lands. Each field biologist is responsible for implementing local CP Program delivery to capitalize on the unique needs of the landscape and landowners to best implement the CP Regional 5-year strategic plan in their work area. Priority projects are identified by looking at a number of project characteristics including:

- Projects must address priority coastal wetland, upland, or riparian habitats
- Projects must have direct benefit trust-species (i.e., migratory birds, threatened and endangered species, inter-jurisdictional fish, certain marine mammals, and species of international concern)
- Preference is given to projects with multi-species benefits, including Threatened and Endangered (T & E) species



- Preference is given to projects within geographic focus areas identified in 5-Year Strategic Plan
- Preference is given to projects that enhance Service fee-title or easement interests
- Preference is given to projects that complement other federal, state, and local habitat conservation efforts
- Preference is given to projects with the highest cost-benefit ratio (acres/dollar)
- Preference is given to projects that protect habitats at the highest risk
- Partnership potential is high (goal is at least 1:1 in terms of funding contributions)

The highest ranking projects address the majority of these criteria and meet the intent of the Recovery Act.

#### **4.4.3 National Fish Passage Program**

The National Fish Passage Program (NFPP) projects were first ranked by the field offices, then by the regional offices based on criteria in the Regional Fisheries Strategic Plans and policies established by the Service. Criteria in those plans and identified within the program policy that were used to rank NFPP projects include:

- Benefit to federal trust species
- Development of new and existing partnerships while leveraging at least a 1:1 match
- Benefit to tribal trust resources
- Benefit to Service and other Federal lands
- Projects that are on the ground actively restoring habitat in the field

The highest ranking projects address the majority of these criteria and meet the intent of the Recovery Act.

#### **4.4.4 National Fish Habitat Action Plan**

The National Fish Habitat Action Plan (NFHAP) projects were first ranked by the field offices, then by the regional offices based on criteria in the Regional Fisheries Strategic Plans and policies established by the Service. Criteria in those plans and identified within the program policy that were used to rank NFHAP projects include:

- Benefit to federal trust species
- Development of new and existing partnerships while leveraging at least a 1:1 match
- Benefit to tribal trust resources
- Benefit to Service and other Federal lands
- Projects that are on the ground actively restoring habitat in the field

Additional criteria reflecting the goals and objectives of the NFHAP Partnerships and the NFHAP Board priorities were used for ranking NFHAP projects. These additional criteria included whether the project would:





- Identify and protect intact and healthy waters
- Restore natural variability in river and stream flows and water surface elevations in natural lakes and reservoirs
- Reconnect fragmented river, stream, reservoir, coastal, and lake habitat to allow access to historic spawning, nursery and rearing grounds
- Reduce and maintain sedimentation, phosphorus and nitrogen runoff to river, stream, reservoir, coastal, and lake habitats

The highest ranking projects address the majority of these criteria and meet the intent of the Recovery Act.

#### 4.4.5 Refuge Project Section Criteria

Recovery Act funding will enable the Service to address a modest number of important habitat restoration needs (i.e., 21 projects) in the National Wildlife Refuge System. These projects were selected using a slightly different process than deferred maintenance or capital improvement projects. Refuge habitat projects were drawn from the Refuge Operating Needs System (RONS) or the Service Asset and Maintenance Management System (SAMMS).

The criteria used for inclusion and prioritization in RONS include:

- Contribution to the goals and purposes of the National Wildlife Refuge System
- Contribution to the goals and purposes of individual refuges
- Contribution to management objectives in management plans

The criteria used for inclusion and prioritization in SAMMS include:

- Contribution to Habitat Management objectives of the Refuge System
- Use of the below DOI asset management ranking criteria (weighted)
 

Critical Health and Safety Deferred Maintenance	10
Critical Health and Safety Capital Improvement	9
Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance	7
Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement	6
Energy Policy, High Performance, Sustainable Buildings	5
Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance	4
Other Deferred Maintenance	3
Code Compliance Capital Improvement	3
Other Capital Improvements	0

From those prioritized lists, the Service identified projects based on criteria of consistency with refuge establishment purposes, consistency with resource management objectives in Comprehensive Conservation Plans, response to an urgent resource threat, effective accomplishment of resource outcomes, and efficient use of funds. Projects were identified at the field level, reviewed and proposed at the Regional Office level and selected nationally. Projects were selected from among those suitable for Recovery Act funding (ability by create jobs and to





be completed within the short timeframe of the Recovery Act). Using this process, a total of 14 RONS projects and 7 SAMMS projects were selected for funding.

### 4.5 Financial Award Characteristics

Type of Award	# of Habitat Restoration Projects *	\$ Value of Habitat Restoration Projects	Targeted Type of Recipients	Award Selection Criteria
In-House	13	\$2,005,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local youth</li> <li>Temporary employees</li> </ul>	Not applicable.
Contracts	52	\$19,582,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A&amp;E firms</li> <li>Construction companies</li> </ul>	Methods available: open market competition; orders using competed Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ); competed GSA schedule order and other. Criteria for evaluation will be based on statement of work, successful record of past performance, and indicated ability to meet cost and schedule milestones.
Grants	8	\$1,070,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local landowners</li> </ul>	Funds will be awarded using established procedures for announcing and making grants through the National Wildlife Refuge System and the National Fisheries and Habitat Conservation programs. Applications will be evaluated on the proposed statement of work, successful record of past performance, and indicated ability to meet cost and schedule milestones.
Cooperative Agreements	100	\$17,410,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Youth organizations</li> <li>Local landowners and organizations</li> </ul>	Criteria for evaluating proposals for award through cooperative agreements will be based on the proposed statement of work and the cooperator's ability to meet mission objectives, successful record of past performance, and indicated ability to meet cost and schedule milestones.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>\$40,067,000</b>		

*Table 4.5a – Characteristics of Habitat Restoration Awards*

\* Some projects may use more than one funding mechanism.

Different financial award mechanisms are used depending on the type of project, recipient and program involved. Regardless of the award mechanism, all Recovery Act transparency and accountability requirements will be met.



## 4.6 Performance Measures

The Fish and Wildlife Service has developed performance measures to monitor the impact of its Recovery Act investments on mission and programmatic goals and objectives. These performance measures can be found on Recovery.Gov.

## 4.7 Project Milestones and Completion Forecast

Habitat Restoration Project Category	Category Description	Funding Amount	# of Projects
National Wildlife Refuge System	Habitat restoration or improvement projects on conservation lands within the Refuge System.	\$21,267,000	57
Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program	Habitat restoration using various techniques to restore and enhance uplands and wetlands on high priority private lands.	\$9,000,000	43
Coastal Program	Habitat restoration using various techniques to restore and enhance high priority coastal ecosystems.	\$5,000,000	24
NFHAP	Habitat restoration activity that restores or enhances aquatic ecosystems off Service lands.	\$2,000,000	23
NFPP	Habitat restoration activity that provides fish passage to blocked and necessary aquatic habitats.	\$2,800,000	26
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$40,067,000</b>	<b>173</b>

*Table 4.7a – Categories of Habitat Restoration Projects*

Quarter	# of NWRS Projects Completed	# of PFW Projects Completed	# of Coastal Program Projects Completed	# of NFHAP Projects Completed	# of NFPP Projects Comp'd	# of Habitat Restoration Projects Completed Per Quarter	Cumulative % of Habitat Restoration Projects Completed
FY 2009 Q4	0	0	0	1	2	3	2%
FY 2010 Q1	4	5	0	4	4	17	12%
FY 2010 Q2	0	4	4	6	7	21	24%
FY 2010 Q3	12	1	0	2	3	18	34%
FY 2010 Q4	0	20	6	3	4	33	53%
FY 2011 Q1	39	13	14	7	6	79	99%
FY 2011 Q2	2	0	0	0	0	2	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>173</b>	

*Table 4.7b – Habitat Restoration Project Completion Forecast by Category*

The project completion estimates in Table 4.7b are based on the assumption that the Service's list of Recovery Act projects will be approved and funds released to the Service no later than May 1, 2009. Estimates will be revised on a day-for-day basis based on the actual approval date.



#### 4.7.1 Habitat Restoration Project Milestones

Project Milestones	Average Length to Complete from Project Initiation
Planning and Design	3 months
Contract Award / Obligation of Funds	4 -5 months
Project Completion	6 - 18 months (varies)

*Table 4.7.1a – Milestones for all Categories of Habitat Restoration Projects*

The milestones presented in Table 4.7.1a are averages for Recovery Act habitat restoration projects. Project durations and milestones have been expedited to help contribute as quickly as possible to the Recovery Act goals of job creation and economic stabilization. The milestone that most significantly influences job creation is contract award (i.e., when money is obligated and hiring decisions are made).

#### 4.8 Cost Implications

Habitat restoration projects will provide benefits to Federal Trust Species and multitudes of other fish and wildlife species all of which have potential value to eco-tourism, hunting, fishing, and bird watching. Habitat restoration projects also provide a wide array of ecosystem services of importance to the public. These projects help to avoid future costs of protecting and restoring degraded habitat, as well as potential regulatory-related costs if a species is listed under the Endangered Species Act due to loss or deconstruction of habitat.



## 5.0 Capital Improvements

Program	Funding Amount	# of Projects Per Category
Capital Improvements	\$11,634,000	22

Table 5a – Overview of Capital Improvement Project Funding

### 5.1 Program Managers

Greg Siekaniec, Assistant Director, National Wildlife Refuge System, 202-208-5333, and Gary Frazer, Assistant Director, Fisheries and Habitat Conservation, 202-208-6394

### 5.2 Objectives

Capital improvement projects are needed to construct, install, assemble a new asset, alter/expand/extend an existing asset to accommodate a change of function or unmet programmatic need, or to incorporate new technologies. These projects eliminate deferred maintenance, improve stewardship of mission critical and mission dependent constructed assets, and improve the Service’s overall Facility Condition Index. Where possible, the Service intends to reduce operations and maintenance costs, increase energy efficiency and increase the use of renewable energy technologies.

### 5.3 Major Activities

To maximize benefits to the Service and the American people, many of the Service’s proposed capital improvement projects include deferred maintenance and energy efficiency components.

The Service will use Recovery Act funds to perform the following types of activities in the National Fish Hatchery System:

- Mission critical water management assets - constructing new wells; connecting existing wells to hatchery infrastructure; installing water heaters for fish production; and installing new raceway covers.
- Buildings –adding office/storage space to existing facilities; correcting major seismic deficiencies; constructing a visitor center; and adding LEEDS certification and solar photovoltaic technology to a visitor center.

The Service will use Recovery Act funds to perform the following types of activities in the National Wildlife Refuge System:

- Rehabilitating, replacing and constructing new small office buildings
- Installing renewable energy elements for buildings
- Completing construction of two mostly complete headquarters/visitor center buildings
- Replacing and constructing maintenance buildings
- Rehabilitating mission critical water management facilities and dams



- Replacing deficient bridges identified through the Service’s bridge inspection program
- Constructing a new accessible foot trail

### 5.4 Project Selection Criteria

The Service selected all Recovery Act capital improvement projects from its merit-based 5-Year Deferred Maintenance and/or Construction Plans based on their ability to address Recovery Act goals and the Service’s mission needs. A description of the Service’s Recovery Act project selection criteria and process can be found in Section 2.4 of this Plan.

### 5.5 Financial Award Characteristics

Type of Award	# of Capital Improvement Projects*	\$ Value of Capital Improvement Projects	Targeted Type of Recipients	Award Selection Criteria
Contracts	22	\$11,634,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A&amp;E firms</li> <li>• Construction companies</li> </ul>	Methods available: open market competition; orders using competed Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ); competed GSA schedule order and other. Criteria for evaluation will be based on statement of work, successful record of past performance, and indicated ability to meet cost and schedule milestones.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>\$11,634,000</b>		

*Table 5.5a – Characteristics of Capital Improvement Awards*

\* Some projects may use more than one funding mechanism.

### 5.6 Performance Measures

The Fish and Wildlife Service has developed performance measures to monitor the impact of its Recovery Act investments on mission and programmatic goals and objectives. These performance measures can be found on Recovery.Gov.



## 5.7 Project Milestones and Completion Forecast

Capital Improvement Project Category	Category Description	Funding Amount	# of Projects
Water Management Asset Construction	Projects where the Service will construct new wells; connect existing wells to hatchery infrastructure; install water heaters for fish production; and install new raceway covers.	\$1,480,000	4
Building Construction	Projects where the Service will add office/storage space to existing facilities; correct major seismic deficiencies; construct a visitor center; and add LEEDS certification and solar photovoltaic technology to a visitor center.	\$6,304,000	14
Large Construction Projects (>\$2M)	A project where the Service will complete construction of a visitor center at Mammoth Spring National Fish Hatchery.	\$2,580,000	1
Other Assets	Projects where the Service will replace deficient bridges identified through the Service's bridge inspection program and construct a new accessible foot trail.	\$1,270,000	3
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$11,634,000</b>	<b>22</b>

*Table 5.7a – Categories of Capital Improvement Projects*

Quarter	# of Water Management Asset Construction Projects Completed	# of Building Construction Projects Completed	# of Large Construction (>\$2M) Projects Completed	# of Other Asset Projects Completed	# of Capital Improvement Projects Completed Per Quarter	Cumulative % of Capital Improvement Projects Completed
FY 2009 Q4	2	2	0	0	4	18%
FY 2010 Q1	0	0	0	1	1	23%
FY 2010 Q2	0	0	0	0	0	23%
FY 2010 Q3	1	3	1	2	7	55%
FY 2010 Q4	0	0	0	0	0	55%
FY 2011 Q1	1	9	0	0	10	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>22</b>	

*Table 5.7b – Capital Improvement Project Completion Forecast by Category*

The project completion estimates in Table 5.7b are based on the assumption that the Service's list of Recovery Act projects will be approved and funds released to the Service no later than May 1, 2009. Estimates will be revised on a day-for-day basis based on the actual approval date.



### 5.7.1 Capital Improvement Project Milestones

Project Milestones	Average Length to Complete from Project Initiation
Planning and Design	3 months
Contract Award / Obligation of Funds	5 months
Project Completion	18 months

*Table 5.7.1a – Milestones for all Categories of Capital Improvement Projects*

The milestones presented in Table 5.7.1a are averages for Recovery Act capital improvement projects. Project durations and milestones have been expedited to help contribute as quickly as possible to the Recovery Act goals of job creation and economic stabilization. The Service intends to use standard design concepts, to the extent practicable, to enhance project efficiency reduce schedule variability. However, milestone variations may occur for certain projects (e.g., projects that use design build contracts). The milestone that most significantly influences job creation is contract award (i.e., when money is obligated and hiring decisions are made).

### 5.7.2 Description of Large Capital Improvement Projects (>\$2M)

Project Name	Description
Mammoth Spring National Fish Hatchery Visitor Center (AR)	Construct new office/visitor contact building - Planning, design and Phase 1 activities were previously completed. New visitor/interpretive facility will include an office space, visitor contact area, auditorium, public rest rooms, and associated support facilities (e.g., parking, utilities).

*Table 5.7.2a – Descriptions of Large Capital Improvement Projects (> \$2M)*

Project Information		Duration of Activities (in months)			
Name of Project	\$ Value of Project	Planning	Permitting/ Pre-Contract Award	Design	Construction
Mammoth Spring NFH Visitor Center	\$2,580,000	Complete	Complete	Complete	18 months

*Table 5.7.2b – Large Capital Improvement Projects (> \$2M) Duration*

## 5.8 Cost Implications

The Service anticipates cost savings at facilities where projects include energy efficiency upgrades, and where inefficient facilities are being replaced. Adding a modest number of new assets will increase costs at those locations. However, the Service expects minimal change to its annual operation and maintenance costs.

A preliminary assessment of Recovery Act projects indicates the Service will achieve an estimated annual energy savings of nearly 22.5 million kilowatt hours (76.77 billion BTU) and an annual operational savings of \$2.9 million. Approximately 1.4 million kilowatt hours (4.77 billion BTU) and \$190,000 of the savings will be attributable to capital improvement projects.



These savings are a conservative estimate and are likely to change as Recovery Act projects are adjusted over the next eighteen months.

To estimate Recovery Act energy savings, the Service segregated energy-related projects into three tiers (refer to Section 9.2.1 of this Plan for a detailed description of each tier). Equivalent kilowatts were computed based on a conversion of \$17,000, \$15,000 and \$10,000 for each tier of projects (i.e., Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3). Kilowatts saved were converted to kilowatt hours using a conversion factor of 1,800. Annual energy savings were converted based on \$0.13 per kilowatt hour.





## 6.0 Construction

Program	Funding Amount	# of Projects
Construction	\$57,487,000	20

Table 6a – Overview of Construction Project Funding

### 6.1 Program Managers

Greg Siekaniec, Assistant Director, National Wildlife Refuge System, 202-208-5333, and Jay Slack, Director, National Conservation Training Center, 304-876-7623

### 6.2 Objectives

Proposed construction projects will provide lasting value to American citizens and enable the National Wildlife Refuge System to more effectively carry out its fish and wildlife conservation mission. New construction will enable the Service to meet its highest priority mission needs; provide an adequate base of operations for select Refuge field stations where there is no on-site presence or staff are located in inadequate facilities with extensive deferred maintenance requirements; enable the Service to better serve visitors where existing capabilities are inadequate to accommodate public demand; and reduce or optimize operating costs. Overall mission related benefits are balanced with goals of the Recovery Act to help stimulate the economy by providing employment opportunities. Cost efficiency measures such as cost savings from reduced leasing costs, more efficient operations by field staff, use of standardized site-adaptable designs, and sustainable building designs are also being applied to maximize project benefits.

The construction of new visitor centers and other visitor facility enhancement projects, incorporating sustainability, energy efficiency, and renewable energy principles will provide for enhanced environmental education and interpretative opportunities and will be evaluated by visitor satisfaction surveys. Through these quality opportunities the public will be made aware of the Service's commitment to environmental stewardship, conservation, and reduction of our carbon footprint that will result in an optimal balance of cost, environmental and societal benefits, while still meeting the Service's mission and intended function of the facility.

### 6.3 Major Activities

The Service will use Recovery Act funds to perform the following types of activities:

Facility improvements are requested at 12 sites for the following purposes:

- Meet mission priority needs at refuges that have significant visitation.
- Provide a much needed base of operations for field staff where existing facilities were destroyed by natural disaster or fire.
- Reduce annual cost of operations by eliminating expensive leases.
- Eliminate significant deferred maintenance by replacing existing facilities in very poor condition.



- Complete a facility which received approximately 60% of the needed construction funds through a non-appropriated source (the Rocky Mountain Arsenal National Wildlife Refuge project in Colorado has funding available from the Department of Defense as part of the transitioning process between managing entities).
- Construct small administrative facilities.
- Reduce energy costs and to continue to have the National Conservation Training Center serve as a model for sustainable building operations.

### 6.4 Project Selection Criteria

The Service selected all Recovery Act construction projects from its merit-based 5-Year Deferred Maintenance and/or Construction Plans based on their ability to address Recovery Act goals and the Service’s mission needs. A description of the Service’s Recovery Act project selection criteria and process can be found in Section 2.4 of this Plan.

### 6.5 Financial Award Characteristics

Type of Award	# of Construction Projects	\$ Value of Construction Projects	Targeted Type of Recipients	Award Selection Criteria
Contracts	20	\$57,487,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A&amp;E firms</li> <li>• Construction companies</li> </ul>	Methods available: open market competition; orders using competed Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ); competed GSA schedule order and other. Criteria for evaluation will be based on statement of work, successful record of past performance, and indicated ability to meet cost and schedule milestones.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>\$57,487,000</b>		

*Table 6.5a – Characteristics of Construction Awards*

### 6.6 Performance Measures

The Fish and Wildlife Service has developed performance measures to monitor the impact of its Recovery Act investments on mission and programmatic goals and objectives. These performance measures can be found on Recovery.Gov.



## 6.7 The Service will measure its performance across all Recovery Act construction projects using the Project Milestones and Completion Forecast

Construction Project Category	Category Description	Funding Amount	# of Projects
Administrative Buildings	Projects where the Service will construct stand-alone administration buildings.	\$1,133,000	2
Headquarters/Visitor Buildings	Projects where the Service will construct standard design buildings that are a base of operations for field management and focal point for visitors.	\$51,325,000	8
Facility Modernization	Projects where the Service will make energy efficiency improvements and other retrofits to existing building HVAC and other systems, including the National Conservation Training Center.	\$5,029,000	10
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$57,487,000</b>	<b>20</b>

*Table 6.7a – Categories of Construction Projects*

Quarter	# of Administrative Building Projects Completed	# of Headquarters/Visitor Building Projects Completed	# of Facility Modernization Projects Completed	# of Construction Projects Completed Per Quarter	Cumulative % of Construction Projects Completed
FY 2010 Q1	0	0	3	3	15%
FY 2010 Q2	0	0	0	0	15%
FY 2010 Q3	0	0	4	4	35%
FY 2010 Q4	0	0	0	0	35%
FY 2011 Q1	1	3	3	7	70%
FY 2011 Q2	1	0	0	1	75%
FY 2011 Q3	0	5	0	5	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>20</b>	

*Table 6.7b – Construction Project Completion Forecast by Category*

The project completion estimates in Table 6.7b are based on the assumption that the Service’s list of Recovery Act projects will be approved and funds released to the Service no later than May 1, 2009. Estimates will be revised on a day-for-day basis based on the actual approval date.

### 6.7.1 Construction Project Milestones

Project Milestones	Average Length to Complete from Project Initiation
Award A&E contract	1 month
A&E design work completed	9 months
Advertising and award of construction contract	11 months
Construction completed	24 months

*Table 6.7.1a – Milestones for all Categories of Construction Projects*



The milestones presented in Table 6.7.1a are averages for Recovery Act construction projects. Project durations and milestones have been expedited to help contribute as quickly as possible to the Recovery Act goals of job creation and economic stabilization. The Service intends to use standard design concepts, to the extent practicable, to enhance project efficiency reduce schedule variability.

### 6.7.2 Description of Large Construction Projects (>\$2M)

Project Name	Description
<b>Headquarters/Visitor Buildings</b>	
Texas Chenier Plain Refuge Complex (TX) (\$6.4 million)	Provide a base of operations for staff and volunteers, and an orientation point for visitors by constructing an energy efficient Headquarters/Visitor Building using a standard floor plan design to gain cost efficiencies. This building will replace facilities destroyed by Hurricane Ike in September 2008. The new location will be outside the area damaged by Hurricane Ike. Annual operating costs are expected to be about the same as the \$35,000 per year currently being paid for temporary office space. No new FTEs will be needed to operate the new facility.
Pea Island/Alligator River NWR (NC) (\$6.7 million)	Establish an on-site base of operations for staff and volunteers, and an orientation point for visitors by constructing an energy efficient Headquarters/Administrative/Visitor New building will use a standard floor plan design to gain cost efficiencies and replaces off-site leased space. Annual operating costs of \$60,000 will be offset by savings of approximately \$125,000 by eliminating lease costs. The total estimated cost savings of roughly \$65,000 per year will result from lease retirement. No new FTEs will be needed to operate the new facility.
San Luis NWR (CA) (\$9.8 million)	Provide a base of operations for staff and volunteers, and an orientation point for visitors by constructing an energy efficient Headquarters/Visitor Building using a standard floor plan design to gain cost efficiencies. Cost savings will result from lease retirement which is projected to be \$300,000 per year beginning in 2010. This is a new facility that will be utilized rather than off-site rental space. Annual operations and maintenance costs for the new facility are projected to be about \$120,000. No new FTEs will be needed to operate the new facility.
Rocky Mountain Arsenal NWR (CO) (\$3.0 million)	Provide a base of operations for staff and volunteers, and an orientation point for visitors by constructing an energy efficient Visitor Building using a standard floor plan design to gain cost efficiencies. The Service will collaborate with the Department of Defense, who will cover more than 50% of the cost. This is a new facility; the existing facility being used to host visitors is inadequate for this purpose but the building is structurally sound. It will be retained and used for office space. Annual operations and maintenance costs for the new facility are estimated at \$66,000. No new FTEs will be needed to operate the new facility.
Kealia Pond NWR (HI) (\$7.3 million)	Design and construct a base of operations for staff and volunteers, and an orientation point for visitors by constructing an energy efficient Headquarters/Administrative/Visitor Building using a standard floor plan design to gain cost efficiencies. Previous building was destroyed by fire and staff is currently operating out of a rented trailer. Annual operations and maintenance costs for the new facility are estimated at \$50,000. No new FTEs will be needed to operate the new facility.



Project Name	Description
Upper Mississippi River NW&FR LaCrosse District (WI) (\$6.1 million)	Provide an adequate base of operations for staff and volunteers, and an orientation point for visitors by constructing an energy efficient Headquarters/Administrative/Visitor Building using a standard floor plan design to gain cost efficiencies. Cost savings of \$120,000 per year will result from lease retirement. Annual operations and maintenance costs for the new facility are estimated at \$40,000. No new FTEs will be needed to operate the new facility.
Tennessee NWR (TN) (\$6.1 million)	Eliminate expensive leases and provide an on-refuge base of operations for staff and volunteers by constructing an energy efficient Headquarters/Administrative/Visitor Building using a standard floor plan design to gain cost efficiencies. Facility will provide a key orientation point for visitors and contribute to local economy through increased tourism. This is a new facility that replaces off-site leased space that presently costs \$66,000 per year. Annual operations and maintenance costs for the new facility are expected to be about \$50,000 per year. No new FTEs will be needed to operate the new facility.
San Diego Bay NWR (CA) (\$6.0 million)	Provide an on-refuge base of operations for staff and volunteers, and an orientation point for visitors by constructing an energy efficient Headquarters/Administrative/Visitor Building using a standard floor plan design to gain cost efficiencies. This is a new facility that replaces off-site leased space presently costing \$55,000 per year. Annual operations and maintenance costs for the new facility are projected to be about \$40,000 per year. No new FTEs will be needed to operate the new facility.
<b>Facility Modernization</b>	
National Conservation Training Center (WV) (\$2.0 million)	Obtain Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Existing Building (LEED EB) certification, upgrade existing building systems to reduce energy consumption, construct onsite sustainable energy systems.

*Table 6.7.2a – Descriptions of Large Construction Projects (> \$2M)*

Project Information		Project Schedules (month/year)				
Name of Project	\$ Value of Project (\$000s)	Planning Complete	Pre-Contract Permitting Complete	Final Design Complete	Construction Contract Award	Date of Substantial Completion
Texas Chenier Plain Refuge Complex Headquarters/Visitor Building (TX)	\$6,400	04/09	05/09	10/09	11/09	11/10
Pea Island/Alligator River NWR Headquarters/Visitor Building (NC)	\$6,650	04/09	10/09	01/10	05/10	05/11
San Luis NWR Headquarters/Visitor Building (CA)	\$9,775	04/09	03/10	03/10	05/10	05/11
Rocky Mountain Arsenal NWR Visitor Building (CO)	\$3,000	02/09	03/09	11/09	02/10	03/11
Kealia Pond NWR Headquarters/Visitor Building (HI)	\$7,300	05/09	03/10	03/10	05/10	05/11



Project Information						
Upper Mississippi River NW&FR LaCrosse District Headquarters/Visitor Building (WI)	\$6,100	06/09	06/09	07/09	06/09*	09/10
Tennessee NWR Headquarters/Visitor Building (TN)	\$6,100	05/09	07/09	03/10	08/09	05/11
San Diego Bay NWR Headquarters/Visitor Center (CA)	\$6,000	04/09	03/10	03/10	05/10	05/11
National Conservation Training Center (WV)	\$2,000	09/09	N/A	10/09	11/09	10/10

**Table 6.7.2b – Large Construction Project (> \$2M) Schedules**

\*The Upper Mississippi River NW&FR LaCrosse District Headquarters/Visitor Building will be a “design-build” project where the designer and builder will be the same contractor. This type of system was chosen instead of using the normal process using standard Refuge designs for headquarters/visitor center because it reduces time to complete. A construction award will be made at project commencement.

## 6.8 Cost Implications

Cost savings will be derived from three sources: 1) eliminating \$718,000 in annual lease costs; 2) operating efficiencies gained by centrally locating Service staff in permanent, on-site office space; and 3) future energy use cost efficiencies at new LEED compliant buildings (typically 30% lower energy costs than a standard building). Roughly \$460,000 per year in annual operation and maintenance costs will offset some of these cost savings. These facilities will be managed by existing Service staff.

A preliminary assessment of Recovery Act projects indicates the Service will achieve an estimated annual energy savings of nearly 22.5 million kilowatt hours (76.77 billion BTU) and an annual operational savings of \$2.9 million. Approximately 9.9 million kilowatt hours (33.8 billion BTU) and \$1.2 million of the savings will be attributable to construction projects. These savings are a conservative estimate and are likely to change as Recovery Act projects are adjusted over the next eighteen months.

To estimate Recovery Act energy savings, the Service segregated energy-related projects into three tiers (refer to Section 9.2.1 of this Plan for a detailed description of each tier). Equivalent kilowatts were computed based on a conversion of \$17,000, \$15,000 and \$10,000 for each tier of projects (i.e., Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3). Kilowatts saved were converted to kilowatt hours using a conversion factor of 1,800. Annual energy savings were converted based on \$0.13 per kilowatt hour.



## 7.0 Reconstruction/Repair

Program	Funding Amount	# of Projects Per Category
Reconstruction/Repair	\$43,381,000	66

Table 7a – Overview of Reconstruction/Repair Project Funding

### 7.1 Program Managers

Greg Siekaniec, Assistant Director, National Wildlife Refuge System, 202-208-5333, and Gary Frazer, Assistant Director, Fisheries and Habitat Conservation, 202-208-6394

### 7.2 Objectives

The objectives of funding reconstruction/repair projects are to improve stewardship of mission critical and mission dependent constructed assets by reducing the deferred maintenance of our facilities and improve our Facility Condition Index (FCI). Where possible, the Service intends to reduce operations and maintenance costs, increase energy efficiency, and increase the use of renewable energy technologies.

The Service has targeted projects that can be initiated quickly, will create jobs, and will not have a significant in-house labor component.

### 7.3 Major Activities

To maximize benefits to the Service and the American people, many of the Service’s Recovery Act reconstruction/repair projects include energy efficiency components that will improve the energy efficiency of Service facilities. The following activities are proposed:

- Mission critical water management assets – rehabilitating/repairing wells and pumps; electrical systems; water supply lines; water control structures; spillways; inlets and outlets; and levees and wetland management impoundments and dams.
- Buildings – correcting seismic deficiencies; making safety improvements; upgrading electrical systems; replacing roofs and doors; making flood repairs; and replacing quarters, maintenance buildings, and office/visitor centers.
- Roads and Bridges – replacing bridges; repairing roads.
- Other assets – installing/repairing/replacing fences, boardwalks, and ramps; correcting safety deficiencies; constructing new septic systems to meet code requirements; and replacing stand-by generators.
- Continue the Facility Modernization Program at Patuxent Research Refuge





### 7.4 Project Selection Criteria

The Service selected all Recovery Act reconstruction/repair projects from its merit-based 5-Year Deferred Maintenance and/or Construction Plans based on their ability to address Recovery Act goals and the Service’s mission needs. A description of the Service’s Recovery Act project selection criteria and process can be found in Section 2.4 of this Plan.

### 7.5 Financial Award Characteristics

Type of Award	# of Reconstruction/Repair Projects	\$ Value of Reconstruction/Repair Projects	Targeted Type of Recipients	Award Selection Criteria
Contracts	66	\$43,381,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A&amp;E firms</li> <li>• Construction companies</li> </ul>	Methods available: open market competition; orders using competed Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ); competed GSA schedule order and other. Criteria for evaluation will be based on statement of work, successful record of past performance, and indicated ability to meet cost and schedule milestones.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>\$43,381,000</b>		

*Table 7.5a – Characteristics of Reconstruction/Repair Awards*

### 7.6 Performance Measures

The Fish and Wildlife Service has developed performance measures to monitor the impact of its Recovery Act investments on mission and programmatic goals and objectives. These performance measures can be found on Recovery.Gov.



## 7.7 Project Milestones and Completion Forecast

Reconstruction/Repair Project Category	Category Description	Funding Amount	# of Projects
Water Management Assets	Projects where the Service will rehabilitate/repair wells and pumps; electrical systems; water supply lines; water control structures; spillways; inlets and outlets; and levees and wetland management impoundments and dams.	\$5,632,000	16
Buildings	Projects where the Service will correct seismic deficiencies; make safety improvements; upgrade electrical systems; replace roofs and doors; make flood repairs; and replace quarters, maintenance buildings, and office/visitor centers, including Facility Modernization Component at Patuxent Research Refuge.	\$31,082,000	28
Roads & Bridges	Projects where the Service will replace bridges and repair roads.	\$2,817,000	8
Other Assets	Projects where the Service will install/repair/replace fences, boardwalks, and ramps; correct safety deficiencies; construct new septic systems to meet code requirements; and replace stand-by generators.	\$3,850,000	14
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$43,381,000</b>	<b>66</b>

*Table 7.7a – Categories of Reconstruction/Repair Projects*

Quarter	# of Water Management Asset Projects Completed	# of Building Projects Completed	# of Road and Bridge Projects Completed	# of Other Asset Projects Completed	# of Reconstruction/Repair Projects Completed Per Quarter	Cumulative % of Reconstruction/Repair Projects Completed
FY 2010 Q3	0	1	0	0	1	2%
FY 2010 Q4	0	0	0	0	0	2%
FY 2011 Q1	16	24	8	14	62	95%
FY 2011 Q2	0	3	0	0	3	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>66</b>	

*Table 7.7b – Reconstruction/Repair Project Completion Forecast by Category*

The project completion estimates in Table 7.7b are based on the assumption that the Service's list of Recovery Act projects will be approved and funds released to the Service no later than May 1, 2009. Estimates will be revised on a day-for-day basis based on the actual approval date.



### 7.7.1 Reconstruction/Repair Project Milestones

Project Milestones	Average Length to Complete from Project Initiation
Planning and Design	3 months
Contract Award / Obligation of Funds	5 months
Project Completion	15 months

*Table 7.7.1a – Milestones for all Categories of Reconstruction/Repair Projects*

The milestones presented in Table 7.7.1a are averages for Recovery Act reconstruction/repair projects. Project durations and milestones have been expedited to help contribute as quickly as possible to the Recovery Act goals of job creation and economic stabilization. The Service intends to use standard design concepts, to the extent practicable, to enhance project efficiency reduce schedule variability. However, milestone variations may occur for certain projects (e.g., projects that use design build contracts). The milestone that most significantly influences job creation is contract award (i.e., when money is obligated and hiring decisions are made).

### 7.8 Cost Implications

These projects impact a wide variety of operating situations. We anticipate cost savings at some facilities where projects include energy efficiency upgrades, reductions in deferred maintenance, and Facility Condition Index improvements. In many situations, annual operating and maintenance costs will be shifted from taking care of partially functioning assets to taking care of assets that are fully functional with no net change in operating costs. In some cases additional staff time may be devoted to taking care of a refurbished asset to protect the Service’s investment in the asset. When considered as a group, these projects will improve functionality and reliability of use of these assets with slight annual operating cost reductions (primarily from reduced energy costs). The Service will not need additional staff to operate these repaired facilities.

A preliminary assessment of Recovery Act projects indicates the Service will achieve an estimated annual energy savings of nearly 22.5 million kilowatt hours (76.77 billion BTU) and an annual operational savings of \$2.9 million. Approximately 4.1 million kilowatt hours (13.99 billion BTU) and \$541,000 of the savings will be attributable to reconstruction/repair projects. These savings are a conservative estimate and are likely to change as Recovery Act projects are adjusted over the next eighteen months.

To estimate Recovery Act energy savings, the Service segregated energy-related projects into three tiers (refer to Section 9.2.1 of this Plan for a detailed description of each tier). Equivalent kilowatts were computed based on a conversion of \$17,000, \$15,000 and \$10,000 for each tier of projects (i.e., Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3). Kilowatts saved were converted to kilowatt hours using a conversion factor of 1,800. Annual energy savings were converted based on \$0.13 per kilowatt hour.



## 8.0 Energy Efficiency Retrofits

Program	Funding Amount	# of Projects Per Category
<i>Energy Efficiency/Green Buildings</i>		
Tier 1 – Energy Conservation	\$0	0
Tier 2 – HVAC and Process Energy Reduction	\$0	0
<i>Use of Renewable Energy Sources</i>		
Tier 3 – Renewable Energy	\$8,382,000	27
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$8,382,000</b>	<b>27</b>

*Table 8a – Overview of Energy Efficiency Retrofit Project Funding*

As reflected in Table 8a, the Service is addressing all Tier 1 and Tier 2 energy efficiency retrofit projects (as defined in Section 9.2.1 of this Plan) under the Deferred Maintenance category of Recovery Act projects. Since the majority of these projects are component replacements, this is appropriate. This category of funding is focused on Tier 3 projects (i.e., renewable energy retrofits to existing facilities such as solar and wind).

### 8.1 Program Managers

Greg Siekaniec, Assistant Director, National Wildlife Refuge System, 202-208-5333, and Gary Frazer, Assistant Director, Fisheries and Habitat Conservation, 202-208-6394

### 8.2 Objectives

The objectives of implementing energy conservation measures and renewable energy systems are to meet mandated energy and water reduction goals while reducing operational costs at Service field stations and facilities.

Just as important, each unit of energy such as kilowatt-hours of electricity or gallons of fuel oil saved will directly reduce the Service’s carbon footprint and its equivalent greenhouse gas emissions.

### 8.3 Major Activities

The Service has grouped its energy efficiency retrofit projects into the following three tiers:

- Tier 1 - Energy Conservation (addressed in Sections 3,5,6, and 7 of this Plan)
- Tier 2 – Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) and Process Energy (i.e., energy consumed by pumps, motors, etc.) Reduction (addressed in Sections 3,5,6, and 7 of this Plan)
- Tier 3 - Renewable Energy

The Service is addressing all Tier 1 and Tier 2 energy efficiency retrofit projects under the Deferred Maintenance category of Recovery Act projects. Within Tier 3, the Service will use Recovery Act funds to perform the following types of activities:



*Electrical Renewable Energy:*

- Installing solar photovoltaic (PV) power arrays
- Installing wind energy systems (e.g., small propeller-type or vertical helix-type wind turbines)
- Investigating the feasibility of and/or installing microhydroturbines at National Fish Hatcheries

*Thermal Renewable Energy:*

- Installing or repairing solar hot water systems
- Replacing HVAC systems with geothermal (ground-source) heat pumps

### 8.4 Project Selection Criteria

The Service selected all Recovery Act energy efficiency retrofit projects from its merit-based 5-Year Deferred Maintenance or Construction Plans based on their ability to address Recovery Act goals and the Service’s mission needs. A description of the Service’s Recovery Act project selection criteria and process can be found in Section 2.4 of this Plan.

### 8.5 Financial Award Characteristics

Type of Award	# of Energy Efficiency Retrofit Projects	\$ Value of Energy Efficiency Retrofits Projects	Targeted Type of Recipients	Award Selection Criteria
Contracts	27	\$8,382,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A&amp;E firms</li> <li>• GSA vendors</li> </ul>	Methods available: open market competition; orders using competed Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ); competed GSA schedule order and other. Criteria for evaluation will be based on statement of work, successful record of past performance, and indicated ability to meet cost and schedule milestones.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>\$8,382,000</b>		

*Table 8.5a – Characteristics of Energy Efficiency Retrofit Awards*

### 8.6 Performance Measures

The Fish and Wildlife Service has developed performance measures to monitor the impact of its Recovery Act investments on mission and programmatic goals and objectives. These performance measures can be found on Recovery.Gov.



## 8.7 Project Milestones and Completion Forecast

Energy Efficiency Retrofit Project Category	Category Description	Funding Amount	# of Projects
Tier 3	Renewable Energy	\$8,382,000	27
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$8,382,000</b>	<b>27</b>

*Table 8.7a – Categories of Energy Efficiency Retrofit Projects*

Quarter	# of Tier 3 Projects Completed	# of Energy Efficiency Retrofit Projects Completed Per Quarter	Cumulative % of Energy Efficiency Retrofit Projects Completed
FY 2009 Q4	1	1	4%
FY 2010 Q1	1	1	7%
FY 2010 Q2	0	0	7%
FY 2010 Q3	5	5	26%
FY 2010 Q4	6	6	48%
FY 2011 Q1	6	6	70%
FY 2011 Q2	6	6	93%
FY 2011 Q3	2	2	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	

*Table 8.7b - Energy Efficiency Retrofit Project Completion Forecast by Category*

The project completion estimates in Table 8.7b are based on the assumption that the Service’s list of Recovery Act projects will be approved and funds released to the Service no later than May 1, 2009. Estimates will be revised on a day-for-day basis based on the actual approval date.

### 8.7.1 Energy Efficiency Retrofit Project Milestones

Project Milestones	Average Length to Complete from Project Initiation
Planning and Design	3 months
Contract Award / Obligation of Funds	5 months
Project Completion	15 months

*Table 8.7.1a – Milestones for all Categories of Energy Efficiency Retrofit Projects*

The milestones presented in Table 8.7.1a are averages for Recovery Act energy efficiency retrofit projects. Project durations and milestones have been expedited to help contribute as quickly as possible to the Recovery Act goals of job creation and economic stabilization. The milestone that most significantly influences job creation is contract award (i.e., when money is obligated and hiring decisions are made).



## **8.8 Cost Implications**

The Service anticipates achieving cost savings from energy efficiency retrofit projects, especially in regions with high electricity costs such as remote National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska. Energy efficiency retrofit projects will all be located on-site at Service field stations and will help reduce the Service's carbon footprint. Reduction in energy intensity and increased use of renewable energy will be used as performance measures and both have cost saving implications.

A preliminary assessment of Recovery Act projects indicates the Service will achieve an estimated annual energy savings of nearly 22.5 million kilowatt hours (76.77 billion BTU) and an annual operational savings of \$2.9 million. Approximately 1.5 million kilowatt hours (5.1 billion BTU) and \$196,000 of the savings will be attributable to energy efficiency retrofit projects. These savings are a conservative estimate and are likely to change as Recovery Act projects are adjusted over the next eighteen months.

To estimate Recovery Act energy savings, the Service segregated energy-related projects into three tiers (refer to Section 9.2.1 of this Plan for a detailed description of each tier). Equivalent kilowatts were computed based on a conversion of \$17,000, \$15,000 and \$10,000 for each tier of projects (i.e., Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3). Kilowatts saved were converted to kilowatt hours using a conversion factor of 1,800. Annual energy savings were converted based on \$0.13 per kilowatt hour.





## 9.0 Crosscutting Analysis

### 9.1 Impact of Recovery Act Funding on the Service's 5-Year Plans

#### 9.1.1 Construction

Current 5-Year Plan		5-Year Plan Projects Funded by Recovery Act		Recovery Act Projects Not on 5-Year Plan			
# of Projects on 5-Year Plan	\$ Value of Projects on 5-Year Plan	# of Recovery Act Projects Selected from 5-Year Plan	\$ Value of Recovery Projects Selected from 5-year Plan	# of Recovery Act Projects Not on 5-Year Plan	\$ Value of Projects Not on 5-Year Plan	# of Recovery Act Projects that Meet Criteria for Inclusion on 5-Year Plan	\$ Value of Projects
190	\$347,141,000	69	\$77,503,000	0	\$0	N/A	N/A

*Table 9.1.1a - Recovery Act Construction Projects Selected from the Service's 5-Year Construction Plan*

The Recovery Act funded projects in this category include Capital Improvement projects funded under both the Resource Management and Construction appropriations. Projects were prioritized for Recovery Act funding by the Service Regions based on their ability to compete and award contracts within the required Recovery Act timeframes.

#### 9.1.2 Deferred Maintenance

Current 5-Year Plan		5-Year Plan Projects Funded by Recovery Act		Recovery Act Projects Not on 5-Year Plan			
# of Projects on 5-Year Plan	\$ Value of Projects on 5-Year Plan	# of Recovery Act Projects Selected From 5-Year Plan	\$ Value of Recovery Projects Selected From 5-Year Plan	# of Recovery Act Projects Not on 5-Year Plan	\$ Value of Projects Not on 5-Year Plan	# of Recovery Act Projects that Meet Criteria for Inclusion on 5-Year Plan	\$ Value of Projects
1,224	\$258,245,200	597	\$148,430,000	0	\$0	N/A	N/A

*Table 9.1.2a - Recovery Act Deferred Maintenance Projects Selected from the Service's 5-Year DM Plan*

Projects were prioritized for Recovery Act funding by the Service Regions based on their ability to compete and award contracts within the required Recovery Act timeframes.



## 9.2 Crosscutting Initiatives

### 9.2.1 Energy Efficiency Retrofits

Renewable energy and energy efficiency projects implement life-cycle cost effective energy conservation measures, process energy reduction strategies, and water conservation technologies, and install renewable energy systems. These projects will address mandated energy and water reduction goals while reducing operational costs at Service field stations and facilities. The Service has segregated these projects into three tiers: Tier 1 - energy conservation measures; Tier 2A - heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) systems; Tier 2B - process energy reduction measures; Tier 3 - renewable energy systems.

**Tier 1 energy efficiency/green building initiatives** include projects that will: retrofit/replace lights and install energy-efficient lighting systems (T-8 lamps and electronic ballasts); increase insulation; install programmable thermostats; weatherize; replace windows; and replace appliances with ENERGY STAR<sup>®</sup> appliances and energy efficient freezers. Projects may include conducting energy audits, sub-metering of facilities, and installation of electric meters. Water conservation practices in buildings and landscaping are also included in the Tier 1 category such as installing: low-flow faucets, showerheads, and fixtures; low-flush toilets and waterless urinals; systems for gray water reclamation and recycling; rain gardens; irrigation control systems; water retention or rainwater catchment basins; and xeriscaping (i.e., landscaping in ways that reduce or eliminate the need for supplemental irrigation). Xeriscaping is promoted in areas that do not have easily accessible supplies of fresh water.

**Tier 2 energy efficiency/green building initiatives** reduce more energy and are separated into two subgroups:

- Tier 2A – Heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. Tier 2A energy efficiency projects include retrofitting energy-inefficient HVAC systems and controls, or installing new or replacement ENERGY STAR<sup>®</sup> HVAC systems and water heaters.
- Tier 2B – Process energy reduction measures. Tier 2B energy efficiency projects include replacing inefficient electric panels, pumps, motors, and drives; and rehabilitation of energy-intensive systems, predominantly at National Fish Hatcheries (e.g., U/V disinfection).

**Tier 3 projects** maximize use of renewable energy. Renewable projects produce electrical energy and thermal energy, which are counted differently toward meeting mandated renewable energy reduction goals. Electrical energy renewable projects include installation of solar photovoltaic (PV) power arrays, wind energy systems such as small propeller-type or vertical helix-type wind turbines, and microhydroturbines at National Fish Hatcheries. Thermal renewable energy projects include installation or repair of solar hot water systems, and installation of geothermal (ground-source) heat pumps. These projects will be designed to minimize the Service's carbon footprint and may result in zero-energy buildings.

As reflected in Table 9.2.1a, the Service's Recovery Act project list contains a total of 210 projects that will directly reduce the energy consumption of Service facilities. Of note, nine projects are included at the National Conservation Training Center (NCTC) that will: enable the



Service to obtain its first Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Existing Building (LEED EB) certification. Obtaining this certification would document via an independent, third-party evaluation that the Service’s largest and most complicated facility is constructed and managed as a “green” facility. Furthermore, the lessons learned in obtaining the LEED EB certification will be distributed throughout the Service’s facility design and management community serving as a learning tool on future design projects, as well as the application of green management practices. Proposed NCTC projects include updating inefficient HVAC systems; as well as installing water-efficient fixtures, low-flow toilets, solar water heating in the campus laundry, exterior solar-powered lighting, occupancy sensors, and ENERGY STAR® kitchen equipment.

Other projects of note include construction of eleven Headquarters/Administrative Visitor Buildings or Visitor Contact Stations. Not only will these new buildings provide a much needed base of operations for staff and volunteers, and an orientation point for visitors, from an energy perspective, all will be sustainable, achieve at least a rating of “Certified” in accordance with the LEED building rating system, and be more than 30% more energy efficient than relevant code (ANSI/ASHRAE/IESNA Standard 90.1-2004) requires, in accordance with Section 109 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Types of Renewable and Efficient Energy Technology Projects	Funding Amount	# of Projects
<b>Energy Efficiency/Green Buildings</b>		
Tier 1 – Energy Conservation Measures	\$21,071,000	69
Tier 2 – HVAC and Process Energy Reduction	\$13,667,000	60
<b>Use of Renewable Energy Sources</b>		
Tier 3 – Renewable Energy	\$103,906,000	81
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$136,644,000</b>	<b>210</b>

*Table 9.2.1a – Types of Energy Efficient Retrofits Projects*

### 9.2.2 Engage America’s Youth

Consistent with Title VII, Section 702 of the Recovery Act the Service intends to “utilize, where practicable, the Public Lands Corps, Youth Conservation Corps, Student Conservation Association, Job Corps and other related partnerships with Federal, State, local, tribal or other non-profit groups that serve young adults.” The Service will provide approximately 500 high school and college age youth with short-term employment opportunities supporting habitat restoration and other work on National Wildlife Refuges.

Types of Youth Outreach Projects	Funding Amount	# of Projects
Temporary employment of high school and college age youth	\$5,000,000	34
Other projects with potential youth involvement	\$4,400,000	13
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$9,400,000</b>	<b>47</b>

*Table 9.2.2a - Types of Youth Employment Projects*



## 10.0 Other Related Costs

### 10.1 Administrative Costs

The Recovery Act provides an unprecedented opportunity for the Service to quickly address numerous construction, deferred maintenance, and habitat priorities while supporting the creation of jobs and helping to stimulate the economy. In addition to quickly and efficiently carrying out the work associated with this one-time funding increase, the Service's administrative staff must continue to support the Service's normal, recurring contracting, financial management, reporting and engineering workload. Consistent with the Service's organizational structure and well established business practices, the bulk of the Recovery Act project work will be executed at the Regional level. To ensure Recovery Act goals are achieved, the Service must enhance its administrative support capabilities in the following key areas:

- Contracting support
- Project tracking / accounting / internal control
- Reporting / communication
- Project management

The report language accompanying the Recovery Act legislation provides that no more than five percent of the Service's appropriated Recovery Act funding (i.e., \$14 million) should be used for related administration costs. Agencies are to "balance carefully the goal of proper management and fiscal prudence when setting funding levels for administrative support." Based on the Service's initial assessment of increased administrative workload and costs necessary to successfully implement the Recovery Act, the Service anticipates using the full five percent to pay for incremental expenses incurred in support of Recovery Act implementation. No more than two percent will be used in the Washington Metro area to ensure a majority of the funds are provided to the regions and program offices where most of the monitoring and reporting activities will take place.

Examples of administrative costs that will be paid for using Recovery Act funds include:

- Term employees and contractors hired to provide acquisition, communications, budget, and/or financial management support for Recovery Act projects
- Salaries of existing Service staff reassigned to work exclusively to provide acquisition, communications, budget, and/or financial management support for Recovery Act projects

Examples of administrative costs that will not be paid for using Recovery Act funds include:

- Minor office supplies
- Travel to meetings where the Recovery Act is discussed, but is not the primary topic
- Existing space or utility costs that are being used by current staff and/or temporary Recovery Act support staff



Actual expenditures will be closely monitored and tracked. At the end of fiscal year 2009, an assessment will be completed by the Washington Office to determine if the full five percent will be needed. If it is not, the balance will be allocated to complete additional projects from the Service’s approved list.

Budget Account	Appropriation Amount	Administrative Cost Limitation
Resource Management, Recovery Act	\$165,000,000	\$8,250,000
Construction, Recovery Act	\$115,000,000	\$5,750,000
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$280,000,000</b>	<b>\$14,000,000</b>

*Table 10.1a – Breakdown of Funding Reserved for Administrative Costs*

In terms of controls, the Service is preparing detailed internal guidance on the proper use of administrative funds and has established separate accounts and fund controls within its accounting system, the Federal Financial System (FFS), to ensure Recovery Act administrative funds are properly allocated. In addition, the Service will perform quality control reviews of costs to ensure compliance with Recovery Act and Department of the Interior guidance.

The following sections provide a more detailed description of how the Service intends to spend Recovery Act administrative related funding:

### **10.1.1 Contracting Support**

A preliminary analysis of the expected numbers and types of projects to be funded under the Recovery Act shows the Service will need to hire (contract for) on a temporary basis up to 34 contract specialists to support the additional workload. The Service is mindful of the conference report’s guidance that “agencies limit the permanent expansion of their workforces and utilize temporary, term or contract personnel as much as possible.” These contract specialists will work primarily in the Regional Offices under the guidance of a senior FWS contracting officer. The Service anticipates these positions will be needed for two years with approximately one third of them being needed part way into the third year. Based on the going rate for experienced contract specialists, this may cost up to \$10 million Service-wide.

### **10.1.2 Project Tracking/Accounting**

The Administration’s Recovery Act implementation guidance establishes a high expectation for accurate project tracking and accountability. The Service expects a significant increase in the workload associated with project accounting set up, payment approvals/ processing, property accounting, and budget tracking. The period of increased workload will span at least two years and cannot be absorbed by existing administrative staff. Each Region will need to contract for or hire, on a temporary basis, an additional budget analyst. The estimated cost is approximately \$1-1.5 million Service-wide.



### **10.1.3 Reporting/Communication**

The Service must implement communications requirements of the Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding. This effort will require a great deal of communications support including coordinating with the Department of the Interior, developing and distributing press releases, engaging Congressional members in events, planning media events to highlight projects, developing and refreshing web sites with the latest information about funding and project development, producing videos for web use, taking and uploading photos on bureau and Department websites, as well as on Recovery.gov and reporting communications efforts on a regular basis to the Department, Office of Management and Budget, and Congress. The Department of the Interior is also requiring the Service to establish an email address to respond to questions and concerns from the public. This increased workload will impact all levels of the Service, particularly the Regions and field where projects are expected to be funded.

In order to successfully accomplish this increased work, additional funding has been set aside to support the Recovery and Reinvestment Act implementation effort.

### **10.1.4 Project Management**

Managing the planning, design and construction oversight for Service construction and deferred maintenance projects is primarily the responsibility of the Regional Engineering Offices. To support what will be an approximate doubling of their normal workload, the Service plans to rely heavily on the support of Architectural and Engineering (A&E) firms already under contract. Temporary engineering staff may also be hired on a case by case basis. Costs associated with project management will be charged directly to the projects being supported. This is consistent with current practices and accounting standards.