DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

PART ASSESSMENTS[1]

[1] For each program that has been assessed using the PART, this document contains details of the most recent assessment. These details are presented in their original form; some programs have revised performance targets and developed or replaced performance measures since the original assessment. The PART summaries published with the 2006 Budget (in February 2005) provide current information on follow-up to recommendations and other updates.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Rating	Page
Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation	Results Not Demonstrated	3
DOI Wildland Fire Management	Results Not Demonstrated	15
Energy and Minerals Management	Adequate	31
Energy Resource Assessments	Moderately Effective	39
Federal Regulatory and Abandonded Land Mine Program	Results Not Demonstrated	55
Geologic Hazard Assessments	Moderately Effective	66
Habitat Restoration Activities	Moderately Effective	87
Indian 477 --Job Placement and Training	Moderately Effective	102
Indian Forestry Program	Adequate	111
Indian Law Enforcement	Results Not Demonstrated	119
Indian Post Secondary Education -- Tribal Colleges	Adequate	128
Indian Roads -- Operation and Maintenance	Results Not Demonstrated	138
Indian School Construction	Results Not Demonstrated	145
Indian School Operations	Adequate	154
Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants	Results Not Demonstrated	164
Migratory Bird Program	Results Not Demonstrated	169
Mineral Resource Assessments	Moderately Effective	185
Minerals Revenue Management	Results Not Demonstrated	199
National Fish Hatchery System	Moderately Effective	213
National Historic Preservation Programs	Moderately Effective	230
National Mapping	Effective	242
National Park Service Cultural Resource Stewardship	Adequate	263
National Park Service Facility Management	Adequate	273
National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship	Moderately Effective	283
National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance	Results Not Demonstrated	295
Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Studies	Moderately Effective	307
Partners for Fish and Wildlife	Adequate	326
Project Planning and Construction	Results Not Demonstrated	339
Realty and Ownership Management	Adequate	351
Reclamation Hydropower	Effective	363
Recreation and Concessions	Adequate	375
Recreation Management	Adequate	391
Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities	Results Not Demonstrated	400
Rural Water Supply Projects	Results Not Demonstrated	425
Science & Technology Program (S&T)	Effective	437
Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act	Results Not Demonstrated	459
Title XVI Water Reuse and Recycling	Moderately Effective	466
Tribal Courts	Results Not Demonstrated	478
Tribal Land Consolidation	Moderately Effective	484
Water Information Collection and Dissemination	Moderately Effective	490
Water Resources Research	Moderately Effective	508

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The AML program purpose is to provide a safer and cleaner environment by reclaiming and restoring as much land and water as possible that was degraded by pre 1977 coal mining operations. The program is implemented through cooperative partnerships between Interior's Office of Surface Mining (OSM) and participating States and Indian tribes -- 26 States and three Indian Tribes.	1) The Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1997 (SMCRA), P.L. 95-87, 30 U.S.C. 1231 & 30 U.S.C. 1333, establish the program. The primary program purpose is to reclaim eligible abandoned coal mine sites by removing health, safety, general welfare, and environmental hazards. 2) OSM 's Strategic Plan states that OSM's primary goal is to protect society and the environment from the adverse effects of past coal mining operations. 3) The National Association of Abandoned Mine Land Programs (representing the 26 States and Indian Tribes with approved AML programs and OSM), established in 1995, promulgated a "Declaration of Shared Commitment". This declaration describes the partnership roles of the Federal/State/Tribal governments in caring out the program.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	SMCRA established a specific program and a dedicated funding source (tonnage based reclamation fee assessed on current coal production) to address the need. Over $3 billion in unreclaimed coal-related health and safety hazards remain to be addressed by the program. In addition, there are general welfare, environmental, and non-coal problems that exist. While over half of the reclamation fees are paid by western coal mine operators, the preponderance (80%) of the unreclaimed coal-related heath and safety hazards are located in the Appalachian Region -- States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Virginia, and Ohio.	1) SMCRA, together with its accompanying legislative history, documents the need to reclaim abandoned coal mine lands. 2) OSM's Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System (AMLIS) contains information (cost, problem type, units, location, etc.) for the over 4,600 known listed sites containing remaining coal-related health and safety hazards. 3) Resolutions from the National Governor's Association and Western Governor's Association express the need to continue reclaiming abandoned coal mine hazards that threaten the citizens of their States.	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	SMCRA established a funding source and formula grants process to provide eligible States and Indian tribes the resources needed to reclaim impacts from abandoned coal mine lands where no responsible party can be found. For the most part, States and Tribes do not supplement their OSM grant to reclaim abandoned coal mine sites.	SMCRA established the basic framework of the AML Program - State/Tribe ability to assume reclamation primacy following the approval by the Secretary of the Interior of the individual reclamation program tailored to specific needs of the State/Tribe within the nationally mandated requirements. This State/Tribe lead concept helps assure that the AML program as a whole has a significant impact in addressing the problems and needs.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	Prior to passage of SMCRA few States had an abandoned mine program, and these were typically under funded. Currently, there is no other federal program that earmarks funds for the reclamation of abandoned coal mine sites, and for the most part, states rely on the program to address health and safety needs. In addition, a nationwide reclamation fee collection program mitigates competitive disadvantages that might occur if only selected States tried to raise adequate funds to address the remaining abandoned mine hazards within their borders. A nationwide program also encourages the exchange of reclamation expertise and provides cross-training opportunities.	This is evidenced by the Congressional findings concerning the widespread existence of abandoned mine health and safety hazards on 1.5 million acres of land and 11,500 miles of streams, and the need for a nationwide program to address these hazards that led to the enactment of SMCRA. More recently, the 5/17/00 testimony on behalf of the Interstate Mining Compact Commission before the House Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources made clear the unique contributions achieved through this cooperative federalism program. At Congressional hearings, the cooperative nature of the program also is highlighted. In addition, OSM provides its partners with extensive and well received technical training. The training program itself is collaborative, with almost 50% of the instructors being State/Tribal employees.	20%	0.2
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	No	SMCRA has the goal to reclaim all abandoned coal mine sites using fees on current coal production to pay for reclamation. The underlying authorizing legislation requires one-half of the fees collected within a state to be return to the state for restoration. If a state has restored its entire abandoned coal mine land the state can use its grant for other purposes. Many states have restored all of their abandoned coal mine sites and are using their grants for other purposes. Two-thirds of abandoned sites remain to be reclaimed. It has taken OSM, working with the states, 25 years to restore only one-third of the sites. As the program is authorized, it will take another 50 years to reach its goal, a length of time that is too long.	Testimony of States/Tribes and citizen organizations at Congressional appropriations hearings consistently address the adequacy of funding. As evidenced by appropriations bills introduced in the House and Senate, many consider the annual discretionary appropriation process to be less than optimum as a mechanism for providing the collected reclamation fees to address the reclamation problems and needs.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**80%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)						
	Questions	**Ans.**	**Explanation**	**Evidence/Data**	**Weighting**	**Weighted Score**
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	Yes	The primary goal of the Abandoned Mine Land (AML) Program is the elimination of health and safety hazards brought about by past coal mining practices. The long term goal is to reclaim an additional 40,000 acres from the baseline fiscal year of FY 1998 by the end of FY 2005. This goal is accomplished through grants to twenty three states and three Indian tribes. OSM has as a secondary long term goal to improve the timely processing of grants. *[Note: When referring to acres in terms of the strategic plan, OSM is referred to a standardized acre. Because this program deals with many types of hazards (i. e. open shafts, mine fires, land slides etc,) OSM in collaboration with the States and Indian tribes developed a formula which converts each of these types of problems into standardized acres.]*	1) OSM's Annual Report for FY 2001; 2) OSM's Strategic Plan for FY 2000 - FY 2005: and 3) the draft Department of the Interior Strategic Plan. The Department's draft plan includes the AML program under two areas -- Resources Protection under "Improve the health of watersheds and landscapes" and Serving Communities under "Protect lives and property."	14%	0.1
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	Yes	OSM measures AML progress in terms of acres reclaimed on an annual basis. This goal is commensurate with the budget request, but keeps in mind the overall 40,000 acres long-term goal.	1) OSM's Annual Report for FY 2001; 2) OSM's Strategic Plan for FY 2000 - FY 2005; and 3) the draft Department of the Interior Strategic Plan.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	Yes	OSM's policy require that grantees and OSM field representatives meet at least annually to discuss restoration planning for upcoming years. These meetings, which are intended to focus on program effectiveness as opposed to process, provide a forum for both OSM and the States and Tribes to evaluate how the individual program can contribute to achieving the overall program goals. They also allow OSM and its partners to decide what needs to be done in the upcoming year to enhance meeting the overall program goals. As mutually reached state and Tribal plans for the upcoming year are developed, they are finalized in a Performance Agreement between the state/Tribe and OSM. These meetings are documented in the OSM prepared Annual Report specific to each State or Tribe. These reports are available on the OSM Website.	1) OSM's Directive AML-22, "Evaluation of State and Tribal Abandoned Mine Land Programs"; and 2) Individual State and Tribal Annual Reports.	14%	0.1
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	While OSM's mission of reclaiming historic mining related problems is unique, OSM and its grantees do regularly collaborate with Federal and State agencies that have responsibility for environmental quality, historic preservation, mine safety and construction management where AML reclamation projects overlap.	1) Past and ongoing cooperative projects between the States and other Federal agencies; and 2) Appalachian Clean Streams Program projects completed in partnership with EPA, Corps or Engineers or other agencies.	14%	0.1
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	No	Audits have been conducted by the Inspector General's office and the General Accounting Office, but these tend to focus on process rather than performance. However, OSM has done an internal evaluation of the program in anticipation of the expiration of the fee collection authority. This study, while not independent, does focus on the program's performance over the past 25 years.		14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	Yes	The primary current Strategic Plan goal for the AML Program is acres of coal-related health and safety abandoned mine land acres reclaimed. The "acres reclaimed" measure is a statistical conversion of the various measurement units (e.g., miles, acres, feet, gallons, etc.) that are associated with the 30 problem types (e.g., highwalls, open shafts, mine fires, etc,) that are part of the AML inventory. As part of the budget formulation process, a calculation is made as to the estimated acres that can be reclaimed at a given level of funding. This information is used in the budget and performance plan.	In determining the program budget for a given year, a calculation is performed to determine the estimated amount of reclamation that will occur as a result of a particular grant funding level. By examining different funding levels, policy makers can estimate the on-the-ground reclamation impact of their decisions	14%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	In fiscal 2002, The Department of the Interior (DOI) began a major effort to revamp its strategic planning processes and measures. OSM staff participated in focus group meetings with key DOI customer and stakeholder groups. Regular discussions with internal and external program stakeholders helps to ensure that strategic planning takes into account the concerns and goals of the various involved groups.	In developing the draft DOI Strategic Plan, internal OSM teams examined the current strategic plan and made changes to fit into the new plan. In addition, teams comprised of OSM staff and State/Tribal partners in the regulatory and reclamation programs were formed and workshops are being held. These workshops will result in developing clear measurable objectives in accordance with the draft DOI plan and with outcome measures for use by OSM/States/Tribes.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**86%**

Section III: Program Management (Yes, No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	Yes	Grantees regularly report on the status of their programs through the grant reporting process and provide input into the Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System (AMLIS) prior to commencing a project and upon completion of a project. Information gathered is used to determine the status of the program for funding purposes.	1) AMLIS input as required by OSM Directive AML-1, Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System.; and 2) Grant Annual Performance and Financial Reports provide information on the status and progress of the annual 3-year grant on a project-by-project basis.	16%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, sub grantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	Yes	OSM and its grantees, in a partnership effort, determine the performance goals in a published Annual Performance Agreement. Oversight and on-site reviews are conducted to ensure that the goals are being met. Consequences of not meeting goals could include not reobligating funds to the State after the initial grant period has expired.	1) Annual Performance Agreements; 2) Division Chief Performance Standards; 3) A-133 audits; and 4) Ad hoc reviews of State and tribal records conducted by the field grants and program staff.	12%	0.1
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Historically, the AML program has had problems getting States and Tribes to obligate grants. However, for Fiscal Year 2002 OSM has finally reduced grants to states and tribes unobligated balances significantly from about $31 million in Fiscal Year 2001 and earlier to $18 million in Fiscal Year 2002. In addition, OSM has made strides to reduce grant recoveries. OSM's efforts ensure that states and tribes are using the funds provided to meet the goals of the AML program.	Department's apportionment and reapportionment schedules (132s and 133s)	12%	0.1
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	N/A	The AML Grant Program is a formula grant program, and therefore incentives are not applicable. However, most grantees have sophisticated, well-established systems to measure and achieve efficiencies. OSM does not mandate specific performance goals or efficiency or productivity targets.		0%	
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Although DOI complies with managerial cost accounting standards, it does not yet have a financial management system that fully allocates program costs and associates those costs with specific performance measures. This requirement might be met through Activity Based Costing (ABC), which DOI is adopting for each of its bureaus.		12%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	OSM's Division of Financial Management has received clean audit reports for the past 11 years and has established internal control procedures for proper and timely payments. Detection of erroneous payments is part of OSM's program management function carried out by grants specialists through on-site reviews.	OSM's annual financial audit results which are reprinted in OSM's Annual Report. According to OSM's Division of Financial Management, the erroneous payment rate is not tracked because this figure is insignificant. This has not been an OIG audit issue.	12%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	OSM's review of AML Programs was changed in 1995 to evaluate performance rather than process. OSM meets annually with each State or Tribal program to discuss areas of concern and enters into formal written agreements to address management concerns. OSM is one of the first Bureaus to begin adapting Activity Based Costing to identify management deficiencies.	1) Individual State and Tribal Annual Reports; and 2) Directive AML-22, "Evaluation of State and Tribal Abandoned Mine Land Programs"	12%	0.1
8 (B 1.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	The Annual Performance Agreement for each grantee is the basis of oversight. The Agreement includes on-site reviews, reviews of expenditures, and program and performance reviews. One to two reviews per grantee are conducted annually, focusing on internal controls and management of the program.	1) Grant Performance Reports; and 2) reviews conducted as agreed to in the Annual Performance Agreements.	12%	0.1
9 (B 2.)	*Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	Yes	OSM collects, compiles, and disseminates grantee performance information through the OSM Annual Report. This report is distributed in hard copy and is available on OSM's Website.	OSM's Annual Performance Report.	12%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**88%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	Large Extent	Since the program began in 1977, it has eliminated problems on over 214,000 acres of land and waters. These problems were the direct result of past coal mining practices. These problems include a myriad of types of hazards, including mine fires, landslides, and subsidence. A complete list of the problems that are encountered in the AML program, along with the reclamation accomplishments in each is attached. Additional health and safety problems caused by other types of mining were eliminated on over 18,000 acres.	1) Abandoned Mine Land inventory System; 2) OSM 's Annual Reports; and 3) OSM's Coal Fee study.	20%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Long-Term Goal I: Increase the number of acres reclaimed Target: Beginning in FY 1998, eliminate 40,000 acres of Abandoned Mine Land coal related hazards by the end of FY 2005. Actual Progress achieved toward goal: Over 40,000 acres have been reclaimed since the end of FY 1997. Except in the first year of our plan, we have consistently exceeded our goal. We are currently in the process of reevaluating these goals and in partnership with the programs, may develop either additional goals and measures, or revise upwards our current ones.					
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	Large Extent	Beginning in FY 1998, OSM set an annual goal of acres reclaimed under the program. In FY 1998, OSM reached 90% of the goal . Thereafter, we exceeded the goal by 48%, 50% and 44%. Given that the goal has been exceed, OSM needs to reassess its method of calculating or data collection before there is certainty that OSM is meeting its goals.	1) GPRA reports to the Department of the Interior; and 2) OSM's Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System. One reason that OSM exceeds its goal is that only when OSM implemented performance based goals, did states and tribes begin updating OSM's automated project data base on completed activities.	20%	0.1
	Key Goal I: To increase the numbers of acres of abandoned mine lands reclaimed. Performance Target: In FY 2001 (latest data available), the goal was to reclaim 8,600 acres. Actual Performance: In FY 2001, 13,808 acres were reclaimed.					
	Key Goal II: Increase the number of grants processed within 60 days of receipt. Performance Target: Improve each year over the prior year until 100% is reached Actual Performance: In FY 97, the rate was 92%. It was 90% in FY 98, 93% in FY99, and 100% in FY2000. OSM will continue to track this goal.					
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	Yes	The AML Enhancement Rule, implemented in 1999, leverages AML funds with outside sources by allowing project reclamation contractors to remove and sell the coal at the reclamation site. Thus far, states have completed 4 projects under this rule. The estimated cost of reclamation without the rule was over $1.5 million. With the rule, the cost to the programs was approximately $133,000. This is a savings of over 90%, freeing about $1.2 million to be spent on other projects. The Clean Streams portion of the program leverages Federal reclamation funding with state and private funding.	1) AMLIS.; 2) 64 Fed Reg 7470 (Feb12, 1999) "Abandoned Mine Land (AML) Reclamation, Enhancing AML Reclamation); and 3) Clean Streams Program guidelines.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	Yes	The Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service have programs to eliminate AML type problems. They are newer and smaller programs. A similar program within the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the Superfund. This program, over the years, has a high ratio of overhead to accomplishments when compared to the OSM program. The Superfund program may have higher administrative costs because of the type of hazardous wastes involved.	1) AMLIS; 2) OSM FY 2004 Budget; and 3) The National Center for Policy Analysis briefing paper "Superfund: History of Failure.	20%	0.2
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	No	While evaluations done on individual programs are favorable, national audits focusing on the overall effectiveness of the AML program have not been done.		20%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**67%**

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	86%	88%	67%	Demonstrated

Measure: Outcome measures under development, such as measuring reduction of health and safety problems of abandoned coal mine sites near communities

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Equivalent acres of abandoned coal mine land with health and safety problems remaining to be reclaimed.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
1999	119,900	118,051
2000	111,800	105,875
2001	103,200	92,067
2002	96,200	
2003		
2004		
2005		
2006		

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	86%	88%	67%	Demonstrated

Measure: Measure under development

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual

Measure Term: Annual

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: DOI Wildland Fire Management

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The 10-Year Comprehensive Fire Strategy has 4 goals. While clear, these goals are set out as co-equal and could benefit from being prioritized. Generally speaking, the agencies (DOI & USDA) put threats to human life and property as the highest priority. Firefighting and fuels reduction resources can be directed at two different purposes: (1) protecting homes and buildings and (2) protecting natural resources. In some areas, both purposes can be met with the same resources, but in other circumstances these two purposes may compete for limited resources. Determining the appropriate balance between these purposes can be subjective and complex. As a result, funds may not be targeted in the most cost-effective manner.	10-Year Comprehensive Strategy (August 2001); 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan (May 2002). The 1995 Federal Fire Policy and the 2001 update of that policy promote the re-establishment of fire adapted ecosystems to reduce large fires and protect communities. The 10-Year Strategy established 4 goals: (1) Improve Fire Prevention and Suppression; (2) Reduce Hazardous Fuels; (3) Restore Fire-Adapted Ecosystems; and (4) Promote Community Assistance.	25%	0.3
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Wildfires are normal events in the life of a forest and other wildlands, however, they can inflict damage to lives, property, and, in some cases, natural resources when they burn out of control. The DOI/USDA wildland firefighting program provides skilled firefighters, specialized equipment, and rapid response capability to respond to wildland fires in a way that many states and localities would be incapable of themselves. This capability is not matched by any other firefighting organization. Fire management on federal lands also falls within the land-management missions of the federal firefighting agencies. Without the DOI wildland fire management program, many communities would be unequipped to protect their own lands and property.	Reciprocal Fire Protection Agreement Act of 1955 Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 Disaster Relief Act of 1974 National Indian Forest Resources Management Act of 1990 43 USC 1469 (authorizes DOI Secretary to perform work due to emergencies)	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	The intent of the program is to protect homes and communities from fire while, as nearly as possible, allowing fire to function in its natural ecological role. The DOI fire program consists of six major activities, each addressing a different aspect of the fire problem. The Interior bureaus fund wildland fire programs on over 500 million acres of public lands and leverage funds by entering into cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies and State and local governments to share resources and protection responsibilities. The federal contribution and impact of the program are significant, but little evidence exists regarding the long-term impact of the current program on fire management goals. The impact of changes in funding in addressing the fire problem may depend on which aspects of the program are affected. Due to the competing goals of the program, wholesale increases or decreases are unlikely to significantly impact goal achievement, but targeted changes may help achieve desired results.	FY 2003 BLM Budget Justifications (Wildland Fire Management); National Fire Plan ("A Report to the President in Response to the Wildfires of 2000, September 8, 2000") The six components of the fire program include: Preparedness – representing the readiness to respond to wildland fires; Suppression – representing the response to wildland fire ignitions; Burned Area Rehabilitation – representing the efforts to minimize site degradation as a result of fires; Hazardous Fuels Management – representing the treatment of wildland fuels to reduce the fire hazard should an ignition occur; Wildland Urban Interface Fuels – representing the treatment of fuels adjacent to the wildland urban interface to reduce the potential for wildland fire to threaten communities; and Rural Fire Assistance – representing assistance, primarily in the form of grants, to rural and volunteer fire departments that may provide assistance in responding to wildland fires.	20%	0.2
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	As part of its land management responsibilities, each bureau is responsible for firefighting on the lands it manages. There are no other programs designed to accomplish this mission on DOI lands. The DOI bureaus work cooperatively with the Forest Service and States to leverage funds and extend the impact of the program. These programs are complimentary and not redundant. Under these arrangements, fire protection responsibilities are exchanged and scarce resources are shared. Some aspects of fire management (e.g., fuels treatments) may not be coordinated as well as possible among bureaus and with other related programs (e.g., BLM restoration programs), but they are not duplicative of one another, and the agency is actively working to improve coordination to better utilize its resources.	2001 Federal Wildland Fire Policy; National Fire Plan ("A Report to the President in Response to the Wildfires of 2000, September 8, 2000"); Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 2002; Federal Wildland Fire Leadership Council Charter	25%	0.3

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	The current mechanism of direct federal management is consistent with each bureau's statutory responsibilities to manage the land under its control. The bureaus have agreements to share both suppression and fuels personnel and equipment as needed to efficiently accomplish program goals. They utilize seasonal employees, contract for aircraft, hire emergency firefighters, and utilize partnerships with state and local governments, the military, and foreign nations to provide wildland firefighting on the federal lands. Highly mobile national resources such as hotshot crews, smokejumpers, helicopters, and airtankers are used where necessary to extend local or regional firefighting capabilities.	National Interagency Mobilization Guide (March 2002); Interagency fire management agreements between BLM, BIA, NPS, FWS, USFS, state, local, and foreign governments.	10%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**100%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning		**(Yes,No, N/A)**				
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	Yes	The 10-Year Implementation Plan defines program outcomes and performance measures to achieve the following four goals: (1) Improve fire prevention and suppression; (2) Reduce hazardous fuels; (3) Restore fire-adapted ecosystems; and (4) Promote community assistance.	10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan; Draft DOI strategic plan goals and measures. The 10-Year Implementation Plan includes the following four major goals: (1) Improve fire prevention and suppression so that losses of life are eliminated, and firefighter injuries and damage to communities and the environment from severe, unplanned and unwanted wildland fire are reduced. (7 measures) (2) Reduce hazardous fuels...to reduce the risk of unplanned and unwanted wildland fire to communities and to the environment. (3 measures) (3) Restore fire-adapted ecosystems so that ecosystems are restored, rehabilitated and maintained...in a manner that will provide sustainable environmental, social, and economic benefits. (3 measures) (4) Promote community assistance so that communities at risk have increased capacity to prevent losses from wildland fire and the potential to seek economic opportunities resulting from treatments and services. (5 measures)	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	No	DOI is in the process of revising its Departmental Strategic Plan and, while the Department has developed performance measures under the 10-Year Implementation Plan, it has not yet finished development of long-term or annual performance goals with quantifiable, discrete targets and baseline data. In addition, some performance measures are vague and in need of greater definition.	10-Year Implementation Plan; Draft DOI Strategic Plan measures. Performance measures are linked to each of the four 10-Year Strategy goals and include monitoring provisions. There are some terms that are difficult to define at the macro-level (e.g., defining the wildland urban interface, communities-at-risk, the appropriate size of buffers to protect a community, or priority watershed) and which will need additional clarification.	14%	0.0
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	No	As DOI received a *No* on Question 2 of this section, it is difficult to make the case that all partners are able to support program planning efforts by committing to the goals of the program. Contractors are required to report on performance (e.g., fuels reduction projects), and grants are monitored to ensure that the grantee (e.g., a local firefighting unit) uses the funds as specified. However, taking a broader view of the wildland fire problem, partners include state, local, and private partners responsible for fuels reduction work on adjacent private or state lands. Along with the Forest Service, DOI is working to improve reporting of performance, and some partners have committed to performance goals in the 10-Yr implementation plan, but much work remains to be done in actually collecting meaningful performance information for work done on state and private lands.	DOI reports on fuels reduction projects the same regardless of whether they are performed in-house or by contract. A new database reporting system now being implemented, "NFPORS" , will identify critical data for agency accountability in meeting performance targets. The database will also link fire assistance grants and information requirements. This is an area that will require close collaboration and monitoring. The program received a *No* on Question 2 of this section. Therefore, the program must receive a *No* answer to this question.	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	No	The DOI bureaus have a longstanding practice of coordinating with one another and with the Forest Service and State and local agencies in fire suppression efforts. Increasingly, this coordination is spilling over into other areas of the fire program, but much work remains in this regard, particularly in working with state and local collaborators. A recent GAO report indicated that DOI and the Forest Service have developed, or are developing, numerous strategies for reducing hazardous fuels that are not linked and that have different goals and objectives primarily because they have planned and managed their lands on an agency-by-agency basis for decades. NAPA also reports that better coordination is needed in program areas such as the production and implementation of cross-boundary, landscape-scale natural resource and fire management plans and community fire-hazard reduction programs. It is also unclear if or how DOI fuels and fire rehabilitation work is coordinated with other DOI or USDA work with the broad goal of land restoration.	Numerous GAO and NAPA reports and testimony, including: GAO Report 01-1022T, "The National Fire Plan: Federal Agencies Are Not Organized to Effectively and Efficiently Implement the Plan", July 31, 2001 GAO Report 02-158, “Wildland Fire Management: Improved Planning Will Help Agencies Better Identify Fire-Fighting Preparedness Needs”, March 2002. GAO Report 02-259, “Severe Wildland Fires: Leadership and Accountability Needed to Reduce Risks to Communities and Resources”, January 2002. NAPA "Wildfire Suppression: Strategies for Containing Costs", September 2002.	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	Yes	The National Fire Plan and Wildland Fire Management program have been under steady and rigorous evaluation since the Plan was implemented following the fires of 2000. A number of independent reviews are currently ongoing, but no regular process has been established. Numerous GAO and other independent evaluations have been fairly critical of various parts of the fire program for both DOI and USDA. However, most reviews thus far have not been truly "comprehensive". GAO also has several ongoing reviews covering (1) suppression, (2) fuels reduction, and (3) burned area rehabilitation and restoration.	Numerous GAO and NAPA reports and testimony, including: GAO Report 01-1022T, "The National Fire Plan: Federal Agencies Are Not Organized to Effectively and Efficiently Implement the Plan", July 31, 2001. GAO Report 02-158, “Wildland Fire Management: Improved Planning Will Help Agencies Better Identify Fire-Fighting Preparedness Needs”, March 2002. GAO Report 02-259, “Severe Wildland Fires: Leadership and Accountability Needed to Reduce Risks to Communities and Resources”, January 2002. NAPA, “Study of the Implementation of the Federal Wildland Fire Policy”, December 2000. NAPA, “Managing Wildland Fire, Enhancing Capacity to Implement the Federal Interagency Policy, December 2001. NAPA, "Wildfire Suppression: Strategies for Containing Costs", September 2002.	14%	0.1
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	Yes	The Wildland Fire Management budget structure was realigned in 2002 to correspond with the goals and work activities of the program in response to guidance from OMB and Congressional Appropriations Committees. The program budget is divided into the following categories: (1) preparedness, (2) suppression, (3) fuels reduction -- WUI vs. non-WUI, (4) burned area rehabilitation, and (5) rural fire assistance. Program goals are roughly aligned in the same manner.	For both previous measures and the new measures included in the 10-Year Implementation Plan, one or two measures is in place for each of the 5 budget line items.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	DOI is in the process of revising its strategic plan. The fire program goals and measures will be included in this integrated framework in two principal mission areas: Serving Communities (Protecting Lives, Resources and Property) and Resource Protection (Improving the Health of Watersheds and Landscapes). This approach reinforces the role of fire in the management of natural resources and is consistent with the principal outcome goals of the fire program: 1) protecting communities and 2) preserving, protecting and restoring ecosystems. However, there remains some cause for concern. At the moment, it appears that all of the 18 measures from the 10-Yr Implementation Plan will be included in the Department-Wide DOI Strategic Plan. With so many measures and no apparent priority among measures, it is unclear what measures managers and/or policy officials will choose to focus on or how effectively the agency will operate utilizing so many measures. The ultimate result of this effort is as yet unknown.	10-Year Strategy Implementation Plan; Draft fire measures for inclusion in the DOI Department Strategic Plan.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**57%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	No	DOI and USDA have been preparing financial and action plans each year under the national fire plan and have submitted an end-of-year accomplishment report for 2001. However, the plans appear to be primarily intended to meet Congressional reporting requirements; it is unclear whether the information in the plans is of sufficient detail to really be used to evaluate performance and manage the program. DOI is establishing a standard automated data collection system for reporting accomplishments. When complete, this information will serve as an interagency database for reporting program accomplishments. The system should reduce the potential for duplication and erroneous information reporting. The data will be used to correlate expenditures with losses. As more data becomes available, trends will be analyzed to validate that accomplishments at local, state and national levels are moving in the desired direction.	FY 2001 and FY 2002 DOI/USDA Action and Financial Plans	14%	0.0
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	Performance measurements do not appear to effect accountability at the program level, nor do they appear to inform budget discussions, though DOI has indicated this is changing. Currently, managers are evaluated based on defacto performance measures of controlling fires without the loss of life or property. The agencies readily admit that suppression cost-control is not a significant factor, especially when homes are involved.	Little or no discussion of performance in budget requests, promotions, or post-fire reviews. Also, no incentives now exist for States and localities to provide cost-share funds or to narrowly define the areas eligible for federal funding.	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Funds have generally been obligated in a timely manner. Bureaus regularly review obligation reports and provide analysis to the Department, and during the fire season, OMB receives obligation reports weekly. DOI experienced some temporary delays after receiving large increases in FY 2001, and it is unclear whether delays will persist for fuels reduction activities. However, the fuels program faces inherent difficulties in the use of prescribed fires due to unpredictable weather and smoke management issues. DOI has developed a plan to attempt to minimize delays of fuels reduction projects. All other parts of the program appear to be obligating funds in a timely manner. There is some concern that, due to the lack of a clear definition of the "wildland-urban interface", funds for fuels reduction projects intended to reduce risks to communities may be used for projects with questionable impacts on at-risk communities. However, there is little clear evidence of this and because the WUI definition is so broad, it difficult to pin the agency down on this.	Recent quarterly SF 133 reports on obligations; reviews as part of the yearly budget process; weekly fire obligation reports during fire season.	14%	0.1
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	No	The agency does not perform systematic or formal cost comparisons for positions within this program. It is unclear whether recent hiring in this program was based on meaningful private sector cost and performance comparisons. DOI has indicated that it intends to contract for 50% of WUI fuels projects in FY 2004. The 10-Year Strategy and Implementation Plan refer to "cost-effective fire protection", but it remains unclear that the agencies really know what this means, and the term is not adequately defined in the 10-Year Strategy.	DOI has indicated that it currently leaves decisions about competitive sourcing and cost comparisons to individual managers but is beginning to address this issue Dept.-wide.	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	Yes	The agency charges all fire-related activities and indirect costs that are under their direct control to the fire appropriation. Indirect costs of CSRS employee pensions and FEHBP program costs are not captured.	2003 BLM Budget Justifications	14%	0.1
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	No	Fund allocation and reporting are complicated in Interior because each bureau uses a different finance system. Data in systems is not integrated, and reports are produced manually on an ad hoc basis. BLM's independent auditor identified accounting for intra-departmental transactions (which occur frequently in the fire program) as a material internal control weakness. Despite these complications, the bureaus utilize budget activities and subactivities within existing financial systems to track expenditures for each component of the wildland fire management program. The programs also use project numbers to track funding for each wildland fire incident and for each fire rehabilitation and fuels reduction project, allowing DOI bureaus to accurately identify specific costs for wildfires, rehabilitation projects, and fuels treatment projects.	FY 2000-2001 Independent Auditor's Report on BLM's Financial Statements; Reviews as part of the yearly budget process; weekly fire obligation reports during fire season. DOI indicates its bureaus routinely monitor obligations throughout the year to ensure proper use of funds and to prepare monthly reports for the Department. Agencies also prepare annual operating budgets, which provide program cost targets to their applicable regions, states, and field units. All offices from the national office to the individual field units are responsible for limiting obligations to their assigned cost target (with the exception of emergency accounts).	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	The Office of Wildland Fire Coordination was established in 2001 to provide for cross-bureau consistency in program policies, practices, and budgets. The budget structure was changed in 2002 to better reflect the nature of the work and to improve accountability. The Wildland Fire Leadership Council was established in April 2002 to support the implementation and coordination of the National Fire Plan and the Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy. DOI and USDA are also working on a new fire preparedness planning model to replace the current "Most Efficient Level" (MEL) model which suffers from a lack of transparency and, in a sense, treats funding needs (i.e., budget) as an output of the planning process rather than an input.	Wildland Fire Leadership Council Charter; BLM Budget Justifications.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**43%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)						
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	Small Extent	Prior to completion of the 10-Year Implementation Plan, long-term goals for the fire program were largely non-existent, with goals existing primarily for GPRA purposes and measuring mostly widgets. (See "Key Goals" listed under Question 2 below.) The new measures adopted in the Plan represent a significant improvement, and the "small extent" rating reflects this progress. However, no data presently exists to evaluate performance, there are too many measures (18) to adequately assess priorities, and the measures lack the clarity and targets needed to be considered long-term goals. Regarding the more generic goal of the fire program to "reduce the risk of wildland fire to communities and the environment", only in recent years have the agencies acknowledged that past practices of fully suppressing fires has actually made the hazardous fuels buildup problem worse. The culture of the fire program has not significantly changed to move away from this full-suppression mentality.	10-Year Strategy Implementation Plan; BLM's FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan and FY 2001 Annual Performance Report; Agency acknowledgement that past actions have made the problem worse and fire research results that indicate many areas of the west are overgrown with understory vegetation that increases the risk of catastrophic fire. Note: The measures listed below represent the measures from the 10-Year Implementation Plan that OMB considers could most appropriately be considered priorities and long-term goals, but improvements could still be made to improve the focus on outcomes.	20%	0.1

Long-Term Goal I:	Improve Fire Prevention and Suppression: losses are life are eliminated, and firefighter injuries and damage to communities and the environment from severe, unplanned and unwanted wildland fire are reduced.
Target:	No targets have been set. DOI has included 7 measures to this effect in the 10-Year Implementation Strategy. For example, DOI plans to measure average gross costs per acre for suppression and emergency stabilization and rehabilitation by size class and fire regime for fires (i) contained within initial attack, (ii) escaping initial attack, (iii) within wildland-urban interface areas, (iv) outside wildland-urban interface areas, (v) in areas with compliant fire management plans, and (vi) in areas without compliant fire management plans.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Unknown. In 2003, the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, States, Tribes, and local officials, will establish baseline data within their respective jurisdictions. It is not clear how meaningful the information collected will be, as there is still not a clear definition of such things as the "wildland-urban interface". Moreover, as there are no incentives for cost-control nor a clear articulation of what "cost-effective fire protection" means, the integration of performance measurement and program management is likely to remain tenuous.
Long-Term Goal II:	Reduce Hazardous Fuels: hazardous fuels are treated, using appropriate tools, to reduce the risk of unplanned and unwanted wildland fire to communities and to the environment.
Target:	No targets have been set. DOI has included 3 measures to this effect in the 10-Year Implementation Strategy. For example, DOI plans to measure the number of acres treated that are 1) in the Wildland-Urban Interface or 2) in condition classes 2 or 3 in fire regimes 1,2, or 3 outside the wildland urban interface, and are identified as high priority through collaboration consistent with the Implementation Plan, in total, and as a percent of all acres treated. A corresponding efficiency measure will track acres treated per million dollars gross investment.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Unknown. Measures not yet tracked. Again, better definition and deliniation is needed. For example, clarifying that the performance goal of WUI hazardous fuels reduction to provide the greatest protection to those most in need by identifying a targeted set of communities and actions that can be achieved with current funding levels.				
	Long-Term Goal III:	Restore Fire-adapted ecosystems: fire-adapted ecosystems are restored, rehabilitated and maintained, using appropriate tools, in a manner that will provide sustainable environmental, social, and economic benefits.				
	Target:	No targets have been set. DOI has included 3 measures to this effect in the 10-Year Implementation Strategy. For example, DOI plans to measure the number of acres in fire regimes 1,2, or 3 moved to a better condition class, that were identified as high priority through collaboration consistent with the Implementation Plan, in total, and as a percent of total acres treated.				
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Unknown. Measures not yet tracked. DOI must work to ensure that it has a handle on what can reasonably be accomplished given limited resources and to ensure that funds are targeted to the highest priorities (i.e., forest and rangeland restoration must be defined to be reasonable and achievable).				
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	Small Extent	Previous goals were inadequate and new goals are still being developed. Thus, it is not possible for DOI to be meeting its annual performance goals at this time. However, past performance indicates that DOI meets or comes close to meeting its annual performance goals in this program. FY 2001 data (shown below) indicates that DOI met 3 of its 5 annual performance goals last year. The fuels treatment program was significantly expanded in 2001, and DOI did not meet its performance target for that year, in part due to weather conditions that significantly reduced the use of prescribed burning. DOI's performance in meeting its previous performance goals is also tempered by the fact that previous performance targets were output-oriented and were not determined through research or to challenge managers to improve. Recognizing the limitations of these measures, DOI and USDA have developed and agreed to common performance measures for the fire program (see previous question).	BLM FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan/FY 2001 Annual Performance Report; BLM Budget Justifications; 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan.	20%	0.1

Key Goal I:	Percent of fires contained on initial attack
Performance Target:	95%
Actual Performance:	95%
Key Goal II:	Percent and number of rural fire departments assisted
Performance Target:	25% (830)
Actual Performance:	45% (1,445)
Key Goal II:	Percent of highest priority community-at-risk projects completed
Performance Target:	3%
Actual Performance:	3%

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Key Goal II: Number of fire facilities under construction, reconstruction, or maintenance Performance Target: 52 facilities Actual Performance: 45 facilities					
	Key Goal III: Number of acres receiving fuels treatments to reduce hazards and maintain ecosystem health Performance Target: 1,400,000 acres Actual Performance: 728,000 acres					
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	No	There is no evidence to indicate that DOI has improved efficiency or cost effectiveness in the fire program on the whole. Although prior years' goals were loosely defined, the agency is working to target resources and overcome barriers to long-term success. However, DOI does not seem to have a good handle on what "cost-effective fire protection" means nor do they have sufficient incentives for managers and other stakeholders to take cost into account. Incentives are needed to encourage prioritizing protections for communities-at-risk, completing restoration work, and cost sharing with states, local governments, and private partners. There is currently little incentive for communities to contribute their own funds to the process to reduce local risks or to take steps to improve community planning and zoning requirements.	No clear evidence of improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness.	20%	0.0
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	Yes	The Forest Service is the only other federal agency that accomplishes similar wildland fire management work. On the whole, DOI seems to have somewhat more control over fire suppression costs than USDA, which had a serious anti-deficiency problem in 2000. However, in other areas of the fire program, performance of both agencies appears to be similar. Data is not yet available to compare performance between the two agencies on the common measures developed as part of the 10-Year Implementation Plan.	GAO Report 02-259, “Severe Wildland Fires: Leadership and Accountability Needed to Reduce Risks to Communities and Resources”, January 2002. GAO Report 02-158, “Wildland Fire Management: Improved Planning Will Help Agencies Better Identify Fire-Fighting Preparedness Needs”, March 2002.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	No	Historically, independent reviews (GAO, IG, etc.) have been conducted frequently in response to policy changes, significant events, appropriation changes, and normal oversight from the executive branch and Congressional oversight committees. The fire program is currently the subject of three different audits by the General Accounting Office and NAPA recently completed a broad review of the suppression and fuels reduction programs. Recent GAO reviews have been fairly critical of several aspects of the fire program.	Numerous GAO and NAPA reports and testimony, including: GAO Report 01-1022T, "The National Fire Plan: Federal Agencies Are Not Organized to Effectively and Efficiently Implement the Plan", July 31, 2001 GAO Report 02-158, “Wildland Fire Management: Improved Planning Will Help Agencies Better Identify Fire-Fighting Preparedness Needs”, March 2002. GAO Report 02-259, “Severe Wildland Fires: Leadership and Accountability Needed to Reduce Risks to Communities and Resources”, January 2002. NAPA “Study of the Implementation of the Federal Wildland Fire Policy”, December 2000. NAPA, “Managing Wildland Fire, Enhancing Capacity to Implement the Federal Interagency Policy, December 2001. NAPA, "Wildfire Suppression: Strategies for Containing Costs", September 2002.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**33%**

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BLM manages approximately 700 million acres of subsurface minerals underlying public, private, and state ownerships. The purpose of this program is to provide the energy and minerals resources the nation needs while balancing these needs with other uses of the public lands as well as private landowner's surface rights. While various minerals are treated somewhat differently under various authorizing legislation, the ultimate goal in all cases is to promote the responsible use of energy and mineral resources.

Evidence: Key authorizing legislation includes:Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA),Mineral Leasing Act of 1920,Materials Act of 1947, Geothermal Steam Act of 1970,Indian Mineral Development Act of 1982.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: These programs clearly address the nation's demand for energy and minerals production.

Evidence: President's National Energy Policy, May 2001BLM-Managed Lands Provide:35% of the Nation's Coal Production48% of the Nation's Geothermal Production11% of the Nation's Gas Production5% of the Nation's Oil Production

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BLM is responsible for permitting the energy and minerals development of federally-owned subsurface minerals. There is no overlap in terms of responsibility with any other authority. Moreover, BLM enters into cooperative agreements with state and federal agencies in order to eliminate redundancy and promote efficiency where development may cross jurisdictional boundaries or where surface and subsurface ownership varies.

Evidence: As an example of coordination, the 1991 Tripartite Memorandum of Understanding between BLM, MMS, and BIA delineates each agency's responsibility for oil and gas leasing. Similarly, a 2001 MOU between BLM, OSM, and BIA delineates responsibilities for coal mining on Indian lands.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BLM does not charge users for some costs directly associated with permitting development. BLM regulations prevent managers from recovering a larger portion of agency costs. In many cases, this has constrained BLM's ability to meet quickly changing market demands for applications for permit to drill (APDs). While many energy and minerals activities are programmatic in nature and so not suitable for cost recovery, BLM could recover more permit-specific costs by charging permittees in connection with APDs and reexamining the appropriateness of the level of fees that it currently charges for a number of other permit-specific activities. In December 2000, BLM published a proposed cost recovery rule to address this problem, but has not yet taken action to complete the rule.BLM also faces an inherent balancing act in meeting public demand for minerals development while providing for other uses of the public lands, such as recreation, grazing, etc. However, from planning through implementation, the program attempts to address and respond to this inherent problem.

Evidence: Inspector General Report 95-I-379 (January 1995) found that, at the time, BLM was losing roughly $8 million per year in forgone receipts by not charging appropriate cost recovery fees.A 1996 Solicitor Opinion clarified BLM's authority to charge users for appropriate costs.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: In an effort to meet the Nation's energy demands in 2004 and beyond, the BLM has developed a series of actions, schedules, and assignments outlining how the Bureau will efficiently and effectively implement the President's National Energy Policy. BLM conducts extensive land use planning to insure that resource uses consider local, state and national needs.

Evidence: BLM National Energy Plan task status reports and tracking of time-sensitive land use plans related to energy development.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: In developing this PART, BLM has established seven new long-term performance measures for this program. While the new measures are still largely output-based, they represent a significant improvement over previous measures. The new measures provide a better link between program performance and industry demand, and the measures can be better understood by a person who is not closely involved in the program. Also, an efficiency measure has been added for the oil and gas program.

Evidence: BLM has developed the following seven new performance measures:- Percent of permits and lease applications processed (fluid, solid, and non-energy minerals);- Percent of permits processed within 35 days of receipt of a complete application (fluid minerals);- Percent of permit violations corrected on first notice (fluid minerals);- Percent of non-compliance and trespass actions resolved (non-energy minerals);- Percent of required inspection and enforcement reviews completed;- Customer satisfaction with permitting process (%, energy minerals); and- Average cost per permit (APD) processed (fluid minerals).

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Baseline data and targets have not yet been developed for BLM's new program measures.

Evidence: NA

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: BLM has developed seven new annual performance measures that directly link to the new long-term measures.

Evidence: In addition to long-term targets, annual targets will be established for the measures listed under 2.1, and these targets will be used to measure annual progress.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Baseline data and targets have not yet been developed for BLM's new program measures.

Evidence: NA

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: BLM's Energy and Minerals programs do not generally have grantees or cost sharing partners; however, BLM's federal partners such as MMS have similar goals for production of energy and federal revenues. State and tribal governments are often cooperators in regional EISs for energy and minerals programs. For example, in Montana, the Crow Tribe, the state DEQ and the state Board of Oil and Gas Conservation were co-preparers of the statewide Oil and Gas EIS. Contractors are also extensively used to accomplish work such as cultural clearance surveys, biological assessments and planning documents.

Evidence: Examples include the MOU in place with the California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources and BLM Wyoming's statewide Biological Assessment contract.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: No regular independent evaluations are conducted for the Energy and Minerals programs. However, BLM regularly evaluates its Oil and Gas program in each state. The members of the evaluation team are drawn from throughout the agency and are allowed to collect evidence and make independent recommendations. BLM also recently contracted for a detailed survey of its energy customers in order to try and improve agency responsiveness to industry needs.

Evidence: Oil and Gas Program Evaluations: Wyoming, California and New Mexico.2002 Energy Customer Surveys Results (Coray Gurnitz Consulting, February 2003)

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Each program change in the budget request is tied to a specific annual target that supports long term goals. For example in recent years, BLM requested program increases to support a higher level of APDs processed (based on demand) and a higher level of inspections. These targeted increases supported the goal of higher levels of natural gas production from lands under DOI management and responded to geographically specific demands from industry.

Evidence: Budget Justification and Performance Information, 2004

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: In developing this PART, BLM has developed new program performance measures, a key deficiency.

Evidence: See performance measures listed above.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Each BLM field office regularly reports program outputs in BLM's Management Information System (MIS). State Offices and the Washington Office review these accomplishments against targets at several points in the year. Budget allocation adjustments and corrective actions are taken after these reviews are completed.BLM also conducts periodic reviews of specific offices in various aspects of the programs to determine compliance with guidance and direction. BLM has indicated it is developing a series of self-assessments so that offices can certify compliance with program guidance.

Evidence: Performance analysis for 2004 Budget Development2001 Budget Analysis - Coal Management

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: BLM program managers' evaluations have elements that are directly tied to output measures and budget performance. BLM evaluates the work performance of all employees annually. Senior level managers' performance is reviewed quarterly. Where appropriate, field manager evaluations include key Energy & Minerals program goals. Many elements within an employee's annual evaluation are tied to agency output measures.BLM tracks performance on 2 specific objectives related to energy. Each objective has an assigned senior manager with lead responsibility for tracking/reporting completion or implementation progress, as well as the current status of each objective. There is also an established target date for completion or implementation.The Director's Tracking System presents the Director with the ability to track key program measures. The Director can see in real time what has been reported compared to targets for key output measures. The report also shows costs by program element.

Evidence: Performance analysis for 2004 Budget DevelopmentManagement-by-Objective Status Reports identify key work activities. Each task has an assigned senior manager and a target due date. BLM Manager Evaluations are directly linked to key National Energy Plan tasks that are tracked regularly by BLM.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: BLM has established a guideline for its offices to allow no more than 2% carryover. In the Energy and Minerals programs, 3.7% of available funding was unspent at the end of 2001 and 0% at the end of 2002. Internal reviews are also used to ensure that funds are spent for the intended purpose.

Evidence: MIS report ' Year End Carryover, 2001-2002, Cost Management Report: 2002 Spending by work activity2001 Budget Analysis - Coal Management

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The BLM uses its MIS to track the performance and unit costs for all programs. An annual performance analysis is conducted to compare offices in achieving reduced unit costs and maximum output.BLM is a leader in the Department of the Interior in implementing IT solutions to improve management processes. BLM's Activity-Based Costing (ABC) system and MIS are being used as templates for other bureaus and DOI works to develop an integrated Department-wide system.

Evidence: Performance analysis for 2004 Budget DevelopmentGAO Report 03-503 identifies BLM's performance budgeting system as an example that may be duplicated by the Forest Service in order to improve accountability.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: BLM enters into a wide variety of agreements with industry, state governments, and other federal agencies which have jurisdiction and/or interest in BLM energy and minerals actions. BLM, BIA and MMS have formally documented the division of responsibilities and provided for information exchange related to mineral leasing. BLM, BIA and OSM recently established an MOU to document responsibilities of the agencies for Indian Coal Management.BLM employees participate in various groups to ensure proper coordination. These groups include the Department's Indian Mineral Steering Committee and MMS's Royalty Policy Committee.

Evidence: 1991 and 2001 Tripartite MOUs governing coordination of programs on Indian lands Charter of the Indian Mineral Steering Committee Charter and sample agenda for the Royalty Policy Committee

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: BLM has received seven consecutive unqualified audit opinions, of which the energy and minerals program is a significant component. Key to its success has been the availability of timely and accurate financial information made available to all employees through its MIS. BLM has also met or exceeded its goals under the Prompt Payment Act, and goals to reduce or eliminate erroneous payments.

Evidence: Independent audit evaluations and unqualified audit opinions.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: BLM has identified deficiencies and developed and implemented plans to improve procedures and correct the deficiencies. Examples include corrective action taken on drainage and inspection and enforcement problems.

Evidence: APD Streamlining Memos Inspection and Enforcement Strategy

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight 25%

Explanation: Previous performance measures were inadequate in determining program performance. New measures have been developed, but baseline data and targets are not yet available, so progress cannot be demonstrated.

Evidence: See explanation and evidence for Questions 2.1 and 2.2.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight 25%

Explanation: As with BLM's long-term performance goals, previous performance measures were inadequate in determining program performance. New measures have been developed, but baseline data and targets are not yet available, so progress cannot be demonstrated.

Evidence: See explanation and evidence for Questions 2.3 and 2.4.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 25%

Explanation: Despite overall problems with the program's performance goals, a performance analysis conducted for FY 2004 budget development generally showed increasing program effectiveness from 2001 to midyear 2003. Expenditures are more closely aligned with performance this year than previously. In some areas, unit costs are increasing as tasks become more complex.

Evidence: Performance analysis for 2004 Budget Development

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Industry data is generally not comparable. Although some state governments may perform similar functions on state lands, the operations are performed under a different set of laws and may not have comparable published data.

Evidence: NA

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 25%

Explanation: Various reviews of specific program components have highlighted problems in those components. BLM has addressed some of the problems highlighted in these reviews, but has yet to fully address others.

Evidence: Inspector General (IG) Report 01-I-297 (March 2001) on BLM's Stripper Oil Well Royalty Rate Reduction program found that BLM had yet to act on 2 of 4 previous IG recommendations for this program.Inspector General Report 95-I-379 (January 1995) found that, at the time, BLM was losing roughly $8 million per year in forgone receipts by not charging appropriate cost recovery fees. BLM has yet to implement an appropriate cost recovery program.IG Report 99-I-358 (March 1999) on BLM's Drainage Protection program provided 4 recommendations which BLM accepted. The IG considers these recommendations resolved.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

Measure: Percent of permits and lease applications processed. (Measures reduction in backlog; fluid, solid, and non-energy minerals tracked separately.)

Additional Information: Tracks how well BLM is meeting overall industry demand for minerals permit applications and whether or not a backlog of permit applications is developing.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2003		69%	
2004		78%	
2005	76%		
2006	80%		

Measure: Percent of permits processed within 35 days of receipt of a complete application (fluid minerals).

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Percent of permit violations corrected on first notice (fluid minerals).

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004		96%	
2005			
2006			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy and Minerals Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	63%	100%	25%	

Measure: Percent of non-compliance and trespass actions resolved (non-energy minerals).

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Percent of required inspection and enforcement reviews completed. (Fluid, solid, and non-energy minerals tracked separately.)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Customer satisfaction with permitting process. (Percent; fluid, solid, and non-energy minerals tracked separately.)

Additional Information: This measure tracks satisfaction of BLM's customers such as leaseholders, coal operators and mineral purchasers.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Average cost per permit (APD) processed (fluid minerals).

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual (Efficiency Measure)
2003		$4,875	
2004		$3,335	
2005			
2006			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Mission of the Energy Resources Program (ERP), as stated in the program's 5 year plan and other planning documents, is to assess the energy resource potential of the Nation and the World (exclusive of U.S. Federal offshore waters) and the environmental and human health impacts of energy production and use in order to plan for a secure energy future and allow for the strategic use and evaluation of resources.

Evidence: Legislative mandates (1.1A). The ERP mission is consistent with: (1) the mission and goals of the DOI Strategic Draft Plan (2003-2008) (1.1B) under Mission Area "Resource Use" - Manage or influence resources to enhance public benefit, promote responsible use, and ensure optimal value - Energy; DOI Strategic Goal "Manage natural resources to promote responsible use and sustain a dynamic economy;" (2) the USGS Strategic Plan (2000-2005) Mission Goal to "Provide science for a changing world in response to present and anticipated needs to expand our understanding of environment and natural resource issues on regional, national, and global scales and enchance predictive/forecast modeling capabilities;" (3) the Geology Science Strategy (2000-2010) Goal 3 -- Advance the understanding of the Nation's energy and mineral resources in a global geologic, economic, and environmental context (1.1C). The NRC review of the ERP (1999) specifically states that the role of the ERP is clearly defined, fulfills a mission essential to the federal government, and is unique from that of other federal agencies (1.1D).

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The ERP is responsible for assessing national and international energy resources and conducting research in order to perform those assessments. A sound, scientific knowledge base is needed to assess available resources and the impact of using those resources, and to put such information into a context as to allow decision makers to understand and weigh the costs, risks, and benefits of energy usage. The ERP addresses these challenges by generating and providing objective, science-based energy information essential for shaping policies regarding domestic and foreign energy resources, making sound decisions regarding Federal land use, and maintaining a healthy domestic energy industry.

Evidence: Energy is one of the most important components of the world's economy. The U.S. is 85% dependent upon fossil fuels. Net energy imports have risen in the last 2 decades and total energy consumption is expected to increase more rapidly than domestic production, requiring increased net energy imports (EIA, 2003 - 1.2A). Adequate and reliable supplies of affordable energy, obtained in environmentally sustainable ways, are essential to economic prosperity, environmental and human health, and political stability. The NRC review (1999) (1.2B) stated that "the products of the ERP are important to the economic, environmental, and security future of the U.S." EIA states that "The USGS petroleum assessments provide an important foundation for geologic, economic, geopolitical, and environmental studies. With many of the world's economies intrinsically linked to energy resource availability, such studies provide essential long-term strategic guidance" (1.2C). The National Energy Policy (1.2D) cites ERP NPRA and ANWR 1002 assessments as the authoritative estimates of undiscovered oil and gas resources in Alaska.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The ERP role is clearly defined and unique from other Federal, state, local, or private entities. The ERP focuses research to define the geologic factors that control the abundance, distribution, quality, and location of energy resources. ERP research focuses on defining technically recoverable undiscovered oil and gas resources, coal resources and reserves, coalbed methane, framework and process studies for all these commodities as well as gas hydrates, and the environmental and human health factors associated with the production and use of energy resources.

Evidence: Other Federal agencies that work on energy-related issues (MMS, BLM, USFS, DOE, EIA) do so in mutually exclusive areas (1.3A). The NRC review clearly stated ERP's unique role in this regard.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: ERP is designed to conduct research and scientific assessments on energy resources. ERP employs an expert federal workforce with extensive experience in energy research, assessment, geochemical, and related expertise, such as IT. Based upon feedback ERP actively seeks, projects' purposes, methodologies, and scopes have evolved over time. ERP partners with others (federal agencies, states, academia, industry consortia), and by leveraging funding, expertise, and facilities, ERP maximizes the impact of science accomplished, lessons learned, and products produced. Laboratories are operated at regional USGS centers where costs are shared with other programs.

Evidence: To gauge ERP's effectiveness and evolve its energy research, stakeholder and partner feedback is actively sought by many venues, including: (1) NRC reviews (see 2.8 for specific steps taken by ERP from NRC review feedback), (2) customer surveys (1.4A), (3) interacting with customers at scientific and technical meetings, (4) calling and e-mailing customers, (5) ERP membership on interagency steering committees (1.4B). ERP scientists develop state-of-the-art methodologies and techniques for energy assessments and are recognized leaders in this field. ERP seeks outside validation of its methodologies, assessments, and studies to ensure that no major flaws are present.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: ERP's mission concentrates on providing original, geologically based, non-biased energy information to policy makers, land and resource managers, other federal agencies, foreign governments, nongovernmental groups, industry, academia, other scientists, and decision makers. Program funding is directed at achieving program goals, namely understanding and assessing the fossil-energy resources of the Nation and the World and the environmental impact of energy resource production and use.

Evidence: ERP's funds go to scientific projects dedicated to the program's goals and mission. Funding procedures follow USGS and GD guidelines which are outlined in section 3. However, energy resource information is the "real" ERP resource that reaches intended beneficiaries. ERP research plays a role in shaping U.S. and international policy, as indicated in press release in (1.5A). Because ERP's purpose is to provide energy information, ERP systematically and proactively seeks feedback from intended beneficiaries, in order to determine that products are useful, data are timely, methodologies are sound. To seek meaningful feedback, ERP employs a number of mechanisms (also outlined in 1.4): (1) Customer Surveys (1.5B); (2) Customer Listening Sessions (1.5C); (3) web statistics (1.5D); (4) scientific and technical stakeholder meetings; (5) calling and e-mailing customers/partners; (6) participating in interagency steering committees (1.4B). The ultimate beneficiary of ERP's work is the public. Results from ERP studies are in GEODE, are found on ERP web sites, on CD's available to all, and are presented at scientific and academic forums.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The program did not have long term measures that focus on outcomes. The measures largely focus on outputs and process (customer surveys). Goals in the 5 year plan were not specific enough to evaluate performance. New measures were developed in the PART process.

Evidence: Outcome goals of the draft DOI Strategic Plan (Resource Use - Energy) include "improve information base, resource management and technical assistance." The current ERP 5-year plan lists 4 major objectives that encompass the work conducted by ERP in order to fulfill its mission. These objectives are: (1) To understand and assess the fossil-energy resources of the Nation and the World; (2) To understand the geologic framework and processes of energy resources; (3) To understand and evaluate the environmental impact of energy resource production and use; (4) To deliver energy resource information to land and resource managers, energy policy makers, other scientists, academia, private industry, environmental groups, and other non-governmental entities. All ERP-funded projects support one or more of these goals.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Long term targets and timeframes for ERP are listed as 5-year objectives in the program's 5-year plan. It is difficult to detemine whether targets are ambitious for the following reasons: program goals and the narrative for 5 year plans are too broad to be considered measures, they do not include time frames or specific products. Annual project work plans contain more detail and time frames, but are not clearly linked to achieving goals in the 5 year plan.

Evidence: ERP 5 year plans, GPRA reports.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Annual performance measures are representative of the overall, broader program mission and goals and serve to illustrate progress on assessing the Nation's and World's energy resources and the impact of their development. GPRA goals address annual performance by reporting, on a quarterly basis the following: number of systematic analyses and investigations delivered to customers, number of long term data collections maintained, number of stakeholder meetings, and number of data delivery systems maintained. All these measures directly relate to the long term goals listed in 2.1 and the ERP 5 year plan. All annual goals support the long term goals outlined on the measures page. Illustrations showing the connection between ERP long and short term goals, GPRA, the GD Science Strategy, USGS Strategic Plan, DOI Strategic Plan, and the President' Business Reference model are found in (2.1A). Each annual measure achieved provides evidence of progress towards long-term goals, but there is not sufficient information to detemrine adequate progress.

Evidence: Annual performance measures demonstrate progress toward ERP's long-term goals and are found in GPRA measures and project plans.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Baselines and targets for ERP projects are listed in the GD Annual Science Plans, annual project work plans and proposals, and in annual federal budget justifications. ERP-funded projects develop new project proposals every year that are consistent with ERP program priorities and goals, to report progress, and make necessary changes to project direction. These project proposals are reviewed annually by a Program Council composed of senior energy scientists, both internal and external to ERP. The Program Council makes recommendations on project progress and ensures that the targets are appropriate, ambitious, and obtainable. Annual measures are documented in tasks for each project and reviewed at the end of the year before additional funds are given out. ERP-funded teams are also reviewed annually by an internal USGS review team and periodically by an external to USGS review team.

Evidence: Baselines and targets include project funding projections, annual project proposals/plans, and targets are established through budget initiatives and annual budget planning. One project proposal, for Alaskan Petroleum Studies for FY2001, FY2002, and FY2003 is included in (2.4A). All project proposals contain objectives, strategy, impacts, products, collaborators, work plans, outreach, publications proposed and delivered, and accomplishments. The Alaskan Petroleum Studies project assesses the hydrocarbon resources of Alaska - an ambitious undertaking. Alaska contains some of the largest hydrocarbon accumulations in the U.S. and is one of the most hotly debated areas in the world. To meet all short and long term targets, this project outlined its annual and long term priorities, worked consistently toward understanding the framework and processes of hydrocarbon occurrrence in Alaska, processing and interpreting seismic information, etc. in order to assess the resources in Alaska in a timely fashion. See also gas hydrate example of project annual goals related to ERP long term goals in 2.3.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: ERP does not fund any work that is not directly linked to and in support of ERP research, annual, and long-term goals. ERP has no grantees, but does have a Cooperative Agreement program with a number of State Geological Surveys. All partnerships and agreements are covered by some formal document (MOU, letter of intent, statements of work, etc.) outlining duties, expectations, and products. All contracts must have a statement of need and be directly tied to an ERP-funded project in order to be approved. As program goals are broad, it is difficult to evaluate the performance impact of partnerships.

Evidence: Where appropriate, ERP forms partnerships to work with others with specific needs, data, knowledge, facilities, where ERP has been asked to help or where there is an ERP need to meet its annual and long term goals. Some partnerships are collaborative and expertise only is shared; others are cost-shared, in terms of facilities, data, or funding (e.g. 2.5A is an agreement between ERP and Geological Survey of Canada for gas hydrate research). Other agreements are in-kind - CRADA's developed with industry and academia to explore for and research coalbed methane (2.5B). Both of these kinds of agreements contribute to the short term goals of understanding the nature, occurrence, and distribution of the resource (gas hydrates or coalbed methane) to fulfill the long term goal of assessing the technically recoverable resource. Other agreements are funded by partners (2.5C - Interagency Agreement with BLM for coalbed methane) where ERP possesses an expertise needed by another agency, thereby providing the scientific information necessary for BLM to produce their Environmental Impact Statement.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Comprehensive, independent program reviews are conducted by the NRC on a periodic basis (approximately every 5 years). ERP uses these reviews to help improve ERP performance, efficiency, and effectiveness. In addition, all projects are reviewed annually by a Program Council composed of senior energy scientists internal and external to the program to ensure progress on project and program goals and to adjust work as needed to meet long term goals, customer needs, emerging energy needs, and evaluate effectiveness and relevance of project work. Furthermore, when major program elements are developed, such as methodologies for oil and gas assessment, ERP seeks outside review and validation. ERP seeks customer input and feedback on a regular basis. All ERP projects also seek feedback from customers, partners, and stakeholders to determine relevance and effectiveness and project development. ERP-funded teams are reviewed annually by an internal USGS review panel and periodically by a review panel external to USGS.

Evidence: The NRC reviews ERP periodically (approximately every 5 years). NRC recommendations are incorporated into ERP practices (details are found in 2.8). As noted in 1.4, ERP sought scientific and technical validation of its oil and gas assessment methodology. Also explained in 1.4 is the ERP-NPC working relationship to develop economic models for unconventional oil and gas. ERP members belong to a number of interagency steering committees that meet regularly, not only to discuss areas of mutual interest, but to obtain feedback of goals, methodologies, products, etc. A few if these interagency committees are listed in (2.6A). ERP members belong to international standardization bodies. ERP assessment projects actively seek input from state organizations and the private sector when developing the geologic models upon which the assessments are based. ERP outside validation comes in many forms - one example is that the ERP World Energy project was 1 of 3 finalists at the Institute of Petroleum for the International Platinum Award, for great international impact and innovation.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Program budgets are not clearly tied to annual and long term performance goals. The items listed in the GPRA table are not clearly tied to descriptions of actual acitvities within the text of the budget materials. Further sufficient, measurable long term perforamnce measures did not exist to determine whether the budget was sufficiently tied to performance.

Evidence: ERP 5 year plan, Project Work Plans, Congressional Justifications.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The NRC review of the program identified a number of areas for program improvement, which have been implemented. The program 5-year plan has been aligned with the USGS and GD Strategic Plan and will be aligned with the DOI Strategic plan. Continuous strategic planning in the ERP anticipates changing policy environments and new developments in science and technology and identifies evolving needs for scientific and technical expertise. Continuous customer and stakeholder feedback also helps to shape ERP direction.

Evidence: ERP (1999) acted upon the recommendations of the NRC (1999) review: (1) NRC: maintain a strong research and knowledge base - ERP: after several years of focus on resource assessment, ERP separated framework and process studies from resource assessments, which aids in developing state-of-the-art assessment methodologies; (2) NRC: improve communication between the oil, gas, and coal sub-programs - ERP: ERP combined projects on a regional basis (Gulf Coast, Appalachian Basin, and Alaska) and these projects study all commodities in the region; (3) NRC: broaden ERP's portfolio to include all geologically based energy resources - ERP: ERP substantially developed coalbed methane and gas hydrate projects and developed a project entitled "Alternative Energy Resources of the Future" to provide periodic updates on the status of other commodities, such as heavy oil and oil shale that are predicted to remain a minor part of the energy mix in the next few decades.

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The program does not assess and compare potential benefits to other efforts that have similar goals. ERP has a unique role and mission. but has a similar goal of better understanding energy resources as programs in state geological surveys and programs at DOE such as the Geothermal Energy program. There are demonstrable benefits to other programs, efforts, and organizations from the program. ERP does evaluate the efforts within the program to attain the best products and advances toward the short and long term goals possible. Though a formal cost/benefit has not been performed for ERP, cost benefit studies of other programs with open access to information policies suggest making information publicly available increases benefits to society. The NRC recognized benefits of ERP when it stated, "A significant duplication of effort would be the result if agencies were to develop internally the information provided to them by the ERP".

Evidence: ERP focuses its efforts on geographic areas, commodities, or studies that will further its short term and long term goals the most - usually in areas where there is relatively little known about the commodity. ERP compares potential benefits of projects within the program in order to balance basic and applied resources, while maximizing outputs and outcomes. ERP focuses on those resources with the greatest potential for meeting the nation's energy needs. ERP focuses on traditional resources of oil, gas, and coal, as well as frontier resources such as gas hydrates and coalbed methane, and only to a very small extent on resources such as oil shale and heavy oil. The knowledge gained from studying gas hydrates will substantially benefit the nation, especially as start up time for producing such new commodities is usually 5-10 years. Research is needed now to be prepared for when the technology and economics are conducive to development. ERP also focuses its efforts in frontier areas, such as Alaska, where little information exists, in order to provide the basic scientific information needed to make sound policy decisions. NRC review of ERP (pg 2)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

2.RD2 **Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The ERP uses a rigorous prioritization process as described above in sections 2.1 through 2.7, 2.RD1, and in section 3. The ERP takes into account and balances long range goals with current affairs, legislative mandates, requests from DOI and other DOI bureaus, stakeholder needs and input. Annual project plans are reviewed by the ERP Program Council to help determine prioritization, direction, mid-project course adjustment. Within project prioritization is critical to success as well, because many ERP projects, assessment projects in particular, are long term and ambitious and have many tasks to accomplish. The 5 year plan has listed priorities, but priorities are not clearly communicated through long term performance measures.

Evidence: ERP uses a rigorous prioritization process, employing long term goals and annual project planning and review. The long term and annual measures, goals, targets, customer feedback, partner input, etc. all described in 2.1-2.7 go toward prioritizing funding decisions. Each project submits a proposal every year. This allows the ERP Program Council to annually review each project and allows for a recalibration of the program every year. The ERP Program Council, with rotating membership of energy experts from ERP, other programs, and outside organizations, reviews projects to identify new ideas and partnerships, bring new expertise and perspective to project decisions, and to help ERP identify stakeholder needs. The prioritization process is housed under the broad goals and objectives of ERP, with annual adjustments determining what is of priority. Priorities in any given year include U.S. and global oil, gas, and coal assessment activities, research in support of these assessments and other agencies' activities, and research where ERP contains significant expertise and has much invested such as gas hydrates, coal quality, and coalbed methane.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: DOI,USGS, and its Programs regularly collect performance information through customer and partner reviews and surveys. Feedback is incorporated into program plans and specific actions are taken in response.The DOI and Bureau Strategic Plans include partner and customer reviewed long term goals, annual performance measures, and GPRA measures. Progress on GPRA are verified quarterly and reported and updated annually. The USGS Director convenes annual listening sessions, recording needs of partners and informing them of response. The NAS/NRC reviews long term goals and program performance, utilizing blue ribbon panels of scientists and stakeholders. All projects are required to record detailed workplans, progress and products, and budgets by object class in the Bureau wide system BASIS+. Projects workplans and grant proposals are reviewed annually by Programs using advisory panels. Written feedback on performance is provided to project chiefs who must correct deficiencies or suffer budgetary penalties for non performance.

Evidence: Documents: Bureau Strategic Plan showing long term goals, measures, and annual GPRA targets (pp 9-15). GPRA update memo for FY-02, GPRA Reports for 03 and example of quarterly verification. Directors 03 Listening Session Report showing recommendations and actions taken. USGS Planning Model process showing performance requirements in program five-year plans (p.9) and collecting performance information in BASIS+ system (p.12-13). Overview diagram of planning process, Geology Strategic Plan, Geology Science Policy, Geology Annual Science Plan and example project of National Seismic Hazards Map. Energy Resources Program: ERP collects timely and credible performance information from a variety of sources: NRC reviews (see section 2.8 for detailed explaination of how ERP incorporated NRC recommendations); interagency steering committees that meet regularly, such as the EPCA committee (composed of USGS-ERP, BLM, USFS, DOE, EIA), which meets at least 4 times a year; annual Program Councils to review all project plans and progress; and whenever a major methodology is developed or product released.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: USGS holds senior management and program partners accountable for performance through performance evaluation, management process controls, and performance guidance provided in agreements, contracts, and grants. Measures for GPRA, financial management, and the Presidents Management Agenda are in all USGS SES performance agreements. Regional Executives and Program Coordinators are accountable for achieving performance as part of the USGS Planning Model. Grant programs have specific performance guidance and include rigorous review panels and budgetary penalties for non performance. Cooperative agreements with states and universities include specific requirements, products, and time schedules with payment penalties for non performance. Contracts for services are competed and contain specific quality and performance requirements and time schedules for services.

Evidence: Documents: SES Performance Plan Guidance and Trujillo Memo, USGS Planning Model responsibilities list (p.4-7). Contract and agency agreement requirements from the USGS Policy Manual. Energy Resources Program: All ERP partners are held accountable for cost, schedule, and performance results. One example is found in (3.2A), Assistance Award for "Assistance in the Development of Coal Resource Assessment Classification System and Evaluation of Coal Quality Data in the USGS Database." The contractual document contains a Scope, Statement of Work, Deliverable and Schedule for such, Background information on why such an Award is necessary, and contains the sentence "Final acceptance will be made upon completion of the work as required and data and reports delivered to the U.S. Geological Survey."

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The USGS has an established budget, allocation, and spending process that includes annual planning, quarterly and monthly reviews, and review of any funds allocation change over 25K. It has implemented management controls and measures to ensure dollars are allocated and obligated in a timely manner and spent for intended purposes. Budget planning to object class is done in the BASIS+ system, which ties budget to intended use. Allocation tables are constructed from BASIS+ and FFS is used to provide monthly and quarterly spending information by object class, to review obligation and debt, and take corrective action. Projects and their budgets are reviewed monthly by line managers and annually by Programs. Changes of over 25K are reviewed by both regional line managers and Programs as they occur. The Bureau conducts quarterly review of status of funds against performance measures. A certified Contracting Officer's Representative annually reviews and verifies contract funds are obligated and spent for intended purposes.

Evidence: Documents: USGS Budgeting and Finance diagram. FY02 Geology Annual Science Plan showing project science and funding targets. FY02 Allocation Process Memo showing appropriation actions and requirements. FY02 Program and admin office allocation tables to cost centers, projects, and accounts. These numbers are consistent with budget numbers in FY-02 Geology Annual Science Plan. FY02 National Seismic Hazard Map project/budget and FFS reports showing FY02 cost center spending on National Seismic Hazards Maps and dollars spent for intended use at project level. Spending progress by object class for all USGS for '02 2nd and 3rd quarters. Summary of Program quarterly obligations for FY02 showing consistent spending of appropriations for intended program. Final spending report for all FY02 Programs. Instructional Memos APS-2003-11-13 showing monthly management control requirements for accounts receivable, unbilled balances, and obligations-accruals-changes to allocations > 25K. Description of cost centers use of FFS monthly reports to inform account holders of spending progress and funds available.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The Bureau is engaged in competitive sourcing for Visual Information Services, Building and Ground Maintenance, and Warehousing. These competitions will improve cost and timeliness of program publications and exhibits and the warehousing we use for major program assets. Geology mission critical information systems have submitted Capitol Asset Plans (Exhibit 300) to DOI and are in the certification and accreditation process. Geology programs are gaining effeciencies in timeliness and cost by serving digital data and analysis tools through common portals. In 2003, all Geology programs are developing Activity Based Costing for 2004 implementation. ABC will allow for comparisons of overhead costs across programs ro research and assessments. Scientists are required to submit annual project work plans and budgets for review of progress, performance, and cost.

Evidence: Documents: April 2002 Memo from USGS Director announcing competitive sourcing, June 2003 update on competitive sourcing. DOI Capitol Asset Guidance. Examples of digital data initiatives and portals. Geology Science Planning Policy. Energy Resources Program: ERP IT improvements are numerous and some details are found in section 4.3. Another example is that ERP's geophysical processing project initiated a contract to provide a fast acquisition path for purchasing reflection seismic data from commercial vendors; ERP and other programs use this contract to acquire such data at a reduced cost and a timely manner; cost benefits of acquiring the data without the contract as compared to acquisition with the contract show that ERP has saved $800,000 in the past 3 years - funds that can be used for other program purposes. The ERP Central Energy Team recently registered its services and data with a geospatial resource web portal called Geography Network, which caused usage to significantly increase after registration.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Geology Programs collaborate with federal, state, and local governments, industry, and academia towards the achievement of complimentary goals. Major partners are identified in the Geology Strategic Plan and in Program Five-Year Plans and include, but are not limited to, DOD, NSF, DOE, EPA, BLM, EIA, and DOI, State Geological Surveys, state and local resource agencies, and major consortia of academic, governmental, and industry groups. In general, USGS provides the broad scientific framework that provides context and support for partners to conduct work on a more specific or local basis. USGS establishes roles and responsibilities with partners through cooperative agreements, Memoranda of Understanding, or Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADA).

Evidence: Effective collaboration between ERP and others is evidenced by many working agreements ERP has with others. Listed in section 1.3 are some of these partnerships - gas hydrate research with DOE, MMS, BLM; coalbed methane work with BLM and industry consortia; BLM collaboration with EPCA; and many others, including State surveys. In all of these relationships, ERP plays a distinct and complementary role. Example: in the EPCA work, ERP provides estimates of undiscovered oil and gas resources underlying Federal lands and BLM provides the surface restrictions and impediments to development. ERP cooperative working relationships benefit both parties, and ERP scientists gain access to data, knowledge, and expertise as well as funding. Sometimes these relationships have other tangible benefits: members of the ANWR consortium requested ERP reprocessed reflection seismic data from ANWR. In return for this reprocessed ERP data, ERP acquired a corresponding number of miles of company owned seismic data at no charge. To acquire these data commercially would have required an expenditure of more than $1.5 million.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The 2002 Audit findings of the Inspector Generals Office conducted by KPMG contained a "no opinion" result and cited 8 reportable conditions in their report dated January 24, 2003. Due the extent of financial management problems cited in the audit and the inability of the auditor to render an option, it is difficult to separate the program from cfinancial magnement problems. USGS submitted a Corrective Action Plan that has been accepted by the Inspector Generals office. In his cover memo, the Asst. Inspectors General for Audits stated: "Based on the response and corrective action plan, all the recommendations are considered resolved but not implemented." Monthly meetings and reports on progress are being provided to DOI and thus far, many tasks are completed and all others are in progress. In the USGS matrix organization, line management and administration is responsible for financial, facilities, and personnel management. USGS Program Coordinators are responsible for scientific planning and coordination, budget formulation, and establishing and reviewing performance.

Evidence: Documents: April 11 Auditors Report 2003, Corrective Action Plan, and cover memo from Asst. Inspector General for Audits Roger LaRoche.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The USGS is taking the necessary steps to resolve management deficiencies. The USGS has aggressively addressed IT control weaknesses. Management control performance measures have been incorporated into all SES Performance Evaluations. An expert team has been formed and operating for the last 6 months to address audit issues and ensure completion of the Audit Corrective Action Plan. Extensive training is underway to address reported conditions and strengthen management practices. Administrative Instructional Memoranda outline in detail all financial processes and requirements. All Geology Programs use an annual review process and the BASIS+ system to review all program work and correct deficiencies. This is described in detail in 3.4 and 3.RD1. The NRC and FACA advisory panels conduct periodic reviews that make recommendations regarding program management, performance, and scientific direction.

Evidence: Documents: Corrective Action Plan Progress Report submitted to DOI showing progress or completion of all actions. Hord Tipton Memo providing improved results of March and April testing of DOI WAN's. Instructional Memoranda from 3.3. ERP is proactive in taking corrective measures when needed: (1) In the past, ERP released assessments periodically (~every 5 years). After the 1995 national assessment, with input from stakeholders, Program Council review, and critically looking at funding, FTE, proposed targets, partner needs, ERP made a systematic change in the process to "rolling assessments." Now, when an assessment is done, it is released rather than waiting for other regions to be finished, thus increasing ERP's timeliness and allows for concentration of limited resources. (2) From the post-appraisal (e.g. customer feedback) of the National Coal Assessment, ERP determined the next phase of assessment would be a methodological revision. Two existing coal projects were combined into 1 to streamline assessment functions. The letter outlining this decision and the prospectus before the combination and after are found in (3.7A).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

3.RD1 **For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Since 1996, Geology Programs have been a leader in conducting a division-wide competitive project proposal process using a prototype of the BASIS+ system now in use across the Bureau. Geology issues an annual call for project proposals called the Geology Annual Science Plan (also known as the Geology Prospectus) which contains scientific and funding guidance for all projects. The annual plan uses the Geology Science Strategy and Program five year plans for its organizing framework. Scientists are required to submit annual project proposals into the BASIS+ system for program review. The system is used to examine strengths and weaknesses in staff, scientific methodology, progress on goals, budgetary structure, use of funds and capital investments, and formulate final allocations. Reviews are conducted by scientific peers and include external scientific or stakeholder review. Earmarked funds are not excluded from review.

Evidence: Documents: Overview diagram of Geology Planning Process demonstrating management and review process. See also answers to 3.1 and 3.3 on planning and allocation processes.

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:20%

Explanation: ERP completes projects that are related to long term goals in energy resource assessment, improved development of assessment methodologies, framework geologic studies, and research studies of environmental and human health impact of energy production and use. The goals in the five year plan are too broad, and do not have baselines or targets to determine if adequate progress has been achieved. While activity and timeline information is collected at the project level it is not clearly linked to long term goals.

Evidence: Examples of ERP contributions to long term performance goals: (1) The World Petroleum Assessment is the world reference standard for international policy development - it is the reference case for IEA's World Energy Outlook (2000,2001, 2002), EIA's International Energy Outlook (2000, 2001, 2002), and the benchmark reference case used by climate modelers at Stanford, MIT, and PEW Center; (2) The results of ERP's assessments of oil and gas resources in Alaska are considered the most objective available and used by the Administration and Congress in formulating energy policy, increased industry interest in NPRA before the lease sales, and used by most groups debating the pros and cons of development in this area (4.1B and 4.1C); (3) Because of ERP's nonadvocacy role, the Northern Cheyenne Tribe requested ERP assistance to evaluate the potential of coalbed methane resources on the Reservation (4.1D), information which will be used to set tribal policy.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Baseline and targets for ERP-funded projects are listed in annual science plans (the Geology prospectus), annual project work proposals and plans, and in documentation of base and initiative budgets. Cooperative and other agreements with other federal agencies, states, academia, etc. all have outlined periodic, usually annual, targets in the written document. See also sections 2.4 and 2.5.

Evidence: Annual priorities are established in the context of long-term goals (ERP 5-year plan, GD and USGS science strategies, DOI strategic plan) and performance is checked by management and Program Council review, approval and funding of both internal USGS projects and external partners. Project funding is adjusted annually based on performance and programmatic priorities. Annual targets are reported every quarter in GPRA. All contractual and working agreements have annual performance goals. See e.g. Assistance Agreement (4.2A) between BLM and ERP which outlines specific deliverables for the fiscal year for gas hydrate work. The EPCA inventory had a congressionally mandated deadline. To complete the work required in the short time available, very tight performance goals were necessary; targets were achieved and the interagency report was released on time. ERP assessments conducted in Alaska (see also 2.4) were done on time, in order to meet a variety of goals, such as conducting workshops open to all to create interest in NPRA lease sales in the time frame required by BLM. All annual goals work toward the long term goals.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: ERP has adopted a number of new technologies, methodologies, ways of conducting science that have increased efficiencies and cost effectiveness. ERP's effective use of IT and GIS have increased its efficiency tremendously (see also 3.4). While savings have occured, there is no regularly collected data which facilitate cost effectiveness determinations over years, or permit comparisons across programs.

Evidence: ERP maps are now digital and most are GIS-based, significantly increasing their usability to a variety of users, not just traditional ones. ERP products are available over the web, reaching a much wider audience than in the past. Digital products have reduced costs for archiving and distributing products. The NERSL project has modernized its storage and near online retrieval systems, switching from CD-ROM to DVD capabilities increasing the amount of storage space and speeding retrievals. The geophysical processing project has evolved tremendously and provides seismic data acquisition, processing, and interpretation support to ERP and others; having an in-house service provides faster service and saves ERP a large amount of money (approx $2 million over the last 5 yrs) which can be used for other scientific endeavors. In the past, ERP produced national assessments periodically. Now, ERP produces "rolling assessments," so that products are delivered in a more timely and efficient manner. Partnering has increased significantly to take advantage of expertise where it exists and fill short term skill needs.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Though there is not specific performance data to compare with other efforts, NRC reports and program partners suggest the program However, many other programs have complementary missions. The ERP works with these other groups or they use data produced by ERP projects for their work.

Evidence: The NRC review of ERP specifically stated that ERP's role is clearly defined and unique (4.4A). Many agencies (listed in 1.3) and the private sector use ERP information: (1) oil and gas assessments feed directly into EIA forecasts; (2) See e-mails (4.4B) describing use of results from the organic geochemistry lab and other ERP projects; (3) Environmental groups use ERP assessments as the basis of their studies (4.4C); (4) The financial community requests "reality checks" on loan requests that use oil or gas as loan collateral and the IRS consults ERP concerning tax policy and reserve growth; (5) The NPC (a DOE FACA), charged with studying natural gas supplies is "using the USGS assessments as the basis" for their study (4.4D); (6) The NPC also requested ERP expertise in gas economic analysis (4.4E); (7) BLM requested ERP assistance in carrying out environmental responsibilities in land planning (4.4F). An important ERP role is to archive information, maps, data that would otherwise be destroyed or disintegrate, such as the NPRA data set rescued from NOAA (originally a billion dollar+ investment) and archived by ERP (4.4G).

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Independent review of the ERP by various groups have found the program to be effective and achieving results. These groups include the NRC, American Association of Petroleum Geology Core Committee, National Petroleum Council, and others as needed, such as the independent Geode review. Also testament to ERP's effectiveness is the vast amount of feedback ERP receives in the form of e-mails, letters, and verbal information indicating the breadth and scope of use of ERP products.

Evidence: The NRC review of ERP states: "the mission of ERP - to provide up-to-date and impartial assessments of geologically based energy resources of the nation and the world - is fully appropriate for a federal earth-science agency. The information and data are essential to the management of federal lands, to the understanding of the environmental impacts of the extraction and use of energy resources, and to the planning of national energy policy." Other examples: (1) AAPG reviewed/endorsed ERP assessment methodology (4.5A); (2) Other organizations use (OPEC) or adopt (Australian gov't) ERP resource estimates; (3) EIA altered their conventional onshore natural gas production forecast as a result of an ERP study indicating that the predictions could not be met with domestic supply (4.5B); (4) the National Petroleum Council technology subgroup, tasked to determine if producing gas hydrates is feasible in the next 25 years, relies of ERP information and data (4.5C); (5) Geode was independently reviewed and found to have "significantly more functionality than ArcIMS software and is well positioned as an enterprise-level solution." (4.5D)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

Measure: # of energy assessments provided to key stakeholders with the information necessary to make sound land use decisions and public policy.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2000	5	5
2002	6	6
2003	6	6
2004	6	
2005	6	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Evaluate the environmental and human health impact of using energy resources to provide scientific information to key stakeholders in support of sound policy decisions.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2003	5	5
2004	5	
2005	5	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: % of formal USGS publications and scientific products receiving appropriate peer review

Additional Information: Indicates whether USGS is delivering energy resource information that is of high quality.

Year	Target	Actual
2002	100%	100%
2003	100%	100%

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

2004	100%
2005	100%

Measure: Number of decision-making/data delivery support systems

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2001	1	1
2002	1	1
2003	1	1
2004	1	1

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Number of long term data collections maintained - 1) National Coal Resource Data System; 2) Organic Geochemistry Database; 3) National Energy Research Seismic Library; 4) World Coal Quality Inventory; 5) National Coal Quality Inventory

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2002	5	5
2003	5	5
2004	5	
2005	5	

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Energy Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	73%	Effective

Measure: % of targeted analyses delivered which are cited by identified partners within 3 years after analysis is delivered.

Additional Information: Objective is to ensure that analyses and investigations delivered are actually used by their intended recipients within a short time of delivery, ensuring both relevance and timeliness.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2004	80%		
2005	80%		
2006	80%		

Measure: # of targeted basins with oil and gas resource assessments available to support management decisions.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2003	7	7	
2004	5		
2005	6		

Measure: Average cost of a systematic analysis or investigation (dollars in millions)

Additional Information: Average cost per analysis allows comparisons among different projects to determine how efficiencies can be achieved.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual (Efficiency Measure)
2003		2.75	
2004	2.75		
2005	2.75		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Regulatory and Abandoned Mine Land Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining (OSM)
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	67%	91%	45%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Federal Program implements the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA) which protects society from the effects of surface coal mining while satisfying the nation's need for coal, and abates or reclaims land scarred and abandoned prior to the passage of the Act.

Evidence: The Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA), as amended, authorizes these programs in sections 410 (Emergency Powers), 504 (Federal Programs), 710 (Indian Lands), 523 (Federal Lands); implementing regulations for conducting surface coal mining operations in each state can be found at 30 CFR 900. The U.S. Department of Interior Strategic Plan, FY 2003 ' 2005, page 12, discusses OSM's mission.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Federal implementation occurs when no entity provides oversight; states chose not to oversee and enforce SMCRA; mining operations reside on Indian Lands; and abandoned mined lands need emergency reclamation. The program remediates problems stemming from AML emergencies in states without emergency programs.

Evidence: The foundation for the programs is found in 1) SMCRA, Title I. 2) Legislative history of SMCRA: Senate Report No. 95-128, May, 1977 and House Report No. 95-218, April, 1977. 3) Federal Lands component has origins in the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended (MLA). 4) Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System contains information (cost, problem type, units, location, etc.) for hazardous abandoned mines sites (www.osmre.gov).

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: While other agencies govern miner safety or control water pollution, OSM's program covers the complete mining cycle. While in most cases primacy states administer abandoned mine land AML programs, non primacy states and tribes cannot and the Federal Reclamation Program must administer AML funds in those states and in states that choose to have no emergency program.

Evidence: The program is designed by law and regulations in SMCRA, Titles I, IV, V, VI, and VII (specifically 702, 523(a) and 710(c) and (d)); Tennessee Federal Program: 49 FR 388892, Oct. 1, 1984, 30 CFR 942. Washington Federal Program: 48 FR 7883. Feb. 24, 1983, 30 CFR 947. OSM Directive REG-22 Developing and Processing State/Federal Cooperative Agreements for State Regulation on Federal Lands identifies requirements for formal agreements-14 States in place. Examples of Agreements for Kentucky and Oklahoma outline the program for those states. August 15, 2003, report to Congress on coal waste impoundments identifies interaction with other agencies.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Indian Lands can only be regulated by the Federal Program, even though OSM found cost savings when states took primacy of the regulation program. Though there may be a concern that Indian lands should not be regulated by Indians as they are beneficiaries of coal receipts

Evidence: Program reviews can be found in: 1) Annual Independent Auditors' Reports for OSM, 2003. 2) DOI IG Evaluation of State and Federally Operated Coal Regulatory Programs - work began on June 17, 2003 (Jan. 7, 2004 preliminary results: Our conclusion is that the processes for performing surface mining inspections and bond release appear to be adequate.) 3) Fiscal Year 2003 Annual Assurance Statement on Management Controls.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Regulatory and Abandoned Mine Land Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining (OSM)
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	67%	91%	45%	Demonstrated

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: OSM designs the program to ensure that surface coal mining is conducted to prevent off-site impacts during mining, to return the lands disturbed by mining to productive uses and to reclaim mined areas left without adequate reclamation.

Evidence: Program reviews and results can be found in: 1) FY03 OSM Annual and Accountability Report. 2) Knoxville Field Office Annual Evaluation Summary Report, 2003. 3) FY04 and 05 Budget Justification include performance data. 4) OSM Directive AML-4, Procedures for Federal Reclamation Program Emergencies and high Priority Projects, May 2000.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Measures focus on protecting people and property by eliminating or preventing adverse effects as shown by the 1) reclamation of abandoned mine lands, 2) number of people with reduced risks from abandoned mine lands, and 3) active mine sites free of off-site impacts. However, the measures fail to effectively address the regulatory aspect of the program. Regulatory measures are "outputs." They do not cover the full scope of the program and do not reflect the total purpose of the program in a meaningful way. However, OSM is creating these regulatory measures with the states.

Evidence: Six end outcome performance measures pertaining to OSM's work are contained in the DOI Strategic Plan FY 2003-2008. Trends from FY 2002 through the current year are contained in the OSM Budget Justification and Performance Information 2005 and earlier. Program statistics are gathered by OSM via Directive REG- 8, Oversight of State Regulatory Programs; and new measures for the AML program were developed and presented at the National Association of Abandoned Mine Land Program in October, 2003.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: A no in 2.1 means a no for 2.2.

Evidence: Targets and timeframes for measures are outlined in: 1) DOI Strategic Plan FY 2003-2008. 2) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004 and 2005. 3) OSM Directive REG-8, Table 4. Targets for new measures will need to use FY 2004 for baselines.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Annual performance measures shows annual increments toward achieving long-term goals. One shows the efficiency of reclaiming abandoned mine lands emergency projects, one measure shows steps for reclaiming active sites, and one shows the number of people directly affected by emergency abatements.

Evidence: The OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2005 outlines targets and measurements for performance goals. It contains six strategic plan goal measures, additional measures developed in response to earlier PART reviews, and several specific Bureau measures.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Regulatory and Abandoned Mine Land Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining (OSM)
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	67%	91%	45%	Demonstrated

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Baseline measures for the AML component have been in place for several years and reflect appropriate levels for accomplishments. However, regulatory component measures are not ambitious as they remain constant regardless of the level of mining activity.

Evidence: Baselines and targets are found in: 1) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2005. 2) DOI Strategic Plan FY 2003-2008.

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Partners assist in collecting data and developing performance measures. The States and Indian tribes are an integral part of achieving the goals for the Surface Mining Program. The partners in the reclamation component are generally contractors.

Evidence: Measures were developed with State,Tribal partners and/or contractors as shown in: 1) AML performance measures at NAAMLP in October 2003. 2) OSM Directive REG- 8, Oversight of State Regulatory Programs. 3) Boilerplate contract language.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Evaluations include: Inspector General audits, management control reviews, alternative management control reviews, audits done under the auspices of the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, and annual state program evaluations. Two IG audits were recently completed and OSM is adjusting the program to address the findings.

Evidence: Evaluations were conducted and results identified in: 1) Annual Independent Auditors' Reports for OSM (KPMG). 2) Federal Annual Reports. 4) Inventory System and Performance Results of the Abandoned Mine Land Program, OSM, September 2003. 5) DOI IG Evaluation of State and Federally Operated Coal Regulatory Programs - work began on June 17, 2003 (January, 2004 preliminary results)

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: OSM's 2004 and 2005 budget requests included the integration of planning and performance and PART reviews. Accomplishment data and planned accomplishments are presented in chart format to support the budget program activities under OSM's business lines.

Evidence: Performance results and budget requests are contained in: 1) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004 and 2005. 2) Program statistics contained in OSM's FY 2003 Annual Report.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Regulatory and Abandoned Mine Land Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining (OSM)
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	67%	91%	45%	Demonstrated

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: OSM identified deficiencies in its program performance measurement, and re-designed its strategic goals and measures with state and Tribal partners. The regulatory program still lacks comprehensive measures though they are working on them with state counterparts.

Evidence: OSM has identified several performance measures as outlined in: 1) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004 and 2005. 2) OSM Directive REG- 8, Oversight of State Regulatory Programs. OSM continues to work with the regulatory States on developing performance measures for that part of its program.

2.RG1 **Are all regulations issued by the program/agency necessary to meet the stated goals of the program, and do all regulations clearly indicate how the rules contribute to achievement of the goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The first Federal rules (March, 1979) addressed SMCRA regulatory requirements. Changes to these Federal rules occur through laws and court decisions that change or affect the interpretation of SMCRA. Additionally, regulations improve current deficincies or address regulatory gaps.

Evidence: SMCRA provides the foundation for rules. Each rulemaking contains a preamble that provides the basis and purpose for the rule.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Data and information from inspections, citizen complaints, state-federal cooperative agreement annual performance reports, the Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System (AMLIS), and the Applicant Violator System (AVS) help OSM adjust priorities and effectively allocate resources.

Evidence: Data is collected via: 1) Oversight guidance (OSM Directive REG-8, "Oversight of State Regulatory Programs." 2) Mine Site Inspection Information (OSM Directive INE-23, December 28, 1998. 3) OSM Annual Report, 2003 and earlier years. 4) State-Federal Cooperative Agreement Annual Performance Reports (OSM Form 51) and Narrative; and Grant/Cooperative Agreement Financial Information Reports (OSM Form 52). 5) November 3, 2003 letter from Coal Creek Watershed Foundation. 6) December 8, 2003 letter from North Chickamauga Creek Conservancy. 7) Various internal management database systems used for program data and tracking. 8) The Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System. (AMLIS). 9) AVS application evaluation report (sample page).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Regulatory and Abandoned Mine Land Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining (OSM)
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	67%	91%	45%	Demonstrated

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Managers must plan and conduct program activities in accordance with regulations and OSM Directives. OSM field managers and staff have performance plans which include responsibility for meeting measures related to OSM's performance goals. These performance measures have recently been placed in manager's contracts. OSM has yet to evaluate managers by these goals and, thus, demonstrate they use these goals to manage.

Evidence: Performance results and schedules can be found in: 1) Federal regulatory program annual evaluation reports for 2003. 2) FY 2003 Annual Assurance Statement on Management Controls. 3) Internal OSM Management FRP Tracking System (sample page). 4) OSM Directive GMT-10, Federal Assistance Manual. 5) OSM Directive AML-4, Procedures for Federal Reclamation Program Emergency and High Priority Projects, May 8, 2000. (They include timeframes to expend funds in accordance with the Federal Assistance Manual and procurement regulations; and prepare reports and annual evaluations.)

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Regional management oversees the allocation and expenditure of funds by field units operating the federal program. The largest portion of the operating budget (approximately 80 percent) is spent on salary and benefits for staff. Federal program management teams regularly monitor non-salary expenditures. The agency's financial system and internal management systems track funds for reclamation projects or emergency abatement.

Evidence: Purposes of funding and expenditures can be found in: 1) Annual budget submission. 2) FY 2003 Annual Assurance Statement on Management Controls. 3)) OSM Directive AML-4, Procedures for Federal Reclamation Program Emergencies and high Priority Projects, May 8, 2000. 4) State-Federal Cooperative Agreement Annual Performance Reports (OSM Form 51) and Narrative; and Grant/Cooperative Agreement Financial Information Reports (OSM Form 52). 5) Data contained in OSM's ABACIS financial system.

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: New technology, like electronic permitting and GIS tools, improves program performance by increasing the speed of review and inspection. Additionally, OSM uses activity based costing system and competitively sources nearly all emergency construction contracts. An internal database allows project managers to compare current and previous project costs in similar geographic areas assuring that the agency receives the best value for its expenditures.

Evidence: The following outline the policies and procedures OSM employs for cost savings: 1) OSM Annual and Financial Accountability Report for 2003 (electronic permitting initiative, 30; training, 39-42; reforestation, 44). 2) Federal program Annual Evaluation Summary Report for 2003. 3) Brochure, "2004 Excellence in Surface Coal Mining Reclamation Awards, Call For Nominations" -- includes rating criteria and point system for evaluation of entries.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Regulatory and Abandoned Mine Land Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining (OSM)
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	67%	91%	45%	Demonstrated

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: OSM directives contain detailed procedures of coordination. Memorandum of Understanding are established among bureaus and/or agencies, as appropriate, to coordinate activities and outline responsibilities. For example, during reclamation of abandoned or emergency sites, OSM works closely with the State Historical Preservation Officer and Fish and Wildlife agencies to minimize historical sites and assure the livelihood of threatened species during reclamation or abatement of AML hazards.

Evidence: Collaborative efforts and coordination are illustrated in the following documents: 1) "Feds Who Get It,' Governing Magazine, November 1999, byline: Jonathan Walters. 2) Proceedings of Technical Forums on CD. 3) SMCRA Sections 503(a)(6) and 504(h) 30 CFR 773.6(a)(3). 4) Memorandum of Understanding BIA-BLM-OSM Management of Coal Mining on Indian Lands, October 23, 2002. 5) Memorandum of Understanding between the Office of Surface Mining and Reclamation and Enforcement and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX on the Process for Obtaining A NPDES Permit Under Subpart H - Western Alkaline Mine Drainage Category, December 19, 2003. 6) OSM Directive AML-4. 7) Draft environmental impact statement (EIS) on Mountaintop mining, released May 29, 2003 for comment. Available on OSM's website.

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: OSM's Division of Financial Management has received clean audit reports for the last 13 years and received a "clean opinion" in all three areas: financial statements, reports on internal controls and compliance with laws and regulations.

Evidence: Financial management practives are reported in: 1) OSM's 2003 Annual and Financial Accountability Report. 2) Annual Independent Auditors' Reports for OSM (Contracted by DOI Inspector General Office to KPMG, LLP, an independent certified public accounting firm), 2003.

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: When deficiencies are identified, OSM implements corrective actions to resolve the issue. Currently, neither the Interior's Office of Inspector General has identified any major performance or management challenges.

Evidence: Independent Auditor's Report on the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement's Financial Statements for Fiscal Years 2003 and 2002 (No. C-IN-OSM-0079-2003) address OSM's implementation of the audit recommendations.

3.RG1 **Did the program seek and take into account the views of all affected parties (e.g., consumers; large and small businesses; State, local and tribal governments; beneficiaries; and the general public) when developing significant regulations?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: OSM is required seek affected party views in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act. In additional to listing regulations in the Federal Register, OSM often conducts outreach when proposing significant revisions to Federal regulations. Additionally, OSM notifies outside parties at the earliest stage of proposed rulemaking to obtain their views.

Evidence: Requests for comments and how they were addressed can be found in: 1) Proposed and final rule preambles (VER and 522(e)). 2) Documentation of outreach (stream buffer outreach plan), 3-21-03. 3) Public hearings on Excess Spoil Rulemaking. 4) Promulgation of Tennessee Federal Program: 49 FR 388892, Oct. 1, 1984, 30 CFR 942. 5) Promulgation of Washington Federal Program: 48 FR 7883. Feb. 24, 1983, 30 CFR 947. 6) Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, Bonding and Other Financial Assurance Mechanisms for Treatment of Long-Term Polllutional Discharges and Acid/Toxic Mine Drainage (AMD) Related Issues, May 17, 2002 (67 FR 35070).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Regulatory and Abandoned Mine Land Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining (OSM)
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	67%	91%	45%	Demonstrated

3.RG2 **Did the program prepare adequate regulatory impact analyses if required by Executive Order 12866, regulatory flexibility analyses if required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act and SBREFA, and cost-benefit analyses if required under the Unfunded Mandates R**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The Federal Program complies with all requirements. The Programs reference the 30 CFR and are updated automatically with changes in Federal regulations. Examples of major analyses include: Fall Creek Falls, Tennessee Petition Evaluation Document/EIS and Environmental Impact Statement and Economic Analysis on Valid Existing Rights

Evidence: Support documents are included in: 1) Promulgation of Tennessee Federal Program: 49 FR 388892, Oct. 1, 1984, 30 CFR 942. 2) Promulgation of Washington Federal Program: 48 FR 7883. Feb. 24, 1983, 30 CFR 947. 3) Fall Creek Falls, Tennessee, Petition Evaluation Document, Environmental Impact Statement, Volumes I and II, February 2000. 4) Valid Existing Rights, Final Economic Analysis and Environmental Impact Statement, July 1999.

3.RG3 **Does the program systematically review its current regulations to ensure consistency among all regulations in accomplishing program goals?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: OSM reviews its regulations for consistency with the entire Federal program throughout the regulatory revision process leading to publication of the final rule. In addition, OSM reviews all its regulations every three years as it re-examines the information collection burden posed by individual Federal requirements.

Evidence: The Record of Compliance for the VER and 533(e) rulemakings contain an economic analysis; the Information Collection Package for 30 CFR Part 779, Supplementary statement dated March 25, 2003, demonstrates reviews of this nature. OSM undertook a Regulatory Review of Rules in March, 2000, to ensure rules were current and consistent.

3.RG4 **Are the regulations designed to achieve program goals, to the extent practicable, by maximizing the net benefits of its regulatory activity?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: OSM regulations are designed to provide the threshold of requirements with which acceptable compliance is necessary. If states cannot comply they relinquish control of their regulatory and AML program tot the federal program.

Evidence: Examples of reviews conducted can be found in: 1) Information Collection, Supporting Statement, Question 3 (for 30 CFR Part 779). 2) Proposed rule: Ownership and Control Settlement Rule, 68 FR 75036, December 29, 2003. 3) Paper on "Enhance Computer Software Applications for Mining and Reclamation."

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 17%

Explanation: A no in 2.1 mandates a no here.

Evidence: Six end outcome perfromance measures are contained in DOI's Strategic Plan 2003-2008. Trends from FY 2002 through the current year are contained in the OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for 2005. OSM's Annual Reports provide program achievements and statistics.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Regulatory and Abandoned Mine Land Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining (OSM)
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	67%	91%	45%	Demonstrated

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: If 2.4 is no then this must be small extent at best. The federal program exceeds measures for bond release and abates emergencies in a timely fashion.

Evidence: Accomplishments are reported in: 1) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004 and 2005. 2) Program statistics contained in OSM's FY 2003 Annual Report.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: OSM continues to demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness through: Improvements in the IT infrastructure in the use of E-gov; electronic permitting; analytic tools to assist inspectors and industry with hydrologic assessments, quantifying potential effects of coal mining.

Evidence: 1) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for 2005 contained program efficiencies for each business line. 2) Program accomplishments identified in OSM's 2003 Annual Report. 4) The FRP has given awards to its employees for new and innovative way to abate emergencies. The OSM has recognized an FRP engineer as, "Engineer of the Year" for his cost cutting approach to abating AML landslides. Also, per-project costs that abatement for AML landslides has declined over the years.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: While there are no comparative studies of the Federal regulatory and reclamation with comparable state-managed programs, it is generally found that though the cost and effectiveness of the programs are equal, OSM is a model for states in some areas, such as bonding. However, states have additional local resources and connections at the regional level that enable them to be more efficient.

Evidence: Collaborative efforts are identified in: 1) OSM's Annual Report. 2) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004, 2005. 3) Draft Programmatic EIS on Mountaintop Mining/Valley Fills in Appalachia. 4) Report to Congress: Responses to Recommendations In the National Research Council's Report Coal Waste Impoundments: Risks, Responses, and Alternatives, August 15, 2003. 5) AVS website at www.osmre.gov. 6) FY 2002 Technical Training Catalog.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Regulatory and Abandoned Mine Land Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining (OSM)
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	67%	91%	45%	Demonstrated

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: OSM is audited annually by an independent firm on all of its spending and programs. In addition, there was a recent IG audit of the Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System. Corrective actions are being taken in response to the audit. One additional audit is underway on the regulatory program and OSM is participating in a cross-cutting GAO review on the Department of Interior's use of financial assurances to ensure reclamation of hardrock and coal mining and oil and gas operations sites.

Evidence: Evaluations of programs are illustrated in: 1) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004 and 2005. 2) Program accomplishments reported in OSM's 2003 Annual Report. 3) DOI IG Evaluation of State and Federally Operated Coal Regulatory Programs - work began on June 17, 2003 (Jan. 7, 2004 preliminary results: Our conclusion is that the processes for performing surface mining inspections and bond release appear to be adequate). 4) GAO job code 360411-DOI's Use of Financial Assurances to Ensure Reclamation of Hardrock and Coal Mining and Oil and Gas Operations Sites.

4.RG1 **Were programmatic goals (and benefits) achieved at the least incremental societal cost and did the program maximize net benefits?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: As shown in the agency annual reports, OSM continues to make progress in encouraging the surface coal mining industry to avoid and reduce the incidence of off-site impacts and to reclaim affected land. Likewise, the statistics show the progress being made on AML reclamation, including those made by watershed organizations.

Evidence: 1) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004 and 2005 show trend data for accomplishments. 2) Program accomplishments reported in OSM's 2003 Annual Report. 3) Annual Independent Auditors' Reports for OSM (Contracted by DOI Inspector General Office to KPMG, LLP, an independent certified public accounting firm), 2003.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Regulatory and Abandoned Mine Land Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining (OSM)
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	67%	91%	45%	Demonstrated

Measure: Number of land acres reclaimed or mitigated from the effects of degradation from past mining (Calculated equivalent acres)

Additional Information: Completed projects are reported by States, Tribes and OSM in the abandoned mine land inventory system, which contains a list of all Priority 1 and 2, and some Priority 3 projects for each State/Indian Tribe. (Wide fluctuations possible due to measure's reliance on limited number of projects)

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2003		147	
2004	260	27	
2005	130		
2006	125		
2007			

Measure: Percent of active sites that are free of off-site impacts

Additional Information: During mining, some activities may impact people, land, water or structures outside the permit area. Data is reported in annual reports on the degree and type of impact, and the resource affected. The measure is percentage of sites free of off-site impacts as compared to the total number of inspectable units.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2003		93.9%	
2004	93%	95.4%	
2005	93%		
2006	93%		
2007			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Regulatory and Abandoned Mine Land Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining (OSM)
Type(s): Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	67%	91%	45%	Demonstrated

Measure: Number of acres where reclamation goals are achieved as evidenced by release from Phase III Performance Bonds

Additional Information: Release from Phase III returns land to use, other than coal mining, in accordance with the reclamation plan for the permit. Acreage released under Phases I and II is also reported on an annual basis.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2003		1219	
2004	1160		
2005	1160		
2006	1300		

Measure: Number of people with reduced exposure potential to safety risks from abandoned mine lands

Additional Information: Reclamation reduces potential danger to the public, land and water.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The purpose of the USGS Hazards Program (earthquake, volcano, landslides, geomagnetism Global Seismograph Network) is to provide the Earth science data and information, analyses, and research needed to reduce the loss of life, property, and economic impact of geohazards.

Evidence: PL 95-124 (Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977) established National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program, defined Earthquak Hazard objectives & authorized USGS participation. Amendment PL 101-614 authorized USGS to: "characterize & identify earthquake hazards, assess earthquake risks, monitor seismic activity, and improve earthquake predictions".PL 93-288 (Disaster Relief Act of 1974) assigns USGS responsibility to work to reduce losses from and enhance public safety for volcano and landslide hazards through effective forecasting and warnings, based on current scientific information--DOI, USGS, Geology and NEHRP strategic plans establish hazards mission areas and set strategic goals for hazards activities. --Program 5-year Plans

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program provides necessary information to DOI and other federal agencies, states, local governments and the private sector to make informed decisions pertaining to geologic hazard loss reduction or mitigation. Citizens, emergency responders, architects and engineers, and aviators rely on the USGS for objective, accurate and timely information on these hazards. Geologic hazards cause loss of life and property every year. For example:--Earthquakes pose significant risk to 75 million Americans in 39 states and cause annual direct losses of $4.4 billion per year.--The US is the third most volcanically active country, and 50 of the 70 potentially active US volcanoes have erupted in the past 200 years.--Landslides cause $2-3 billion in damages and 25 deaths annually in the U.S., and are a national problem, affecting most states.

Evidence: PL 95-124, Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977, w/amendments, reviews need for earthquake hazard reduction and defines specific program objectives NRC report "Impacts of Natural Disasters" identified Northridge quake (1994) as most costly U.S. disaster.VHP 5-yr plan, appendix B, lists volcanic activity for 1999-2003; older activity in Smithsonian archiveScience article on volcano monitoring advances, v.299, 28 Mar. 2003, p.2015-2030National Landslide Hazard Mitigation Strategy, 2000, states that landslides result in deaths, injuries and property loss; the NRC Interim Report 2002 concurs that integrated program must be developed.Significant Landslide Events in the U.S.FEMA Publ. 366 (2000), provides estimated annualized losses for US quakes at $4.4 billion

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: All of the hazards programs are closely coordinated with Federal and State efforts in risk and mitigation activities. For example, DHS (FEMA) has responsibility for response, assistance and promotion of mitigation practices, and NSF supports basic research in geosciences, engineering, and social and economic impacts. USGS provides unique skills and capabilities in hazards assessment, monitoring and notification, and research on effects and mitigation, and maintains offices and observatories to meet regional needs. USGS works closely and cooperatively with state geological surveys, emergency management offices, and local governments and private interests.No other agencies provide hazard assessments and long-term monitoring operations.There are no private companies involved in hazards monitoring and notification, although some re-package or reinterpret USGS data or products for commercial use.

Evidence: PL 93-288 (Disaster Relief Act of 1974) Sec. 202, elaborated in F.R. 42 19292-19296 expressly and uniquely empowers USGS to issue warnings and provide technical assistance for earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, landslides or other geologic hazards. USGS unique role validated by NRC reviews of VHP (2000) and LHP strategy (2002).PL 101-614 defines the "Responsibilities of Program Agencies" for NEHRP. The NEHRP Strategic Plan further defines agency roles and responsibilities. The NEHRP Policy Coordination Group (policy level) and the Interagency Coordination Committee (working level), both chaired by DHS (FEMA), ensure coordination of NEHRP, through regular meetings and ad hoc contacts, to resolve specific issues.Annexes to an USGS/NSF MOU define agency roles and responsibilities with respect to EarthScope and GSN.The National Space Weather Program Implementation Plan defines agency roles in geomagnetic monitoring.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Each of the Geologic hazard subactivities are funded and managed seperately with individual outcomes and goals. As a result, overall program efforts are not coordinated, through the GD and USGS planning process, to ensure that resources are allocated across hazard areas for the purpose of reducing overall loss of life and property due to geologic hazards.

Evidence: DOI, USGS, and Geology Strategic Plans establish a framework of goals and activities [attachment 1.1].NEHRP Strategic Plan shows major design elements of NEHRP program. PL 101-614 and PL 106-503, the 1990 and 2000 reauthorizations of NEHRP, made adjustments and clarifications to agency responsibilities within NEHRP.EHP 5-Year plan details implementing NEHRP and DOI/USGS/Geology strategic plans. VHP 5-yr plan describes observatory structure; cooperative agreements demonstrate effective partnerships. NRC review validates program structure.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Research and program resources are targeted at the highest hazard areas of the country. Research and program resources are targeted at the highest - hazard areas of the country. External grants are targeted at applied research tasks identified in planning documents, are limited to 1 or 2 years. Cooperative agreements for monitoring ensure that regional, state or local monitoring and notification needs are met. Both are fully competed and reviewed annually.Products are reviewed through a series of regional and national meetings. Lack of data connecting USGS science to reduced hazard losses makes it difficult to evaluate whether the program could more effectively target resources to result in the greatest reduction in loss of life and property due to geologic hazards.

Evidence: EHP Program Announcements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements.International Building Code (IBC) 2000EHP Web Statistics reviews earthquake monitoring and notification operations.Report ATC-35 "Enhancing transfer of USGS research results into engineering practice," promotes engineering applications of EHP results. Resources targeted for public safety benefits by observatory agreements with clientele: Alaska interagency plan for aviation safety; MOU with Pierce Co. for lahar monitoring system on Mt. Rainier; OFR 01-453 on volcanism in Nat'l Parks; letters from superintendents & Director of NPSUSGS OFR 97-289, Landslide Overview Map of the Conterminous U.S. GSN Standing Committee minutes & reports; USGS OFR 01-460, Review of GSN Program.Geomag. program data is reviewed daily by USAF and NOAA Space Environment Center.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The Hazard Program is focused on measures corresponding to four major elements: Hazard Assessments, Monitoring, Research and Outreach/Communications (see attachment 2.1). These measures are taken from the program's five-year plans and track directly the strategic goals and objectives of the Geology Discipline, the USGS, the DOI Strategic Plan and the President's Business Reference Model (see attachment 1.1). Improved measure were developed during the PART process and are included in the measures section, including a common measure across the USGS geological hazards activities. However across the USGS hazard programs (and related federal programs) there is not an outcome measure that captures the impact of, or reduced risk provided by federal activities.

Evidence: DOI and USGS Strategic Plans. Geology Science Strategy 2000-2010. Goals 1 and 2 pertain specifically to the hazards programs. Goal 1: Conduct geologic hazard assessments for mitigation planning. Goal 2: Provide short-term prediction of geologic disasters and rapidly characterize their effects. Hazards Programs Five-year Plans: establish specific tasks and priority ranking for work needed to achieve these goal Future Science Directions of the Earthquake Hazards Program lays out EHP's very-long-term goals. Advanced National Seismic System is described in USGS Circular 1188. Document was developed in collaboration stakeholders and describes equipment & facilities needed to achieve rapid, quantitative maps of earthquake impacts and early warning.Report of the Committee appointed to review the Global Seismograph Network, April 2003.Geomagnetism Program - Program Priorities 1999-2004.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Long term goals for Hazard programs are listed in the program's 5-year plan. With the exception of earthquake hazards, program goals and the narrative for 5-year plans are too broad and did not include time frames. Improved measures have been developed as part of the PART process and are included in the results section.

Evidence: Hazard Programs Five Year Plans, contain targets and timeframes for 5-yr tasks and objectives.USGS Circular 1188, "Requirement for an Advanced National Seismic System", ANSS Management Plan, ANSS, Technical Guidelines for Implementation of the ANSS. ANSS Annual Plan FY03.Open File Report 00-450 National Landslide Hazards Mitigation Strategy provides baselines and targets for LHP.Various EarthScope planning documents and the EarthScope annex to the USGS/NSF MOU. Southern California Earthquake Center - The SCEC Community Modeling Environment - An Information Infrastructure for System Level Earthquake Research.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Seven annual measures have been identified pertaining to each of the four program elements. These include the GPRA performance goals: 1) Number of monitoring networks maintained; 2) Number of real-time earthquake sensors installed and operational; and 3) Number of stakeholder workshops or meetings held. 4) Number of hazard and risk assessments completed.The hazards programs consistently meet or exceed the GPRA targets. An annual efficiency measure is the percent availability of GSN data, toward a long-term goal of 90% data availability. Annual measures achieved but as timeframes did not exist for all long term goals, it is difficult to assess whether adequate progress was achieved.

Evidence: GPRA documentation sets annual performance targets for network operations, installation of new instrumentation, hazard assessments and stakeholder meetings.Program Five Year Plans set out priority tasks for each program element. Annual USGS Director's Guidance and Geology Science Strategy give high-level guidance and solicit new project proposals or annual work plans.Annual work plans of internal projects and external grant proposals describe expected results and accomplishments. FY03 Project Work Plans and ReportsExternal grant solicitation and applications.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Annual baselines and targets for achieving the overall goals of using knowledge and technology to achieve loss reduction include: projections of planned enhancements to monitoring networks, new or revised hazard assessments and outreach activities. Baselines and targets are set in GPRA plans, program 5-year plans, capital asset plans (e.g., ANSS), and the GD annual science plan. Project proposals and annual work plans include additional annual targets for project-specific work. An annual measure for the GSN, percent data availability, tracks progress toward the long-term goal of achieving 90% recovery of GSN data.Specific baselines and targets for the Hazards Programs are given on the Measures spreadsheet.

Evidence: Current state of hazard assessments and data published or on web: Improvement measured against this documentation. Targets stated in annual Project Work Plans. Inventories of current ANSS instrumentation. Annual improvement targets set down in annual development plans of regions, summarized in GPRA goals & documents. Research targets defined in annual project work plans for internal projects, solicitations for external research, SCEC planning documents.VHP: Baseline in 2001 of 27% of 70 potentially active volcanoes had published assessments in 2001; target in 2004 is 37%. Baseline in 2001 of 61% of 70 potentially active volcanoes monitored in 2001; target in 2004 = 67%. Baseline in 1999 = 19 volcanoes with info. supporting public safety decisions; target in 2008 = 33. Baseline in 2003 is 5 active volcanoes with integrated geologic models; target in 2007 is 8 (PART Meas Tab, VHP 5-Year Plan, GPRA Docs).Annual targets for GSN stations installation & operations set by GSN standing committee, documented in committee Minutes. Annual GSN work plan gives performance goal.Annual work plan of Geomag. Project describes work to improve data quality.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: --At a high level, the Stafford Act and NEHRP commit the USGS and partnering federal agencies to a common set of public safety and loss reduction goals. USGS builds relationships with partners having complementary goals (e.g., NOAA, for ash cloud, landslide and tsunami hazards; NSF, for Earthscope) to leverage resources/expertise.--Cooperative agreements, competitive grants are employclose coordination through monthly reviews and annual reports.

Evidence: NEHRP Strategic Plan 2001-2005.EHP annual Program Announcement 04HQPA0001 includes the research priorities based on the 5-year plan.Five-Year Plans are used to set and publicize program priorities with partners, grantees, etc..ANSS Management Plan, ANSS Technical Guidelines, and a separate solicitation document for cooperative agreements are used to set priorities for the regional seismic network operations awards. Annual performance reports from grantees and cooperative agreements.Cooperative agreement with the American Planning Association for preparation of guidebook for land use plannersVHP Cooperative agreements with universities and AK-DGGS, and MOUs withother agencies support program goals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Each Hazards program has periodically engaged the National Research Council (NRC) for comprehensive review, or for specific review of aspects of the program, and to identify future challanges. Numerous reports have been produced since 1977. For example, the NRC has been commissioned to conduct a cost-benefit study of earthquake monitoring. GSN and Geomagnetism have had similar reviews.EHP uses a permanent FACA committee, the Scientific Earthquake Studies Advisory Committee (SESAC), made up of independent, knowledgeable scientists, engineers, and state officials, that reviews the plans, progress, and performance measures of the EHP. The SESAC meets two to three times each year and reports to the USGS Director and the Congress. The ANSS National Steering Committee (NSC) is a sub-committee of the SESAC. It reviews and guides annual ANSS work and development. EHP also supports the standing Committee on Seismology of the NRC for general guidance on seismological research and practice.External input to all programs is obtained through stakeholder workshops.

Evidence: NEHRP reauthorization testimony, legislation and committee reports-Letter reports of the SESAC. -Reports of the ANSS National Steering Committee. -Minutes of the IRIS/USGS GSN Standing Committee.-Report of the ad hoc Committee to Review the USGS Geomagnetism Program, 1999-NRC Interim Report, Assessment of Proposed Partnerships to Implement a National Landslides Hazard Mitigation Strategy-VHP uses NRC reviews to identify program improvements-Attachment 2.6EH: List of "Independent Reviews of U.S. Needs and Efforts in Seismology and Earthquake Hazard Mitigation, 1977-2003". This list summarizes the findings and recommendations of 26 published reviews and studies of EHP and related activities.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Program budgets are not clearly tied to annual and long term performance measures or goals in 5 year plans. Not all items listed in the GPRA table are not clearly tied to descriptions of actual acitvities within the text of the budget materials. Measurable long term performance measures only existed for earthquake hazards but these were not clearly reflected in congressional justifications or submissions to OMB to determine whether budget was sufficiently tied to performance.

Evidence: DOI, USGS, and NEHRP strategic plans. Geology Science Strategy and annual Geology Science Plan. Hazard Programs' Five Year Plans. Budget justifications, given in the USGS Annual Budget Justification and Performance Information.VHP 5-year plan, annual VHP line-item justification in DOI Budget JustificationsExample of successful Initiative: Multi-Urban Hazards Initiative (e.g., Fact Sheet 99-4182)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Individually, the subactivities of the hazard progam have taken steps to correct strategic planning deficiencies identified by external reviews, examples are provided in the evidence column.

Evidence: EH:--recognized need for a standing advisory committee to give critical review/advice. In 2000, asked Congress to authorize an advisory committee in the reauthorization of NEHRP. In 2002, established the Scientific Earthquake Studies Advisory Committee (SESAC). --recognized inadequate management structure for ANSS. With ANSS partners, developed a management structure that included regional & national advisory and a Technical Integration Committee.--recognized need for coordinated management of the GSN. In 2001, formed MOU with NSF for joint oversight of the GSN, through the GSN Stdg. Comm.VH:--in response to 2000 NRC review, revised 5-yr plan to strengthen research capabilities, add new technologies (e.g., INSAR), open data policy, enhance monitoring and streamline management.LH:--A National Landslide Hazard Mitigation Strategy addressed Congressional concerns that landslide hazards needed more attention.

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Hazards does not measure the benefit of reduced losses between the various geologic hazard or with programs with comparable goals outside the Geology Discipline or USGS. The benefits of nor within the Geologic Hazards program.'--A recent OSTP/RAND Corp. study compared R&D efforts for pan-hazard loss reduction across federal Agencies, including earthquake, volcano, landslide and geomagnetic hazards. The report suggested improved analysis of loss data is necessary to determine proper allocation of R&D spending across hazards. The EHP Program Coordinator participated as a reviewer of this study.

Evidence: Stafford Act, NEHRP authorizations and the NEHRP Strategic Plan define agency roles.Rand Corp., 2003, Assessing Federal Research and Development for Hazard Loss Reduction, DRU-2992-OSTP.Federal responsibility for volcano monitoring & volcanoes on public lands (PL 93-288, Disaster Relief Act of 1974, Sec. 202, elaborated in F.R. 42 19292-19296 , 5-year plan, Letter from Director of NPS to Director of USGS)

2.RD2 **Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: 1. Long-range strategic planning documents set overall goals and priorities (e.g., NEHRP, DOI, USGS, and Geology strategic plans).2. Earthquake five-year plan details specific near-term objectives and tasks; these are prioritized and have timeframes.3. GD annual science plan and Director's guidance set and prioritize annual activities within the major program elements that conform to the strategic planning docs. 4. Proposals from individual projects are directed at these activities (or else competed through the Director's science initiative process).Based on these four processes, funds are allocated to specific projects by the program coordinators, in consultation with regional geologists.The IRIS/USGS GSN Standing Committee separately provides priorities for GSN activities.EHP priorities are additionally reviewed by its FACA committee (SESAC).

Evidence: NEHRP Strategic PlanDOI Strategic PlanUSGS Strategic PlanGeology Annual Science Plan. EHP, VHP, LHP and Geomag. Five Year Plans. Annual Project ProposalsGSN Standing Committee Reports and Minutes. SESAC Committee reports and minutes

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: DOI,USGS, and its Programs regularly collect performance information through customer and partner reviews and surveys. Feedback is incorporated into program plans and specific actions are taken in response. The DOI and Bureau Strategic Plans include partner and customer reviewed long term goals, annual performance measures, and GPRA measures. Progress on GPRA are verified quarterly and reported and updated annually. The USGS Director convenes annual listening sessions, recording needs of partners and informing them of response. The NAS/NRC reviews long term goals and program performance, utilizing blue ribbon panels of scientists and stakeholders. All projects are required to record detailed workplans, progress and products, and budgets by object class in the Bureau wide system BASIS+. Projects workplans and grant proposals are reviewed annually by Programs using advisory panels. Written feedback on performance is provided to project chiefs who must correct deficiencies or suffer budgetary penalties for non performance.

Evidence: Att. 3.1 illustrates/describes USGS planning and review processBureau Strategic Plan shows long term goals, measures & annual GPRA targets (pp 9-15). GPRA update memo for FY-02, GPRA Reports for 03 and example of quarterly verification. Directors 03 Listening Session Report shows recommendations and actions taken. USGS Planning Model process shows performance requirements in program 5-year plans (p.9) and collecting performance information in BASIS+ (p.12-13). Example project: National Seismic Hazards MapNRC periodically reviews program performance and direction using panels of scientists & stakeholders.Programs prepare annual science plans by goal and objective with budget targets for individual projects. Project Work Plans reviewed annually; feedback on performance and budget provided. Workplans annually updated including progress, products, outcomes & partner interactions. EHP: SESAC reviews projects on a 3-yr cycle. Similar process used for grant programs & cooperative agreements, incl. rigorous annual/triennial reviews VHP: Input from Air Line Pilots Association, FAA & industry representatives led to major, decade-long refocusing of VHP to address volcanic ash hazards to aviation (VHP 5-Year Plan, USGS Bulletin 2047, AK Interagency Ops Plan, Letter to Asst. Sec., DOI from ALPA 4/25, 2003).Customer surveys used to review product satisfaction.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: USGS holds senior management and program partners accountable for performance through performance evaluation, management process controls, and performance guidance provided in agreements, contracts, and grants. Measures for GPRA, financial management, and the Presidents Management Agenda are in all USGS SES performance agreements. Regional Executives and Program Coordinators are accountable for achieving performance as part of the USGS Planning Model. Grant programs have specific performance guidance and include rigorous review panels and budgetary penalties for non performance. Cooperative agreements with states and universities include specific requirements, products, and time schedules with payment penalties for non performance. Contracts for services are competed and contain specific quality and performance requirements and time schedules for services.

Evidence: SES Performance Plan Guidance and Trujillo MemoUSGS Planning Model responsibilities list (p.4-7)Contract and agency agreement requirements from the USGS Policy Manual. Cooperative agreements with states and universities include specific requirements, products, and time schedules with payment penalties for non performance. Examples: Alaska DGGS, and the Univ. Utah, Hawaii, and WA require specific monitoring, field work, telemetry, database, maintenance & QA, training and reporting activities, which directly contribute to program goals Contracts for services are competed and contain specific quality and performance requirements and time schedules for services.

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The USGS has an established budget, allocation, and spending process that includes annual planning, quarterly and monthly reviews, and review of any funds allocation change over 25K. It has implemented management controls and measures to ensure dollars are allocated and obligated in a timely manner and spent for intended purposes. Budget planning to object class is done in the BASIS+ system, which ties budget to intended use. Allocation tables are constructed from BASIS+ and FFS is used to provide monthly and quarterly spending information by object class, to review obligation and debt, and take corrective action. Projects and their budgets are reviewed monthly by line managers and annually by Programs. Changes of over 25K are reviewed by both regional line managers and Programs as they occur. The Bureau conducts quarterly review of status of funds against performance measures. A certified Contracting Officer's Representative annually reviews and verifies contract funds are obligated and spent for intended purposes.

Evidence: Diagram of USGS Budgeting & Finance. FY02 GD Annual Science Plan shows project science & funding targets used for budgetingFY02 Allocation Process Memo shows appropriation actions & allocation requirementsFY02 allocation tables by Programs & administrative office give allocations to cost centers, projects, and accounts. Numbers consistent with budget numbers in FY-02 Geology Annual Science PlanFY02 National Seismic Hazard Map project and budget & FFS reports with FY02 spending at cost centers on National Seismic Hazards Maps show dollars spent for intended use at project levelSpending progress by object class for all of USGS for the 2nd and 3rd quarters of 2002Summary of Program quarterly obligations for FY02 show consistent spending of appropriations for intended programFinal spending report for all Programs for FY02Instruct. Memos APS-2003-11-13 show monthly mgmt control req'ts for accounts receivable, unbilled balances & obligations, and accruals & changes to allocations > 25KDescription of how cost centers use monthly reports from FFS to inform account holders of spending & funds avail.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The Bureau is engaged in competitive sourcing for Visual Information Services, Building and Ground Maintenance, and Warehousing. These competitions will improve cost and timeliness of program publications and exhibits and the warehousing we use for major program assets. Geology mission critical information systems have submitted Capitol Asset Plans (Exhibit 300) to DOI and are in the certification and accreditation process. Geology programs are gaining efficiencies in timelines and cost by serving digital data and analysis tools through common portals. In 2003, all Geology programs are developing Activity Based Costing for 2004 implementation. Since 1996, Geology Programs have been a leader in conducting competitive project proposal and review processes and project based costing using a prototype of the BASIS+system now in use across the Bureau. Scientists are required to submit annual project work plans and budgets for review of progress, performance, and cost.

Evidence: April 2002 Memo from USGS Director announcing competitive sourcingJune 2003 update on competitive sourcingDOI Capitol Asset GuidanceExamples of digital data initiatives and portalsGeology Science Planning PolicyGeology Science Plan PolicyProgram Examples: --Implementation of Akamai web server technology review in Washington Technology--EHP terminating its contract for a dedicated satellite data transmission link and moving to a leased satellite-internet communication service--ANSS stations are installed on the lowest-cost basis, using either regional operators or USGS technicians--ANSS uses multi-vendor contracts for procurement, so that competition ensures direct cost savings for equipment with highly technical specifications.--VHP Standardization on Earthworm seismic data software for processing and distribution of seismic data and on VALVE for time-series analysis of volcano monitoring data at all observatories (VHP-5 Year Plan)

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Hazards Programs collaborate with federal, state & local governments, industry, and academia towards achievement of complimentary goals. Major partners identified in the Geology Strategic Plan and in Program five-year Plans. Include DOD, NSF, NOAA, NASA, EPA, USDA, and DOI, State Geological Surveys, state and local emergency management offices, state & local agencies, and major consortia of academic, governmental, industry groups. USGS provides broad framework and support and establishes roles & responsibilities with partners through cooperative agreements, MOUs or CRADAs.

Evidence: PL 95-124 and subsequent reauthorizations established partnership between USGS, NSF, NIST and FEMA within NEHRPNEHRP Strategic Plan, 2001-2005, reviews cooperation among the agencies.USGS Circular 1242 establishes guidelines for collaboration between agencies following an earthquake.Requisition for Landslide Loss Estimation Pilot Project with CA Dept. Mines&Geol.APA technical evaluation of report "Landslide Hazard and Planning"VHP leverages resources for volcano hazard monitoring, research and notification with NOAA, NASA, NSF, universities, (VHP 5-Year Plan, MOU's with NOAA, UAF/DGGS, NASA, NSF/EarthScope,), other USGS programs (InSAR budget initiative, FY03 DOI Budget Justifications, Long Valley Response Plan, USGS Bull. 2185).Key MOUs: Air Force Technical Applications Center on data exchange; Nuclear Regulatory Commission on hazard assessments; NOAA National Weather Service on tsunami warning; NSF on GSN & EarthScope; Univ. Alaska on Alaska Earthquake Info. Ctr.; Insurance Institute for Property Loss Reduction for quake loss reduction; Calif. Div. of Mines & Geol. on hazard studies & assessmts;

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The 2002 Audit findings of the Inspector Generals Office conducted by KPMG contained a "no opinion" result and cited 8 reportable conditions in their report dated January 24, 2003. USGS submitted a Corrective Action Plan that has been accepted by the Inspector Generals office, In his cover memo, the Asst. Inspectors General for Audits stated: "Based on the response and corrective action plan, all the recommendations are considered resolved but not implemented." Monthly meetings and reports on progress are being provided to DOI and thus far, many tasks are completed and all others are in progress. In the USGS matrix organization, line management and administration is responsible for financial, facilities, and personnel management. USGS Program Coordinators are responsible for scientific planning and coordination, budget formulation, and establishing and reviewing performance.

Evidence: April 11 Auditors Report 2003, Corrective Action Plan, and cover memo from Asst. Inspector General for Audits Roger LaRoche.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: USGS taking necessary steps to resolve management deficiencies. USGS has aggressively addressed IT control weaknesses. Management control performance measures have been incorporated into all SES Performance Evaluations. An expert team was formed and for last 6 months addressed audit issues to ensure completion of Audit Corrective Action Plan. Training underway to address reported conditions and strengthen management practices. Administrative Instructional Memoranda outline detailed financial processes & requirements. Geology Programs use annual review process and BASIS+ system to review program work and correct deficiencies (described in 3.4 and 3.RD1). NRC and FACA advisory panels conduct periodic reviews that make recommendations regarding program management, performance & scientific direction. Example: In 2002, OMB identified a deficiency in security planning and implementation for ANSS, during Exhibit300 evaluation. In 2003, EHP overhauled procedures, made physical security upgrades and completed a new major application security plan. ANSS subsequently passed a management control review with no weaknesses identified. Revised Exhibit 300 has now received top ranking for security (5 of 5) in both contractor and DOI scorings.

Evidence: Corrective Action Plan Progress Report for April 2003 submitted to DOI, shows progress or completion of all actions. Memo from Hord Tipton shows improved results of March-April testing of DOI WAN's. Instr. Memo from Q3.3. Program Examples:--EHP recognized deficiency of not having standing advisory committee, asked Congress to authorize an advisory committee in the reauthorization of NEHRP. EHP subsequently established SESAC. --EHP recognized deficiency of not having a management structure for ANSS. With ANSS partners, EHP developed a management structure to include regional and national advisory committees and a Technical Integration Committee to set stds. & specs.--USGS recognized need for coordinated management of GSN; formed MOU with NSF for joint oversight through the GSN Standing Committee.--VHP responses to NRC Review Recommendations (App. E, VHP 5-yr Plan)--VHP response to 2003 OMB review, began development of a National Volcano Monitoring System plan and incorporated it in 5-yr plan.--National Landslide Hazard Mitigation Strategy, developed through the NRC, built to address Congress' concerns that landslide hazards were not given proper attention by USGS.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

3.CO1 **Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Proposals for grants are solicited by an annual Request for Proposals (RFP). The proposals are put in one of eight regional / topical panels for review. Each panel is multi-disciplinary and includes diverse representation from academia, industry, Federal, State and local government, and USGS. Each proposal is examined by five to seven scientists and engineers The panels evaluate the technical merit of the proposals especially in the context of the development of an integrated program of research for that region with attention to specific research priorities, which are part of the Program RFP. All proposals are evaluated for their relevance and timeliness, technical quality, the competence and recent research performance of the PI and other researchers, and appropriateness and reasonableness of the budget. Each panel ranks the proposals being considered, and this ranking is considered final within each panel.Example: In 1998, the review panel denied funding to a new proposal because of the investigator's non-performance on a previous grant (see evidence).

Evidence: USGS Program Announcement 04HQPA0001 gives a detailed description of the process of solicitation and evaluation criteria. Approximately $10,500,000 of the funds managed by the External component of the Earthquake Program are subject to a peer review process. Approximately $9,000,000 of the funds go to awards considered by the review panels described above. An average of 90 to 100 new grants, and about 25 to 35 multi-year awards are made each year. --In FY2003, 101 new grants were awarded out of 232 proposals received.--Of the 101 new grants awarded in FY2003, 59% were awarded to investigators who had not received an award the previous year. --Similarly, in FY2002 50% of the 103 funded grants were awarded to individuals who had not received support in FY2001.Panel recommendation to deny funding based on past non-performance, 1998, appl. 8080.List of Panel Composition, 2003 review cycle.Publicly accessible web site: www.erp-web.er.usgs.gov. Also through "External Research" on the EHP website.

3.CO2 **Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The Hazards Program management oversees the scientific performance of the grantees; it is the responsibility of the USGS Office of Acquisitions and Grants, National Assistance Program Branch to oversee expenditures, invoices, and other financial matters pertaining to the grants. The Hazards Programs work closely with the Office of Acquisitions and Grants. The Program conducts site visits to grantees' institutions on a regular basis and attends various scientific meetings where grantees disseminate the results of their research.

Evidence: Documents related to each grant held by the EHP and the USGS Office of Acquisitions and Grants.Prior to FY2003, expenditures were reviewed as invoices were received for payment; typically quarterly. The final invoice was paid after the Final Technical Report was received. Currently, under the Payment Management System, the total funding is transferred directly to the awardees' institution when the grant is awarded. Statements of Work require annual and final reports. Panels consider past grant performance as a principal review criterion. We have not terminated a grant because of performance since at least 1996, but see example of denied funding of a new grant application because of non-performance, in 3.CO1.Special Terms and Conditions for EHP external grants

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

3.CO3 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Every active grantee is required to submit an Annual Summary Report at the end of each fiscal year. These reports are submitted in electronic format and are published on the Program's publicly available web site. When each grant is completed the grantee must submit a Final Technical Report which contains the results of his research. Copies of these reports are sent to the three main USGS libraries and are available there. In the past, only abstracts of the Final Reports were published on the Program web site, but beginning in FY2002, complete versions of the reports were put on the web site if the grantee provided the report in electronic format. Beginning in FY2004 grantees will be required to submit their Final Reports in electron format for publication in full on the Program web site.

Evidence: Publicly accessible web site: www.erp-web.er.usgs.gov. Provides full grant information and reporting. Also accessible through "External Research" on the main EHP website.Attached FY2004 RFP and review criteria.

3.RD1 **For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Since 1996, Geology Programs led a division-wide, competitive project proposal process using the BASIS+system. Geology issues an annual call for proposals called the Geology Annual Science Plan containing scientific and funding guidance for projects. The annual plan uses the Geology Science Strategy and Program 5 year plans for its organizing framework. Scientists are required to submit annual project proposals into the BASIS+ system for program review. System is used to examine strengths/weaknesses in staff, scientific methodology, progress on goals, budgetary structure, use of funds & capital investments, and formulate final allocations. Reviews, conducted by scientific peers, include external scientific or stakeholder review. Earmarked funds are not excluded from review.For EHP, SESAC evaluates the research program annually incl. all research activities at project level. Individual projects reviewed in depth every 3 years. Project performance judged by comparison with EHP 5 year plan.

Evidence: Overview diagram of Geology Planning Process demonstrating management and review process. See also answers to 3.1 and 3.3 on planning and allocation processes. Scientists propose work based upon the Geology Annual Science Plan which contains guidance for all projects within the framework of Geology Goals and Objectives and provides information on new opportunities and funding targets. Scientists submit annual project proposals and work plans for program review to determine progress, performance, and scientific soundness. The system is used to examine staffing, scientific methodology, progress on goals, budgetary structure, use of funds and capital investments, and formulate final allocations. Reviews are conducted by scientific peers and include external scientific or stakeholder review depending on the nature of the project. RGE quadrennial review documentation, SESAC periodic and annual reports, FY04 LHP Prospectus revisions

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Earthquake hazards was the only subactivity which had measurable long term goals with specific products, but this element demonstrated adequate progress towards goals. Activities reported to the right are each evidence of progress toward goals identified in 5 year plans. While progress was demonstrated, adequate progress is difficult to determine for volcanoes and landslides as long term goals were not clearly linked to specific products, timelines in 5 year plans, or budget justitification materials.

Evidence: Reviewing accomplishments in 5-year plans:EH: --Natl. Hazards Maps, evolved from 6 broad qualitative zones nationwide to 150,000 points with quantitative information on expected seismic shaking, incorporated into IBC 2000 and IRC 2000.--In 1980, data analyzed by hand, notifications made by phone, taking hours. Analysis now automated, notifications by pagers & e-mail in minutes. Shakemaps incorporated into emerg. procedures in 4 at-risk urban areas, supported by aggressive ANSS annual station installation targets (> 400 stations in 4 yr)--GSN: exceeded goal of installing 128 stations in 20 yr.; approaching long-term data avail. goal of 90% VH: --real-time monitoring achieved at 26 of 41 remote Alaskan volcanoes, allowing timely aviation safety warnings for N. Pacific routes--since 1999, 13 new or updated hazard assessments providing basis for interagency response plans--major advances in the use of geodetic techniques for deformation monitoring at 14 volcanoes.LH: --Communities in 5 states incorporated hazard info. in land use or emerg. response plans--comprehensive National Landslide Hazards Mitigation Strategy developed. Geomag. prog. automated 11 of 14 observatories in 15 years.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: GPRA annual performance goals (for hazard assessments, network operations, station installation, stakeholder meetings) have been established for all Hazards Programs and GSN. These goals, which involve partners such as the university-based operators of regional seismic networks, have been consistently met or exceeded. Additional annual goals (e.g., ANSS targets for station installation), set in annual work plans for program projects, are also consistently met or exceeded.

Evidence: GPRA based achievements are included in quarterly and annual GPRA reports. Annual plans and accomplishments are included in project work plans for the following year, and reviewed annually. Accomplishments through work carried out by partners under grants and cooperative agreements are included in annual reports and final reports.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Hazards program have focused on the aggressive use of technology and telecommunications to achieve cost efficiencies and improve the quality and effectiveness of data acquisition, processing and information dissemination. The program has not regularly collected data from which to measure efficiencies and systematically report them over time.

Evidence: Current earthquake notification procedures & products of EHP. EHP National Seismic Hazard Maps, EHP CDs, EHP web site - earthquake.usgs.govInternational Building Code 2000 & International Residential Code 2000Customer surveys: NEIC & National Seismic Hazard Maps, show over 90% satisfaction with services & products.Exploitation of remote sensing for volcano monitoring summarized in volcanoes.usgs.gov/About/What/Monitor/RemoteSensing/RemoteSensing.htmlEarthworm & VALVE technology summarized in VHP 5-year plan & abstract for NSF meeting, GIS application documented in volcanoes.usgs.gov/Products/SProdsDigital.html#KilaueaOutreach & communication improved with Smithsonian thru Weekly Volcano Update www.volcano.si.edu/gvp/reports/usgs/index.cfmAPA Tech. eval. of report "Landslide Hazard and Planning"GSN: graph showing decreasing cost per station while increasing percent data availability

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: There is no specific data comparing USGS Geological hazards with other efforts. Private interests do not operate seismic or geodetic networks or maintain observatories and data analysis centers for rapid hazard notification. Instead, private interests re-package USGS results for economic gain in specialized applications (i.e., "value-added"). There is a substantial body of 'risk consultant' groups that provide advice on risk to insurance companies, investors, banks, corporations, and other interests. On an international scale, there are no hazard programs of comparable scope and effectiveness, and USGS is routinely tapped for assistance in crisis response.Similar programs are the National Weather Service (NWS), in forecasting and reporting on weather conditions, and NSF for geosciences research The budget of NWS is approximately $800 M annually, not including other weather related research conducted at NOAA. Like the NWS, the EHP must report on earthquake activity on a 24x7 basis, and reports must be accurate and timely. EHP provides NWS-like functions and services for earthquakes, and supports research to improve these functions and services. A recent report by OSTP/RAND states 'The majority of natural hazards R&D spending supports weather-related hazards ' approximately 85%', and concludes that "earthquake R&D may ultimately prove a more cost-effective investment." NSF Geosciences research is not focused or directed at specific problems in earthquake hazard reduction.

Evidence: Budget of the United StatesNEHRP Strategic PlanRAND Corporation Report MR-1734-OSTP 'Assessing Federal Research and Development for Hazard Loss Reduction'. CRADAs with Pacific Gas & Electric and Swiss Reinsurance. PASA's with USAID's OFDAMOU with Nuclear Regulatory Commission.MOU with Insurance Institute for Property Loss ReductionWorld leadership by VHP in volcano hazards: volcano hazard responses in 5-Year Plan, Appen. C; letter to Asst. Director, OFDA, from Secretary General of IAVCEI (1997), letter to Director USGS from Director NPS, 2003; letter from ALPA to Asst. Secretary, DOI, 2003, letter to NRC from Minard Hall, Instituto Geofisico, Ecuador)Certificates of Commentation from Micronesia (LHP)Letter of commendation from National Monument (LHP)Corporate membership list of Seismological Society of America and Earthquake Engineering Research Institute.Recent report by OSTP/RAND states "majority of natural hazards R&D spending supports weather-related hazards ' approx. 85%'; concludes that "earthquake R&D may ultimately prove a more cost-effective investment."NEIC out-performs ISC and all other EQ monitoring orgs.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The hazards programs periodically engage the NRC to review the scope, quality of research and general effectiveness of each program or program element/product. The most recent review of the VHP found it to be effective and achieving results. NRC's evaluation of LHP's National Strategy affirms the program's role in reducing losses and damage from landslides.EHP's employs an independent FACA oversight committee. Its charter states the "Committee shall advise the USGS Director on matters relating to the USGS participation in NEHRP, including the USGS's roles, goals, objectives within that program, its capabilities and research needs, guidance on achieving major objectives, and establishing and measuring performance goals." SESAC meets 2-3 times per year and prepares an annual report to the Director & Congress. EHP's effectiveness is witnessed by recent testimony given before Congress on NEHRP authorization, praising EHP's National Seismic Hazard Maps. Customer surveys report >90% satisfaction with NEIC and National Seismic Hazard Maps. Under an MOU with NSF, the GSN Standing Committee and IRIS committees review the GSN program. These reviews indicate that the program is effective in achieving results.

Evidence: SESAC report of September 2002 stated that USGS EHP "'plays a central role in bringing science to the public good." Referring to earthquake monitoring products, "These products are an outgrowth of efforts to integrate and modernize regional and national seismic monitoring systems". May 2003 testimony on NEHRP reauthorization, T.D. O'Rourke, referring to national hazard maps: "USGS has successfully developed a procedure for translating earth science into information needed for seismic design" and L.D. Reaveley "This most important advancement was made possible through NEHRP". Both O'Rourke and Reaverley are engineers. Customer satisfaction surveys. e.g., for the National Earthquake Information Center and the National Seismic Hazard Maps surveys show over 90% satisfaction with these services and products.2003 report of GSN review committee indicates " ...success of the GSN as the primary tool of the worldwide seismological community...". NRC Report of 2001 validates USGS role and responsibility for monitoring, reporting & forecasting critical phenomena like earthquakes.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

Measure: Reduced loss of life and property from geologic hazards (New Measure, Targets under Development)

Additional Information: Reduced loss of life and property indicates whether the program contributes to the outcome of avoided deaths and economic damage.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

Measure: Cumulative number of ANSS seismic monitoring stations

Additional Information: Measure tracks the completion of urban networks contributing to real-time earthquake products (e.g., Shakemap); target set based on annual appropriated funding

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2002		429	
2003	499	476	
2004	540		
2005	577		

Measure: Number of areas or locations for which geophysical models exist that are used to interpret monitoring data

Additional Information: Measure tracks development of models of earthquake occurrence in fault systems, magmatic systems in different volcanic settings, and landslide stability as a result of rainfall. Targets under development in draft 5-yr plan.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2003		3	
2004	3.33		
2005	3.66		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

Measure: Percent data availability for real-time data from the Global Seismograph Network

Additional Information: Measure tracks progress toward the GSN's long-term goal of 90% data availability.

Year	Target	Actual
2001	90%	79%
2002	90%	84%
2003	90%	90%
2004	90%	
2005	90%	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Data processing and notification costs per unit volume of input data from geophysical sensors in monitoring networks (in cost per gigabyte)

Additional Information: This measures indicates improvement in the scope and efficiency of real-time hazards monitoring.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		1,007
2004	997	
2005	990	

Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)

Measure: Number of completed landslide hazard and risk assessments

Additional Information: Assessments require completion of landslide inventories, threshold calculations and other research on landslide processes

Year	Target	Actual
1996	1	1
1999	1	1

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

1999	1	1
2002	1	1
2003	1	1

Measure: The number of counties, or comparable jurisdictions, that have adopted improved building codes, land-use plans, emergency response plans, or other hazard mitigation measures based on USGS geologic hazard information

Additional Information: Loss of lives and property and economic impacts from geologic hazards can be reduced through the adoption of improved building codes, land-use plans, and emergency response plans

Year	Target	Actual
2003		833
2004	860	
2005	886	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Adoption of National Seismic Hazard Maps by NEHRP provisions and International Building Codes

Additional Information: Measure tracks incorporation of EHP quantitative hazards assessments into codes that regulate construction practices.

Year	Target	Actual
1996	release new maps	achieved
2000	IBC adoption	achieved
2002	update maps	achieved
2003	IBC revisions	
2009	update maps	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

Measure: Number of urban areas for which detailed seismic hazard maps are completed

Additional Information: Measure tracks the delivery of special purpose maps and products for state regional and local risk evaluation and mitigation activities

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
1999	1	1	
2002	1	1	
2003	1	1	
2004	1		
2005	1		

Measure: Number of volcanoes for which information supports public safety decisions

Additional Information: Measure tracks the number of U.S. volcanoes for which there are response plans, warning systems or hazard awareness programs

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2002		45	
2003		48	
2004	49		
2005	50		

Measure: Percent of potentially hazardous volcanoes with published hazard assessment

Additional Information: Includes significant revisions and periodic updates of assessments and input to community response plans

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2001	27%	27%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Geologic Hazard Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	80%	91%	80%	Effective

2002	30%	30%
2003	34%	34%
2004	37%	

Measure: Percentage of potentially active volcanoes monitored

Additional Information: Includes network expansion, maintenance, and upgrades of monitoring instruments, communication and database management systems

Year	Target	Actual
2001	61%	31%
2002	63%	63%
2003	66%	66%
2004	67%	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Number of metropolitan regions where Shakemap is incorporated into emergency procedures

Additional Information: Measure tracks the ability to serve the emergency response community.

Year	Target	Actual
2002	1	3
2003	3	4
2004	5	
2005	5	

Measure Term: Long-term

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: Habitat Restoration Activities

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) habitat restoration activities are consistent with, and directly support, the agency's mission under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), BLM's organic statute. There is a strong consensus among interested parties (e.g., Congress, states, environmental groups, and the general public) about the need for restoration work on BLM lands. Habitat restoration is a major component of the following BLM programs, each of which also corresponds to a budget subactivity in the Management of Lands and Resources and Oregon and California Grant Lands Appropriations or in the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund: - Soil, Water, and Air Management - Rangeland Management - Riparian Management - Public Domain Forestry Management - Fisheries Management - Wildlife Management - Threatened and Endangered Species Management - Western Oregon Resources Management - Jobs-in-the-Woods - Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery	The mission of the BLM is "to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations". The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) provides for the: protection of resource values, preservation of certain lands in their natural condition, and compliance with pollution control laws, among other things. Other relevant statutes include: Endangered Species Act of 1973 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974	20%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
		Cross-cutting activities include restoration of threatened watersheds, restoration of at-risk resources and maintainance of functioning systems (upland and aquatic), recovery planning and recovery implementation for Federally listed species and special status species, invasive species management, and the Great Basin Restoration Initiative. For the purposes of this review, habitat restoration activities were defined as resource programs that support the "Resource Protection" mission area of DOI's Draft Strategic Plan by improving the health of watersheds and landscapes or sustaining biological communities on DOI-managed or influenced lands and waters.	Note: This PART review does not directly cover land restoration work, such as fuels reduction or burned area rehabilitation, performed within the Wildland Fire Management program, as this is addressed in a separate PART review. This assessment does not cover abandoned mine land restoration activities, remediation of hazardous materials sites, or cleanup of current or past commercial energy and minerals operations.		
2 *Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	The combination of activities that constitute BLM's habitat restoration programs address specific interests, problems and needs such as rehabilitation of lands degraded by invasive species or past unsustainable livestock grazing, timber harvests, and mining practices. These are highlighted in BLM's strategic and annual performance plans and in policies and directives to the Bureau's field operations. Projects completed through these programs typically involve habitat and/or water quality improvement projects for which the natural resource impacts being addressed cannot easily be associated with a particular party/polluter or which address impacts of past land use practices. An example would be projects designed to address invasive species issues.	BLM's Annual Performance Plans (APPs) and Strategic Plan (as modified) address specific restoration problems and needs as outlined in relevant statutes, including: Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) Endangered Species Act of 1973 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	BLM's restoration programs are designed to have a significant impact in addressing restoration issues, needs and challenges, and constitute the majority of such work conducted on BLM lands. BLM leverages its available funding through the interest and participation of volunteers and partners as well as through cost sharing agreements with State and local governments and non-governmental institutions. Several BLM restoration programs require leveraging appropriated funding with third-party in-kind contributions of materials, labor, and services.	The BLM's Challenge Cost Share program has made significant contributions to restoration of public lands through development of partnerships, leveraged funding, and on-the-ground enhancements. Partners include Federal, State and local governments, private and non-profit groups, and individuals. In 2001, the BLM completed approximately 400 projects and received a greater than 2:1 match in funds, materials, and in-kind labor. Annually, thousands of volunteers contribute time and skills to assist, in part, with restoration efforts. During FY 2000, volunteers contributed over 750,000 hours, or the equivalent of $11.6 million worth of work.	20%	0.2
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	Habitat restoration is an important component in meeting environmental goals on BLM lands. Under FLPMA, BLM is the principle party responsible for management of that part of the public domain known as "the public lands". BLM operates under a different statutory framework than other Federal land management agencies (NPS, FWS, and USFS), and BLM's restoration programs reflect its unique requirements. Many of BLM's habitat restoration functions, for instance, address the need to monitor, mitigate the effects of, and regulate authorized uses that would not be permitted elsewere in the Federal estate. There is some overlap in "restoration" functions funded by the wildland fire management program. Fuels treatments may resemble other types of forestry and range management treatments, which in some cases are implemented to support habitat restoration objectives. Emergency rehabilitation, meanwhile, uses seeding and weed control techniques that might also be appropriate long-term restoration functions funded out of BLM's regular operating funds.	Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) Endangered Species Act of 1973 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
			In general, however, while BLM works with many partners to improve the condition and health of the public lands, BLM's role is not redundant with work performed by other entities. The nature of BLM's watershed/sub-basin approach involves many land ownerships in restoration activities. BLM works closely with its partners in developing and applying land health standards to the management of the public lands.			
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	The current mechanism of direct federal management is consistent with BLM's statutory responsibilities to manage the land under its control, and provides BLM the flexibility needed to balance restoration program needs with other BLM programs, consistent with the agency's land use plans and multiple-use mandate under FLPMA. There is no clear evidence that another mechanism would better accomplish restoration work on BLM lands. Overall, individual BLM restoration activities address specific on-the-ground interests, problems or needs.	Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA)	20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**100%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	Yes	The 2003 Annual Performance Plan includes 4 long-term goals that directly relate to habitat restoration. Three of these goals are outcome goals. Goals are specific and, in most cases, appear to be ambitious, though none are efficiency goals. DOI is in the process of developing a new Departmental Strategic Plan, and these goals may be refined or replaced as part of this process.	FY 2003 BLM Annual Performance Plan. FY 2003 Long-Term Goals that relate to restoration activities are identified in Section 4.	14%	0.1
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	Yes	The 2003 Annual Performance Plan outlines four annual performance goals (a one-to-one relationship with the long-term goals) that directly relate to restoration. These performance goals demonstrate progress toward achieving the Bureau's long-term goals. However, discrepancies between planned and actual accomplishments are not fully explained and raise questions about the process by which annual targets are established. Since 2001 represented the first full year of data for these measures, it is expected that future targets will be better refined. (Note: Measures and targets may change upon completion of DOI's new strategic plan.)	For each FY 2003 long-term goal, there is a corresponding FY 2003 Annual Performance Goal. FY 2003 Annual Performance Goals that relate to restoration activities are specifically identified in Section 4.	14%	0.1
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	Yes	Grantees, contractors, and BLM's many partners are required to report on performance in a manner that allows BLM to tie accomplishments to annual and long-term goals.	BLM partners with many organizations interested in habitat restoration activities. For example, BLM and the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation jointly review and approve public land restoration projects funded through the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation and produce an annual report on accomplishments.	14%	0.1
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	BLM actively works with a variety of Federal and non-Federal partners to complete restoration projects and gives priority to projects that have multiple cost-sharing sources. Partners include historic trail organizations, the Forest Service and the National Park Service, the Nature Conservancy, the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation, the governments of Mexico and Canada, educational institutions, and the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. BLM's Challenge Cost Share program leveraged approximately $16.4 million in 2002 with Federal funding of $9.1 million.	BLM Budget Justifications; BLM Challenge Cost Share project list; NFWS/BLM 5-Year Report and partnership project list; BLM's Annual Volunteer Report; Multi-agency MOU and periodic updates on species conservation in sagebrush ecosystems; Various other MOUs, coordinating documents, and reports.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	No	There are no independent evaluations (GAO, IG, etc.) addressing the wide breadth of BLM's habitat restoration activities, and few external reviews of specific component programs exist. There has been one GAO audit addressing a specific fisheries-related restoration issue in western Oregon; however, this audit was limited in scope to a very specific issue. The IG has also conducted one audit of BLM's "Rangeland Improvement Program" (IG Report 99-1-677) that could be considered a component of BLM's habitat restoration activities. BLM does conduct internal program-specific evaluations, but not on a regular, periodic basis. Historically, program evaluations have been more output-oriented rather than outcome-oriented.	GAO Report, 02-136: Land Management Agencies: Restoring Fish Passage Through Culverts on Forest Service and BLM Lands in Oregon and Washington Could Take Decades, November 2001. IG Report 99-1-677, BLM's "Rangeland Improvement Program", July 1999. BLM indicates it is working to develop a process by which evaluations are completed on a more regular basis.	14%	0.0
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	Yes	While habitat restoration work is actually a subset of several BLM programs (each of which is defined as a specific budget subactivity), funding changes in these subactivities produce changes in performance that can be clearly tracked in BLM's Management Information System (MIS). This allows BLM to track the impacts of funding, policy, and legislative changes on habitat restoration programs as a whole. As BLM prepares its budget justifications, close coordination is maintained with the program's long- and short-term performance goals, and the agency is capable of identifying the impact of funding level increases or decreases on program outputs. The ability of BLM to predict the impact on outcomes, however, is less clear.	Through the agency's Planning Target Allocation (PTA) process, specific national-level direction relating to the completion of annual performance goals is provided to the field organizations (States). In addition, each State is requested to identify a projected specific workload measure to be accomplished based on an identified projected funding level. BLM includes a crosswalk table in its Annual Performance Plan indicating the budgeted amounts from each subactivity that contribute to the GPRA goal "Restore At-Risk Resources and Maintain Functioning Systems".	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	Through development of its Annual Performance Plan, BLM now undertakes a review of its long-term and annual performance goals. In addition to the Annual Performance Plans, BLM prepares program-specific strategic plans as needed to address significant resource issues and needs. In addition, DOI is in the process of developing a new, Department-wide Strategic Plan that better integrates the various bureau plans, with the intent to improve coordination among bureaus and better align activities based on meaningful outcome goals.	FY 2000 - FY 2005 BLM Strategic Plan; Draft DOI strategic plan goals and measures.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**86%**

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)					
1 *Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	Yes	The BLM uses its Management Information System (MIS) to track program performance throughout the fiscal year. Performance indicators are used to show outcomes as they relate to GPRA requirements. Workload measures are used to show outputs and volumes. During development of the Annual Work Plan, workload targets are established by each State Office, as negotiated with Washington Office Program Leads for all BLM restoration activities. The MIS provides cost information that is up-to-date and accurate. The Bureau has 35 established workload measures or program elements to track restoration-related accomplishments. Most of the performance information collected is generally output-related, not outcome-related. In addition to the MIS, the Bureau collects information through data calls. For example, the fisheries, wildlife, and threatened and endangered species management program staff request qualitative and quantitative information to document work accomplished, partners, and project benefits. The Bureau also has standards in place to track contractor accomplishments.	BLM's Washington Office staff formally conduct reviews of States' progress toward meeting workload targets at midyear, third quarter, and end-of-year during each fiscal year. The Washington Office uses MIS information to examine BLM State accomplishments and recommend resource reallocations where workload targets are not being met. For example, the Bureau used FY 1999-2001 data to adjust State base funding and workload targets planned for FY 2003. Several Internal Memoranda have been issued relative to contractor performance, including IM 99-043, Performance-Based Service Contracts; and IM 97-91, A Guide to Best Practices for Past Performance.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	Yes	BLM's Employee Performance and Position Review Evaluation (EPPRR) outlines key annual performance expectations and standards by employee, including managers. Key program partners are held accountable through award and supervision of contracts, assistance agreements and cooperative agreements that contain specific requirements. BLM has attempted to emphasize the use of PBSCs bureau-wide and requires reporting of all PBSCs over $100k in order to monitor the status of PBSC implementation across its offices. Specific annual workload accomplishment expectations are outlined in each manager's annual performance evaluation. BLM has indicated that it is now using this information in determining annual bonuses for senior managers.	Quarterly reviews of performance data are conducted by the Deputy Director, the State Directors and program leads. In addition, several annual performance measures have been included in the State Directors' performance evaluations and on the Director's Tracking System, a database management tool. Performance of program partners is evaluated as different authorizing documents (contracts, assistance agreements) are reviewed.	14%	0.1
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	The BLM's budget allocation process reinforces responsibility and accountability for all offices. The development of the Planning Target Allocation (PTA), which precedes the formulation of BLM's Annual Work Plan, determines base funding levels for the States, National Centers and Headquarters, identifies projects or issues which will be centrally funded, and distributes the remaining or "flexible funds" to the highest priorities. Funds must be spent or obligated to allow no more than 2% carryover with no overspending. This strategy allows for reasonable flexibility for unplanned events while ensuring tight funds control.	The BLM Washington Office formally conducts reviews of State's progress towards meeting planning targets at midyear, third quarter, and the end of each fiscal year. Reviews are conducted using the MIS to obtain up-to-date budgetary, financial, and fund status information. These reviews analyze unliquidated obligations and subactivity spending. States/Centers/Offices are asked to provide information for those subactivities where work/demand is exceeding funding capabilities, or identify those subactivities where funding is not needed for the remainder of the fiscal year so that it can be used by other states where restoration projects are ready to go.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	No	While the agency has made significant progress in implementing IT systems (specifically, its MIS system) to improve cost measurement and comparisons across BLM offices, there is little evidence that such procedures have, up to this point, informed overall budget decisions between program areas. Program performance plans do not currently include efficiency measures, and in most cases, budget documents do not link discussions of performance to discussions of budget requests.	BLM Budget Requests to OMB; BLM Budget Justifications; Data/examples provided from BLM's MIS system.	14%	0.0
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	Yes	Aside from the inability to determine full costs that include retirement and health benefits (which are only available from the Office of Personnel Management), BLM can capture all other direct and indirect costs associated with habitat restoration work.	Displaying full costs for restoration is accomplished with BLM's Management Information System (MIS). MIS data indicates the cost for restoration activities in FY 2001 was $210.9 million for all program elements (35 program elements associated with restoration) for resource protection, excluding OPM-managed retirement and health benefit costs.	14%	0.1
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	BLM's use of Activity Based Costing (ABC) as part of its MIS automated data warehouse has helped the agency demonstrate strong management practices for most activities, including habitat restoration. No material internal control weaknesses exist for issues that would specifically relate to BLM's habitat restoration programs.	FY 2000-2001 Independent Auditor's Report on BLM's Financial Statements; BLM has received unqualified audit opinions on its financial statements for the past 3 years. The BLM reviews expenditures to ensure that erroneous charges to the restoration activities do not occur. The MIS system is used to ensure that only proactive program work is charged against funding intended for restoration activities. The continued review of the unliquidated obligations report by State Budget Officers ensures that erroneous charges to restoration activities do not occur.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	Program evaluations of specific activities are conducted using a state-by-state approach over a multi-year basis using small teams, typically varying from 4 to 8 members, of resource and administrative professionals and managers who are experienced and knowledgeable of the program/activity being evaluated. Final evaluation reports are used to relay the evaluation findings and recommendations to the appropriate State for implementation. Follow up evaluations are used to verify implementation of the recommendations. *BLM has also taken steps to implement recommendations from external reviews, such as the IG's report on BLM's "Rangeland Improvement Program".* Three of the four recommendations from this IG audit have been implemented. Implementation of the remaining recommendation has been delayed for budgetary, project sequencing, and pilot study reasons.	Summary of FY 2000 - FY 2002 BLM Program Evaluations: <u>FY 2000</u> Financial Procedures Review - Colorado (January 12, 2001) <u>FY2001</u> 1. Noxious Weeds - Utah, Colorado (August 31, 2001) 2. Financial Procedures Review - New Mexico (July 31, 2001), Nevada 3. Resource Improvement Project & Land Management - Wyoming (May 14 - 18, 2001), Nevada (May 21 - 24, 2001) <u>FY 2002</u> *(Scheduled. Final reports may not be complete.)* 1. Noxious Weeds - New Mexico (March 2002) 2. Public Domain Forestry/Forest Ecosystem Health & Recovery Fund - Alaska, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Wyoming (November 2001) 3. Wildlife, Fish, Botany and T&E Species - Alaska, Idaho, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah (Nov. 2001) 4. Financial Statements & Reporting 5. National Validation of Self-Assessment - Alaska (February 2002)	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**86%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)						
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	Small Extent	BLM has met or is making measurable progress toward the long-term targets of all four of its long-term goals, three of which are outcome goals. However, it appears that BLM will be challenged in its efforts to meet three of these goals. It is unclear whether this is a result of unrealistic targets, poor performance, or a combination of the two. One additional potential problem lies in the inability of BLM to monitor resource conditions over time to accurately gauge the impacts of its activities on meeting long-term goals. BLM's performance in this program is complicated by its multiple-use mission, which requires that the agency balance many often-competing priorities. As priorities in one area change (e.g., energy resource development), it may become more difficult to achieve goals in other areas such as habitat restoration.	Based on BLM's FY 2003 Annual Performance Report, it appears that the agency is on target to meet its long-term goal of improving populations of listed and sensitive species by FY 2005. However, the data in the report seems to suggest that BLM will be much more challenged in attempting to meet its other three long-term goals by FY 2005.	25%	0.1

Long-Term Goal I: By FY 2005, implement water quality improvement prescriptions on BLM lands in 20% of watersheds within priority sub-basins that do not meet State/Tribal water quality standards.

Target: 20%

Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	FY00	FY01	FY02 Planned	FY03 Planned
Cum. % of watersheds w/ prescriptions implemented	-----	5%	6%	9%

Long-Term Goal II: By FY 2005, achieve proper functioning condition (PFC) or an upward trend on BLM-administered riparian/wetland areas in 80% of the watersheds within priority sub-basins.

Target: 80%

Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	FY00	FY01	FY02 Planned	FY03 Planned
Cum. % of watersheds achieving PFC or upward trend	-----	14%	24%	34%

Long-Term Goal III: By 2005, achieve an upward trend in the condition of BLM-administered uplands in 50% of watersheds within priority sub-basins.

Target: 50%

Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	FY00	FY01	FY02 Planned	FY03 Planned
Cum. % of watersheds achieving upward trend	-----	8%	16%	26%
Additional Output Measure (contributing to long-term goal) # of acres treated to prevent noxious weeds	290,000	252,000	245,000	245,000

Long-Term Goal IV: By FY 2005, achieve a stable or increasing trend in the resident populations of 50% of the plant and animal species listed or proposed for listing pursuant to the Endangered Species Act. Also, achieve a stable or increasing trend in the resident populations of 20% of the species identified by BLM as "sensitive".

Target: 50% (listed or proposed species); 20% ("sensitive" species)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data				Weighting	Weighted Score
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:			FY00	FY01	FY02 Planned	FY03 Planned		
			Cum. % of populations (listed) w/ stable or increasing trend	-----	28%	35%	43.5%		
			Cum. % of populations (sensitive) w/ stable or upward trend	-----	10%	12.5%	16.5%		
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	Large Extent	BLM largely met or exceeded its annual performance goals in FY 2001. However, this is tempered somewhat by the fact that it is unclear how aggressive the targets actually were. Discrepancies between planned and actual accomplishments are not fully explained and raise questions about the process by which annual targets are established. Since 2001 represented the first full year of data for these measures, it is expected that future targets will be better refined. It is also unclear how accurate the data are given that BLM's resource monitoring activities are fairly limited.	See FY 2001 performance targets and actual performance below.				25%	0.2

Key Goal I:	In FY 2001, implement water quality improvement prescriptions on BLM lands in 10 watersheds (approx. 1%) within priority sub-basins that do not meet State/Tribal water quality standards; remediate 60 abandoned mines and plug/reclaim 15 orphas wells. (Note: Measure was new in 2001, and no baseline is available.)
Performance Target:	1% of watersheds (10) w/ prescriptions implemented 60 abandoned mines remediated 15 orphan wells plugged or sites reclaimed
Actual Performance:	5% of watersheds (50) w/ prescriptions implemented 47 abandoned mines remediated 47 orphan wells plugged or sites reclaimed
Key Goal II:	In FY 2001, achieve proper functioning condition (PFC) or an upward trend in riparian/wetland areas in 100 watersheds (approx. 10%) within priority sub-basins. (Note: Measure was new in 2001, and no baseline is available.)
Performance Target:	10% of watersheds (100)
Actual Performance:	14% of watersheds (143)
Key Goal III:	In FY 2001, achieve an upward trend in the condition of BLM-administered uplands in 50 watersheds (approx. 5%) within priority sub-basins and treat 235,000 acres to prevent the spread of noxious weeds and undesirable plants. (Note: Measure was new in 2001, and no baseline is available.)
Performance Target:	5% of watersheds (50) 235,000 acres treated to prevent noxious weeds
Actual Performance:	8% of watersheds (84) 252,000 acres treated to prevent noxious weeds
Key Goal IV:	In FY 2001, achieve a stable or increasing trend in the resident populations for 50 (17.5%) of the plant and animal species listed or proposed for listing pursuant to the Endangered Species Act. Also,achieve a stable or increasing trend in the resident populations for 100 (8%) of the species identified by BLM as "sensitive". (Note: Measure was new in 2001, and no baseline is available.)
Performance Target:	17.5% of listed or proposed species (50) 8% of "sensitive" species (100)
Actual Performance:	28% of listed or proposed species (80) 10% of "sensitive" species (122)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	Small Extent	BLM's MIS allows the agency to track cost per output unit and thus compare efficiency across the organization and from one year to the next. Based on this information, BLM has made changes in the implementation of certain restoration activities and has been adopting best management practices from one state to another to allow for improved efficiencies. However, while internal BLM processes appear to be working well, external transparency needs to be improved.	BLM has provided documentation indicating some small internal adjustments have been made based on relative efficiencies identified (through its MIS) among its state offices.	25%	0.1
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	Large Extent	The performance of BLM's restoration programs appear to compare favorably to other agencies' programs or activities with similar purposes and goals. However, there are no independent evaluations or comparisons of similar programs from which to make a comparison, and comparisons of performance measures is currently difficult. DOI's revision of its strategic plan and the agency's development of cross-cutting "common measures" will hopefully allow for better cross-comparison of DOI bureaus (BLM, NPS, FWS) in the future.	DOI and BLM FY 2003 Annual Performance Plans. The varying types of land and uses permitted on federally-managed lands make it difficult to make direct comparisons on the basis of acres treated or restored or of species improved.	25%	0.2
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	N/A	There are no independent evaluations (GAO, IG, etc.) addressing the wide breadth of BLM's restoration activities. There has been one GAO audit addressing a specific fisheries related restoration issue in western Oregon; however, this audit was limited in scope to a specific issue. In addition, there was one IG audit of BLM's "*Rangeland Improvement Program" (IG Report 99-1-677)* that could be considered a component of BLM's land restoration activities.	GAO Report 02-136, "Land Management Agencies: Restoring Fish Passage Through Culverts on Forest Service and BLM Lands in Oregon and Washington Could Take Decades" (November 2001) IG Report 99-1-677, BLM's "Rangeland Improvement Program", July 1999.		
Total Section Score					**100%**	**50%**

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Habitat Restoration Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	86%	86%	50%	Effective

Measure: Percent of upland acres achieving proper functioning condition or an upward trend (revised measure).

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2003			
2004	63%	55%	
2005	56%		
2006	58%		

Measure: Percent of stream miles achieving desired conditions where condition is known (revised measure).

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2003		91%	
2004		89%	
2005	89%		
2006	89%		

Measure: Measures under development

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian 477 - Job Placement and Training
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	53%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: This voluntary program is intended to demonstrate how Native American Governments can integrate similar federal programs on employment, training and related services funded by BIA, DOL, HHS and DoEd to improve the delivery and effectiveness of those services. Under this program, Native American Tribes can pool funding from all of these sources to meet individual Tribal needs. Effectiveness relates to reduced joblessness in Federally recognized Native American communities and fostering economic development on Indian lands. In addition, the program supports and promotes Native American self-determination and self-governance.

Evidence: Pub. L. 102-477, of October 23, 1992, the "Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992." Amended by Pub. L. 106-568, Section 1103 of December 27, 2000, the "Indian Employment, Training, and Related Services Demonstration Act Amendments of 2000.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program's purpose is to: 1) eliminate duplication of effort by tribes implementing many related federal employment, training, education, and related services programs; 2) address high unemployment, low educational attainment, and low wages of Native Americans; and 3) promote self-determination.

Evidence: 1) Legislative history. 2) Documentation of high unemployment and high poverty on Indian reservations from U.S. Department of Agriculture report. 3) Bureau of Indian Affairs Labor Force Report documenting high poverty and high unemployment levels. 4) One tribal chairman testimony regarding preference for Pub. L. 102-477 coordinated federal programs. 5) Washington University study on "new and innovative approaches to restructing and integrating services under Pub. L. 102-477.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: This program integrates Federal funding for the purpose of job training, tribal work experience, employment opportunities or skill development, or any program designed for the enhancement of job opportunities or employment training so all funding can be rolled into a single comprehensive resource for tribes. Current funding sources include BIA, DOL, and HHS.

Evidence: 1) Pub. L. 102-477, as amended, design of the program. 2) Pub. L. 102-477 Tribal Work group documenting comprehensive approach to services. 3) 477 Regulations documenting reduction of duplication in tribal reporting from 166 pages to 6 pages annually. 4) U.S. Department of Labor website documenting benefits of Pub. L. 102-477. 5) Programs eligible for integration into one comprehensive program.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Some Indian communities do not have sufficient jobs on Native American reservations to place all tribal members that are trained through the program and some trained individuals do not wish to work outside the reservation, which contibutes to the continued high unemployment even though the individuals are trained for jobs.

Evidence: 1) Public law 102-477 is Under-Utilized and Section 1103 allows for job creation. 2) Brookings Institution on lack of jobs at liveable wages in fight against welfare reform.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian 477 - Job Placement and Training
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	53%	Effective

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Through this program, Tribes spend less funds on administration and more directly on client services through the reduction of administrative burdens. For example, annual tribal reporting has been reduced from 166 pages a year of forms and instructions to 12 pages per year. Implementation of the program requires one set of client files and application instead of as many as 12 different application forms, eligibility documents, and other related burdens

Evidence: 1) Pub. L. 102-477, as amended stating target of program. 2) annual tribal report forms OMB approved, documenting reduction in administrative reporting burden. 3) 1998 submission to OMB for approval documenting 166 pages reduced to 6 pages annually. (now 12 pages annually).

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The program is part of the Job Training Common Measures Initiative. Accordingly, it has adopted outcome measures and one efficiency measure for adults and youth and lifelong learning. Beginning in 2004, BIA using these common measures, will better measure the impacts of the program than current measures and allow caparisions across similar Government programs. BIA is implementing the common measures and will establish numerical targets for 2005.

Evidence: 1) White House Initiative on Common Performance Measures for all Federal employment and training programs, nationwide. 2) OMB approved pub. L. 102-477 annual report forms. 3) strategic plan for Department representing the Pub. L. 102-477 program.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: GPRA measures include long-term goals of tribal communities reaching parity with other rural communities for unemployment rates

Evidence: 1) strategic plan for Department representing the Pub. L. 102-477 program. 2) Bureau of the Census data identifying annual average unemployment status for rural U.S. for purposes of striving for parity.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: Measures on job retention, cost per job and job creation are included within the DOI Strategic Plan .

Evidence: 1) Strategic Plan. 2) 05 Budget Request. 3) newly approved OMB reporting forms capturing job retention, cost per job and job creation data from tribes.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 13%

Explanation: The BIA has been measuring job retention on the basis of 90 days employment constitutes success of an individual in the program since FY 1999. The new measure within the DOI Plan requires that this goal track retention out to one year beginning in FY 2004.

Evidence: 1) Strategic Plan. 2) Annual Performance Plans. 3) Previously approved OMB 477 reporting forms collecting 90 day job retention data. 4) current OMB approved reporting forms for Pub. L . 102-477 revised per White House directive.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian 477 - Job Placement and Training
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	53%	Effective

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Reporting of program performance has received full compliance from grantees since the inception of the initiative. Federal partners continue to participate including Department of Labor (Gregg Gross representative (202) 693-3752) and Robert Shelbourne representing DHHS, (202) 401-5150 and DHHS Child Care representative Ginny Gorman, (202) 401-7260).

Evidence: Copies of grantee submitted OMB approved forms since beginning of program.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Independent reports by local universities, Department of Labor, HHS contractors , and tribal representatives have concluded that 477 programs are generally more effective than if the programs are implemented by tribes as seperate programs.

Evidence: 1) Joint report prepared by Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy of the University of Arizona and the Geroge Warren Brown School of Social Work of Washington University. 2) U.S. Department of Labor website on benefits of Pub. L. 102-477. 3) Report of the Indian and Native American Employnent and Training Coalition concerning evaluating 10 years of 477 implementation. 4) Congressional Record and statements made by Senator Stevens on effectiveness of 477 in Alaska. 5) Program comments by University of Arizona.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Budget requests are written in the context of what the program success rate will be and the number of jobs that will be created and individuals placed in employment.

Evidence: FY2005 Budget justifications.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: As part of the Job Training Common Measures initiative, the program has adopted long-term and annual measures and will establish numerical values for those goals in 2004. BIA's performance measures have been modified to show a greater accountability in tracking job retention for an entire year.

Evidence: 1) Revised OMB information collection requirement for tribes to track job retention for one year based upon UI data provided by states (standard requested by white House). 2) Strategic Plan.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian 477 - Job Placement and Training
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	53%	Effective

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Grantee reports are used to determine whether their programs are operating successfully. If the program is having management trouble then DOL technical assistance funding is requested to allow for oversight and assistance to correct deficiencies.

Evidence: 1) Sample copies of annual reports for calendar year 2003 2) Sample of on-site program reviews documenting DOI staff evaluation of tribal performance. 3) sample letter sent to tribe denying further participation due to non-compliance.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: If grantees are delinquent in submision of annual reports, they will cease receiving funds until reporting is complete. If audit problems are uncovered, the grantee will be placed on quarterly payment status until the problems are resolved. In addition, BIA included GPRA performance measures in the Individual Performance Plans of all program managers in FY 2004. Because this is the first year of implementation accountability for adhering to performance and cost measures cannot yet be proven. The performance measures lack measurable outcomes or outputs and because BIA has just implemented the measures to rate individuals, there is no evidence that BIA has actually held individuals accountable.

Evidence: 1) Letter sent to one tribe limiting drawdown of funds due to audit issues. 2) Copies of annual reports for 2003.

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: While typical delays do occur in the Federal obligation of funds, once grant awards are made and accepted by the tribe, grantees usually have funds within 5 weeks. The program is still working to improve this timeline. In reviewing the annual reports it appears that some program participants are not obligating all the funds allocated to them in a timely manner. BIA explains that this is usually due to the varied timing of funds from the various agencies. Some DOL and HHS funds are not issued until after July 1 of each year and the TANF funding is obligated in May of each year. If a tribe begins a program on July 1 or they receive this late funding from DOL and HHS, they are still required to submit their annual report on September 30 and it may appear that they have large balances because they just recently received their funding.

Evidence: BIA reports that funding from non-BIA sources are awarded tiemely if no audit sanctions or other related issues exist. BIA TPA funds are delayed to the extent that funds located at Regional offices must be pulled int Central office for distribution. BIA is working on improvements in 2004 to shorten the obligation process.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian 477 - Job Placement and Training
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	53%	Effective

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: DOL funds support an incentive effort for those grantees that show "Best Practices". For those grantees that have good overall success rates and show innovative approaches to employment and job creation there is a small amount of funding that can be made available to implement new initiatives under the program.

Evidence: 1) Tribal 477 plans containing performance measures; 2) performance monitoring through annual tribal reports; and 3) copies of BIA on-site progam reviews.

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Coordination and collaboration is daily between the DOI, HHS and DOL. A MOU is in place, federal partners transfer funds, receive 100% of tribal grantee reports, approve tribal plans, provide TA to tribes and assist by serving as a resource for tribes.in the day-to-day management of 477 and meet regularly. There are Annual Federal Partners meetings and there are quarterly Tribal Workgroup Meetings.

Evidence: 1) Copy of initial MOU between all participating agencies, DOL and Interior. 2) Sample meeting agenda for the most recent, March 19, 2004 annual Federal partners Meeting.

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: 100% of funds received from DOL and HHS are transferred to tribes. Tribes with audit issues are placed on quarterly payments systems until audit issues are resolved. System could be improved by providing additioanl resources to handle financial transactions. BIA's 2003 audited financial statement did not identify any reportable conditions for this program.

Evidence: 1) Copy of initial MOU between all participating agencies, DOL and Interior. 2) Example of denying further participation due to non-compliance. 3) Sample letter limiting drawdowns due to audit issues.

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Funding and obligation practices are being reviewed to reduce the level of carryover balances. The timing of funds released from Federal partners has been adjusted to avoid transfers late in the year that only allowed 3 days for accounting and obligation practices before fiscal close out.

Evidence: Tribes and partners meet at least quarterly and federal partners meet at least annually to discuss and improve financial, management and progam operations. Reviewed document containing past ten years of implemention activities.

3.BF1 **Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: 100% of grantees are monitored once every three years or more. Attention is paid to compliance with Single Audit Act or funds are withheld from grantee, as necessary. If Participant's Annual Report reviews show problems, onsite reviews are conducted.

Evidence: Sample of an on-site program review reports.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian 477 - Job Placement and Training
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	53%	Effective

3.BF2 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: All grantee reports are made available to HHS, DOL and DOI. HHS and DOL use this data in their annual reports. DOI uses the data in performance reports. Data could be more successfully distributed if staff was available. To ensure that future performance data is compatible accross government, the program is participating in the President's Job Training Common Measures initiative.E67

Evidence: 2003 tribal reports.

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight20%

Explanation: BIA has adopted new long-term goals as part of the Job Training Common Measures initiative. BIA will establish numerical annual and long-term targets in 2004. Partial credit is based on the fact that BIA had a previous long-term measure, which supports achievement of new long-term goals -- lowering the unemployment rate hasn't been met.

Evidence: 1) BIA report "Ten Years of Building a New Tribal Federal Relationship, dated June 2004. 2) Brookings Institution study addressing lack of access to higher wage employers contributing to on-going welfare on Indian Reservations. 3) The Citizen Potawatomi power point presentation on their successful job creation projects.

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight20%

Explanation: BIA has adopted new long-term goals as part of the Job Training Common Measures initiative. BIA will establish numerical annual and long-term targets in 2004. Partial credit is based on the fact that BIA had existing job retension measures that showed that BIA has been able to successfully meet its goals and maintain a 92% success rate for the program which is defined by 90 day job retention.

Evidence: Department of Labor's web site on the benefits of Pub L. 102-477 and successes experienced.

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight20%

Explanation: 100% of the grantees participating in 477 report reduced administrative burdens and increased resources to assist members with job training and education. In addition, Senate Indian Affairs Committee and GAO, support the program for all the good work it has done.

Evidence: Report entitled The "477' Demonstration - Ten Years of Building a New Tribal-Federal Relationship, June 2004.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian 477 - Job Placement and Training
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	53%	Effective

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The 477 program has a higher success rate than Federal partner programs such as the DOL's Division of Indian and Native American Programs, which measures positive termination in the same manner as the 477 program. DOL's program has an 83% success rate compared to the 477 program's 93% success.

Evidence: Based on the performance measures BIA has inplace that are similar to some of the White House Initiative common measures.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: SMALL EXTENT

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Independent reports by local universities and HHS contractors have concluded that 477 programs are generally more effective than if the programs are implemented by tribes as seperate programs. However, until the adoption of common measures across Government for similar programs there is no way to quantify what the reviewers were reporting.

Evidence: BIA provided a number of studies conducted to evaluate the program. However, additional studies need to be accomplished once the common measures are in place.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian 477 - Job Placement and Training
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	53%	Effective

Measure: Percentage of adults employed after exiting the program. (BIA had similar measures with ambitious targets in place and is now working to develop targets for these common performance measures).

Additional Information: New Measure: results of common measures initiative; targets to be determined in 2004.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual and Long Term

Measure: Percentage of adults employed after program exit that were still employed after one year. (Targets under development)

Additional Information: New Measure: results of common measures initiative; targets to be determined in 2004.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual and Long Term

Measure: Percentage change in adult earnings: preregistration to post progam after exit. (Targets under development)

Additional Information: New Measure: results of common measures initiative; targets to be determined in 2004.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual and Long Term

Measure: Cost per adult participant. (Targets under development)

Additional Information: New Measure: results of common measures initiative; targets to be determined in 2004.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Efficiency

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian 477 - Job Placement and Training
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	100%	100%	53%	Effective

Measure: Percentage of youth program participants who entered employment or enrolled in education and/or training after program exit. (Targets under development)

Additional Information: New Measure: results of common measures initiative; targets to be determined in 2004.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Percentage of adult participants in an Education/Training program that earned a diploma, GED or certificate. (Targets under development)

Additional Information: New Measure: results of common measures initiative; targets to be determined in 2004.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Percentage of students that have a goal of increased literacy and numeracy that attain improved literacy and numeracy skills. (Targets under development)

Additional Information: New Measure: results of common measures initiative; targets to be determined in 2004.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Through treaties dating back to the 1800's and legislation starting with the Synder Act of 1921, the federal government has assumed a responsibility for the benefit, care and assistance of Native Americans throughout the U.S. for general support, including the management of Indian forests.

Evidence: The National Indian Forest Management Act (NIFRMA) of 1990 (25 U.S.C. 3101) allows the Secretary of the Interior to "take part in the sustainable management of Indian forest lands, with the participation of the land's beneficial owners, in a manner consistent with the Secretary's trust responsibility and with the objectives of the beneficial owners...".

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Prior to the passage of NIFRMA, Congress identified a series of findings that: Indian forests are among the tribes most valuable resources; the U.S. has a trust responsibility for the lands; Federal laws do not sufficiently assure the adequate management of these lands; tribal governments are making substantial contributions to the overall management of the lands; and there is a serious threat arising from trespassing and unauthorized harvesting of the resources.

Evidence: NIFRMA, P.L. 101-630 Sec. 302.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: While the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, and some states manage similar forestry programs within their respective areas, they do not service this population.

Evidence: Various treaties and legislation.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The overall objective of the Indian forestry program is to manage or assist Tribes with the management of their forests consistent with Tribal goals and objectives. There is no evidence that a different approach would be more efficient or effective.

Evidence:

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Nearly 50% of the BIA forestry appropriation is contracted by tribes through self-determination contracts and self-governance compacts.

Evidence: The following approximate percentages of the forestry budget categories are targeted at the field level rather than for overhead/administration: 100% of TPA; 87% of Non-Recurring; 50% of Regional Office Operations; 30% of Central Office Operations. In addition, tribes receive contract support for administrative expenses (i.e., personnel and accounting).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: BIA has a long-term performance goal to manage or influence resource use to enhance Tribal benefit and promote responsible use of forest products.

Evidence: See GPRA plans and the Department's FY 2004 Strategic Plan.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Indian forests cover over 17 million acres on 275 reservations in 26 states with a commercial timber volume of approximately 42 billion board feet with an annual allowable harvest of 779 million board feet. There are several performance measures that reflect the program purpose, including increasing the actual timber harvest to the level of the calculated allowable harvest or to the tribes expressed goals; and increasing the number of Indian forest lands covered under a Forest Management Plan (FMP), or forest implementation plans under an approved Integrated Resource Management Plan (IRMP).

Evidence: See GPRA plans and the Department's FY 2004 Strategic Plan.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The NIFRMA requires a FMP for each of the forested reservations. While BIA has made some progress, only 40% of the forested reservations have current FMPs and only 28 have IRMPs with an additional 46 under development. BIA has developed a goal to cover 100% of the tribes with a plan.

Evidence: See GPRA plans and the Department's FY 2004 Strategic Plan.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: BIA has developed a long term goal to have a forest management plan for 100% of Indian forest land.

Evidence: See GPRA plans and the Department's FY 2004 Strategic Plan.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Tribal forest programs under self-determination contracts and self-governance compacts are managed in accordance with their FMP and/or IRMP and report accomplishments to BIA and GPRA coordinators.

Evidence: Reporting requirements under BIA and GPRA, along with the self-governance funding agreements.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The BIA forestry program is subject to an independent evaluation every 10 years as required by NIFRMA. The first assessment was completed in the 1993, and the second was due to be published in the fall of 2003. In addition, some individual tribal forestry programs have elected to be evaluated by independent certifiers of sustainable forestry.

Evidence: NIFRMA, PL 101-630; 1993 Assessment by the Indian Forest Management Assessment Team; draft 2003 Assessment by the Indian Forest Management Assessment Team. In addition, a report is prepared every 5 years by the BIA, Office of Trust Responsibilities, that focuses on tracking the adequacy of funding and FTE levels.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: BIA has not met its goal for the past several years for harvesting and has lowered its goal. Budget requests do not reflect a reduction in the amount of funding needed to achieve a lower goal. In fact, both the FY 2003 enacted and FY 2004 budget requested a $1.5 million increase to help narrow the gap between allowable and actual.

Evidence: Refer to budget narratives.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Strategic planning measures have been newly refined for FY2004. Forestry lies within the "Resource Use" quadrant of the Department's Mission and Outcome Goals contained within the Strategic Plan. Recently, six "Activities" for Activities Based Costing (ABC) were defined for measure within the Forestry Program.

Evidence: Refer to Strategic Plan Measure Definitions and ABC Activity Definitions for Resource Use - Forest Products .

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: Performance data is collected on an annual basis from all forest managers of Indian forests, both the federal managers and tribal forest manager partners. Data is used to produce an annual performance report to Congress. Performance data is frequently used to adjust annual allocations of non-recurring project-based funding.

Evidence: Allocation changes, based on performance or lack thereof in non-recurring forest development funding, are documented.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: SES Performance Plans include "Forestry Performance" for those managers who have forest responsibilities. In addition, forest managers are responsible for operating within their approved FMP or IRMP, and have performance measures of various types that enforce this responsibility.

Evidence: Examples of performance measures for forest managers and SES Performance Plan language. BIA has the ability to adjust funding levels. For example, no funds have been allocated to the Navajo Nation in the last 2 years due to the lack of an acceptable FMP.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: TPA funds are spent for general forest operations and for timber sale preparation and administration. Non-recurring funds are project specific and spent for forest development work (thinning and planting), inventory and management planning, woodlands management, watershed restoration, and increased timber harvest initiatives. Funds are obligated within their two-year funding cycle. Because most forestry work is project specific and dependent upon weather conditions, market conditions, wildland fire situation, etc., some project obligations understandably do not occur until the second year of the two-year budget cycle.

Evidence: Contracted funds are routinely examined via 638-contract audits and self-governance trust reviews to track expenditure timeliness and to ensure funds are being used for the intended purpose.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Of the tribes with forestry programs, 121 or 47% provide management services for their own forests. Compact/contract agreements permit tribes to use any cost savings achieved for related program purposes. In addition, Indian forests often are valued by the tribes for ceremonial or cultural purposes rather than as a source of revenue; therefore, cost efficiencies are not necessarily important or desirable. Tribes are encouraged to manage their programs for self-sufficiency; therefore, competitive sourcing to private entities to achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness would be contrary self-governance.

Evidence: Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (P.L. 98-638), as amended and Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-413)

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: Collaborations occur regularly with the U.S. Forest Service (FS), the Fish and Wildlife Service, the states and the forest industry. Some examples of FS collaborations are: the use of FS entomologists and pathologists as technical experts on reservations; the application of FS pest management funding for activities on reservations; and cooperative agreements with some FS offices for staff exchanges to improve efficiency. In addition, BIA partners with FS on a cooperative education agreement at Haskell University to train 20 students annually in resource management, including forestry.

Evidence: Refer to pest management allocations from the FS. Also, cooperative agreements regarding personnel exchanges occur at the field level.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: The FY 2002 Audited Financial Statement shows a BIA-wide material weakness for inadequate controls over financial reporting. However, the material weakness is not directly related to the forestry program.

Evidence: FY 2002 Audited Financial Statements

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 17%

Explanation: The draft 2003 IFMAT-II executive summary shows that major progress has been made to 3 of the 4 major gaps identified by the 1993 team.

Evidence: An Assessment of Indian Forests and Forest Management in the United States, June 2003, Executive Summary by the Second Indian Forest Management Assessment Team (IFMAT-II) for the Intertribal Timber Council.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The NIFRMA requires a forest management plan for each of the forested reservations. While BIA has made some progress, only 40% of the tribes have current FMPs and only 28 have IRMPs with an additional 46 under development.

Evidence: BIA Greenbook and IFMAT-II

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: Annual performance goals are achieved in some years and not in others. The reasons behind this lack of achievement are somewhat different than not achieving the long-term goals. Achieving the annual goals can be hampered by: (1) severity of wildland fire season, as forestry staff can be drawn away from normal duties to perform wildland fire suppression duties, and large forest areas can be shut down from meaningful work accomplishment; (2) other weather conditions, such as extremes in any weather facet, can seriously detract from the number of productive work days in the forest; (3) market conditions for the forest products being produced (poor markets can slow production); and (4) expressed goals of the tribes differing from FMP as a result of a change in leadership.

Evidence: Refer to GPRA reports and Report to Congress.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: BIA has not met its goal for the past several years for harvesting and has lowered its projected harvest levels. The FY 2003 budget includes a $1.5 million increase in TPA funds to target tribes with differences between actual and allowable harvests. The FY 2004 budget request contains an identical request. Data showing the effect of the increase for narrowing the gap between allowable and actual is not available.

Evidence: BIA Greenbook

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The traditional cultural and spiritual connection between the tribes and their lands make them unique to comparisons to state or private entities whose goals may be more closely aligned to economic outcomes. However, because the BIA forestry program has a large timber sale component, a comparison to BLM or FS is not feasible. A recent GAO report on BLM Public Domain Lands found that a sharp decline in timber volume since 1990 is the direct result of the governmentwide shift from timber production to enhancing forest ecosystem health. BLM's timber volume in 2002 was 26 million board feet compared to BIA's harvest of 569 million board feet.

Evidence: GAO-03-615 - BLM Public Domain Lands - Volume of Timber Offered for Sale Has Declined Substantially Since Fiscal Year 1990

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 25%

Explanation: The 2003 IFMAT-II report indicates progress has been made in several key areas since the 1993 IFMAT Assessment including narrowing the gap between Tribal and BIA forestry program visions with greater Tribal participation in planning and management However, some gaps remain including the need for all forested reservations to have a management plan.

Evidence: Some individual tribal forestry programs have elected to be evaluated by independent certifiers of sustainable forestry, such as the American Forest and Paper Association or the First Nation Development Institute (FNDI) that provide third party certification that forest practices and harvesting methods are sustainable. However, FNDI found that "tribes that focus their forest management practices on ceremonial activities and use forest products predominantly for internal, non-commercial use may not be interested in the market-driven characteristics..." of certification. See "The Place of Third-Party Forest Products Certification in Native American Forestry."

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

Measure: Percentage of acres on forested reservations that have a forest management plan.

Additional Information: This long-term goal will measure the percentage of the 17 million acres covered by a forest management plan.

Year	Target	Actual
2003	44%	
2004	73%	
2005	76%	
2006	76%	
2015	100%	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Percentage of forested reservations covered by forest management plans.

Additional Information: This goal measures the annual increment of the 275 forested reservations with a plan toward the long-term goal of covering 100% of the 17 million acres of trial forests.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		37%
2004	39%	
2005	36%	
2006	40%	
2007	41%	

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Forestry Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	100%	33%	

Measure: Percentage of current allowable annual harvest taken.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the gap between the actual annual harvest and the current allowable annual harvest.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		73%
2004	74%	
2005	76%	
2006	78%	
2007	80%	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Measure Under Development

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual

Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)

Measure: Percentage of acres of acres achieving desired conditions where condition is known and specified in management plans, consistent with applicable environmental laws and regulations, and Tribal goals and objectives.

Additional Information: This goal will ensure that Tribes are benefiting from the full potential for economic or cultural development as outlined in the forest management plans.

Year	Target	Actual

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	43%	65%	0%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Statutory responsibilities of BIA's Division of Law Enforcement include: (1) enforcing federal and tribal laws; (2) investigating criminal offenses; (3) protecting life and property; (4) providing detention and correctional services; and (5) providing training, prevention and outreach programs.

Evidence: Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-379) [25 U.S.C. 2802(b)]

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: On Indian reservations, violent crime rates (657 per 100,000 residents) are higher than national average (506 per 100,000 residents); aggravated assault rates are higher (600 vs. 324); property crime rates are lower (1,083 vs. 3,618).

Evidence: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Fact Sheet (January 2003).

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Law Enforcement: Subject to federal statutes, tribal, federal and state agencies may carryout some law enforcement activities within Indian reservations. BIA coordinates operations with other federal, state and local agencies through formal agreements. In 2000, BIA and tribal agencies employed (full-time) about 2,300 law officers and 1,160 support personnel. Other federal agencies employed over 88,000 officers and 72,000 support personnel. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) conducts felony (criminal) investigations on Indian reservations. State/local agencies employed over 708,000 officers and 311,000 support personnel. Detention Facilities: BIA operates 20 facilities and tribes operate 48 facilities, with combined capacity of 2,100 inmates. DOJ replacement/renovation completed for 4 facilities, ongoing for 12 facilities, and planned for 4 facilities. Tribes also incarcerate prisoners at other federal, state, and local facilities.

Evidence: Law Enforcement: In 1999, DOJ began awarding Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) grants directly to tribal governments to support new police officer, criminal investigator, dispatcher, and detention officer positions. COPS Tribal Resources Grant Program may cover 75% of additional salary, training, and equipment expenses for 3 years. COPS Tribal Hiring Renewal Grant Program may cover 4th and 5th year salary/benefit costs for police officers. Other DOJ grant programs include COPS in Schools, Troops to COPS, Tribal Mental Health Community Safety Initiative, and Methamphetamine. U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) provides grant assistance for tribal police recruitment, training, and equipment. Detention Facilities: DOJ provides tribal grants for construction of detention facilities; BIA fund operations and maintenance.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: In FY 2002, BIA supported 206 Indian police agencies. Tribes managed 163 (79%) local agencies under Indian self-determination contract or compact agreements. BIA managed 43 (21%) agencies. BIA and DOJ have no formal coordination on tribal COPS grant applications, awards, and compliance oversight.

Evidence: Tribal COPS grant awards required to supplement BIA resources. BIA has not yet identified the tribal COPS positions scheduled for funding expiration under DOJ programs.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	43%	65%	0%	Demonstrated

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BIA program allocations use Base funding levels to maintain current services, with limited flexibility for significant redeployment of resources to target specific types, patterns, or geographic centers of crime.

Evidence: For FY 2005, BIA plans to target any new funding on specific problem areas, such as border security and violent crimes. BIA has no plan to address retention of personnel as COPS grants expire. Section 1.5 may be reassessed upon submission of 2005 budget/strategic plan.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight 14%

Explanation: Long-Term Goal: By 2005, reduce the 2000 Part I (violent) crime rate from 16,500 to 10,500 reported crimes per 100,000 inhabitants.

Evidence: See Section on Performance Measures (Annual targets).

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight 14%

Explanation: Targets for reducing crime rates may not be realistic because of adverse social-economic conditions on most Indian reservations.

Evidence: See Section on Performance Measures (Annual targets).

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: NO Question Weight 14%

Explanation: The Office of Law Enforcement and Security (OLES) has researched current literature and several reports from academic sources, other Federal law enforcement entities (including DOJ), and has met with the Director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police to discuss performance measures. OLES has recently drafted new performance measures from this research and will work with BIA and OMB to standardize and finalize the measures. These new measures will allow for more reliability in analyses of changes in resources over time once baseline data is established.

Evidence: There is currently no clear baseline year to use for BIA crime statistics. This is caused by two situations: 1) The OLES adjusted the data reporting requirements several times attempting to capture adequate and sufficient data to accurately reflect crime activities in Indian Country. These adjustments are now stabilizing. 2) Tribes and Law Enforcement District Offices have been less than consistent in reporting crime data. BIA and OLES are working together to reengineer the reporting process to ensure that timely and accurate data are received from all offices. Law Enforcement District Offices will work with Tribal Police Forces to improve consistency in reporting crime data.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight 14%

Explanation: No baseline/trend data available as BIA is converting to DOJ approach in calculating crime rates. Targets for reducing crime rates may not be realistic because of adverse social-economic conditions on most Indian reservations.

Evidence: See Section on Performance Measures (Annual targets).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	43%	65%	0%	Demonstrated

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: BIA standards established in regulations and manuals for uniformed police, criminal investigators, detention operations, radio communications and dispatch programs. Tribes have increased participation in BIA reporting system.

Evidence: BIA's Model Contracts/Annual Funding Agreements require tribes to conform to specific program standards for duties/responsibilities, hiring/training, equipment/uniforms, and operations/performance evaluations.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: No GAO or IG program impact reviews conducted in past ten years. BIA's Internal Affairs unit reviews compliance of tribal agencies with program standards/guidelines, such as personnel qualifications, training, operational procedures, and recordkeeping. Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA) conducting compliance reviews of BIA agencies on 439 standards. Site reviews completed/scheduled at 50 BIA agencies. CALEA assessment to be completed in November 2003.

Evidence: In 2002, DOI's Inspector General conducted a department-wide review of law enforcement programs. Report includes 25 recommendations for improving central leadership, organization, resource control and accountability. BIA cited a model for personnel and training standards, operations manuals, staffing redeployment, records systems, and incident reporting. IG report does not assess program performance and results. BIA has not yet provided program studies based on such statistics as officers and vehicles per capita/land area and response/arrest rates by types of offenses for making comparative evaluations among Indian reservations.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: BIA's program/budget plans did not anticipate expiration of initial COPS grants in 2003. BIA's 2003 and 2004 budget estimates did not provide for operations of new detention facilities.

Evidence: DOJ secured authority for tribal COPS renewal grants for 4th and 5th years. Recently, BIA and DOJ began coordinating on construction priorities for new detention facilities, which should help BIA to schedule operational resources needed for expansions in number of facilities.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: BIA's 2005 Strategic Plan expected to include proposals for program improvement.

Evidence: Section 2.8 may reassessed upon submission of 2005 Strategic Plan.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	43%	65%	0%	Demonstrated

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BIA compiles annual information from tribal law enforcement agencies on personnel and crime statistics for submission to DOJ. BIA-tribal agency participation has increased from 71% in 1998 to 87% in 2001. However, BIA does not yet use this more complete and reliable data for program management improvements, such as targeting program resources to locations with higher crime rates.

Evidence: U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Tribal Law Enforcement, 2000" (January 2003).

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Indian tribes operate 163 (79%) of BIA-funded law enforcement agencies under non-competitive contract/compact agreements. Model agreements require tribes to conform to BIA personnel, training, program regulations and standards, including record keeping and performance evaluation.

Evidence: Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act of 1974 (P.L. 98-638), as amended [25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.]. BIA has exercised authority to terminate tribal law enforcement contracts and resume direct management of services.

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight 15%

Explanation: BIA obligates all tribal contract/compact funds at start of fiscal year. Tribes receive separate contract support funding for adninistrative (i.e. personnel, accounting, procurement) services.

Evidence:

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Indian law enforcement is an inherent federal/tribal government function, not subject to competitive sourcing. Model contract/compact agreements permit tribes to use any cost savings achieved for related program purposes.

Evidence: Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act of 1974 (P.L. 98-638), as amended [25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.].

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: NO Question Weight 15%

Explanation: BIA and DOJ need to coordinate on expiration of COPS grants. New COPS positions are funded for three years; extension grants for two additional years are authorized. BIA and tribes need to plan for the transfer of these additional personnel expenses.

Evidence: During FY 1999 - 2002, 48 BIA and tribal police operations received three annual COPS grants. Up to 125 COPS funded positions may have to transfer to BIA's FY 2005 Budget.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	43%	65%	0%	Demonstrated

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:15%

Explanation: BIA conducts annual program and financial reviews of tribal contract/compact operations for compliance with program regulations and standards. Single Audit reports are also reviewed to resolve high risk, material, and other adverse findings.

Evidence: BIA has recently terminated two tribal contracts for cause and resumed direct management of law enforcement.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:15%

Explanation: No GAO or IG program impact reviews conducted in past ten years. BIA's Internal Affairs unit reviews compliance of tribal agencies with program standards/guidelines, such as personnel qualifications, training, operational procedures, and recordkeeping. CALEA conducting compliance reviews of BIA agencies on professional standards.

Evidence: BIA has recently terminated two tribal contracts for cause and resumed direct management of law enforcement. BIA's 2005 Strategic Plan expected to include proposals for program improvement.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Number of PART I (Violent & Property) offenses have increased during the joint BIA-DOJ program initiative: 24,830 (1999); 24,815 (2000); 26,417 (2001); 29,323 (2002).

Evidence: U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Tribal Law Enforcement, 2000" (January 2003).

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: No assessment/data available on number of BIA/tribal agencies that have achieved progress on annual targets for reduction in crime rates.

Evidence: Comparative assessments could be conducted on tribal/reservation conditions, crime patterns, police, and court operations to establish local performance goals and targets.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Since BIA-DOJ Indian law enforcement intitiative, BIA funding has increased from $96.3 million in FY 1999 to $159 million in FY 2003. BIA's FY 2004 Budget requests $169 million for police and detention facility operations. DOJ funding has increased from $182 million in FY 1999 to $209 million in FY 2003. DOJ's FY 2004 Budget requests $214.9 million, including $30 million for COPS and $35 million for new detention facilties.

Evidence: No study/data available comparing efficiency and effectiveness of BIA law enforcement programs or agency operations.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	43%	65%	0%	Demonstrated

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: No comparative study on effectiveness of BIA law enforcement to other federal/state/local operations.

Evidence: DOJ's reports on Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies and Federal Law Enforcement Officers provide personnel, operation, and crime data for trend and comparative analyses.

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BIA's 2005 Strategic Plan expected to include proposals for program improvement. CALEA reviews assess compliance with professional standards, not impacts and effectiveness of program operations.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	43%	65%	0%	Demonstrated

Measure: Violent crime reported in Indian Country per 100,000 inhabitants.

Additional Information: In 2000, the Part I (violent) crime rate was 16,500 reported crimes per 100,000 inhabitants.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2001	15%		
2002	13.5%		
2003	12.0%		
2004	10.5%		
2005	10.5%		

Measure: Rate of suicides per 100 inmates at detention facilities in Indian Country.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Number of inmates per rated detention facility capacity in Indian Country.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Police average response rate for Part I (violent) crimes, reported in minutes. (New measure under development.)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2005			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	43%	65%	0%	Demonstrated

Measure: Measures under development

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2005				

Measure: No. of police officers per 1,000 inhabitants in Indian communities under 10,000 population.

Additional Information: Compare to 2.9 in non-Indian communities in 1996.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Long-term
1996		1.3		
1999		2.3		

Measure: Police Arrest rate for Part I (violent) crimes.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Annual

Measure: Percent of Part I (violent) crime cases accepted for prosecution

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Annual

Measure: Conviction rate of Part I (violent) crimes prosecuted.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Law Enforcement
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	43%	65%	0%	Demonstrated

Measure: Percent of Indian community satisfied with law enforcement services rendered in Indian Country

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Rate of personal assaults per 100 inmates at detention facilities in Indian Country.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Post Secondary Education - Tribal Colleges
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs/OIEP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	78%	26%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The progarm is intended to provide Native Americans with post secondary education opportunities. Native Americans are primarly located on remote Indian reservations with limited access to post secondary schools. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) role is to promote a progam of comprehensive higher education services of high quality that are financially and geographically accessable that meet individual, business and community needs. The BIA program strives to achieve its purpose through four program elements: (1) undergraduate scholarships (scholarships) for Indian students attending any accredited college or university, (2) direct Federal operations of two post secondary schools named Haskell Indian Nations University and Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute (HINU/SIPI), (3) operations grants for 25 Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities (TCCUs), and (4) special higher education programs (shep) for graduate level studies, for members of a Federally recognized Indian Tribe.

Evidence: P.L. 105-244-Higher Education Amendments of 1998, Title IX PART A Extension and Revision of Indian Higher Education Programs Sec. 901 Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities, Sec. 902 Reauthorization of Navajo Community College Act; P.L. 95-471 Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978; 25 USC Chapter 20 Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Sec. 1802 Purpose; 25 CFR PART 41 Grant To Tribally Controlled Community Colleges and Navajo Community College; 25 CFR PART 40 Administration of Educational Loans, Grants, and Other Assistance for Higher Education; 1921 Snyder Act Title 25 USC 13, Expenditure of Appropriations by Bureau of Indian Affairs.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program addresses a significant problem for the Native American community, low rates of post secondary education as compared to the non-Native American community. Based on the 2000 Bureau of Census data, approximately 26% of the US white population reported total schooling of a bachelor or graduate degree. By contrast, only 13% of the US American Indian and Alaska Native population reported total schooling of a bachelor or graduate degree. Whites tend to graduate from college and graduate school at twice the rate of American Indian and Alaska Natives. To help bring parity to Indian Country, BIA provides annual financial assistance for approximately 9,500 Indian students seeking undergraduate degrees, direct operations of two post secondary schools (HINU/SIPI) which serve approximately 2,000 Indian students seeking post secondary degrees and training, operational funding for 25 TCCUs which provide college and training to 20,000 Indian students and provides fellowships for 299 Indian students preparing to or attending professional or graduate level schools.

Evidence: P.L. 105-244: P.L. 95-471; 25 USC Sec. 1802; 25 CFR 41; 25 CFR 40; 25 USC 13; Census Data 2000 Educational Attainment.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Post Secondary Education - Tribal Colleges
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs/OIEP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	78%	26%	

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BIA's post secondary program provides education services and opportunities to American Indians and Alaska Natives, which do not duplicate other funding sources. These post secondary programs are based on a unique legal and political relationship with Indian tribes over many years. While other Federal funding sources of post secondary programs offer funds to Indian undergraduate students, TCCUs, HINU/SIPI, and graduate level Indian students, these grants or awards are competitive and not awarded because of a legal or political relationships with Indian tribes. BIA's contribution to the TCCUs ranges from 25% to 38% of operating expenses based on specific Tribal authorizations and the number of students attending the respective TCCUs. Since the passage of the TCCU Act, BIA's contribution has provided base funding and the TCCUs have been encouraged to supplement their total funding requirements from other sources and the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act allows for access to the opportunities afforded other institutions.

Evidence: P.L. 105-244: P.L. 95-471; 25 USC Sec. 1802; 25 CFR 41; 25 CFR 40; 25 USC 13

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program does not appear to have major design flaws. However, TCCU's argue that because appropriations are less, by about one-third, then the annual authorized funding limit they are not able to raise graduate rate. BIA has not been able to demonstrate that additional funding will increase the program's overall effectiveness in raising the number of Indian students receiving bachelor and graduate degrees.

Evidence: BIA formula for HINU and SIPI, TCCU regulations, Scholarship financial unmet need form

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program is effectively targeted to reach the inteneded beneficiaries -- colleges and students. For HINU/SIPI and TCCUs funds are distributed by formula based on the Indian Student Count (ISC). For undergraduate scholarships (scholarships) for Indian students attending any accredited college or university, funds are distributed from the Tribal Priority Allocation base to the BIA Regional Office where funds are provided to the Tribe via the PL 93-638 Indian Self Determination, Contract and Compact and or Grant process. The Special higher education programs (shep) for graduate level studies are earmark in the budget line item activity Special Program and Pooled overhead for Special Higher Education Scholarship and funds distribution are made under a Grant Process to the American Indian Graduate Center.

Evidence: Fund Distribution Documents (FDD); Tribally Controlled Community College Grant Application OMB # 1076-0018; Grant Agreement/Amendment OIEP FORM 21; Tribal College & University Indian Student Count (ISC) Reporting Form OIEP Form 22; Indian Student Count for FY 04; Higher Education Scholarship Contract Standard Form 30,; American Indain Graduate Center Grant Agreement form/requistion. NCES Profile of Undergraduates in US Postsecondary Education Institutions: 1999-2000.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Post Secondary Education - Tribal Colleges
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs/OIEP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	78%	26%	

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: BIA has identified new long term and annual measures, which are included in the Department's current strategic plan, for achieving parity between the Tribal community and US rural area national average on college graduation. For the 2005 budget, no efficiency or scholarship measures were identified. In addition, the measures developed do not cover all aspects of academic quality and operational efficiency and the data collection methodology has yet to be developed to ensure that BIA measures are the same as national measures. For example, there are no measurement of student advancement rates; number of transfer students to four-year institutions; first-time, full-time graduation rate after three years; percentage of educational and general activities on instruction and academic support; etc. BIA will be investigating these and other measures as they finalize their performance reporting.

Evidence: Performance measures and 3 year results analysis of degrees conferred. Haskell and SIPI enrollment and graduation data for three academic years

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The new long term measure of achieving parity between Tribal community and US rural area national average on college graduation is an ambitious target, given the fact that based on the 2000 Bureau of Census data, approximately 26% of the US white population reported total schooling of a bachelor or graduate degree. By contrast, only 13% of the US American Indian and Alaska Native population reported total schooling of a bachelor or graduate degree. Whites tend to graduate from college and graduate school at twice the rate of American Indian and Alaska Natives. In terms of obtaining Associate degrees conferred, from 1976-77 to 1997-98 the percentage distribution of degrees conferred indicates 75.7 white compared to 1.1 American Indian/Alaskan Native this is indicative that achieving parity of college graduation is ambitious.

Evidence: Performance measures and 3 year results analysis of degrees conferred. FY 05 Budget submission Appendix 11; Table A Total enrollment Title IV postseconday NCES fall 1998) Table 263- Associate degrees conferred 1976-77 to 1997-98) NCES.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: GPRA goals and new measures in proficiency for required core courses are as follows:1) Number of Degrees granted by Junior and Senior Colleges and Universities will increase by 2%, 2) Number of students achieving proficiency by passing the two required freshman level English courses or testing out, will increase by X% from the previous academic year and 3) The number of students achieving proficiency by passing the one required freshman level Math course or testing out, will increase by X% from the previous academic year. However, BIA should consideration adding measures on academic quality and operational efficiency, such measures as student advancement rates; number of transfer students to four-year institultions; first-time, full-time graduation rate after three years; space utilization, percentage of educational activities on instruction and academic support.

Evidence: Performance measures and 3 year results analysis of degrees conferred. FY 05 Budget submission Appendix 11

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Post Secondary Education - Tribal Colleges
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs/OIEP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	78%	26%	

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: While the BIA has base line data on graduation rates, base line data for the annual goals are being established in 2004. In addition, measures such as measurement of student advancement rates; number of transfer students to four-year institutions; first-time, full-time graduation rate after three years; classroom and laboratory space utilization, percentage of educational and general activities on instruction and academic support are being added. The data results for the Annual measures will be collected from TCCUs, Haskell and SIPI through the revised TCCU Annual Report form. The Annual Report Form was modified through the Federal Register Notice process to reflect the data collection for revised performance measures.

Evidence: Copy of revised TCCU Annual Report Form; Federal Register Notice.

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: All partners in the four elements of the Post secondary programs work towards the education and graduation of Federally recognized Native American students through the fulfillment of the new annual performance goals and then provide performance reporting through the submission of annual reports and surveys.

Evidence: TCCU and survey reports, Higher education annual report, AIGC annual report, Template provided for partner review. Federal Registier Vol.69, No. 74/Friday April 16, 2004 Notices

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The two post secondary progam elements -- HINI/SIPI and TCCU -- are required to maintain accreditation from a nationally recognized accrediting agency, which are considered independent academic reviews. These accrediting entities require academic accreditation evaluation on a 3-5 year cycle. From the evaluation, any academic deficiences are corrected by the accreditation process. As to the non-academic portions of the program -- scholarship and SHEP -- independent evaluation/reviews have been limited. In addition, evaluations are discouraged under P.L. 93-638. BIA should encourge the colleges to participate in independent reviews of these two program elements.

Evidence: HINU Accreditation reports 9/26/03, SIPI Accreditation Report 2/14/2000; Singel Audit report Oglala Lakota College for FY ended 9/30/2002; Administrative Review current schedule. Independent Compliance panel review 2004

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Post Secondary Education - Tribal Colleges
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs/OIEP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	78%	26%	

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: While the HINU/SIPI and TCCUs do create performance based budget packages, the scholarship program has focused on cost per student counts and has failed to focus on how the level of funding reflects graduation rates. BIA budget request write-ups will be modified with the FY 2006 budget. The budget will make a presentation based on comparisons in scholarship funding to the number of students that are able to complete their educational objectives and graduate.

Evidence: Appendix 11 of the FY 05 President's Budget Request

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Additional performance measures to track the proficiency level of students in required courses to assist and correct problem areas and ensure student success have been developed. In addition, scholarship performance measures are to be developed. BIA will also review non-Indian postsecondary education institutions and ensure that in making comparisons with Indian institutions, like measures are being compared.

Evidence: Appendix 11 of the FY 05 President's Budget Request

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: BIA collects and uses performance information to effectively manage the program. The BIA currently collects information from TCCUs and HINU/SIPI on the number of degrees conferred, and they collect an annual program description report on the scholarship program that outlines the results of funding. The BIA will begin collecting data based on the revised TCCU's annual report, for the TCCU's and HINU/SIPI and the HE annual report, to make even better informed decisions about the program. BIA will be reviewing non-Indian post secondary education institutions to ensure that when making comparisons with Indian institutions, that like measures are being compared. In addition, BIA will review measures that both Indian and non-Indian institutions are being asked to provide by other agencies to determine if measures should be added to BIA's list or if BIA measures should be revised to reduce the reporting burden on Indian institutions.

Evidence: TCCU and survey reports, Higher education annual report.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Although Individual performance plans for the SES personnel include individual GPRA performance measures there is no evidence that the program managers below the SES level have performance measures included in their annual performance plans, and if they did, that BIA actually used these measures in evaluating individuals.

Evidence: Haskell Presidents Performance Plan sample. Directors SES Performance Plan

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Post Secondary Education - Tribal Colleges
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs/OIEP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	78%	26%	

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Federal funds are fully obligated annually to grantees. All grants are subject to annual compliance audits under the Single Audit Act. BIA works with grantees to correct any problems identified by audits. No systematic problems have been identified through audits.

Evidence: Copy sample of Grant document and Fund Distrubution Documents. Single Audit.

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The BIA is in its first year of collecting cost data and to date no comparative analysis has been done on any of the programs to determine cost effectiveness or efficiencies. However, the BIA has begun working to collect comparative data from community colleges to draw cost and efficiency comparisons for TCCU and HINU/SIPI. BIA expects to have the analysis complete by September and from the analysis develop efficiency measures. Haskell and SIPI currently use student data management systems that are conducive to enhancing the performance of the schools in terms of management information. Haskell uses the Comprehensive Academic Management Systems (CAMS) which functions as an operational information system, and SIPI uses a custom designed management information system software called Student Admissions and Reporting System (STARS) that provides for reports on admission statistics, enrollment, and assessment information etc.

Evidence: Sample table of data to be gathered and analyzed. MIS: STARS and CAMS

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Under the Budget Process, BIA collaborates with the Native American Budget advisory council to develop a meaningful budget proposals for all BIA programs. The Education Line Officers collaborates with the local tribes to get input in developing program priorities for BIA. All financial aid offices must keep track of all avenues of funding supplied to applicants to determine eligibility for scholarship funding under HE on the basis of unmet need. This requires that there be constant collaboration with all scholarship and grant programs that offer assistance. Through collaboration with the Small Business Administration, SIPI is developing and implementing a small business development training program targeting American Indian entrepreneurs.

Evidence: Sample Financial Approval Package Form, SIPI/SBA agreement October 1, 2003.

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Contractors must meet the standards for Tribal or Tribal Organization Management Systems, including the Standards for Financial Management systems. Grantees must adhere to Principles for Determining Costs Applicable to Grants. HINU/SIPI adheres to the Federal Finance System (FFS), and the Bureau received a clean audit on financial practices in FY 2003.

Evidence: 25 CFR Subpart A General provision Part 900 ; Copy of the latest Bureau Annual financial report

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Post Secondary Education - Tribal Colleges
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs/OIEP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	78%	26%	

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: HINU/SIPI have implemented an independent personnel system under PL 105-337, the Administrative Systems Act of 1998, 112 Stat.3171, to improve hiring practices. The deficiencies were, that the personnel system was not addressing the needs of the HINU&SIPI. To effectively and efficiently provide quality post secondary education, the institution must employ top-quality faculty, administrators, support staff and technical/specialist workforce. Hiring restrictions and overly complex job classifications unduly exhaust valuable resources (staff, time, and budget), and unnecessarily detract attention from the institution's educational mission.

Evidence: PL 105-337 Haskell Indian Nations University and Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute Administrative Systems Act of 1998; 25 CFR 38.15 Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute

3.BF1 **Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Administrative Reviews are conducted by the Deputy Director with a team that includes Education Line Offices and program specialist, this review includes HINU and SIPI. Reviews of the Annual Reports are conducted and monitoring procedures are in place for all Grantees. The Audit and Evaluation office tracks all single audit report as submitted, and collaborates with Grant officer and the grantee to resolve material weakness identified in the audit. Further, the BIA requires the Grantees to submit a performance report.

Evidence: Annual Report, Monitoring Schedule with check list of compliance reviews.

3.BF2 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The graduation results are collected through the TCCU Annual Report form and on the GPRA performance reports. The BIA provides copies of the overall performance report to all Central Office and Field Directors and final performance information is reported in the Performance and Accountability Report for DOI.

Evidence: GPRA data collection forms, Sample Performance Report, 2003 PAR

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Based on the results of the annual data collected, the program has demonstrated some progress. However, BIA has and continues to develop new performance measures and baselines to better demonstrate program progress. If these new measures were in place, BIA still does not have the data to demonstrate progress.

Evidence: BIA Performance Reports; 2003 PAR; Performance reports from Green book, Continued accreditation of TCCUs and Postsecondary

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Post Secondary Education - Tribal Colleges
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs/OIEP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	78%	26%	

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The results of the annual data collected from all programs shows the BIA has achieved its annual performance goals on degrees conferred. While BIA does has base line data for graduation rates and accreditation the collection methodoloy and measures need to be reviewed to ensure they are the same script as non-Native American institutions. BIA is establishing base line data for the new proficiency goals during FY 2004, and will ensure that all the new measures collected to compare Indian institutions with non-Indian institutions will have the same definition data collection scripts.

Evidence: BIA Performance Reports; 2003 PAR.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BIA is developing efficiency measures.

Evidence: AIHEC contract, AIGC grant; On-line/Distance learning (Bay Mills, SIPI. HINU)

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: A current study available on NCES_IPEDS shows that Bureau Community colleges compare favorably to similar rural community colleges on their individual graduation rates. The BIA will be tracking parity with US rural average for graduation through the DOI strategic plan, however, the Department of Education has not finished establishing their baseline level for a national graduation rate and necessary statistical data will not be available until late in calendar year 2004 to develop a comparison based upon community college achievements.

Evidence: DOI's strategic plan. NCES-IPEDS comparsion of data of selected community colleges

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Accreditation reviews are done by recognized accrediting associations. All of the programs are responsible for obtaining audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 (31 U.S.C. 7501et. Seq.). As to the non-academic portions of the program, scholarship and SHEP, no independent evaluation/reviews are required and, infact, are discouraged under P.L. 93-638. However, one review was conducted on the Scholarship program by an outside entity. The review was conducted by Kate Sildes of NIGA and evaluated such areas as Federal commitment to education, expected growth in college enrollment, the rising cost of higher education, comparison of the BIA Scholarship program to National benchmarks, in which the only disparity seems to be the low level of resources to address the needs of all grant requests. At least one independent evaluation was conducted on TCCUs in 2004 which included an independent panel that reported compliance with P.L. 95-471

Evidence: Sample copy of accreditation report; Sample of Single Audit. Independent Compliance panel review 2004.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Post Secondary Education - Tribal Colleges
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs/OIEP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	78%	26%	

Measure: Achieve X percent parity on graduation rates between Tribal and non-Tribal community colleges. (Measure and Targets under development.)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

Measure: Number of Degrees granted by Junior and Senior College/Universities will increase by 2%

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2003	1,400	1,723	
2004	1,700	TBD	
2005	1734	TBD	

Measure: The number of students achieving proficiency by passing the two required freshman level English courses or testing out, will increase by x% from the previous academic year. (Targets under development)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: The number of students achieving proficiency by passing the one required freshamn level Math course or testing out, will increase by X% from the previous academic year (Targets under development)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Post Secondary Education - Tribal Colleges
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs/OIEP
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	78%	26%	

Measure: (Measure under development)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual

Measure Term: Efficiency

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Roads - Operation and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	38%	57%	13%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Program is intended to maintain certain roads and bridges (referred to as "BIA system") within Federally recognized Native American reservations to help meet their design life and to provide services, such as snow removal, striping, and ditching for their satisfactory and safe use. The BIA system is a subset of the larger Indian Reservation Road (IRR) system which includes all public roads on reservations. The IRR system provides safe and adequate transportation and public access to, within, and through Indian reservations for Native Americans, visitors, recreational users, resource users, and others, while contributing to the health and safety and economic development of Native American communities. The IRR system is funded by the Federal Highway Trust Fund (HTF) and the BIA. The HTF program funds are statutorily reserved for construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation and replacement of roads and bridges, not for activities specific to the maintenance of roads/bridges. The BIA maintenance funds are for the maintenance & protection of the public investment of highway trust fund dollars.

Evidence: 23 U.S.C. 101(a) Definitions, 23 U.S.C. 204(a) Federal Lands Highways Program, 23 U.S.C. 116 Maintenance, 25 U.S.C. 318(a), 25 CFR 170.2 Roads of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Definitionsand 170.19 Appeals, 58BIAM Bureau of Indian Affairs Manual, Road Maintenance.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: As of April 2004, the IRR system consisted of approximately 25,700 miles of BIA and tribally owned public roads and 800 bridges. This represents over $3.4 billion in federal investment back to 1982 when the IRR program was established through the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 and continued with subsequent reauthorization of the highway act. Maintenance of these roads/bridges is necessary to protect the federal investment and to provide needed transportation facilities for Tribes and the general public traveling through Indian reservations.

Evidence: Indian Reservation Road Inventory as maintained by the BIA Division of Transportation, Report 3, 4/30/2004; History of IRR program funding, 1982-2003, BIA Division of Transportation; Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 (STAA) Pub. L. 97'424.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: There is no duplication of maintenance activites. The BIA system roads and bridges, through rights-of-way either granted by, or assumed from, the Tribe is under the jurisdiction of the BIA. The BIA is the local public authority as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a). Other public authorities have public road systems also on or near Indian reservations, which are not the maintenance or reconstruction responsibilities of either the BIA or the tribal government. Unless BIA expressly grants another agency or entity the right to perform maintenance activities, only the BIA may perform maintenance activities on BIA system roads/bridges.

Evidence: 23 U.S.C. 101(a) Definitions, 23 U.S.C. 204(a) Federal Lands Highways Program, 23 U.S.C. 116 Maintenance, 25 U.S.C. 318(a), 25 CFR 170.2 Roads of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Definitions, 58BIAM Bureau of Indian Affairs Manual, Road Maintenance.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Roads - Operation and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	38%	57%	13%	Demonstrated

1.4 **Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The IRR HTF road/bridges construction program is supposed to coordinate with the BIA road maintanence program to achieve the design life of roads/bridges. This is not occurring. Tribes are not using all of their HTF funding on the BIA system to reconstruct roads/bridges that have met their design life, increasing BIA maintenance costs for those deferred reconstruction road/bridge projects. States, counties and local governments constructed over 38,000 miles of roads on reservations using HTF funding. The problem is 1) local public entities are refusing to use their HTF funding to reconstruct their roads/bridges when they have met their design life, forcing tribes to redirect their IRR HTF funding to reconstruct these roads/bridges; and 2) local public entities do not maintain their roads adequatly requiring these roads/bridges to be reconstructed more frequently. This results in ineffective use of BIA road maintenance resources and Tribal HTF resources. A reassessment of the current law regarding HTF funding and the responsibilites of Tribes and non-Tribes on reservations is needed.

Evidence: Significant increase in Road Construction funds vs Interior appropriated road maintenance funds (TEA-21, annual DOI appropriations).

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Current resources are directed consistently at road maintenance and routine maintenance activities of BIA system roads/bridges. Despite the average age of the BIA bridges (81 years), bridge maintenance resources although small still results in a BIA bridge deficiency percentage comparable to the nations bridge percentage. A road maintenance program is generally designed to maintain or preserve the existing level of service of a road system not improve it. A consistent application of resources will assure that the design life of roads/bridges are met and at the end of that design life, other resources for construction, rehabilitation, and replacement can then be maximized for their intended purposes. In practice, however, non-BIA roads are being subsidized with IRR HTF construction funds, effectively limiting the amount available for the reconstruction of BIA roads.

Evidence:

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight 13%

Explanation: The Road Maintenance Program has newly established goals within the Department's Strategic Plan that focus on improving the actual condition of roads and bridges. However, BIA needs to develop more specific measure to demonstrate parity between BIA roads and other rural roads.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight 13%

Explanation: Uncertain if the targets and timeframes are ambitious. Baseline data is not available because this is the first year that road and bridge condition data will be collected and will be available in at end of FY2004.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Roads - Operation and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	38%	57%	13%	Demonstrated

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The Bureau has established measures to track the condition of roads and bridge based on a 5 level condition rating index, a rating system used by the State of Washington. The rating system was selected because it is similar to those used by most state DOT's. It reflects a wider range of ratings for low volume roads, using a visual basis for consistency purposes. BIA can also use this rating system to calculate the Facility Condition Index on roads and bridges so that the Department can compare the condition of capital investments across all of the Departmental Bureaus.

Evidence: BIA FY 2004 GPRA data collection form

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: FY 2004 is the first year of collecting road/bridge condition data and targets cannot be set until baseline data is established. Baseline data and targets will be available in the Fall after the close of the FY 2004 Fiscal Year.

Evidence:

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Field staff were instrumental in the development of the goals based on condition ratings, but tribal response to requests for performance information still needs to be improved.

Evidence: BIA FY 2003 and 2004 GPRA data collections

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Very limited program reviews are conducted by Central Office and Regional Offices at the agency level. Information and guidance provided under these reviews is limited and sometimes confusing. There is a strong need for independent review by external agencies to identify program deficiencies and improvements.

Evidence: Process and product reviews are provided in conjunction with Federal Highway administration, but are limited to the requirements of 23 USC 116, Highways, Maintenance and 204 (c), Federal Lands Highways Program.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Roads - Operation and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	38%	57%	13%	Demonstrated

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The requested funding level is not based on local or national program needs and is inadequate to meet extensive maintenance backlogs. The program budget has not kept pace with the introduction of new roads built under the IRR HTF program. Once these roads are placed within the BIA system they become part of the inventory that must be maintained. The inventory of BIA roads since 1989 has increased from approximately 21,000 to 25,000 miles or about 20%.

Evidence: Indian Reservation Road Inventory as maintained by the BIA Division of Transportation, Report 3, 4/30/2004;

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The program has developed new performance goals to track actual condition of roads and bridges to ensure safe and efficient travel in Indian Country. Clearly defined measurement under these new goals was developed and presented to all of the road maintenance engineers in the field. Some on-site visits were conducted to make sure that the field engineers understand how to implement the new measurement system to ensure valid data consistency.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan, FY 2004 GPRA data collection form, Condition Level Handbook.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Bureau has had performance measures in place for the roads program since FY 1999 and has collected performance information for those goals quarterly. Unfortunately the goals established in 1999 were measuring the output of miles maintained as opposed to the actual outcome of road conditions and didn't provide for good program management. An additional problem area has been one of receiving full reporting from tribes performing road maintenance under self-determination contracts and self governance annual funding agreements. This area is being addressed for all performance reporting through an overall agency approach of negotiating GPRA reporting language into P.L. 93-638 contracts and Annual Funding Agreements for compact tribes.

Evidence: Proposed language to be included in self-determination contracts and self-governance annual funding agreements by OSG/BIA.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Bureau is including GPRA performance measures in the Individual Performance Plans of all program managers in FY 2004. Because this is the first year of implementation accountability for adhering to performance and cost measures cannot yet be proven. As a result, there is no evidence that BIA has used the measures to rate individuals.

Evidence: Draft performance plans

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Roads - Operation and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	38%	57%	13%	Demonstrated

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Funds are made avaiable to the Program are obligated in a timely manner for road maintenance and routine maintenance.

Evidence: FY2002, FY2003 and current FY2004 obligation of road maintenance program funds from the Federal Finance System (FFS) shows that of the amount received in each of these fiscal years were obligated.

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: There is no set automated system that is in place at this time for the collection of road maintenance data. Field programs collect data in a variety of ways. The Bureau is initiating the development of activity base costing (ABC) for use in collecting both deferred maintenance and performance information. Processes traditionally used by program managers for data collection were put on hold due to the formalization of automated systems within the Bureau. Costing information and will not be available for comparison until after the collection of initial cost data this year.

Evidence:

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The program has close collaboration with the IRR HTF program within the Division of Transportation. However, the BIA has no direct control over county and state federal-aid programs, and therefore cannot provide assurance that these roads for construction are being properly maintained. All roads/bridges constructed with HTF are required to be maintained by law. Although, the BIA does provide that agreements with public entities require compliance with a maintenance agreement, BIA has no way to enforce the agreements.

Evidence: See Stewardship Agreements; 23 USC 116, Highways, Maintenance.

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The program financial system provides for tracking of activities such as program management, snow/ice removal, ferry boat operation, routine maintenance, etc. The report is available to Regions. The tracking system is however dependent upon the close updating by the agency and region offfice personnel. New efforts on the part of the Bureau to implement activity base costing /management will help to support better data.

Evidence: FY2002, FY2003 and current FY2004 obligation of road maintenance program funds from the Federal Finance System (FFS) shows that of the amount received in each of these fiscal years were obligated.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Roads - Operation and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	38%	57%	13%	Demonstrated

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The program has developed a workgroup committee to address development of the Indian Affairs Manual (IAM) on Road Maintenance to established defined policies and procedures for the program. The group will also work on the refinement of the Road Maintenance Handbook and improvement of information and data collection procedures. Newly published requirements for the BIA on the use of HTF is found in 23 CFR 973. This will require three national systems for managing IRR (including BIA roads/bridges).

Evidence: 23 CFR 973- Management systems for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Bridge, Safety and Pavement)

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight20%

Explanation: Appropriate long-term measures were not developed until FY 2004 data collection and some of the measures are being refined.

Evidence: Annual Performance Reports for FY 1999 through FY 2002 and the FY 2003 PAR.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight20%

Explanation: New goals have just been put in place for 2004 and targets have not be set since baseline data is not available until the end of the year.

Evidence: Annual Performance Reports for FY 1999 through FY 2002 and the FY 2003 PAR.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight20%

Explanation: Past rating measures were based on program outputs and not program efficiencies and were not help in determining the effectiveness of the program.

Evidence:

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NO Question Weight20%

Explanation: Cost comparisons with local governmental agencies (state and county) reveal that those agencies with similar purpose and goals provide more resources per mile than the BIA. The condition of the current BIA road system (2/3 of the system) is unimproved and earth surface and, therefore, requires far more extensive methods to maintain for public use.

Evidence: Bureau of Transportation Statistics, DOT annual publication (minor collector, rural).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian Roads - Operation and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
60%	38%	57%	13%	Demonstrated

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program because of its close association with the FHWA funded IRR program requires that funds are provided and that roads are maintained. Annual process reviews or product reviews are performed by the oversight agency, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), this includes road maintenance. The FHWA believes that BIA roads are not adequately addressed relative to road maintenance activites.

Evidence: Process reviews for Regional programs.

Measure: Achieve X percent parity on road conditions between Tribal and non-Tribal rural roads. (Measure and targets under development.)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

Measure: Percent of miles of road in good or better condition based on the Service Level Index. (Targets under development)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Percent of bridges in good or better condition based on the Service Level Index. (Targets under development)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: (Measure under development)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Efficiency

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian School Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	78%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The BIA education system was established to provide learning opportunities for non-public school Native American children. 25 CFR Part 32.4(i) allows parents the choice of sending their children to a BIA school rather than a public school. The Education Construction program enhances educational opportunities for Indian children by providing and maintaining safe and nurturing facilities in which to learn.

Evidence: In treaties dating back to the 1800's and legislation starting with the Synder Act of 1921, the Federal Government has assumed a responsibility to provide an education, including the construction and maintenance of schools, to Indian children who wish to attend an Indian school. Current laws governing Indian students include: No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; the Synder Act, and the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: 25 U.S.C. 2005(b) requires the BIA to bring all schools, dormitories, and other Indian education related facilities operated by the Bureau or under contract or grant with the Bureau into compliance with applicable Tribal, Federal, or State health and safety standards.

Evidence: Approximately 48,000 instructional students and resident-only boarders (approximately 7% of all Native American children) in 23 states attend the 184 elementary and secondary schools and dorms that form the BIA school system.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: This question received a yes, because currently the BIA is the only entity performing this function for this population of Native American children. This does not mean that another entity could not perform the function. Every year throughout the Country, new schools are built and existing schools are renovated by state and local school districts and private contractors. While school construction is not a process unique to the BIA, it serves a population which is not currently served by other programs.

Evidence: BIA report to Congress on the integrity of school construction grants, May 1999.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Public laws are fairly prescriptive for guidelines governing what the BIA can regulate as far as the terms and conditions being negotiated between the Tribes and the Bureau. Once the project is funded, the Tribes has a great deal of latitude on the project, including the choice to plan, design and construct the project. BIA has very little flexibility to redirect projects as priorities change, or to compel a Tribe to complete a project within a certain timeframe.

Evidence: For FY 2005, new appropriations language has been adopted which will allow the Secretary to assume control of a project and all funds related to the project if construction does not start within 18 months of appropriations. Data is not yet available to indicate how well this provision works.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian School Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	78%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BIA uses an independent engineering firm to perform a cyclic inventory and backlog assessment on each facility. Based on this assessment, projects are prioritized, and funding requested as a result of the ranking. BIA awards contracts, compacts and grants for all of its construction projects. BIA also encourages the Tribes to perform the work in accordance with the BIA mission to promote self-determination.

Evidence: Approximately 80% of the construction project work is performed through PL 93-638 (Indian Self-Determination), PL 103-413 (Self-Governance) compacts, and PL 100-297 Tribally Controlled Schools which allows Tribes to delegate authority to their school boards. Although the actual construction of the schools is performed by contractors, there may be opportunity for further efficiency of the management functions within the account.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight 11%

Explanation: BIA's long term outcome goal is to provide students and teachers with a safe physical environment in which to learn and grow.

Evidence: BIA has an FCI assessment completed by an independent contractor for 100% of its facilities. BIA has established a goal of attaining a .10 FCI or less for the overall condition of its facilities by FY 2008. The September 2001 FCI of .266 serves as the baseline for measuring improvement. The FY 04 FCI is .124. BIA appears to be on track to meet this long-term goal.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight 11%

Explanation: BIA has one long-term measure that facilities will be in fair or good condition as measured by the Facilities Condition Index. BIA has agreed to adopt additional performance goals for a reduction in cost per square foot; elimination of excess space; and time required to complete a construction project.

Evidence: BIA will be publishing these goals in various documents including the Performance Accountability Report and the Congressional Budget Justification.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight 11%

Explanation: BIA is on target to reach its FCI goal of .10 or less.

Evidence:

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight 11%

Explanation: BIA has collected data on baselines for the new annual goals.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian School Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	78%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: For new school replacement and major facilities improvement and repair projects, the program partners submit monthly status and financial reports showing summary of activities, funding outlayed to date, and current status of project milestones. However, construction starts are slow and often delayed due to design problems, negotiations with sovereign tribal entities, changes in tribal leadership that alter previous decisions, need to complete land acquisition approval processes, and religious and cultural considerations.

Evidence: For the most part, the partners support the program. DOI has noted problems in the past caused by turnover of tribal government councils and its effect on the commitment to the program goals. BIA is providing OMB with monthly detail of the status of the replacement schools. New appropriations language may help speed up construction completion.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: There have been several evaluations on Indian Schools in the last 2 years. One report by the Inspector General found that BIA's student enrollment projection process generally produced inflated estimates which resulted in schools being planned, designed, and constructed with excessive space, costing in excess of $110 million. BIA has also contracted with a third-party to independently review the proposed space guidelines, and analyze and provide a comparison of BIA school construction criteria to non-BIA schools. The study found BIA guidelines were in line with other rural states.

Evidence: IG Report 2003-I-0070, September 2003; Verificaiton of Studies Used in Planning and Constructing BIA Schools, New West Technologies, LLC-June 2003

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: BIA is in the process of establishing goals. The goals were not used to formulate BIA's budget request.

Evidence:

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: BIA participates in the Department's Capital Planning and Investment Control Process. BIA has developed a Facilities Management Information System (FMIS) which contains data used to make strategic planning decisions.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian School Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	78%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

2.CA1 **Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: BIA has been working on improved cost and scheduling processes. BIA has established new policies for student enrollment projections, acceleration of school construction starts, reduction in the use of contingency funds, and the use of facility improvement and repair in lieu of total replacement of a school, where feasible.

Evidence: Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs and senior managers have been very involved in improving this program. It will take time to see if the new policies are working.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: BIA collects quarterly progress and financial status reports from its 638 contractors and grantees. In addition, BIA also conducts periodic field inspections to ensure quality of construction. The construction program is assessed as part of the regional program reviews conducted by BIA.

Evidence: BIA has produced a report in response to an OMB request for information on how BIA spent or intended to spend $1.2B appropropriated within the past few years. However, it was not readily available, and required a great deal of time and effort on BIA's part to produce. As a result of the exercise, it is unclear what information BIA collects or how they use the information to manage the program.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The Director of Facilities/Construction performance agreement contains an element for timeliness of projects and financial management; however, it is very generic and not tied to performance goals. 43 CFR Part 12 permits BIA to place special conditions on grantees for project accountability. BIA uses a "high risk" ranking system to identify tribes with financial and management deficiencies. If a tribe cannot conform, sanctions such as limiting Federal funding to a cost-reimbursement basis, are implemented.

Evidence: OIG Semi-Annual Report. See SES Performance Measures

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: BIA continues to carry over large amounts of unobligated balances. In addition, there are indications that BIA committed anti-deficiency violations in FY 2003 although the violations do not indicate that the funds were not used for the intended purpose. The violations are undergoing review.

Evidence: BIA carried over $224m from FY 2003.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian School Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	78%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: While no contracts currently have incentives, BIA uses multiple program management methods, such as the Means National Cost Estimating System, to measure cost effectiveness of the program.

Evidence: Incentives would only be applicable to 20% of BIA contracts.

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: BIA coordinates with public schools to develop education space guidelines for school construction. In addition, BIA works with the National Indian School Board Association to convey program information and progress on projects.

Evidence: BIA participates on the New Mexico State Public School Capital Outlay Task Force. The school construction program conducts joint reviews with the BIA school operations program to evaluate replacement school applications to determine school replacement priority. However, BIA needs to improve on this coordination.

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The FY 2000 audited financial statements identified a need to improve controls over Construction-in-Progress as a material weakness. Subsequent audited financial statements show the problem has been resolved.

Evidence: Department of the Interior Annual Report on Performance and Accountability, November 2004

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: BIA has the FMIS which provides information for program decision making. Program reviews are conducted of the region's facility management operations under A-123 Internal Controls. BIA has completed its initial round of facility condition assessments.

Evidence: OIG Report 2002-1-0008, dated December 2001. "The bureaus are beginning the essential and critical tasks of assessing the conditions of their facilities, identifying the extent of deferred maintenance needs, and implementing the information systems necessary to effectively manage and maintain facilities."

3.CA1 **Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: BIA does not have the ability to adjust quickly to changing situations. BIA has little control over cost and established schedules for 80% of its program once the project is contracted, granted, or compacted to the Tribes. However, FY 2005 appropriations language will allow the Secretary to assume control of a project if construction does not start 18 months after appropriations is finalized.

Evidence: It is too early to gauge the effect of the language change on the program.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian School Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	78%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: BIA has a long-term goal for its FCI, and it is in the process of adopting additional goals for excess space, cost per square foot, and time required to complete a construction project. No data is available for meeting these new goals.

Evidence: BIA has made progress in its FCI goal. The current FCI is .124 down from the .262 September 2001 baseline. The FY 2005 President's Request would have reduced the FCI to .113. The FY 2005 enacted level needs to be evaluated for its effect on the FCI.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: BIA appears to be on track to reach its goal of .10 in FY 2008. No data available for the new goals which were recently established.

Evidence:

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: As a result of a 2004 PART finding, BIA no longer finalizes its cost estimates for construction projects until planning and design have been completed. This will likely have an effect on BIA's newly established goal for reduction of cost per square foot.

Evidence: While data is not available to show the effect of achieving its program goal for cost per square foot, BIA reports that program managers have found improved efficiency in negotiations with tribes over the size and scope of projects as a result of this change.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: For school space size guidelines, a recent report found that BIA's guidelines are generally in line with guidelines from other state and national sources. In addition, the IG found BIA's space guidelines were suitable; however, student enrollment projections were generally inflated. The Replacement School Construction Cost Analysis report found that construction administration costs are typically 5% of facility cost for public schools; however, BIA estimates construction administration costs at 30-34%. These additional costs are often the result of Tribal taxes and fees. Tribal employment and contract preferences may require additional training costs. In a recent report, the IG found that, while BIA has improved since its May 1999 plan, opportunities exist for more improvement.

Evidence: Audit and Verificaiton of Studies Used in Planning and Constructing BIA Schools, New West Technologies, LLC-June 2003
Office of the Inspector General, May 2003 Replacement School Construction Cost Analysis, Applied Management Engineering, Inc. December 2002 Office of the Inspector General Report BIA-0047-2002, February 2004

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian School Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	78%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: NO Question Weight:17%

Explanation: BIA has instituted new policies in response to independent evaluations; however, it is too early to determine if these new policies will be effective.

Evidence:

4.CA1 **Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: BIA has had success in achieving its FCI goal within budgeted costs and established schedules.

Evidence: BIA has not requested any additional funding to complete projects above original estimates.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian School Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	78%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

Measure: Average BIA School Facility Condition Index. An FCI score of .10 or lower means a facility is in good or better condition.

Additional Information: Baseline: September 2001 FCI was .266

Year	Target	Actual
2004		.124
2005	.113	
2006	.1012	
2007	.105	
2008	.100	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: % of BIA replacement schools constructed within 4 years of commencing planning

Additional Information: Baseline: 28% of new schools are completed within 4 years

Year	Target	Actual
2004		28%
2005	40%	
2006	60%	
2007	80%	
2008	100%	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian School Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	78%	50%	28%	Demonstrated

Measure: Average cost per square foot for new replacement schools

Additional Information: Baseline: Average cost per square foot is $198. Reduce 5% per year.

Year	Target	Actual
2004		$198
2005	$188	
2006	$179	
2007	$170	
2008	$161	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Eliminate 20% of excess academic space from inventory as of September 2004

Additional Information: Baseline: 1.5 million sq feet of excess space

Year	Target	Actual
2005	300000	
2006	300000	
2007	300000	
2008	300000	
2009	300000	

Measure Term: Long-term

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)
Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: Indian School Operations

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The mission of the BIA, Office of Indian Education Programs, is to provide quality education opportunities in accordance with the tribes' needs for cultural and economic well-being in keeping with the wide diversity of Indian Tribes and Alaska Native villages as distinct cultural and governmental entities.	In treaties dating back to the 1800's and legislation starting with the Synder Act of 1921, the Federal Government has assumed a responsibility to provide an education to Indian children. Mission statement 25 CFR Part 32.3, Pub.L 95-561 (as amended), and 25 CFR 39. "It is the responsibility and goal of the Federal government to provide comprehensive education programs and services for American Indians and Alaska Natives."	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	BIA serves approximately 48,000 students in 185 schools located in 23 states and 63 reservations, representing 263 tribes, and includes the basic instructional program, student transportation, and administrative costs.	Nationwide there are approximately 517,000 Native American children: 465,000 (including BIA students) attend public schools, and the remainder attend private schools.	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	BIA school operations program provides 78% of all Federal funding for BIA schools.	In FY 2002, total Federal funding was $645M, with $504M from BIA and $141M from Education.	20%	0.2
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	BIA schools meet the unique cultural needs of American Indians, and serve children in remote and isolated communities not accessible to public schools. A limited number of Indian students attend boarding schools which are unique to state and local governments. However, less than 10% of all eligible American Indian and Alaska Native students attend BIA schools. In addition, BIA schools are accredited by state/regional agencies and must meet the same standards for education.	Of the 185 schools, 26 schools are on reservations in which there are no public schools, and 37 schools are more than one hour from the nearest public school. Of the 171 BIA schools operating in the 2001-02 school year, 96% were accredited under state or regional accreditation associations. There are 20,027 students in 54 boarding schools and 1,556 students in 14 dormitories.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	BIA encourages the tribes to perform the work through contracts and compacts in accordance with the BIA mission to promote self-determination.	Currently 121 schools are currently contracted through P.L.. 93-628 (Indian Self-Determination) and P.L.. 100-297 (Tribally Controlled Schools Act) grants.	20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**100%**

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	Yes	Current strategic planning documents include the long-term goals of improving the succession of Indian students to each educational level The goals address: (1) student proficiency in math; (2) student proficiency in language arts; (3) student attendance, (4) teacher proficiency in use of new assessments; and (5) reduction in violence and substance abuse among students.	BIA Strategic Plan (current) BIA FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan Draft DOI Strategic Plan for FY 2003-2008	14%	0.1
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	Yes	The BIA FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan contains GPRA performance targets that are annualized targets for each of the measures above. The proposed goals and measures in the DOI strategic plan would also have annualized targets.	BIA FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan Draft DOI Strategic Plan for FY 2003-2008	14%	0.1
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	Yes	School boards, school staff, administrators and parents are involved in developing the consolidated school reform plan. Stakeholders assist in developing the strategic plan, goals and measures.	The consolidated school reform plan and annual report card are shared with all stake holders.	14%	0.1
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	BIA collaborates with the Department of Education to approve state education plans and the allocation of funds to individual schools. Each school works with the state to obtain teacher certification and accreditation.	BIA and Dept. of Education MOU and approved state plan. Individual state/regional accreditation and teacher certification. Multiple school attendance and curriculum policies.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	Yes	An external evaluator conducts the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) with a team composed of education specialists. One-third of the schools are reviewed annually. Schools develop and implement action plans to address areas needing improvement. CIMP reports and action plans are maintained for each school reviewed.	Standardized state achievement tests are administered at all BIA schools.	14%	0.1
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	Budget request does not reflect program goals. Most of school operations funds are distributed by formula, not on factors related to goals and objectives. The schools are allowed to shift funds among program activities, for instance student transportation funds can be used for ISEP.	Local schools consider the unique needs of students when developing their school reform plan and consolidating resources available to implement the reform plan.	14%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	BIA requires Corrective Action Plans when schools fail to achieve partial proficiency results. BIA adjusts its strategic plans yearly relative to actual accomplishments on annual targets. BIA and Education are collaborating to develop a criterion-referenced test aligned with national standards to assess student achievement while eliminating the cultural bias in the 23 state tests currently administered to BIA students.	Strategic plan for Office of Indian Education Programs and DOI. As of the Fall 2002, 25% of schools require corrective action plans.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**86%**

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	Yes	A student count is conducted annually to determine the Average Daily Membership; consolidated school reform plans and performance report cards are submitted annually. Based on the data submitted, schools not making adequate yearly progress in (partial) proficiency are placed on a corrective action plan.	OIEP provided lists of schools in corrective action for math proficiency: 26 schools made adequate annual progress in basic proficiency; 107 schools did not make progress this year; 2 are in year three of the plan; 6 are in year four and 38 schools have needed corrective action plans for the last 5 years.	14%	0.1
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	Yes	The director, deputy directors, education line officers and school principals have student achievement results as a critical element in their annual performance appraisal.	Eighteen principals were replaced and 56 teachers were released in SY 2002 due to performance.	14%	0.1
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Based on a recent IG report of 4 sample schools, all 4 schools had questionable expenditures or inadequate financial plans. BIA has taken corrective actions at the schools. For the most part, it appears BIA schools are obligating funds in a timely manner and for the purpose intended. The Office of Audit and Evaluation coordinates responses to corrective actions found in the single audit reports.	IG report, Annual Financial Plan for Bureau operated schools; Audit Status Report. In FY 2002, there was a 71% closure rate on audit findings.	14%	0.1
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	Yes	BIA school funding is allocated by formula(s) without factors that provide for incentives. However, schools can reallocate BIA and Education funds to address needs and effectiveness consistent with a Comprehensive School Improvement Plan. The NCLBA provides for additional incentives/awards for schools that meet annual progress in student achievement.	BIA completed IT improvements by connecting all schools to the Internet. This has made teachers and students more proficient using modern technology to access/improve education skills and knowledge.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Although DOI complies with managerial cost accounting standards, it does not yet have a financial management system that fully allocates program costs and associates those costs with specific performance measures. This requirement might be met through Activity Based Costing (ABC), which DOI is adopting for each of its bureaus.		14%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	No	The Bureau received a clean audit for FY 00 and FY 01; however, BIA received a material weakness for inadequate controls over financial reporting.	FY 2001 Audited Financial Statements	14%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	Financial management training have been provided to all education line officers and staff. Corrective action plan was submitted to the IG to address findings from the last IG audit.	Corrective action plan for BIA operated schools. Technical assistance and resource staff to provide on-site guidance to grant schools identified as high risk	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**71%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	Small Extent	Of 169 schools, 24 are at/above 70% goal in Math, and 34 are at/above 70% goal in Language Arts.	26 schools are within 10% of 70% goal in Math, and 12 are within 10% of goal in Language Arts.	20%	0.1

a	Long-Term Goal I:	Average proficiency score (expressed as a percentage) in Math.
	Performance Target:	Achieve 70% by 2012
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	FY97: 38% FY98: 41% FY99: 43% FY00: 50% FY 01: 50% FY02:
b	Long-Term Goal II:	Average proficiency score (expressed as a percentage) in Language Arts.
	Performance Target:	Achieve 70% by 2012
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	FY97: 39% FY98: 41% FY99: 41% FY00: 48% FY 01: 50% FY02:
c	Long-Term Goal III:	The Bureau will increase teacher proficiency in new assessments to 73 % by FY 03.
	Performance Target:	FY97: NA FY98: NA FY99: 50% FY00: 59% FY 01: 73% FY02: 71% FY03: 73%
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	FY97: NA FY98: 45% FY99: 54% FY00: 68% FY01: 69% FY02:
d	Long-Term Goal IV :	The Bureau will increase student attendance rate to 92 % by FY 03.
	Target:	None. BIA plans to revise goal to national average (93%) by FY 2005.
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	FY97: 90% FY98: 90% FY99: 91% FY00: 90% FY01: 90% FY02:

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
e	Long-Term Goal V: The Bureau will provide for a 10% reduction in violence per school year through FY 03. Performance Target: FY97: NA FY98: NA FY99: NA FY00: NA FY 01: NA FY02: NA FY03: 7.624 Actual Progress achieved toward goal: FY97: NA FY98: 9,963 FY99: NA FY00: 10,706 FY 01: 8,471 FY02:					
2	Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?	Large Extent	Of 169 schools, 82 are at/above FY02 (52%) target in Math, and 77 are at/above FY 02 (52%) target in Language Arts.	20 schools are within 10% of FY02 target in Math, and 13 within 10% of FY 02 target in Language Arts.	20%	0.1
a	Key Goal I: The Bureau provides for a 2% percent increase in proficiency of students in math achievement Performance Target: FY:97 NA FY98: NA FY99: 45% FY 00: 47% FY 01: 54% FY02: 58% FY03: 54% Actual Performance: FY97: 38% FY98: 41% FY99: 43% FY00: 50% FY 01: 50% FY02:					
b	Key Goal II: The Bureau provides for a 2% increase in proficiency of students in language arts achievement Performance Target: FY97: NA FY98: NA FY99: 45% FY00: 45% FY 01: 52% FY02: 52% FY03: 54% Actual Performance: FY97: 39% FY98: 41% FY99: 41% FY00: 48% FY 01: 50% FY02:					
c	Key Goal III: The Bureau will achieve teacher proficiency in new assessment to 73% Performance Target: FY97: NA FY98: NA FY99: 50% FY00: 59% FY 01: 73% FY02: 71% FY03: 73% Actual Performance: FY97: NA FY98: 45% FY99: 54% FY00: 68% FY01: 69% FY02:					
d	Key Goal IV: The Bureau will increase student attendance rate to 91% by FY 01. Performance Target: FY97: NA FY98: NA FY99: 93% FY00: 94% FY01: 93% FY02: 91% FY03: 92%					

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Indian School Operations
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	86%	71%	20%	

Measure: Percentage of students achieving standardized proficiency ratings in math and language arts

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2012	70	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Percentage of students achieving standardized proficiency ratings in math

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
1999	45	43
2000	47	50
2001	54	50
2002	58	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Measure and targets under development

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	0%	44%	0%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The LWCF Act clearly states the purpose is "to assist in preserving, developing, and assuring accessibility to all citizens . . . outdoor recreation resources" by "providing Federal assistance to the States in planning, acquisition, and development of needed land and water areas and facilities."

Evidence: Land and Water Conservation Act (LWCF) Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460l-4). Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission Report (1988). National Park System Advisory Board findings (1994).

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The need for outdoor recreation opportunities is broadly recognized. Almost 40 years ago, the LWCF Act spoke of the need for outdoor recreation resources "to strengthen the health and vitality" of U.S. citizens; today, health advocates continue to cite that need. Many surveys show the importance of outdoor recreation for people's quality of life. States regularly pass bonds for outdoor recreation needs. Demand for hiking, camping, and other outdoor activities continues to increase.

Evidence: LWCF Act (16 U.S.C. 460l-4). See each of the 56 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans, or SCORPs.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program is well designed to assist State and local government efforts in providing outdoor recreation opportunities. Although the program duplicates State and local programs, the gap in non-Federal services is large enough to warrant a Federal program. Requirements for States to match funds and prepare statewide plans help to ensure that the Federal grants mesh with non-Federal responsibilities. Some other Federal programs (e.g., HUD's Community Development Block Grants, or CDBG) can support outdoor recreation activities, but LWCF grants have a much broader population of applicants.

Evidence: See a cross-cut comparison between LWCF and other Federal programs. NPS notes there are 87,000 units of governments that are eligible to receive LWCF State grants, compared to about 1,000 for CDBG grants. NPS also notes that 98% of all counties have received an LWCF grant at some point. NPS argues the gap in non-Federal efforts is best shown through surveys, various capital investment plans, and the large number of applicants willing to meet the 50 percent matching requirement.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program does not have sufficient program measures and reporting requirements to determine the overall effectiveness of the program. As a result, NPS cannot adequately document program results or verify the extent to which Federal funds are well targeted to meet program purposes.

Evidence: Section 6(d) of the LWCF Act (16 U.S.C. 460l-8) authorizes NPS to collect "other necessary information, as may be determined by the Secretary", but so far no performance information has been required from States. NPS will work cooperatively with the States to identify performance measures by 10/1/04 and begin collecting performance data no later than 10/1/05.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	0%	44%	0%	Demonstrated

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: States use the SCORP planning process and an "Open Project Selection" process to identify and select priorities that target beneficiaries most effectively. These processes ensure that no grant is funded without proof that it meets some need as defined by the State in the SCORP. NPS reviews the States' final project selections to ensure that the Federal funds are passed on to the intended beneficiaries.

Evidence: See examples of State SCORP plans and Open Project Selection procedures. NPS notes that the 50/50 matching requirement also helps to ensure that funds go only to serious applicants, since half of the funds for each project must come from non-Federal sources.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight 12%

Explanation: NPS lacks salient, meaningful performance measures that capture the most important aspects of the program. NPS will need extensive coordination with State partners to develop adequate measures that support the goal in the new DOI Strategic Plan to "improve access to appropriate recreation opportunities on DOI managed or partnered lands and waters."

Evidence: No evidence provided to show that the program systematically collects information from States on program outcomes. NPS does track one measure (the number of acres made available for outdoor recreation through LWCF acquisition grants), but it still lacks adequate information on prior performance and future targets.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight 12%

Explanation: See explanation for question 2.1.

Evidence: See evidence for question 2.1.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight 12%

Explanation: NPS lacks salient, meaningful performance measures that capture the most important aspects of the program. NPS will need extensive coordination with State partners to develop adequate measures that support the goal in the new DOI Strategic Plan to "improve access to appropriate recreation opportunities on DOI managed or partnered lands and waters."

Evidence: No relevant evidence available. Although the program has limited measures on its processing of grant applications, these workload measures do not demonstrate progress towards reaching long-term goals.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight 12%

Explanation: See explanation for question 2.3.

Evidence: See evidence for 2.3.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	0%	44%	0%	Demonstrated

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The program cannot measure and report on the performance of its partners as it relates to accomplishing the overall goals of the program. Nevertheless, evidence suggests that most State partners are committed to working with the program through (a) timely updates to their SCORPs, (b) obligation of funds, (c) project completion as outlined in grant agreements, and (d) post-completion site reviews.

Evidence: No relevant evidence available.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: No independent evaluations have been conducted since the 1980s, and no reviews are currently scheduled. As a result, DOI is strongly encouraged to conduct a review as soon as possible.

Evidence: GAO conducted a review of the program in 1981 and cited problems with the program. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission in 1988 evaluated the national need for outdoor recreation, and the American Planning Association reviewed the SCORP planning process in 1989, but these reviews did not focus on the overall effectiveness of the program.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Budget planning cannot be adequately tied to performance planning until sufficient outcome-based performance measures are developed. Program budget documents do not clearly indicate the full costs of achieving performance goals.

Evidence: No evidence was provided to show that budget plans are based on performance or results.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The program has not completed any formal strategic planning, but has begun to work aggressively with States to identify program performance goals that are consistent with the new DOI Strategic Plan to "improve access to appropriate recreation opportunities on DOI managed or partnered lands and waters." NPS and the States will need to reach agreement on ways to measure performance and collect data that demonstrate progress in addressing these goals.

Evidence: There is no relevant evidence available.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	0%	44%	0%	Demonstrated

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: NPS does not collect performance data related to key program goal and use that information to adjust priorities, allocate resources, or make management decisions. Although NPS does monitor how grantees obligate and use funds, that is a basic requirement and not a systematic process to monitor overall program performance.

Evidence: NPS and the States do not have a systematic process for setting and monitoring results-oriented performance targets. So far, the LWCF Grants Manual (Chapter 600.8) only describes the procedural requirements for State programs to comply with basic Federal grant requirements (e.g., appraisals, financial reporting).

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: NPS does not require partners to set and meet cost, schedule and performance goals. Although the program does require State partners to meet certain Federal grant requirements (e.g., obligate funds within three years), these requirements do not represent specific performance standards. NPS has no systematic policy on how States may use grant funding for administrative purposes, so there is a wide variety of rates used by States to determine the amount of indirect costs charged against Federal funds.

Evidence: So far, the LWCF Grants Manual has no requirement for States to measure results using performance goals. NPS has not provided evidence of specific performance standards or incentives for program partners, or evidence that grant and contract awards consider past performance. NPS did provide limited evidence that it enforces compliance with Federal grant requirements.

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The LWCF Act requires States to obligate grants within three years. NPS appears to have adequate procedures in place to encourage timely obligations, including a Special Reapportionment Account for funds that have been withdrawn or deobligated.

Evidence: LWCF Act section 6(b)(4), LWCF Grant Manual (chapter 600.3), reports on apportionments for 02, 03 and unobligated balances for 02 & 03.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	0%	44%	0%	Demonstrated

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program has not developed adequate procedures to measure and achieve efficiencies. It has begun to track average grant processing time, but more evidence is needed (e.g., future targets and written explanations of why processing time has not improved). The program has begun to make some IT improvements, and may be able to show improved efficiencies through the use of an electronic grant application and management system.

Evidence: The only efficiency measure shows that the average LWCF grant processing time has increased from 31 days in 2000 to 66 days in 2002. This is due to many factors, including a 168% increase in grants, but NPS needs to provide more information (e.g., written explanation for changes, outyear targets) before this becomes useful evidence. It also needs to find additional measures, such as cost per grant application processed, to track cost effectiveness in program application. NPS and DOI have taken steps toward electronic grant applications, which could improve program efficiencies by next year.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program coordinates with the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers (NASORLO) and individual State offices to ensure the grants go to projects consistent with the States' SCORPs. The States, in turn, coordinate with NPS and other Federal agencies to ensure that the SCORPs are consistent with various Federal requirements. NPS conducts a limited review of SCORPs, but does not produce an annual report that compiles information from States on accomplishments and performance.

Evidence: Examples of State SCORPs show some meaningful collaboration with NPS and other Federal agencies. Coordination with other agencies shown in other grant manuals, such as U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Grants Manual, 660 FW 4); Federal Highway Administration (Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning); and USDA Forest Service (Eastern Region Recreation Blueprint). NPS still needs to work with grantees to jointly produce an annual report, performance goals, and grant announcements that demonstrate meaningful collaboration.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program manages payments through HHS's SMARTLINK system, which is used by many Federal grant programs. This system allows for up-to-date monitoring of grantee payments and draw-downs. Also, the NPS Accounting Operations Center (AOC) tracks obligations and provides regular updates. The program is not aware of any questioned costs or audit exceptions found under the Single Audit Act process. It is also using the Federal Audit Clearinghouse to monitor audits more closely.

Evidence: See description of SMARTLINK system. Also see example of AOC's reports generated through the Document Direct system.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program has been slow to address management deficiencies, partly because it is rebuilding after no funding during much of the 1990s. NPS and a NASORLO task force have identified portions of the Grants Manual that require updating, and are revising the State Review Workbook. NPS still needs to identify deficiencies in performance information.

Evidence: No evidence provided of an annual report or summary of accomplishments in meeting performance goals and addressing management deficiencies. However, NPS has made some initial efforts, such as convening a NASORLO task force and drafting updates for the State Review Workbook.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	0%	44%	0%	Demonstrated

3.BF1 **Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: NPS has a reporting system to track expenditures by grantees. It also reviews SCORPs and conducts post-completion site inspections to verify that funds are used for their designated purpose.

Evidence: The LWCF Grants Manual identifies procedures for site visits, periodic inspections, SCORP reviews, and post-completion inspections. NPS still needs to document the annual accomplishments from grantee activities.

3.BF2 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program does not collect performance information in a user-friendly manner. NPS should prepare an annual report that includes information on project accomplishments, annual expenditures by state, workload measures, and performance results.

Evidence: NPS did not provide evidence of grantee performance data. NPS did publish on the internet a three-year summary report (FY2000-02), but this was just a list of approved projects (see: http//www.nps.gov/lwcf/). The program plans to develop an annual report for calendar year 2003.

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: NPS lacks salient, meaningful performance measures that capture the most important aspects of the program. NPS will need extensive coordination with State partners to develop adequate measures that support the goal in the new DOI Strategic Plan to "improve access to appropriate recreation opportunities on DOI managed or partnered lands and waters."

Evidence: No evidence provided to show that the program systematically collects information from States on program outcomes. NPS does track one measure (the number of acres made available for outdoor recreation through LWCF acquisition grants), but it still lacks adequate information on prior performance and future targets.

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: See explanation for question 4.1.

Evidence: See evidence for question 4.1.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	0%	44%	0%	Demonstrated

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program has not yet developed efficiency measures or been able to demonstrate high levels of efficiency through other means. It has made some initial IT improvements, such as including forms on its website, but it has not provided evidence that management practices have resulted in efficiency gains over the past year.

Evidence: No evidence of meeting performance targets to reduce per unit costs or other steps that result in tangible productivity or efficiency gains. Although NPS did provide data on grant processing time, the trends do not indicate improved efficiencies. NPS also did not set targets or identify strategies for improving processing time.

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program did not provide sufficient evidence to determine if (a) benchmarks exist to compare performance against other programs, or (b) no comparable programs exist.

Evidence: No evidence of benchmarks to compare performance to other programs. NPS did provide evidence for question 1.3 that shows the program purpose and design is not redundant or duplicative of other Federal programs. Yet, that is not the same as showing that the results of this program cannot be compared to other programs.

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: No independent evaluations have been conducted since the 1980s, and no reviews are currently scheduled. As a result, DOI is strongly encouraged to conduct a review as soon as possible.

Evidence: GAO conducted a review of the program in 1981. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission in 1988 evaluated the national need for outdoor recreation, but it did not focus on the effectiveness of the program. The American Planning Association reviewed the SCORP planning process in 1989.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) State Grants
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	0%	44%	0%	Demonstrate

Measure: Measure under development

Additional Information: To be determined. NPS will work with States to identify suitable output measures.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Long-term

Measure: Number of acres made available for outdoor recreation through LWCF grants.

Additional Information: Each State needs to set its own target and report its performance in meeting that target.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Annual

Measure: Measure under development

Additional Information: To be determined. NPS will work with States to identify suitable efficiency measures.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Annual	(Efficiency Measure)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Migratory Bird Program's (MBP) mission is to conserve migratory bird populations (including neo-tropic birds) and their habitats for future generations, through careful monitoring and effective management.

Evidence: >Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) - 16 USC 703-712.>Migratory Bird Management - A Trust Responsibility. FWS brochure.>Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1980 requires the Secretary of the Interior to identify conservation measures to assure that nongame migratory bird species do not reach the point at which measures of the Endangered Species Act are necessary. (16 U.S.C 2912)>North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA), Sec. 4401. - Findings and statement of purpose>Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act (NMBCA) (114 Stat. 593, PL 106-247).>A Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds. The Service is authorized by more than 25 primary conventions, treaties, and laws to ensure the conservation of more than 800 species of migratory birds and their habitats (see Appendix 3 of Blueprint).

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 30%

Explanation: Declining numbers of migratory birds and the adverse impacts on related economic and recreational activities resulted in International treaties and domestic laws to protect migratory birds. While some of the causes for bird declines have been adequately addressed (e.g. plume hunting, use of DDT), many new or recurring factors continue to adversely impact migratory bird populations and public benefits derived from healthy bird populations. More than 400 species, subspecies, or populations of migratory birds have been identified as Birds of Management Concern (BMC) due to listing under the Endangered Species Act, declining population trends, populations below desired levels, or overabundance that is potentially damaging to natural ecosystems or human interests. Reductions in habitat quantity and quality are the primary causes of negative population trends, but pesticides and contaminants; invasive species; collisions or entanglement with human-made structures; and disease outbreaks also cause significant migratory bird mortality. For example, Grassland nesting migratory birds have been declining since the late 1960s, with 61 percentshowing significant population declines due to loss or degradation of grassland habitat from agricultural uses.

Evidence: >A Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds, Appendix 4.>NAWCA, Sec. 4401. - Findings and statement of purpose>NMBCA, Sec. 6101. - Findings>NAWCA Progress Report (pgs 13-14) see Q1.5 >Migratory Birds of Conservation Concern list (http://migratorybirds.fws.gov/reports/BCC02/BCC2002.pdf)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight:30%

Explanation: The Migratory Bird Program is the only entity devoted specifically to the range-wide conservation of migratory birds. Many entities support or are involved in activities related to bird conservation, but no other agency, organization, or program, public or private, is designed to address the full range of issues, problems, and interests related to migratory bird conservation and management. These other efforts compliment rather than duplicate Migratory Bird Program efforts. Other conservation agencies/organizations have land or species conservation programs directed at or contributing toward healthy migratory bird populations or habitats. These programs, however, are generally more limited in scope either geographically or by species (or both). The FWS Refuge System and other land management agencies contribute to bird habitat conservation, but generally don't address habitat on private lands or outside the country. The FWS Partners program provides habitat conservation on private lands but not specifically for birds. Many state wildlife agencies have migratory bird programs but they are limited geographically and do not address range-wideneeds or concerns. U.S.G.S. contributes to bird population monitoring and assessment but do not have the authority for promulgating regulations to ensure conservation.

Evidence: >The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (1918)

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: No major design flaws have been identified that would prevent the program from meeting program goals and objectives. The program uses a wide array of tools to achieve its mission and goals such as land acquisition and easements, monitoring, and establishing hunting regulations. The past 6 years have been virtually free of any serious GAO corrective actions or Congressional Oversight Hearings. A 1997 Inspector General audit of North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) grant administration found no material weaknesses. Litigation involving the MBP has generally involved challenges to the scientific information used as a basis for management decisions.

Evidence: >A Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds.>Migratory Bird Treaty Act, >FWS Manual Chapters>Review of Flyway councils>NAWCA audit results>Summary of recent litigation

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The MBP targets funds and activities directly to address its purpose to maintain healthy populations of migratory birds to benefit the American public. Program resources support 5 broad strategic plan strategies: population monitoring; assessment & management; habitat conservation; permits & regulations; consultation, cooperation, and communication; and recreation. Each strategy contains detailed sub-strategies which guide development of action plans, budget requests, and project proposals necessary to achieve overall program goals. Individual components have targeting mechanisms to ensure resources reach intended beneficiaries. For example, competitive grants selection criteria prioritize awards to projects that best address priority species, habitats, and conservation actions in intended geographic areas. Joint venture (JV) funding is allocated to individual JV's based on assessments of regional bird conservation needs. Population surveys are prioritized to provide the information necessary to establish sound hunting regulations for those species desired by migratory bird hunters.

Evidence: >A Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds>FY05 Budget Request>JV Strategic Plans and reports>NAWCA biannual reports>NAWCA and NMBTA application guidelines>Joint Venture funding needs assessment.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The MBP recently completed a comprehensive strategic plan that identifies 3 program strategic goals and supporting strategies to fulfill the program's purpose. The strategic plan identified 3 strategic goals and supporting strategies to help guide development and refinement of program activities. During the PART specific long-term outcome performance goals were developed, consistent with the program strategic goals, to measure the effectiveness of the various components of the program. These goals all support the program's mission and are consistent with outcome goals of the DOI Strategic Plan.

Evidence: >Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds: Migratory Bird Program Strategic Plan 2004-2014>DOI Strategic Plan FY2003-2008

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The program developed targets for the long-term outcome measures developed during the PART process. Joint ventures, through their individual strategic plans, have developed ambitious long- term targets for achieving landscape conditions necessary to sustain migratory birds, but most other program components do not have comparable targets.

Evidence: >Joint Venture Planning documents

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: During the PART process, specific annual output performance goals were developed, consistent with the program strategic goals, to measure the effectiveness of the various components of the program. These goals all support the program's mission and are consistent with outcome goals of the DOI Strategic Plan.

Evidence: >Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds, Appendix 5>DMBM planning documents

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Baselines and ambitious targets for annual performance measures are under development.

Evidence: >Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds, Appendix 5>FY 05 Greenbook

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?**

Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Partners generally support the overall strategic goals of the program. The 3 strategic program goals included in the new program Strategic Plan were accepted in the general sense by program partners. Some program components have established partnerships directed associated with more specific goals and objectives. The National Flyway Council is an organization representing all the States and works with the Service for a common goal of developing annual hunting regulations that protect the breeding stock of all migratory game birds and yet provide recreational hunting opportunity to the public. JV'S are partnerships comprised of agencies, organizations, and individuals that have accepted migratory bird population goals and related habitat objectives detailed in joint venture plans as a common purpose. Grant agreements for NAWCA and NMBCA include program performance measures in their reporting requirements.

Evidence: >See Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds in other questions>Director's Order 98>Grants policies and assistance agreements

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The scope and complexity of the Migratory Bird Program make a single comprehensive evaluation difficult. Various program components have conducted or are planning to conduct evaluations aimed at evaluating effectiveness and identifying needed improvements (e.g. Flyway Council System Review; periodic review of individual MB survey programs, review of permit program). One of the operating principles of the program's Strategic Plan (Blueprint) is the application of science-based management and an adaptive approach for improving programs components. This commitment to regular assessments for improving program performance is tied to the other operating principle, partnerships. The program relies on collaboration with partners to pool expertise and resources to bring peer review and the best analytic practices to migratory bird conservation efforts. Nevertheless, the program does not conduct independent evaluations covering the program through either a single comprehensive evaluation or multiple evaluations on a regular or as needed basis.

Evidence: >NAWCA programmatic evaluation>NAWCA evaluation grant summaries>NAWMP Assessment Framework>AHM Task Force>Permit Workload study>Permit Program Scoping Notice (63FR 42639; August 10, 1998).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrate

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: While some program components can connect Budget requests and annual appropriations with outputs and performance goals, a complete and transparent linkage between performance targets and budget needs has not been made. Past Budget requests have failed to fully account for indirect costs and administrative overhead associated with the program. Recent funding shortfalls in the program have resulted partly because of this disconnect. Reprogramming of funds from other programs has been required to ensure the program was able to continue with minimal damage to the sustainability of ongoing monitoring and other program efforts. The recently completed Migratory Bird Program Strategic Plan will serve as a guidepost for identifying program needs and priorities for budgeting purposes in the future. Program staff are currently involved with developing short-term (3 year) action plans that will step down the priorities and strategies identified in the Blueprint into projects and program components so that managers can link program goals and performance targets with comprehensive budget needs.

Evidence: >Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds>FY2005 Budget Request>Project database

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:20%

Explanation: The Service has recently completed a two-year effort to develop a long-term strategic plan for Migratory Birds. This effort was undertaken to identify priority program needs, coordinate with partners on those priorities and needs, and link the resulting priorities and needs with the DOI Strategic Plan, GPRA measures, and future budgeting activities. The Migratory Bird Program has been a leader in promoting an adaptive management approach to wildlife conservation through its role as a leader in the development of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, individual joint ventures, other national and continental bird conservation plans, and Adaptive Harvest Management.

Evidence: >Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds>NAWMP>JV evaluations>PIF, USSCP, NAWCP, Woodcock Plan>AHM and AMAT documents

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

2.RG1 **Are all regulations issued by the program/agency necessary to meet the stated goals of the program, and do all regulations clearly indicate how the rules contribute to achievement of the goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The Law prohibits all activities regarding migratory birds (e.g., take, possession, commerce) except as authorized by permit or regulation. The Service issues regulations that balance use and conservation, using monitoring and assessment information to manage populations (e.g. each year the Service issues regulations to allow recreational and subsistence hunting based on annual field surveys). Permits and regulations authorize other activities as well (e.g.control of depredating birds, scientific collection, etc.). These activities are not stimulated solely by conservation and recreational considerations. The underlying treaties and laws recognize other legitimate activities provided the regulations are compatible with the treaties and demonstrate due regard for biological attributes that are coincident with the Federal Government's mandate to maintain healthy bird populations for the benefit of the American public. Regulation preambles explain the treaties' purposes and the objective of the regulation. Service continues to improve the regulatory process to better serve the resource and the public.

Evidence: Statutes and CFR:>MBTA (16 U.S.C. 703-712) >BGEPA (16 U.S.C. 668)>50 CFR part 20 (Migratory Bird Hunting) >50 CFR part 21 (Migratory Bird Permits) >50 CFR part 22 (Eagle Permits)>National Defense Authorization Act of 2003 (NPR imminent)Treaties Other: >Blueprint for the Future of Migratory Birds>Migratory Bird Permit Program Mission Statement and Guiding Principles>Leaving a Lasting Legacy (Permits Vision document)Rulemakings (sample): -Annual Hunting Frameworks-Cormorant Depredation Order (March 4, 1998)-Special Canada Goose permit rulemaking-Migratory Bird Permits--Regulations Governing Rehabilitation Activities and Permit Exceptions (NPR-66 FR 63349, December 6, 2001; FR-68 FR 6123, October 27, 2003) -Migratory Bird Permits--Regulations for Double-Crested Cormorant Management final rule (68 FR 58022, Oct 8, 2003) (especially page 58031, section Executive Order 12866)

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 5%

Explanation: The competitive grant programs regularly collect grantee performance information and use this information to manage and improve the grants program. On an annual basis the Migratory Birds Program (MBP) and key partners conduct over 200 surveys and assessments of migratory bird populations. These measures are used to develop long term trend information for migratory bird populations, evaluate management and conservation activities and other impacts on migratory bird populations, and set harvest seasons for those species which are legally hunted. Survey information feeds directly into the regulatory framework for game birds (e.g. length of hunting seasons), species specific management plans, and development of the list of birds of conservation concern. Priorities & work activities are adjusted based on these plans and this list.

Evidence: >Bird surveys >Birds of Conservation Concern>Species Management plans>June 1, 1998, Director memo re New Approach to Permitting>Permit scoping notice (63 FR 42639, August 10, 1998)>Proposed policy on General Conservation Permits (64 FR 58086, October 28, 1999)>July 11, 2001, Director memorandum re The permits Initiative and Request for Information >December 10, 2001 Director memorandum re. Status of the Service wide Permits Program Evaluation and >Call for a Plan of Action>Leaving a Lasting Legacy (permits vision document)>Permits Website fact sheet>Proposed Fee Rule (68 FR 51222, August 26, 2003) >Permit Workload Study

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 5%

Explanation: Annual performance plans for MBP staff are being revised currently to have the GPRA measures included as critical factors in the plans. For most surveys, work must be completed fully and on time so that tight schedules for establishing migratory game bird hunting seasons can be met using the data collected that year. All competitive grants require signed agreements which hold the grantees accountable for project cost, schedule, and performance results. Unmet performance by grantees results in payment modifications, project cancellation, and grantees being designated as high risk for future grants.

Evidence: >Annual reports of gamebird survey results>Example NAWCA Grant with Administration Policies (3/14/2001)>Example Grantees Report>MBCC March 2004 meeting response to Congressmen Dingle

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 5%

Explanation: MBP obligates 95-100% of its resource management funds in the fiscal year it is appropriated. For grant programs approval for obligations are completed on a timely basis through a standard review and approval process. Obligation of these funds can take longer due to the peculiarities of the grants and grantees. To expedite this process many of our grants are executed as unilateral agreements making it possible to obligate the funds upon the sole signature of the FWS official. MBP ensures funds are expended for their intended purpose through end-of-year reporting requirements for GPRA, review of JV management plans and actions, reporting requirements instituted through the NAWCA and NMBCA grants processes, and financial reporting requirements that are regulated by 43 CFR and Treasury as related to reporting of costs and expenditures. MBP recently completed risk assessment concluded that none of the MBP activities are considered susceptible to significant erroneous or improper payments.

Evidence: >Recently completed Risk Assessments for the Migratory Birds Program and the NAWCA, and NMBCA grant programs.>analysis of completed NAWCA grant match proposed/received 2001-2003>Greenbook>Mig birds workplan>Grant program guidelines>NAWCA Programmatic Evaluations at http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/images/programmaticevaluation.pdf and http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/images/programmaticevaluationMX.pdf

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 5%

Explanation: The NAWCA grants program has a wetlands efficiency measure developed as part of the Administration's common measures activity. Additional program efficiencies are sought through consolidation of purchases and standardization of equipment such as IT contracts. MBP completed a permits workload study in 2002 to better determine the minimum operational needs of the permit program based on workload functions. The implementation plan being developed for the MBP strategic plan includes project tracking system to improve alignment of efforts with program priorities and strategic plan goals. In 2003 the MBP implemented unilateral grants and SMARTLINK, an electronic payment system, which increased obligation rate to 91% in 2003, improved the grant payment process, expedited delivery of federal funds to coincide with recipient outlays, and reduced paper invoices processed. NMBCA grants are applied for and reviewed entirely on-line reducing paperwork and facilitating quicker review and responses.

Evidence: >Permits workload analysis and follow up>Ongoing workload analysis of NAWCA grants program>Leveraging funds

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: MBP's mission extends across all programmatic functions within FWS and effectively coordinates with the other programs. For example, using NAWCA grants the MBP collaborates with the Refuge program to restore habitat on Refuge lands. Outside the Service, MBP collaborates with other Federal agencies as well; for example with the Dept. of Agriculture to prepare Environmental Impact Statements on wildlife damage issues. Additionally, much of MBP's work requires the collaboration and assistance of other states and foreign governments. Joint Ventures are an example of the effective partnerships the MBP has fostered in order to complete its conservation mission, so is the research funded by MBP and conducted by states and others for webless migratory game species. Non-governmental partners and the general public promote and participate in events such as International Migratory Bird Day and Urban Treaties for migratory birds and demonstrate innovative and unique partnerships.

Evidence: >Executive Order 13186 (January 10, 2001) Responsibilities of Federal Agencies To Protect Migratory Birds>Partners in Flight Strategic Plan>The North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4401)>DEIS on Resident Canada Goose Management>FEIS on Cormorant Management>DOI FY2002 & 2003 Annual Reports on Performance Accountability>Birdscapes Articles>Director's memo on Wind Energy>Leaving a Lasting Legacy

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 5%

Explanation: MBP is considered a low risk for making significant erroneous or improper payments under Public Law 107-300. Restructuring of personnel and programs has enabled MBP to limit access to financial data based on clearly defined responsibilities and authorities and provides direct lines of reporting and improved efficiency. Financial information systems improve obligations and payments, and provide comprehensive obligation and payment data. MBP actively participated on the DOI working group (P.L. 106-107) for the purpose of ensuring compliance with current and changing federal regulations and developing good management practices in the area of financial assistance. A 1997 Inspector General's audit of the NAWCA grant program identified several improper financial practices and made recommendations to improve grant administration, these were adopted. Despite established procedures for financial management, the MB Program experienced a significant shortfall in operating funds for FY04, resulting in reductions in activities and a request for reprogramming.

Evidence: >DMBM annual workplan detailing allocations of funds by project>Risk assessment reports

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 5%

Explanation: A 2001 Control Review of the NAWCA program identified 4 system design weaknesses dealing with grant processes, these have been corrected and are being implemented.

Evidence: >Workload analysis follow up report>Management control review and follow up>letters from Director to State agencies, citing need for State input and emphasizing placement of highest priority on activities related to the annual development of migratory game bird hunting regulations.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

3.CO1 **Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: NAWCA and NMBCA funds are awarded following highly competitive processes. Proposals are scored by panels of experts, and only the most meritorious are selected. 100% are peer reviewed; none are earmarked. Outreach for NAWCA has been conducted through Federal Register notice, Grants.gov, our publication 'Birdscapes', and through partner networks. The NAWCA Small Grants program is designed specifically to reach new awardees, and the majority each year are new. NMBCA outreach has been hampered by Internet problems, although partner networks such as the 'La Tangara' newsletter have been effective in Latin America. Since NMBCA is a new program (2002), and covers a large geographic area, most awardees are new.

Evidence: >North American Wetlands Conservation Act, Section 5. Approval of Wetlands Conservation Projects.>North American Wetlands Conservation Act, United States Standard Grants, 2004 Proposal Instructions>NMBCA Grant Instructions>Indirect Costs Budget Justification>NAWCA Small Grant Evaluation Questions

3.CO2 **Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: NAWCA and NMBCA projects require annual and final reports that track both financial and programmatic activities, as well as quarterly reports of expenditures. All projects are subject to periodic desk monitoring (email and/or telephone contact with grantees) and a protocol and schedule for post award site visits has been developed.

Evidence: >Annual and final reports for a NAWCA project.>Annual and final reports for a NMBCA project.>Site visit report for a NAWCA project.>Site visit report for a NMBCA project.>SF272, Report of Federal Cash Transactions, for a NAWCA project.>SF272, Report of Federal Cash Transactions, for a NMBCA project

3.CO3 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: NAWCA performance data are collected on an annual basis from grantees. These data are compiled every two years into a Progress Report, which is distributed widely and also posted on the program website. All projects are described on the program website as soon as information is available. The NMBCA is just two years old and although some site visits have been made to project sites, performance data are not yet compiled.

Evidence: >North American Wetlands Conservation Act Progress Report, 2002 ' 2003. North American Wetlands Conservation Council, January 2002, 41 pp.>On the Internet, go to http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/grants.htm. Click on 'Biennial Progress Report'.>For detailed NAWCA project information, go to http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/projects/USprojects/USmap.htm. >For a list of NMBCA projects, go to http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NMBCA/projectsNar.htm.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

3.RG1 **Did the program seek and take into account the views of all affected parties (e.g., consumers; large and small businesses; State, local and tribal governments; beneficiaries; and the general public) when developing significant regulations?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 5%

Explanation: All regulations are developed under the Administrative Procedure Act allowing for full public comment. Comments are thoroughly considered and addressed and often lead to rule modifications. Additionally, annual migratory game bird hunting regulations are developed in consultation with Flyway Councils (composed of State fish and wildlife agency representatives) and tribal governments. Annual subsistence regulations for migratory birds in Alaska are developed in consultation with the Migratory Bird Co-Management Council (composed of Alaska native representatives). Additionally, Environmental Impact Statements prepared for regulations to manage Double-crested Cormorants (final), resident Canada geese (NPR) and light geese (NPR) involved 30 public meetings and thousands of public comments. The rehabilitation permit NPR was mailed to every rehabilitators and the Service held permit panels at annual NWRA and IWRC rehabilitators conferences resulting in rule modifications.

Evidence: EIS's: >The Sport Hunting of Migratory Birds; >Use of Lead Shot for Hunting Migratory Birds in the U.S.; >Light Goose Management; >Resident Canada Goose Management; >Double-crested Cormorant Management in the U.S.Regulations: >Annual Migratory Game Bird Hunting Regulations; >Annual Migratory Bird Subsistence Regulations for Alaska; >Migratory Bird Permits--Regulations Governing Rehabilitation Activities and Permit Exceptions, proposed rule (66 FR 63349, December 6, 2001) and final rule (68 FR 6123, October 27, 2003);

3.RG2 **Did the program prepare adequate regulatory impact analyses if required by Executive Order 12866, regulatory flexibility analyses if required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act and SBREFA, and cost-benefit analyses if required under the Unfunded Mandates R**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 5%

Explanation: Each rule includes required determinations and certifications, and a description of the basis for each. The migratory bird hunting regulations were determined economically significant under Executive Order 12866 and the Regulatory Flexibility Act. As such, a cost/benefit analysis was initially prepared in 1981. This analysis was subsequently revised annually from 1990'96, and then updated in 1998 and 2004. Results from the 2004 analysis indicate that the expected welfare benefit of the annual migratory bird hunting frameworks is on the order of $734 to $1,064 million, with a mid-point estimate of $899 million. In 1995, the Service issued a Small Entity Flexibility Analysis (Analysis), which was subsequently updated in 1996, 1998, and 2004. The 2004 Analysis estimated that migratory bird hunters would spend between $481 million and $1.2 billion at small businesses in 2004.

Evidence: >Regulatory Impact Analysis of the Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations for the 2004-05 Season and Small Entity Analysis ' Initial Regulatory Flexibility Act>Resident Canada goose proposed rule and DEIS..

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

3.RG3 **Does the program systematically review its current regulations to ensure consistency among all regulations in accomplishing program goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 5%

Explanation: Migratory bird hunting regulations expire each year; MBP must annually review these regulations in cooperation with the Flyway Councils to assure that they meet the desires, goals, and objectives of the FWS and the Councils. Additionally, the use of Adaptive Harvest Management in establishing regulations for duck hunting utilizes a built-in iterative process for incorporating program goals and objectives. The non-hunting regulations, however, are not systematically reviewed. In cooperation with the four other permit programs operated by the Fish and Wildlife Service, the program has identified and is developing a number of needed rulemakings and policies aimed at promoting permits as a conservation tool and streamlining permit processes and requirements. The Service's cross-program permits vision document (Leaving a Lasting Legacy) action plan tasks the five permitting programs to identify needed regulatory revisions and establish a 5-year schedule (objective 4). A long-term schedule has not been set.

Evidence: >Annual hunting regulations>Leaving a Lasting Legacy (Permits Vision document) >Permits Mission Statement and Guiding Principles>Permit Policies Status Report >Permit scoping notice (63 FR 42639, August 10, 1998)

3.RG4 **Are the regulations designed to achieve program goals, to the extent practicable, by maximizing the net benefits of its regulatory activity?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 5%

Explanation: Regulations are designed to provide long-term resource conservation while minimizing public burden. In developing annual hunting regulations the objective is to provide as liberal a hunting season as possible. Permit regulations are developed to clarify requirements, permit activities not previously allowed, streamline requirements by reducing reporting and recordkeeping, or establish permit exceptions that will not significantly reduce conservation. Recently the MBP finalized two depredation orders to allow cormorant control without permits, established a special permit for State agencies to manage resident Canada geese, and eliminated a permit requirement for public health officials monitoring infectious disease. While the regulations are designed to achieve program goals, there has not been any analysis as to whether the current regulatory scheme maximizes net benefits.

Evidence: >Supplemental Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations EIS, 1988 >Cooperative Waterfowl Management Plans>Paperwork Reduction Act 30-Day Notice for Applications and Reports (OMB Control Number 1018-0022)>Cormorant Depredation Order proposed and final rules>Rehabilitation Permit and Permit Exceptions final rule>Special Canada goose permit final rule>Light Goose Management proposed depredation order>Resident Canada Goose Management proposed conservation order;

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 17%

Explanation: Long-term performance goals and performance measures for the MBP were developed during the PART. Consequently, there are no data at present to measure performance. However, long-term GPRA goals in place prior to 2004 are useful in identifying program direction at that time and demonstrating progress made in achieving those goals. The previous long-term goal projected that, by 2005, 48 (12%) of the migratory bird populations of management concern in North America would show improvement in their numbers. Through 2003, 27 populations had improved their status; 21 monitoring programs were initiated for reliable baseline information on these populations of management concern to inform management activities and decisions. Prior to 2004, no long term goals specific to habitat acreage for NAWCA existed. By 2005, habitat goals were 850,000 acres of habitat protected, and 3,200,000 acres enhanced and restored. For 2001-2003, NAWCA contributed 1,125,547 acres protected and 1,025,391 acres restored to the Service goals.

Evidence: >FY2001 Annual Performance Report

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:17%

Explanation: New annual goals for the migratory bird program are under development. As mentioned in 4.1, significant progress was demonstrated towards achieving the previous set of long-term GPRA goals within the migratory bird program, indicating that annual performance goals were, in large part, accomplished. For example, in FY 2003, the migratory bird program met three of the old annual goals (e.g. number of birds of management concern with improved population status; number of baseline monitoring programs initiated; habitat acres added to the NWRS).

Evidence: >FY2001 Annual Performance Report

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight:17%

Explanation: The program has undertaken a number of activities, especially related to the permitting part of the program, to achieve improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness. Tangible productivity or efficiency gains, however, have not yet been realized and/or measured.

Evidence: >Webless Migratory Game Bird Research Program Report 2002

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: While the program is not duplicative of other programs, some of the activities conducted by the program are also conducted by other programs for similar purposes and goals. Restoring, protecting, and enhancing wetlands is an example. Data collected for the wetlands common measures exercise indicates that the Migratory Bird Program compares somewhat favorably to other FWS programs that protect and re-establish wetlands.

Evidence:

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:17%

Explanation: There has never been a comprehensive, independent evaluation of the overall migratory bird program, however, independent evaluations have occurred for significant parts of the program. For example, the US/Canada North American Wetlands Conservation Act programs (2002) and the Mexico program (2003) have been assessed. These evaluations concluded that the NAWCA is effective and achieving results in the U.S., Canada, and Mexico. Key findings were the number of acres affected, partnership dollars that are leveraged, the number of partners involved with the program, and the economic benefits that have accrued. The program's migratory bird survey activities have also been examined independently to ensure optimal design, reliability, realistic objectives, and cost-effectiveness. In 1995, the flyway system for managing migratory game birds, including Service participation, was examined by a panel of State, federal, and private representatives. Today, many Flyway Council activities reflect recommendations from this review. More recently, the Service's program for issuing take permits for migratory birds was reviewed to improve all aspects of program delivery, staffing, and funding support. In some instances these evaluation may not meet the PART requirements for adequate scope and quality.

Evidence: >NAWCA Program Evaluation-Mexico>NAWCA Program Evaluation-US, Canada>Flyway Council System Review Report>Workload Study/Migratory Bird Program>Waterfowl Survey Review 1973>Waterfowl Survey Review 1995>Draft Report Congress, Federal Regulations & Unfunded Mandates, 2004>Evaluation Plans, PPJV, LMVJV >NAWMP Progress Assessment

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

4.RG1 **Were programmatic goals (and benefits) achieved at the least incremental societal cost and did the program maximize net benefits?** Answer: NO Question Weight:17%

Explanation: Regulations allow activities that are otherwise prohibited. The program does not analyze the actual implementation of regulatory actions after promulgation to assess societal cost and benefits to evaluate whether the actions are achieving program goals at the least incremental societal costs. Analysis of alternatives is done primarily during regulation conception and development. However hunting regulations provide significant recreational and economic benefits to the hunting public and supporting industries while providing long term conservation of game birds, and clearly result in greater benefits than costs.

Evidence: >2001 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

Measure: Percent of all migratory bird species that are at healthy and sustainable levels.

Additional Information: This measure reflects the efforts of the Fish and Wildlife Service•s Migratory Birds Program to protect and manage birds (permits, surveys, species management plans, national and international agreements and strategies such as the National Bird Conservation Initiative), restore bird habitat through grants (NAWCA and Neotrops), and partnership initiatives (Joint Ventures and the NAWMP), manage game species (surveys, population estimates, hunting seasons), and super abundant nuisance species (mute swans, cormorants, etc.).The percent of bird species that are at healthy and sustainable levels will be defined as those species that are not on the FWS Birds of Management Concern List, or in the case of game species (which are all considered •of management concern•) those for which the populations are at desirable management conditions, as a percentage of all migratory bird species (n=912).

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2001	61.8%	Baseline	
2005	61.8%		
2008	62.3%		

Measure: Percent of adult Americans who participate in bird-related recreation.

Additional Information: This measure reflects the commitment of the Fish and Wildlife Service•s Migratory Birds Program to improving hunting, bird-watching, and other outdoor bird-related experiences and opportunities for the continuing benefit of the American people. bird-related recreation will be defined as migratory bird hunting, bird watching, bird photography and bird feeding. This information is collected, analyzed, and published every 5 years by the Departments of Interior and Commerce, and the Census Bureau as the National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation. The most recent survey was published in 2001 and the next will be available in 2006, and then 2011.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2001	29.8%	Baseline	
2005	29.8%		
2011	30%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrate

Measure: Percent of bird population management needs met to achieve healthy and sustainable populations of birds listed on the Birds of Management Concern list. (Baseline and targets under development.)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2005	Baseline		
2002			
2003			
2004			
2008			

Measure: Percent of habitat needs met to achieve healthy and sustainable levels of migratory birds.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	Baseline		

Measure: Acres of wetland restored per million dollars expended.

Additional Information: Efficiency measure assumes restoration cost only, does not include land acquisition.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2005	Baseline		
2006			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Migratory Bird Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Birds
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	70%	85%	22%	Demonstrated

Measure: The percent of Migratory Bird species that may be harvested for sport hunting or falconry according to the Migratory Bird Treaties for which harvest is formally approved.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2004	58.6	
2005	58.9	
2006	58.9	
2007	58.9	
2008	58.9	

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The mission of the Mineral Resources Program (MRP) is clear. MRP is the sole federal provider of scientific informtion, objective resources assessments, and unbiased research results on mineral potential, production, consumption and environmental effects.

Evidence: The USGS Organic Act (43 U.S.C. 31 et seq.) includes instructions that the USGS is to "classify the public lands and examine the geological structure, mineral resources, and products within and outside the national domain." (see attachment for additional legislative mandates).MRP 5 year plan

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The US is the world's largest user of mineral commodities, and in 2002 US manufacturers and other mineral users depended on other countries for 100% of 14 commodities and for more than 50% of 37 commodities. Making decisions about supply and development of mineral depends on having current and reliable information on mineral resoures and implications of their development. MRP reports on mineral commodities to inform macroeconomic policy, and provides research and assessments to support mangement of minerals on federal lands. Regional, national, and global mineral assessments provide broader context for long-term land use and economic policy planning, rather than from one company's or one county's perspective.

Evidence: The 1996 National Research Council (NAS) review of the MRP 5 year plan identified (Mineral Resources and Society, p. 2, p. 16-22, p. 23). Three functions that are considered appropriate: supply unbiased information related to mineral resources, provide advice and analysis to other government agencies, and conduct basic research on mineral resources. NRC, Future Roles and Opportunities, p. 40

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The MRP is the only federal, state, local, or private entity whose purpose is to provide objective resource information concerning mineral commodities for the nation. The framework data and process understandings provided by MRP are used by land managers and industry to identify and address site-specific mineral resource and mineral environmental issues and challenges ranging from determining the feasibility of new mine development to remediation of long-abandoned mine sites.

Evidence: The 1996 NAS review of the MRP stated "...there do not appear to be other federal agencies that duplicate MRSP activities. On the contrary, with the demise of the US Bureau of Mines, the MRSP stands as the only federal program with clear responsibilities in hard mineral resources. MRP's activities do not duplicate those of State geological surveys.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

1.4 **Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: MRP is designed to conduct three functions necessary to carry out its mission: research, assessments, and minerals information. MRP employs an expert federal workforce with extensive experience in mineral deposits research, mineral resource assessment, geochemical and geophysical research, and information technologies, and leverages this expertise with others. World-class laboratories are operated at regional USGS centers where costs are shared with other programs, and the program has a small headquarters staff in Reston, VA, where interaction with other USGS programs and other federal agencies is facilitated.

Evidence: The MRP is designed around a 5 year plan which is reviewed periodically by the NAS, and implemented through the USGS annual science plan. The program was modified significantly in response to the 1996 review (see evidence for question 2.8 for responses to the review.) MRP scientists are distributed nationally, fostering local and regional expertise on mineral-related issues, as well as contact with academic institutions and partner agencies and companies. MRP continues to refine its program design by actions such as outsourcing routine work whenever possible.

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: MRP targets beneficiaries for mineral commodities reports, and activities in support of federal land management. MRP supports DOI's resource use goal for non-energy minerals, providing decision-specific information on mineral availability and related environmental issues to Federal land managers, regulators, and other users worldwide. Information is also disseminated to all users at the same time. Recent advances in data-serving tools have increased availability of both data and reports. However, the difficulty of applying geospatial mineral information excludes decision makers with less technical sophistication.

Evidence: Minerals program 5 year plan and list of cooperators. Statistics concerning data downloads and letters of support from both state geological surveys and the private sector.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight 10%

Explanation: The program has developed a long term measures that is better focused on outcomes. USGS should develop additional outcome measures. The current measures largely focus on outputs and process (citation of USGS documents for policy use). However, the goals in the current 5 year plan are not specific enough to evaluate performance and need to be refined.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for 2004 Outcome measures for MRP in this plan are as follows: 80% of U.S. with geochemical and lithologic data coverage, 80% customers satisfied with timeliness of data, 80% of customers for which minerals data meets their needs, and 100% of formal USGS publications and scientific products receiving appropriate peer review. "Science Strategy for the Geologic Division of the USGS, 2000-2010" includes the goal "Advance the understanding of the Nation's energy and mineral resources in a global geologic, economic, and environmental context." The five goals outlined in the MRP 5-year plan for 1999 to 2004 (see 1.1 and 2.2) are the basis for achievement of these outcome measures.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: It is difficult to detemine whether targets in GRPA documents and 5 year plans are ambitious for the following reasons: Program goals and the narrative for 5 year plans are too broad to be considered measures, they do not include time frames or specific products. Annual project work plans contain more detail and time frames, but are not clearly linked to achieving goals in the 5 year plan. New performance measures were developed in the PART process, with more ambitious targets.

Evidence: The MRP 5-year plan lists five goals. Project work plans refer to 5 year plan goals; all projects have established time frames for completion in project work plans.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Annual performance measures are identified in GPRA and in the DOI Strategic Plan (draft). Each annual measure achieved provides evidence of progress towards long-term goals. Due to insufficient targets for long term goals, it is difficult to determine whether adequate progress was achieved.

Evidence: USGS GPRA Reports and DOI Strategic Plan (draft)

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The annual measures appear to be ambitious and have baselines. However, it is not clear how annual measures will contribute to increased efficiencies or long term goals. Baselines and targets for MRP projects are listed in Geology's Annual Science Plan, and annual project proposals and work plans.

Evidence: Baselines and targets include projections of planned enhancements to MRP's five major databases, projected delivery dates for scientific assessments and research products, dates and topics for stakeholder meetings, trainings, and workshops, and projected enhancements for decision-making support systems. MRP reviews projects annually, in collaboration with Team managers, to track progress of work and ensure that targets are ambitious, but reachable. Each target is associated with a specific project. Team managers conduct performance reviews with each scientist every six months to ensure appropriate progress towards products expected from funded research.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: CRADAs and MOUs supplied provide information about the cost, scope, and deliverables. The agreements are related to the goals stated in 5 year plans. But as the goals are broad it is difficult to determine impact of partnerships activities on MRP performance.

Evidence: In order to achieve specific annual or multi-year tasks, MRP establishes Cooperative Research and Development Agreements, project implementation plans associated with Memoranda of Understanding, and/or contracts with public or private sector organizations who have access to the required information or technology and who can perform the required research or analysis. Activities undertaken by them with MRP funds are limited to work that explicitly supports MRP project and program goals. Technical guidance and supervision, as appropriate, are provided as a part of partnership or contractual agreements. Examples of the official documents by which these agreements are made are attached. Each shows the relation between the outlined work and MRP's goals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: USGS uses independent committees of the National Academy's National Research Council to conduct reviews of the MRP. In addition to this formal process, MRP managers utilize mid-term project reviews and periodic discussions with users, collaborators, and stakeholders as feedback on the direction and significance of MRP project work.

Evidence: NRC reviews are conducted on a 5-7 year cycle. The last was in 1996; the current review is scheduled to be completed in August 2003. Information on status of the current review is available on the NAS website at http://www.nas.edu/. Regular meetings with public- and private-sector customers (annual, quarterly, or as needed) are another source of information on relevance and significance of MRP work to those groups.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Program budgets are not clearly tied to long term performance goals. The items listed in the GPRA table are not clearly tied to descriptions of actual acitvities within the text of the budget justifications. Further outcome oriented and measurable long term performance measures did not exist, and accordingly could not be tied to the budget.

Evidence: Minerals Program 5 year plan, Project Work Plans, Congressional Justifications.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?**

Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: MRP has taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies. The NRC review completed in 1996 included one recommendation specifically addressing strategic planning. MRP has developed new vision, mission, and goals. The 5 year plan strategic goals are still broad and not clearly linked to societal outcomes. Further, long term goals need to be outcome oriented and need specific time frames to provide context for assessing performance reported at the project level.

Evidence: The NRC recommendation said: "The MRSP and its Plan should place greater emphasis on improving the mechanisms and procedures for comprehensive planning, setting priorities, and evaluating and enhancing performance, particularly through external reviews or advisory panels." (Mineral Resources and Society, p. 55.) Continued refinement of the strategic planning processes are demonstrated in MRP's leadership in USGS-wide and Geology-specific strategic planning. The Full Report of MRP responses to NRC recommendations provides sumary of MRP actions in response to NRC recommendations for strategic planning.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Many other organizations collect information on mineral resources but few make the information publicly accessible. Though a formal cost/benefit has not been performed for MRP, cost benefit studies of other programs with open access to information policies suggest making information publicly availabe increases benefits to society. 27 state geological surveys conduct mineral-resource related research or compile data on mineral production for their states. Of those who compile data, nine use USGS data for some or all of their reports. Only two state geological surveys report attempts to conduct mineral assessments for their states. Neither has published the results.

Evidence: Evolution of research in mineral-resource assessment provides an example of the results of continuing evaluation of the ways MRP provides information for the Nation. MRP management determined that a more efficient approach to mineral resource assessment was required in order to provide information required by Federal land management agencies. The 1996 NRC review agreed with this view. As documented in the report on mineral resource assessment supplied with question 3.1, MRP dramatically changed its approach from site-specific (e.g. small areas proposed for wilderness status) to regional, national, and global scales. This made possible the first ever National mineral resource assessment, and is the basis for work on the first ever global assessment. MRP participates in forums on minerals topics (e.g. Sustainable Minerals Roundtable (see attached), Acid Drainage Technology Interest Group) to identify partners with expertise that complements program goals, build partnerships based on shared strengths, and participate in joint planning toward group goals that complement MRP goals.

2.RD2 **Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: MRP has a process for reviewing programs and priorities. One priority in the 5 year plan was to improve the content and delivery of MRP data sets. The priority is reflected in increased funding for data management and distribution.

Evidence: The following priorities are stated in the MRP 5 year plan, 1. major improvements to both the content and delivery of MRP's largest data sets and 2. research on the processes through which mineral deposits form and are destroyed. MRP planning process: MRP uses annual and long-term prioritization processes as described in 2.1 - 2.7 and Section 3. Funding is directed to achieve program priorities through long-term and annual planning, through annual project and task-level prioritization involving partners and customer input, and through annual and quarterly tracking and reporting on project and program level performance.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: DOI, USGS, and its Programs regularly collect performance information through customer and partner reviews and surveys. Feedback is incorporated into program plans and specific actions are taken in response.The DOI and Bureau Strategic Plans include partner and customer reviewed long term goals, annual performance measures, and GPRA measures. Progress on GPRA is verified quarterly and reported and updated annually.

Evidence: MRP documents: NAS reports related to MRP, report of FY03 listening session, sample MRP customer survey, documents demonstrating changes in mineral resource assessments. General: USGS Strategic Plan showing long term goals, measures, and annual GPRA targets (p 9-15). GPRA memo for FY02, GPRA reports for 03 and quarterly verification. USGS Planning Model showing performance requirements in 5-year plans (p.9) and performance information in BASIS+ system (p.12-13).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: USGS holds senior management and program partners accountable for performance through performance evaluation, management process controls, and performance guidance provided in agreements, contracts, and grants. Grant programs have specific performance guidance and include rigorous review panels and budgetary penalties for non performance. Cooperative agreements with states and universities include specific requirements, products, and time schedules with payment penalties for non performance. Contracts for services are competed and contain specific quality and performance requirements and time schedules for services.

Evidence: MRP's utilization of a contract for geochemical analyses by XRAL demonstrates through-going accountability. As is shown in evidence for 1.4, use of this contract has reduced MRP's cost per analysis by almost 50%. In addition, the contract (attached) specifies (in part IV, p. 21 et seq.) timeliness, reporting, and quality control/quality assurance requirements. The 30-day period for completion of analysis ensures that MRP can provide geochemical data and analyses in accordance with its established goals for project work. In another example, MRP's cooperative research and development agreement with DuPont. Documents: SES Performance Plan Guidance and Trujillo Memo, Bureau Program Planning Process responsibilities list. MRP-specific documents: XRAL contract, cooperative research and development agreements (specifically the CRADA with DuPont).

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?

Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The USGS has an established budget, allocation, and spending process that includes annual planning, quarterly and monthly reviews, and review of any funds allocation change over 25K. It has implemented management controls and measures to ensure dollars are allocated and obligated in a timely manner and spent for intended purposes. Budget planning to object class is done in the BASIS+ system, which ties budget to intended use. Projects and their budgets are reviewed monthly by line managers and annually by Programs. The Bureau conducts quarterly review of status of funds against performance measures.

Evidence: Documents: Diagram of USGS Budgeting and Finance. FY02 Geology Annual Science Plan showing project science and funding targets used for budgeting. FY02 Allocation Process Memo showing appropriation actions and allocation requirements. FY02 allocation tables made by Programs and administrative office giving allocations to cost centers, projects, and accounts. Summary of Program quarterly obligations for FY02 showing consistant spending of all appropriations for intended program. Final spending report for all Programs FY02. Instructional Memos APS-2003-11-13 showing the monthly management control requirements..

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The Bureau is engaged in competitive sourcing for Visual Information Services, Building and Ground Maintenance, and Warehousing. Geology mission critical information systems have submitted Capitol Asset Plans (Exhibit 300) to DOI and are in the certification and accreditation process. In 2003, all Geology programs are developing Activity Based Costing for 2004 implementation. Since 1996, Geology Programs have been a leader in conducting competitive project proposal and review processes and project based costing using a prototype of the BASIS+system now in use across the Bureau.

Evidence: Since the beginning of the current five-year plan (FY 1999), MRP has used contractor-provided services to migrate its geochemistry, geophysics, and mineral deposits databases to SQL-based data structures in order to minimize the in-house expertise required to maintain those structures and to maximize the opportunity for data interoperability. Similarly, when cost comparisons demonstrated that routine geochemical analyses could be obtained on contract (rather than with a Federal workforce), MRP implemented the required contract, lowering the cost by almost 50% (see questions 1.4 and 3.2 for more information.) Documents: April 2002 Memo from USGS Director announcing competitive sourcing, June 2003 update on competitive sourcing.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: MRP actively collaborates with a significant number of agency, state, and local partners, industry, and academia towards the achievement of common or complimentary goals. Major partners are identified in the Geology Strat Plan and MRP 5-year plan and include but are not limited to DOI bureaus and other Federal land management agencies, NASA, EPA, DOD, and DOC as well as State Geological Surveys, state departments of natural resources, local resource and planning agencies, and academic, governmental, and industry consortia. USGS establishes roles and responsibilities with partners through cooperative agreements, Memoranda of Understanding, or Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADA).

Evidence: Upcoming project to assess mineral resources on Federal lands in central Colorado, partners will include USGS's National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program (particular skills in mapping at the scales required by Forest Service), Colorado Geological Survey (expertise in evaluating physical hazards at abandoned mine sites in Colorado), and Forest Service (expertise in planning requirements and information on land use and land status). Other MRP projects collaborate with USGS Programs (e.g., Volcano Hazards, Toxic Substances Hydrology) or with State geological surveys (e.g., Colorado in the recently completed Front Range Infrastructure Resources Project or 46 States in the collection and dissemination of minerals information.) In the case of Pennsylvania (attached), the State provides site-specific information.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The 2002 Audit findings of the Inspector General's Office conducted by KPMG contained a "no opinion" result and cited 8 reportable conditions in their report dated January 24, 2003. The 2002 Audit findings of the Inspector Generals Office conducted by KPMG contained a "no opinion" result and cited 8 reportable conditions in their report dated January 24, 2003. USGS submitted a Corrective Action Plan that has been accepted by the Inspector Generals office, In his cover memo, the Asst. Inspectors General for Audits stated: "Based on the response and corrective action plan, all the recommendations are considered resolved but not implemented." Monthly meetings and reports on progress are being provided to DOI and thus far, many tasks are completed and all others are in progress. In the USGS matrix organization, line management and administration is responsible for financial, facilities, and personnel management. USGS Program Coordinators are responsible for scientific planning and coordination, budget formulation, and establishing and reviewing performance.Due the extent of financial management problems cited in the audit and the inability of the auditor to render an opinion, it is difficult to separate the program from financial management problems.

Evidence: Documents: April 11 Auditors Report 2003, Corrective Action Plan, and cover memo from Asst. Inspector General for Audits Roger LaRoche.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The USGS is taking the necessary steps to resolve management deficiencies. The USGS has aggressively addressed IT control weaknesses. Management control performance measures have been incorporated into all SES Performance Evaluations. An expert team has been formed and operating for the last 6 months to address audit issues and ensure completion of the Audit Corrective Action Plan. Extensive training is underway to address reported conditions and strengthen management practices. Administrative Instructional Memoranda outline in detail all financial processes and requirements. All Geology Programs use an annual review process and the BASIS+ system to review all program work and correct deficiencies. This is described in detail in 3.4 and 3.RD1. The NRC and FACA advisory panels conduct periodic reviews that make recommendations regarding program management, performance, and scientific direction.

Evidence: In its 1996 review of MRP, the NRC provided four general and 16 specific recommendations, all of which required management action. MRP has responded to all of them by changing management practices, by moving away from an organizational culture dominated by self-direction and independent research, by instituting stricter controls on project planning, execution, and reporting, by developing more efficient approaches to performing mineral resource assessments, and by developing significant relationships with a wide variety of customers and collaborators. A full report of these actions is included with evidence in 2.8. Documents: Corrective Action Plan Progress Report for April 2003 submitted to the DOI and showing progress or completion of all actions. Memorandum from Hord Tipton providing improved results of March and April testing of DOI WAN's. Instructional Memoranda from 3.3.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

3.RD1 **For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Since 1996, Geology Programs have conducted division-wide competitive project proposal process using a prototype of the BASIS+ system now in use across the Bureau. Geology issues an annual call for project proposals called the Geology Annual Science Plan (formerly know as the Geology Prospectus) which contains scientific and funding guidance for all projects. The annual plan uses the Geology Science Strategy and Program five year plans for its organizing framework. Scientists are required to submit annual project proposals into the BASIS+ system for program review. Reviews are conducted by scientific peers and include external scientific or stakeholder review. Earmarked funds are not excluded from review.

Evidence: In response to the 1996 NRC review, MRP instituted a practice of convening project review panels of internal and external scientists. This practice is required in Obj. D of the MRP 5-year plan (see 1.1). Another approach to increasing external input into MRP is through conducting stakeholder workshops before a project begins. In FY 2003, MRP conducted two workshops of this type to determine are the highest priorities for new work in Alaska. Results of those workshops have shaped the request for new project that appears in the FY 2004 prospectus. Documents: Overview diagram of Geology Planning Process demonstrating management and review process. See 3.1 and 3.3 on planning and allocation processes.

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Every year, MRP completes project work that addresses long-term goals. Completions reported to the right are each evidence of progress toward one of the five goals laid out in the MRP 5-year plan. While progress was demonstrated, adequate progress could not be determined as long term goals were not clearly linked to specific products, timelines in 5 year plans, or budget justitification materials.

Evidence: MRP 5 year Plan, Project work plan Completions, FY 2000-2002.

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:20%

Explanation: see also 2.4, 2.5. Baselines and targets for MRP projects are listed in annual science plans (the Geology Prospectus), annual project work plans and proposals, and in documentation of base and initiative budgets. A modest amount of the work is conducted by contractors or other cooperators in the accomplishments of these annual goals; the work of these partners is included within accomplishments identified in GPRA.

Evidence: Annual priorites are established within the context of long-term goals (e.g., MRP 5-Year plan, Geology Science Strategy, DOI Strategic Plan) and performance is achieved through management review, approval and funding of both internal USGS projects and external cooperative grants. Project funding for all projects, including support of cooperative agreements, is adjusted annually on the basis of performance, programmatic priorities, and resource availability. In the FY 2002 GPRA performance report, MRP met all targets. For FY 2003, MRP has met all targets identified for the first and second quarters.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: MRP adopts new technologies that increase efficiencies. (See also section 3.4) In addition, program and project staff monitor the effectiveness of long-term efforts on a periodic basis, to ensure that the work remains appropriate and that the cost-benefits can be demonstrated. While savings have occured, there is no regularly collected data which facilitate cost effectiveness determineations over years, or permit comparisons across programs.

Evidence: Examples (all from the last 3 years): stable isotope analysis has seen a 10-fold increase in productivity (= cost savings) due to development of automated sample handling equipment; gravity data acquisition has seen a factor of 2 decrease in expense due to the replacement of traditional surveying methods by global positioning satellite (GPS) techniques; magnetic survey processing and interpretation has seen a factor of 2-10 decrease in expense due to the use of GPS and the investment in new software; research trace element chemistry has seen a 10 fold increase in productivity (= cost savings) due to the replacement of single-element instruments (e.g., mass spectrometers) with multi-element, multi-tasking instruments (e.g. inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometers). See section 1.4 and 3.2 for information on outsourcing saved almost 50% on the cost of geochemical analyses.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: MRP has two key groups of functions: research and assessment and minerals information. As described in question 1.3, there are no government or private programs with purpose and goals similar in breadth and depth to MRP. Comparisons of specific functions within MRP to other programs are somewhat instructive, although this comparison by components does not allow discussion of the benefits gained by having the two groups of functions together. In one such comparison, MRP compares favorably with DOE's Energy Information Agency (EIA). NRC reviews suggest that USGS compares favorably to other programs with similar goals.

Evidence: MRP compares its Minerals Information function with that conducted by DOE's Energy Information Agency (EIA). The functions are similar in that both produce independent information about non-renewable resources for policy and other uses. Both produce data on production and consumption domestically and worldwide. They are different in that MRP provides information on over 80 metallic and industrial mineral commodities, whereas EIA provides information on five energy sources (petroleum, natural gas, coal, nuclear, and renewables/alternates.) EIA's budget for FY 2003 is $80 million and supports 374 people; the information function of MRP is budgeted at $16.4 million and is conducted by 140 FTE. MRP compares favorably for response rate to surveys issues and the amoung of data collected to support statistical reporting. NRC summary report (Mineral Resources and Society, 1996, p. 23-24)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Independent NRC/NAS review of the program found it to be effective and achieving results. Though the last NRC report noted that the program had strategic planning difficulties including too broad a vision, mission, and objectives. These factors are critical in determining effectiveness, if they are not clear it would be difficult to determine effectiveness.

Evidence: The NRC summary report (Mineral Resources and Society, 1996, p. 23-24) indicates that MRP made many scientific contributions, including "characterization of major deposits in the U.S. and overseas, and understanding of ore-forming processes"; "excellent descriptions of ore deposits that proved useful for environmental mitigation and remediation of abandoned mine lands as well as for mineral exploration"; and "mineral resource assessments and mineral-environmental assessments... [that] contributed to land use decisions by the USFS and the BLM". The report also stated that the program needed new, clearly articulated statements of vision, mission, and objectives.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

Measure: % of targeted analyses/investigtions delivered which are cited by identified partners within three years of delivery

Additional Information: Objective is to ensure that analyses and investigations delivered are actually used by their intended recipients within a short time of delivery, ensuring both relevance and timeliness.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2004	80%		
2005	80%		
2006	80%		

Measure: Number of completed systematic analyses and investigations delivered to customers

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2002	4	4	
2003	4	4	
2004	5		
2005	3		

Measure: Number of decision-making support systems

Additional Information: MRDATA is a web-based, data delivery system providing basic GIS and analytical tools and data download functions for the geochemicl, geophysical, mineral deposit, and lithologic data.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2001		1	
2002		1	
2003	1	1	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

2004	1	

Measure: Number of formal workshops or training provided to customers

Additional Information: Workshops are held a formal meetings, professional society meetings, and at the request of partners or customers.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2001		4	
2002		8	
2003	8	8	
2004	4		

Measure: % of formal USGS publications and scientific products receiving appropriate peer review

Additional Information: The goal is for all USGS formal publications or reports to be published in trade journals

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2002	100%	100%	
2003	100%	100%	
2004	100%		
2005	100%		

Measure: Average square miles (in millions) of the US with non-energy mineral information available to support management decisions

Additional Information: This measures thecoverage of the US with basic information required to understand mineral resources.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2003		2.37	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Mineral Resource Assessments
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: U.S. Geological Survey
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	67%	Effective

2004	2.54
2005	2.76

Measure: Number of long-term data collections maintained

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2002	5	5
2003	5	5
2004	5	
2005	5	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Average cost of a systematic analysis or investigation

Additional Information: Average cost per analysis allows comparisons among different projects to determine how efficiencies can be achieved.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		$4.125m
2004	$4.125m	
2005	$4.125m	

Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Department of the Interior through the Minerals Management Service's (MMS) Minerals Revenue Management (MRM) Program is responsible for managing the 'revenues generated from offshore and onshore Federal mineral leases and from producing Indian mineral 'leases. Responsibilities include mineral valuation, revenue collection and distribution, and compliance and reporting. The program is authorized to take federal royalties either in-value (RIV) or in-kind (RIK).

Evidence: 1) The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, the Indian leasing Acts of 1909 and 1938, the Outer Continental Shelf lands Act of 1953, and the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (FOGRMA). 2) MMS FY 2004 'Budget Performance Chart, linking MRM goals to the DOI Draft Strategic Plan's Resource Use and Serving Communities Mission Components.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Federal Government is the largest single land owner and mineral leasing entity within the United States. Following the enactment of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (FOGRMA) the Secretary of the Interior created MMS, Secretarial Order 3087, designating MMS 'as the 'agency 'responsible for fulfilling the Secretary's obligations to ensure proper 'fiscal accountability 'and management of the mineral revenues (rents, royalties, and bonuses) from federal and 'Indian lands. MMS's current workload includes the collection and distribution of 'revenues from over 84,000 leases and oversight of industry's compliance with lease terms and 'statutes. This is done to ensure that public and Indian beneficiaries receive their 'rightful shares from the disposition of these public and Indian mineral revenue assets

Evidence: 1) The Federal Government has been collecting revenues from mineral production on Federal 'onshore lands since 1920, from American Indian lands since 1925, and from Federal offshore 'lands since 1953. 2) Total mineral revenue collections by the Federal Government from 1920-1981 were about $20 billion; however, in the 20+ years since inception, MMS has collected over $89 billion. 3) Average annual collections now total more than $6 billion with approximately 63 'percent going to the U.S. Treasury, 23 percent to special purpose funds, 11 percent to States, 'and 3 percent to American Indians. 4) Over "$1 billion in offshore mineral revenues is deposited annually into the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the National Historic Preservation 'Fund.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: While the MMS revenue operation is similar in some respects to private and State operations, it is vastly more complex in scope and scale of activity, variety, and complexity of lease terms and statutes. The MMS was created to centralize and standardize reporting and collection of mineral revenues and accounting and distribution of 'proceeds on federal lands, thereby improving controls and simplifying reporting and payment for industry. MMS's operations are unique among Federal programs and dwarf any state programs in size and complexity. MMS collects over $6 billion annually from 84,000 leases and disburses minerals revenues to State, Federal, and Indian accounts. MMS energy industry constituents benefit from uniform rules, regulations, and reporting requirements that are possible by having centralized authority and responsibility and standardized operations. Although the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Simplification Act of 1996 (RSFA) expanded the duties States could assume from MRM, no States have yet requested 'delegation of additional functions beyond the audit function.

Evidence: 1) Key reengineering benchmarking reports include State Benchmarking Study of Royalty Programs in Wyoming, New Mexico, Louisiana, 'and Texas. 2) The Preliminary Design Concepts of the RMP Reengineering Team, March "1998; Reports of RIK Pilots with Texas General Land Office and State of 'Wyoming; the RIK Road Map, include information on benchmarking efforts. 3) RSA and the 'Final Rule, Delegation of RMP Functions to States, published "1997, and amended 1999, provided for additional delegation of functions to states. 4) MOU's with BLM, DOE, State of Louisiana, and Wyoming. Cooperative agreement with State of Texas/General Land Office.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: A primary objective in forming MMS was to centralize and standardize 'reporting, "payment, accounting, and disbursement for Federal and Indian mineral 'revenues'. This 'provided increased efficiency and internal control over the 'previous geographically 'decentralized approach. In 1997, after 15 years of experience, MRM reassessed its 'program structure, benchmarked itself against others, and reengineered its business 'processes to become more efficient, cost effective, customer responsive, and to take 'advantage of current technology. MMS believes its MRM program is free of major 'design flaws, and this conclusion has been further confirmed by the fact that such issues 'have not been raised during frequent reviews by GAO, OIG, and others. The 'independent reviews, however, have made operational improvement recommendations, 'which MRM is in the process of implementing.'

Evidence: 1) The MRM reengineering project modernized the MRM systems infrastructure to support reengineered business processes. 'MMS engaged Accenture, LLP, to develop two new royalty management systems ' a financial management (FM) system and 'a compliance and asset management (CAM) system. A relational database, a data warehouse, and a 'variety of technology tools were developed to support both systems. The systems infrastructure and 'technical architecture was built to support additional systems and functionality in the future. 2) The RIK operations component of the MRM is now building on the Reengineering 'Initiative and advancing with new processes and approaches that are aligned with the two core business 'processes, and adopting industry-proven approaches to marketing oil and gas production. 3) Sources: 'Reengineering Road Map to the 21st Century, November 1998'; David Blackmon Article (IPAA); RIK Road Map January 2001; GAO Report January 2003; March 2003 IG Report - Audit of MMS Audit Offices, MMS Reports on RIK Pilots.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: MRM's resources are directly targeted to two core business processes'financial management (FM) and compliance and asset 'management (CAM). By carrying out these processes efficiently, effectively, thoroughly, and 'timely, MRM enhances service to its beneficiaries'the recipients of the mineral revenues (States, 'Indians, and the American public) and enhances achievement of MRM's 'strategic goals and measures. MRM's Indian CAM is specifically dedicated to 'serving 'mineral 'producing tribes and individual Indian mineral owners. ' MRM serves the mineral industry by providing structure and guidance for the proper 'reporting and payment of mineral revenues and for compliance with laws, regulations, 'and lease terms. MRM provides industry training in a variety of geographic areas, and communicates regularly with companies. MRM also frequently participates in collaborative activities with states, tribes, and industry, 'such as joint rule-makings, the State and Tribal Royalty Audit Committee (STRAC), and the Royalty Policy 'Committee (RPC). '

Evidence: 1) MRM reengineered its organization and relocated its staff to facilitate mission accomplishment and enhance service delivery. Though MMS is headquartered in Washington DC, most staff is located in offices nearer to beneficiaries. Primary operations are in Lakewood, Colorado, 'with field offices in Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico. MRM's Indian CAM is based in Lakewood, and is augmented by teams in 'Oklahoma City, Tulsa, and Muskogee, OK, and Farmington, NM. 'The Farmington office unites oil and gas staff from the BIA, BLM, and MMS, under one director for compliance services to industry and 'American Indian allottees and their heirs. States and 'Tribes are working partners with our CAM offices (in Colorado, Texas, and Oklahoma) and are an integral aspect of the overall onshore compliance 'effort. The MRM systems contractors, primarily located in Lakewood, provide operations & maintenance and electronic commerce support. 2) Sources: Organization Chart, and STRAC & RPC minutes/agendas.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight 10%

Explanation: See "Part Performance Measures" provided by MMS. These measures are "outputs,' they do not cover the full scope of the MRM program, and therefore, do not reflect the program in a meaningful way. MMS notes that new measures are being developed for the RIK program, a program that once is out of the pilot stage, may become a significiant method of acquring revenue. MRM has two primary long-term performance measures supporting MMS's mineral resource asset-management responsibilities, and aligning with two MRM core end-to-end business processes ' Compliance and Asset Management and Financial 'Management (both integrating Indian Trust responsibilities). Although the primary outcome of the MRM Financial Management process is to ensure that beneficiaries receive and have use of mineral revenues timely the actual measure is not presented in these terms. Another primary outcome of the MRM Compliance and Asset Management process is to ensure that beneficiaries receive proper value, whether royalties are received in-value or in-kind, the actural measure is not presented in these terms.

Evidence: 1) Two outcome measures supported by reengineered systems, align with two MRM core end-to-end business processes, shown in the MRM Arrow Diagram. 2) SOURCES: Other documents including these primary outcome measures include the DOI Draft Strategic Plan 2003-2008; MMS Draft Operating Plan 2003-2008 Logic Model; MMS FY 2004 Budget Justifications - Performance Chart; and Capital Asset Plans (Exhibit 300's) for Reengineering and RIK

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight 10%

Explanation: The PART instructions require a "NO" rating if the program received a NO rating in Question 2.1.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: See "Part Performance Measures" provided by MMS. MRM's annual measures -- most of which are incorporated as Intermediate Outcome measures in the DOI Plan -- provide ongoing indicators of progress toward achieving long-term MRM measures. MMS's increased focus on providing capability and incentives for companies to electronically report and pay have resulted in increased accuracy in company reporting (now above 95% -- but targeted to be at 97% by 2008). Increased reporting accuracy leads directly to increased timeliness in disbursing mineral revenues. The annual compliance strategies focus on properties representing the highest percentages of royalties, and is a direct indicator of MMS's progress in achieving its long-term MRM outcome of ensuring receipt of proper value. MMS has ambitious targets to increase each year the properties in its 3-year compliance cycle until it 'completes its compliance work within 3 years for properties representing "95 percent of all royalties. Within both FM and CAM, MMS monitors specific goals focused on Indian Trust responsibilities.

Evidence: 1) MMS has 5 annual measures that are primary indicators of progress in Financial Management, Compliance and Asset Management, and Indian Trust responsibilities. In addition to these program-wide goals, MRM monitors a variety of internal tactical goals that cascade from and link to the DOI, MMS, and MRM strategic goals. These tactical goals provide indicators to management on how well their office is contributing to overall MRM performance achievement. 2) In FY 2003, MRM offices began to maintain a variety of output measures, linked to costs, which will provide managers productivity information for decision making and resource allocation. 3) MMS Draft Operating Plan 2003-2008 Logic Model. 4) MMS Performance charts in FY 2004 Budget Justification. 5) Preliminary reports of MRM measures/costs from MMS Activity-Based Costing and Management (ABC/M) system. 6) Annual Performance Report tables; Performance Accountability Report tables

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Because MMS has reported and monitored performance data over several years, baselines and prior trend data is available for most MMS measures. Only a few measures lack baselines due to their focus on new MMS strategic directions or new calculation methodologies. In addition, MMS will be developing measures for its RIK program. MMS has set ambitious annual targets related to two core end-to-end business processes, ensuring that both FM and CAM measures integrate MMS's focus on Indian Trust.

Evidence: 1) During the reengineering effort, MMS challenged itself to cut the 6-year compliance 'cycle in half, while increasing royalty coverage to ensure MMS receives the correct value for all royalties. By FY 2001, MRM had demonstrated feasibility of the 3-year goal by completing compliance work for "Operational Model" properties representing 11% of the 1999 royalty universe. During FY 2002, MMS increased coverage within the 3-year cycle to 49% of the 2000 royalty universe, and is on track to complete at least 95% of that compliance work by the end of FY 2003. 2) During FY 2002, following implementation of the new MRM systems, MMS disbursed 80% of revenues timely; this was low due to the court-ordered Department-wide Internet system shutdown. However, thus far in FY 2003, MMS has significantly improved to 88% timely, with more aggressive targets in the future. Indian Trust goals are monitored in both FM and CAM's. 3) Sources: Reengineering & RIK Road Maps, Strategic Plan 2003-2008 Logic Model, performance charts in FY 2004 Budget.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: MRM coordinates closely with the State and Tribal audit groups to 'achieve compliance goals for 'targeted mineral properties within the 'states and reservations within 3 years of 'the date royalties are 'paid. Each State and Tribe 'commits to and works toward the "3-year goal by including targeted properties 'within their state and reservation on a 'work plan. MMS provides oversight to ensure States and Tribes successfully achieve their audit plans. 'Additionally, MMS coordinates closely with contractors in development and implementation of its reengineered systems. "MMS's contract with Accenture to build-out RIK management systems was specifically 'designed to accomplish the goals, objectives, and action items of the RIK Road Map. The MMS/'MRM Quality Steering Committee -- consisting of all of the top business managers in MRM -- provides oversight to ensure that MRM performance measures are on track, and that systems are aligned and fully supportive of the DOI, MMS, and MRM Strategic Goals.

Evidence: 1) MRM established quality partnering agreements with Accenture Partnership, with related service level agreements. Earned value metrics are being employed to monitor work progress, schedule and compliance and manage costs under the Accenture contract. 2) MRM Senior Managers frequently review IT project deliverable and system operations metrics, to ensure systems provide the support needed to achieve MRM strategic goals. 3) The Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (FOGRMA), Sections 202 and "205, authorized the Secretary to develop cooperative agreements with States and tribes to 'carry out certain inspection, auditing, investigation, and enforcement activities for leases 'in their jurisdiction. 'RSA expanded the functions States could perform; however, no state has requested expansion of functions beyond audits already performed by 10 states. States and Tribes develop annual audit plans, in coordination with MRM, and aligned with MRM strategic goals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?

Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: MRM's activities result in a major source of revenue to the states, Tribes and Federal Government, so MRM is continuously 'under review by oversight agencies such as the Office of Inspector General (OIG) and the 'U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO). KPMG, contracted to the OIG, performs annual reviews of MRM custodial accounts under the Chief Financial Officers Act. These external reviews augment an aggressive internal review function within MRM, focused on highest-risk areas. Also, MMS performs oversight of the State and Tribal Peer Review Process, their quality reviews of one another. The RIK pilot program has been and continues to be independently evaluated by OIG and GAO, and internally, to determine 'program effectiveness. These reviews are comprehensive and involve all aspects 'of the RIK activity. Additionally, MMS's independent policy office has conducted three RIK 'program assessments. Also, the RIK pilot program is currently being examined by a 'commercial energy commodity consultant to independently evaluate the effectiveness of 'the program.

Evidence: 1) MRM's Internal Control Evaluations annually include 8 Internal Quality Control Reviews (IQCR) to ensure compliance with Government Auditing Standards and 2 or more Alternative Management Control Reviews (AMCR) addressing management controls, records, and measures for MRM functional areas. 2) PMI issued reports in March 2001 and March 2002 on the Wyoming and Texas RIK Pilots. 3) The OIG issued a report on the RIK Program in August 2002, followed by the GAO report in January 2003. MRM has completed implementation of OIG recommendations, and implementation of GAO recommendations is well underway. 4) A competitive contract was awarded January 2003 to Lukens Energy Group to independently assess current RIK capabilities & performance and provide recommendations. 5) SOURCES: Annual Assurance Statement, Example IQCR/schedule, Example AMCR/schedule, PMI reports on Texas & Wyoming RIK pilots; GAO Report January 2003, August 2002 IG Report, Announcement of 'Solicitation resulting in competitive award to Lukens.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?

Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Budget initiatives are performance based. MMS formulation process involves forecasting future funding needs to maintain service and performance levels, projecting new mission requirements, and harvesting savings resulting from new efficiencies realized. New requests are prioritized by increased performance, 'enhanced service delivery, and opportunities for new efficiencies. Operations are routinely analyzed for areas where new efficiencies and cost savings can be or have been realized. Those savings either offset new costs internally or are offered as budget decreases to offset new initiatives. Budget execution accomplishes the 'integration with performance through an Activity Based Cost/Management tool implemented by MMS in FY "03. This tool will enable MMS, for each of its cost centers, to fully cost program accomplishments and better project future budget requirements. 'MRM, through ABC/M, and 'cost accounting' prior to that, will be able to map these cost centers directly 'to the MMS and DOI strategic goals.' '

Evidence: 1) Preliminary ABC Data is available from MMS' pilot year. The ABC model fully costs MRM end outputs and rolls-up to the draft DOI strategic plan. 2) Budget Justifications,' Initial Budget Requests from the Divisions for FY 2003.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: MMS continuously works to improve strategic planning efforts. In 1993, RMP (now MRM) was selected as a Pilot program to implement the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). This was due in part to the fact that RMP had a history of strategic planning and performance measurement. In addition, the program offices developed tactical plans linking to the overall program plan. Over the years, MRM has improved strategic planning by involving mid-level managers in setting strategy and targets, increasing employee involvement and input, and aligning with MMS and DOI plans. Additionally, MMS Reengineering and RIK pilot initiatives involved radical shifts in direction. For these initiatives, MRM Managers set long-term "stretch" goals, designed to focus and align the organization toward the new direction. MMS Strategic Plan goals and targets have also shifted to align with these stretch goals. MMS continuously benchmarks and assesses the external environment, and managers discuss performance status regularly and revise strategic direction as necessary.

Evidence: 1) MMS has recently contracted with the Lukens Energy Group to 'develop a post-Road Map 5-year Strategic Business Plan that will facilitate accomplishment of 'long term RIK performance goals for the years 2004 and beyond.' 2) OTHER SOURCES: 1994, 1996, 1998, 2000, and 2001 MRM Managers' workshop agendas. Reengineering Road Map; RIK Road Map, MRM Arrow Chart, Budget and other documents that discuss/align with "stretch" goals. Statement of work for Luken's contract. October 2002 AD memo to the DOI Assistant Inspector General for Audits (RIK).

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: MMS has measured and reported performance at least quarterly using a variety of reporting and collection tools since FY 1997. During prior years, MRM compiled and reported measurement data at least annually. MRM Managers regularly review quarterly data (on both externally reported and internally tracked measures) and redirect staff resources to address areas where increased progress is required -- either to achieve externally reported measures, or to address internal office targets. Performance measurement has been an integral part of program management. MRM is now utilizing the MMS-wide ABC/M system that integrates workload and process outputs with cost data. MMS also collects quarterly performance data from States and Tribes, and incorporates that data into MRM's reported progress toward the 3-year compliance goals. Additionally, MRM COTR's receive Metrics Reports tracking contractor progress and performance in meeting Service Level Agreements (SLAs) in the contracts, and identifying trends and problem areas to ensure proper dedication of system resources.

Evidence: 1) During the GPRA pilot years (1994-1997), MRM established an internal performance measurement team that reviewed all MRM performance measures, determine whether they were the right measures, recommended new measures to managers -- many of which were implemented, and developed a useful tool for regularly reporting performance data to managers. MRM benchmarked with other organizations and adopted the Kodak matrix approach for a few years, continuing to work with managers to refine reporting and enhance usefulness. 2) OTHER SOURCES: MRM measurement Matrix 1996-1998. DOI Reporting documentation for 1998 - current. Internal draft MRM tactical plans/measures. Sample 202/205 Reports. Accenture contract and RIK build out metric reports.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: All of MMS's SES managers performance standards include responsibility toward annual 'strategic goals and other mission objectives, including the President's Management Agenda and the Secretary of the Interior's 4 C's. Performance responsibility cascades down to other MRM managers'. The MRM Associate Director reviews quarterly performance data, and discussed concerns with the accountable managers. In addition, MRM 'managers are responsible for monitoring related costs. MMS's 'partners -- states and Tribes with whom 'MRM has cooperative agreements -- are 'held accountable for their 'costs 'and achievement of MRM's 3-year compliance goals for 'targeted properties under their responsibility. MMS ensures accountability by completing regular reviews 'of internal CAM offices and of State and Tribal audit offices. 'Frequent external reviews from OIG, GAO, and others provide increased 'assurance of accountability in achieving performance goals. The 'AD ensures that action plans are developed and implemented 'to correct weaknesses found during reviews. '

Evidence: 1) A significant portion of MMS's reengineering systems contract was converted to fixed price, providing cost effectiveness. 2) During reengineering and RIK system implementation, MMS and the contractor held monthly contract status meetings and reports. 3) The MRM Quality Steering Committee meets at least quarterly. 4) In addition, MMS annually provides incentives to the mineral industry to report and pay timely and accurately through awards to top company performers. With the Mineral Revenues Stewardship Award, MMS elevates mineral companies' awareness of how their proper reporting and payment practices 'contribute to MRM's success in achieving its mission. ' 5) SOURCES: Example SES Performance Standards. Example Work Plan w/ State and Tribe. March 2003 OIG Report - Audit of MMS Audit Offices. Action Plan/Status of implementing OIG's prior recommendations. Capital Asset Plans for RIK & Reengineering.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?

Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The MMS begins formulating funding requirements for the next fiscal year during the mid-year budget review of the current year. At that time anticipated expenditure levels are estimated and thereafter the current fiscal year is "closed out" as a staging for the subsequent fiscal year. MMS senior management develops initial detailed funding requirements for the full fiscal year in October. Final allocations are made shortly after passage of the budget, or in the case of extended continuing resolutions, tentative allocations are made as soon as practical. These allocations are officially reviewed and analyzed for mid year, third quarter and other periodic reviews by MMS's senior managers. Budget controls, including signature authority limitation, also ensure that funds are obligated timely and spent for the intended purpose. In recent years, MMS consistently has obligated over 98% of appropriated funds by the end of the fiscal year, carrying over any remaining funds for anticipated projects in the new fiscal year.

Evidence: 1) The MMS operating budget staff evaluate disbursements/obligations on a monthly basis, and adjust funding allocations quarterly to meet unanticipated circumstances. 2) Reprogramming rules established by the Appropriations Committee are strictly adhered to if funding needs to be adjusted from one activity to another. This ensures appropriate and proper approval of usage of funds prior to expenditure. 3) Since FY 2000, MRM has carried over appropriated fund balances of approximately $1 million each year on total appropriations of between $83 and $86 million. 4) Sources: Initial budget requests from Divisions FY 2003. Carryover Balances for FY 2002 and 2003.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The MRM culture continually monitors efficiency and cost effectiveness. MMS recently implemented an ABC/M system to facilitate these efforts. MMS measures timeliness of financial disbursements and completed compliance and audit plans, performance goals and targets with actual MRM performance, and staffing allocations to achieve MRM's priority performance goals. Additionally, an MRM-wide reengineering effort reorganized the program in FY 2000 to implement improved business practices. MMS also focuses on efficient and cost-effective management of the mineral revenue asset. For example, the RIK pilot program performs assessments to ensure that value has been optimized. Most MRM IT functions are contracted out using Performance Based Contracts and Service Level Agreements to provide greater efficiencies, flexibility and cost savings. Additionally, MMS has eliminated duplication and reduced overhead costs by contracting out enterprise-wide IT functions. MMS has competed specific FTE percentages, and has targeted additional functions for study during FY 2004.

Evidence: 1) MMS promotes realization of optimal value through implementation of an 'asset management approach to administering the oil and gas mineral revenue stream. Capabilities to 'perform asset management were the primary focus of the Reengineering Initiative and 'RIK Road Map. 2) MRM 'contracted with Lukens Energy and implemented a Risk and Performance 'Management System (scheduled for September 2003). This will further leverage MMS's 'understanding of the production and marketing environment to make asset management 'decisions that optimize value through taking royalty-in-kind or in-value.' 3) Through competitive sourcing initiatives, MMS direct converted 10 MRM FTE in FY 2002 for IT management efficiencies; in FY 2003, MMS used streamlined cost comparison for 28.5 MRM FTE, and work was retained in house, avoiding over $3 million in cost over 5 years. 4) OTHER: Capital Asset Plans (Exhibit 300's); RIK Road Map; PMI reports on RIK pilots; Lukens SOW/RFP; Competitive Sourcing Plan/Report. Accenture Report on "As-Is Business Processes" January 2002. GAO Report 2003.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: MRM actively collaborates with a variety of programs and constituents. For example, the development of MRM's RIK capability is a collaborative effort with Wyoming through joint crude oil RIK sales pilot, with the Texas General Land Office 'in joint management of RIK gas sales pilot, and with BLM in the sale of natural gas 'from the Federal Helium Reserve. MRM also coordinates with the mineral industry in developing FM, CAM, and RIK processes.' MMS regularly meet with State and Tribal partners to receive their input on audit policy, and to annually coordinate audit plans. Similarly, the Royalty Policy 'Committee (RPC) meets with representatives from the energy industry, Federal 'Government, States, and Indian Tribes recommends royalty management policy. MRM continuously works with MMS's Offshore Program, BIA, Office of the Special Trustee, 'and other programs on issues of mutual concern. MRM is also successfully collaborating with the DOE to respond to the November 2001 'Presidential Directive to fill the remaining capacity of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve "(SPR) with RIK oil.

Evidence: 1) The MMS/MRM is a member of the Indian Mineral Steering Committee (IMSC), an oversight group for the Federal Indian Mineral Office (FIMO) in Farmington, 'New Mexico. This office is a collaborative effort between MMS, BIA, BLM and OTFM 'to provide 'one stop shopping' for individual Navajo mineral owners in the San Juan 'Basin region.' Much data/information is exchanged among MRM, BLM, BIA, and OST. 2) COPAS, a broad-based industry technical group has been consistently involved as MMS developed reengineering and RIK processes. 3) SOURCES: DOI Budget Justifications and Performance Information for Fiscal Year 2004 for the 'Minerals Management Service. MOU with Wyoming; MOU with Texas; MOU with 'BLM. Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act, as amended; RPC Charters; Annual Audit Coordination Agenda; STRAC & RPC Minutes; Division of Responsibility, OMM/MRM; Indian Mineral Steering Committee Minutes.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: In 2003, Interior's OIG found that MMS's internal quality control of its audit function was insufficient to ensure that its audits follow Government Auditing Standards because it lacked accountability, does not cover all audit work, was incomplete, and some (12%) auditors did not meet their continuing education requirements. However, annual audits of MMS have consistently found the MRM custodial financial activity to be fairly presented and 'without material weaknesses. In November, 2001, MRM implemented a commercial off-the-shelf accounting system that is Joint Financial Managers Improvement Program (JFMIP)-compliant, further enhancing our financial controls.

Evidence: 1) March 2003 OIG audit of MMS's MRM program audit offices. 2) The Independent Auditors Report of the Annual Financial Statement have generally indicated that prior findings were fixed or that progress, in most cases substantial progress, has been made. Additional staffing/financial resources were redirected to ensure that the strong commitment to accurate accounting of the mineral revenue stream were not compromised by the court ordered Department-wide Internet shut-down of the newly developed and implemented system. SOURCES: Fiscal Years 2001 and 2002 Annual Financial Reports.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: MRM has a history of continuous review and improvement, utilizing a good mix of external oversight, internal review, and contracts for independent review. MRM proactively addresses deficiencies identified by external oversight groups and internal reviews. Also, MRM focuses to actively implement the President's Management Agenda, and has continued strong collaboration with constituents in support of the Secretary's 4 C's. Performance data demonstrates the significant progress MMS has achieved. Also, MRM has completed all actions in the Reengineering Road Map, and is near completion of the RIK Road Map -- a series of actions to 'implement management controls/systems applications to transition RIK from pilot to 'operations if approved. Recommendations from the 'August 2002 OIG report on RIK pilots have also been implemented. The 'MRM contract with Lukens Energy Group will result in the development of a 5-year 'Business Plan that includes specific management improvements and strategies that 'optimize their use, and implementation of the recommendations from recent GAO Reports.'

Evidence: '1) During MRM's reengineering effort, MRM recognized that the compliance 'function was resource intensive, burdensome on industry, and did not fully 'address issues of non- or under-payment of royalties. MMS developed a 'Road 'Map' to move to a more efficient compliance process. Financial management was improved by increase electronic reporting and increasing financial controls. The Change Readiness Assessment and Transition Plan addressed human capital transition to reengineered processes. The MRM 'contract with Lukens Energy Group includes development of a RIK Strategic Business Plan for 2004 and beyond, including human resource development, acquisition of intellectual 'capital; identification and application of best practices; and installation of software 'applications. 2) SOURCES: October 2002 AD memo to the DOI Assistant Inspector General for Audits (RIK); RIK Road Map 2001; Reengineering Road Map 1998'; PMA implementation examples; 4 C's examples; Examples of corrected OIG or GAO noted deficiencies. Change Readiness Assessment.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:16%

Explanation: The PART instructions require a "NO" rating if the program received a NO rating in Question 2.1.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:16%

Explanation: See "PART Performance Measures" provided by MMS. For the measures used by the MRM program, the annual performance trends show that MRM historically meets or exceeds most of its annual goals -- a strong indicator of progress toward its long-term goals. In cases where MMS has not met the goal, managers have made decisions on redirecting staff resources to increase progress. As with the long-term goals, some of our MMS's FY 2002 progress was impacted by the court-ordered Department-wide Internet shutdown; however, the 2nd quarter FY 2003 reporting demonstrates significant progress toward achieving those annual targets. MMS's State and Tribal Partners' progress is calculated in with MRM's progress in achieving the 3-year compliance goal, so MRM actively coordinates with States and Tribes to ensure their progress toward MRM goals.

Evidence: 1) MMS FY 2001-2002 Performance Results. 2) MRM 2003 GPRA Report. 3) Performance charts from the MMS FY 2004 Budget Justifications.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:16%

Explanation: MMS has no efficiency measures demonstrating improved cost effectiveness. However, MRM has a well established culture of pursuing new efficiencies and capturing 'cost savings through innovative thinking and organizational restructuring. In 1998, 'MRM conceptualized, designed and began the building phase of reengineered business 'practices. Achievement of these new processes required wholesale restructuring of the organization, 'development of new core business systems and retraining of human resources. MRM routinely evaluates the most efficient means for accomplishing mission 'requirements and assesses and adjusts workforce requirements to gain the greatest efficiencies. Savings 'from improvement initiatives have allowed MRM to continue covering uncontrollables 'and unfunded mandates related to cost of living increases and added building, IT and internet 'security costs while continuing to achieve high performance standards. In FY 1998, MRM piloted a cost-accounting system, a project that aided MMS in developing a bureau-wide ABC/M system.

Evidence: MRM Reengineering: MRM 'goals were to cut the compliance business cycle time in half, expedite the disbursement of funds and reduce our constituent's reporting and recordkeeping burden. Due to an extended internet shutdown during initial implementation, MMS is only now beginning to realize the benefits associated with the reengineering 'effort.'Efficiently Accomplishing Mission Requirements: "" Technology Investment Analysis of Electronic Commerce Services showing that MRM has 'been able to reduce it's contractual data entry costs from $773,998 in FY 1999 to ''$162,271 in FY 2003."" Publishing statistical reports and training manuals on CD and Internet instead of paper."" Expands Electronic Funds Transfer use to reduce 'check processing and courier services.Workforce Efficiencies: MRM Personnel Reduction Summary details that show that since FY 2000, MRM has reduced its staff levels by approximately 10% through attrition.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Comparisons have been sought over the years, however, MRM has not been able to identify a comparable 'organization in terms of purpose and goals. There are other programs that perform functions similar to some of MRM's specific functions, but there is no other program that performs at the scale and variety of MRM. Though MMS has identified no organizations that provide the comprehensive mineral revenues management services provided by MRM, MMS continues to incorporate "best practices" as it encounters them. For example, the RIK pilot program uses standard industry contracts and credit management terms to collect revenues and minimize Government risks. And the compliance process radically changed from the company focus to a property/producing area focus, aligning with industry business processes, and providing MRM capability to more efficiently determine whether the government is whole. MMS has also noted that its electronic commerce initiatives -- resulting in 98% of all royalties and production now reported and paid electronically -- are ahead of most organizations.

Evidence: Final State Benchmarking Study; Final Report on Benchmarking Work with Norway 1996; Benchmark Visit to Alberta, Canada Department of Energy 1997; Capital Asset Plan (Exhibit 300) for RIK; RIK Roadmap; Technology Investment Analysis for Electronic Commerce Services; Benefits of Property/Producing Area focus (company quote)

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: MRM proactively addresses and implements recommendations of oversight agencies including OIG and GAO. Many of the recommendations require multi-year initiatives to implement, and MRM provides regular status reports to the oversight agencies on its progress. Recommendations from MRM's internal reviews have not historically been as aggressively addressed; however, in recent years, MRM has developed and implemented procedures to correct this. MRM frequently seeks independent review of significant IT investments. In 1998, an independent validation of the MRM "Plan for Reengineering Business Processes and Support Systems for the 21st Century (March 1998)" endorsed reasonableness of the schedule, appropriateness of the requested budget, and acceptability of the planned contractual approach for its reengineered systems.

Evidence: 1) An outside contractor, PEC, performed an independent assessment of MRM existing technology and provided recommendations of alternatives for future technology solutions. As a result of reviews of the court appointed Special Master on MMS security, MMS has been allowed to reconnect to the Internet and additionally have been allowed to give access to State and Tribal sites via Citrix/NFuse. Examples of improvements to MRM implementation of recommendations from Internal Reviews: Nearly all recommendations in the FY 2002 AMCR on "Physical Security Over Proprietary Data" have been implemented. 2) A recent IQCR of Offshore CAM's Tulsa Office has been closed, with all items on the action plan, completed and addressed. 3) SOURCES: Independent Review of RMP Business Process Reengineering Initiative (September 1998), an engineering review by PDS Advanced Technologies, Inc., of the MMS/RMP business process reengineering initiative and support systems for the 21st century.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

Measure: Outcome neasures under development

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

Measure: Proper royalty value received from mineral lease operators on their initial royalty submission, reported as a percentage of the total submissions received.

Additional Information: A primary outcome of MRM is to ensure that ultimate beneficiaries of mineral revenues receive fair value. MRM measures this by comparing actual payments received voluntarily from companies to predicted value. MRM influences correct voluntary payments by providing training/consultation to select companies, as determined necessary through MRM's compliance verification and audit work.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2001		98%	
2002		99%	
2003	98%		
2004	98%		
2005	98%		

Measure: Rate of timely disbursement of mineral revenues to recipients, reported in percent.

Additional Information: A primary MMS end outcome is timely disbursement of funds to recipients (States, American Indians, and the U.S. Treasury). MMS measures percent of mineral revenues disbursed to states by the end of the month following the month received (as required by regulation). Recipients use these revenues for schools, roads, other public works, etc.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2001		98%	
2002		80%	
2003	92%		
2004	94%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Minerals Revenue Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal Regulatory Based

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	80%	89%	61%	Demonstrated

2005	95%

Measure: Increase rate of company accuracy in royalty reporting

Additional Information: Accurate reporting directly impacts MMS's ability to timely disburse mineral revenues. MRM influences company's accurate reporting by providing reporter training to payers and operators, and by requiring electronic reporting with built-in edits, and contracting for electronic commerce infrastructure/interface with companies.

Year	Target	Actual
2001		96%
2002		86%
2003	94%	
2004	94%	
2005	96%	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Increase percent of financial distribution details to BIA within 21 days of receipt

Additional Information: MMS immediately transfers Indian mineral revenues to OTFM interest-bearing accounts. However, •BIA requires lease-level financial distribution details from MMS to •distribute funds to Indian individual mineral owners.• MMS is seeking to reduce the current 30-day target to 21 days. This is a new measure.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	90%	
2005	92%	

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Fisheries Program's mission is 'Working with partners to restore and maintain fish and other aquatic resources at self-sustaining levels and to support federal mitigation programs for the benefit of the American public". The National Fish Hatchery System is a tool to implement the mission of the Fisheries Program.

Evidence: December 27, 2002 memorandum from USFWS Director re: Fisheries Leadership Conference and What it Means to the Service; Fisheries Program Vision for the Future; Draft National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The National Fish Hatchery System helps to conserve a growing number of aquatic species that are declining at alarming rates. One-third of the Nation's freshwater fish species are threatened or endangered, 72 percent of freshwater mussels are imperiled, and the number of threatened and endangered species has tripled in the last 20 years. Concurrently, utilization of captive propagation and refugia as important tools in the recovery of these species has greatly increased. The National Fish Hatchery System also fulfills federal responsibilities to provide fish to replace or maintain harvest levels lost as a result of federal water development projects.

Evidence: Nearly three quarters (56 plans, covering 72 species) of all Endangered Species Act Recovery Plans for fish (76 plans, covering 96 species) include captive propagation technology or refugia as part of the recovery strategies to re-establish wild populations; ESPN/B.A.S.S letter to Secretary Norton; Gulf Sturgeon Recovery Plan, showing the National Fish Hatchery System responsibilities in the recovery strategy.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The National Fish Hatchery System (NFHS) is the only federal fish hatchery program and does not duplicate other federal efforts. The NFHS fulfills responsibilities related to recovery of threatened and endangered species, restoration of self-sustaining native populations, and meeting Tribal trust responsibilities. The NFHS produces catchable fish when fulfilling mitigation responsibilities as a result of federal water development projects. State, Tribal, and private hatcheries primarily raise and stock catchable fish in state waters or for commercial purposes. In the few cases where state and NFHS facilities stock fish in the same water body, the NFHS stocks different populations from those stocked by the state. State and Tribal efforts are complimentary, and not duplicative of NFHS activities. For example, federal and state facilities work collaboratively to aid in the recovery of the endangered Wyoming toad, by holding separate captive subpopulations to avoid the possibility that a single catastrophic event would eliminate the entire captive population.

Evidence: (See Q 4.4 for the) Sept. 2001 letter from U.S. Army to Region 2 on poor quality of privately stocked recreational fish compared to recreational fish provided by National Fish Hatchery System; GAO Report GAO/RCED-00-151, June 2000, p. 3; Recovery Plan implementation schedules for Gulf Sturgeon and the species of the San Marcos/Comal Springs Complex, showing the contributions of the NFHS and other agencies towards recovery of those species. Wyoming toad summary (see Q 4.4 for document). Data identifying the total restoration, recovery, and mitigation contributions of State, tribal, and private hatcheries is not available; MOU between Region 2 and Arizona Game and Fish 7/23/2001; GAO Report June 2000.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Over the years, many specific authorities have led to a myriad of mechanisms and responsibilities for establishing, funding, and operating national Fish hatcheries. GAO found that these numerous legal mandates require the Service to meet a multitude of goals that sometimes conflict. In some instances, these mandates required establishment and maintenance of hatcheries in locations no longer suitable to achieve production goals and in some cases, according to GAO, have resulted in compromised fish quality. Recognizing that the numerous legal mandates have led to inefficiencies and a decline in performance, GAO recommended legislative changes to the design of the NFHS program so that the Service would have the flexibility to open, close, change, move, and consolidate hatcheries to help target resources. GAO also identified a second design flaw related to the Service's inability, in some instances, to receive funds from federal water development agencies and/or project beneficiaries for hatchery operations and maintenance expenses associated with federal water projects. GAO recommended that the Service be provided the authority to obtain reimbursement from the agencies and/or beneficiaries to support these costs. Similar cost-sharing recommendations have been repeatedly called for in various reports on the NFHS since 1985.

Evidence: GAO/RCED-00-151, June 2000, NATIONAL FISH HATCHERIES: Authority Needed to Better Align Operations With Priorities, p. 16-17; '... to allow the Service to more efficiently and effectively align its operations with congressional directed priorities, we recommend that the Congress authorize the Service to open, close, change, move, and consolidate hatcheries. . . we recommend that the Congress provide the Service with clear authority to seek reimbursement from federal water development agencies and/or project beneficiaries for all hatchery operation and maintenance expenses associated with such projects.' See also pages 4-5. Also, Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council Report (SFBPC), A Partnership Agenda for Fisheries Conservation: Report of the Fisheries Program Strategic Plan Steering Committee to the SFBPC, January 2002. Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council Report (SFBPC), Saving A System in Peril: A special Report on the National Fish Hatchery System, September 2000. FY 2000 House Appropriations Report. Recommendations from FWS Stakeholders Meetings, 1996-1997. Report of the National Fish Hatchery Review Panel, December, 1994. FWS review of its Fishery Resources Program in 1985, cited in "Saving A System in Peril".

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Funds are targeted to accomplish Fisheries Operational Needs System database projects, each developed with partners and prioritized to meet the goals and objectives outlined in the draft Fisheries Program National Strategic Plan. The partner-based Aquatic Animal Drug Approval Program is designed to maximize the effectiveness of the National Fish Hatchery System's Fish Health Center and USDA partnership in both the drug Research and Development process and the dissemination of the results of these efforts. Cooperative Agreements between the Service and principal Federal and State stakeholders outline the goals to investigate and approve priority drugs for use in public and private aquaculture throughout the U.S., and the individual responsibilities for meeting the goals.

Evidence: Funded FY 2004 FONS project linked to National Fisheries Strategic Plan goals and objectives; March 2001 Hatchery System Alignment Report (Executive Summary, 5th paragraph); 1.5.1: Initial Cooperative Agreement that established Service involvement in partnership drug approval efforts from March 1994 - October 2002; 1.5.2: Draft Cooperative Agreement that is currently being established to ensure continuation of ongoing partnership efforts to obtain new animal drug approvals for aquatic species.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The National Fish Hatchery System (NFHS) has specific long-term performance measures developed during the FY 2004 PART. Additionally, new measures for facilities and fish health were developed during the FY 2006 PART review. The NFHS continues to use primarily output performance measures while comprehensive Fisheries Program outcome measures are developed and implemented, however, one new outcome measure was developed during this year's PART process.

Evidence: Draft National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008; Regional Strategic Plans from Service Regions 1-7; FY 2005 Budget Justification, pps. 245-247, showing the measures developed during the 2004 PART; Hatchery Operations and Maintenance: Program Performance Summary.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Long-term performance targets are set for key Program Focus area in the National Fisheries Strategic Plan. The seven Service Regions worked closely with partners and stakeholders to set ambitious targets for FY 2004-2008 that reflect the effort required to meet Regional priorities and to fulfill the Fisheries Program's mission. Baseline data and targets for most measures were established during FY 2003 and FY 2004. Targets have been revised for FY 2004, based on improved information submitted to the Fisheries Information System (FIS) by the Service Regions (Plans and Accomplishments Modules). Baseline data and targets for the new annual and long-term measures and new Fisheries Program outcome measure, evaluated in Q 2.1, were set by the Regions in FY 2004.

Evidence: Draft National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008; Regional Strategic Plans from Service Regions 1-7.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The National Fish Hatchery System developed annual performance measures during the FY 2004 PART. Some of the measures were included in the FY 2004 Government Performance Results Act plans, but with different target levels - a result of improved data developed by the Service Regions and submitted to the Fisheries Information System (FIS)

Evidence: FY 2004 National Fish Hatchery System Budget Justification Performance Summary; Draft National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008, showing annual performance targets; Department of the Interior GPRA Strategic Plan, 2003-2008

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Annual performance targets are set for key Program Focus area in the National Fisheries Strategic Plan. The seven Service Regions worked closely with partners and stakeholders to set ambitious targets for FY 2004 that reflect the effort required to meet Regional priorities and to fulfill the Fisheries Program's mission. The annual efficiency measure developed during the FY 2004 PART was acceptable and the baseline was established using FY 2001 - 2003 data. Baseline data and targets for most measures were established during FY 2003 and FY 2004. Targets have been revised for FY 2004, based on improved information submitted to the Fisheries Information System (FIS) by the Service Regions (Plans and Accomplishments Modules). Baseline data and targets for the new annual and long-term measures and new Fisheries Program outcome measure, evaluated in Q 2.1, were set by the Regions in FY 2004.

Evidence: National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008, detailing the FY 2003 baselines and out year targets; Regional Implementation Plans Regions 1-7 (see Q 2.1).

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Partnerships with states, universities, other federal agencies, and/or private firms are generally based on achieving program goals.

Evidence: Recovery Procedures Cooperative Agreement for FWS, CO, UT, and WY; US v MI Court Decree, and link to "A Lake Trout Rehabilitation Guide for Lake Huron" Interagency agreements between FWS/BOR for Coleman and Leavenworth NFHs (see Q 3.5 for reference); Columbia River Fisheries Development Program document; Lower Snake River Memorandum of Agreement between FWS and BPA; Cooperative Agreement with Region 4 and the states of AL, FL, and GA; MOU between FWS and Conservation Fisheries, Inc.; MOU between FWS and TN, MO, and Conservation Fisheries, Inc.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: In 2003, the Fish and Wildlife Service Director requested the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council to develop evaluation protocols and to perform annual evaluations of the Service's Fisheries Program. The Council's Evaluation Workgroup represents a broad base of stakeholder interests, and has been working since December 2003 to develop comprehensive processes and protocols for thorough and regular evaluations. The protocols were approved (with minor editing) by the full Council in May 2004, and the first evaluation of the Fisheries Program is scheduled for January/March 2005. The Scope of the evaluation will be refined to ensure evaluation examines how well program is accomplishing program mission, long-term goals, and program effectiveness. To ensure a quality evaluation, the framework is based on an evaluation process developed by the Ecosystem Management Institute at the University of Michigan which will help to ensure a rigorous process is undertaken. Since the Council is heavily influenced toward recreation, the Council has brought together a collection of stakeholders representing varied backgrounds and interests to counter balance biases.

Evidence: Executive Order 12962 ' expands SFBPC's authority to monitor and evaluate Federal activities affecting aquatic systems and associated recreational fisheries; Letter of request from FWS Director to Dr. William Taylor (SFBPC Chair), asking the SFBPC to develop evaluation protocols and undertake regular external reviews of the Fisheries Program; SFBPC Evaluation Workgroup member list; SFBPC Fisheries Program Evaluation Protocols and Questions. Measuring Progress, a Guide to the Development, Implementation and Interpretation of an Evaluation Plan, Ecosystem Management Institute, School of Natural Resources, University of Michigan.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The FY 2004 and FY 2005 Budget Justifications link funding increases to performance measures and targets that contribute to the Department's and the Fisheries Program's Strategic Plan annual and long-term goals. FY 2005 Justifications include performance and cost information for each program budget activity/subactivity. Budget narratives for funding increases include specific projects that demonstrate how the funds will contribute to the Department's and the Fisheries Program's long-term Outcome Goals. Service-wide implementation of Activity Based Costing/Management began in January 2004 to provide linkage between budget and specific program performance measures.

Evidence: FY 2004 Budget Justification; FY 2005 Budget Justification; ABC/M Memo from FWS Director 4/06/04; personnel timesheet example; FONS accomplishments for FY03; Grant Thornton SAS Strategic Performance Management Pilot Outline

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: After the FY 2004 PART review, eight committees were established to address strategic planning deficiencies. Each of the seven Service Regions completed Regional Fisheries Program Strategic Plans in FY 2003, after extensive discussions with local, regional, and national-level partners and stakeholders. The Regional Plans describe priorities and tactics required to accomplish measurable resource outcomes. The Draft National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan is a compilation of the Regional Plans and sets the course established by our collective partnership for the future of America's fisheries resources. Consistent with the President's Management Agenda, the National Fish Hatchery System worked with Office of Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, and Service planning personnel to develop ambitious annual and long-term performance goals and targets included in the Regional and National Strategic Plans. A group of stakeholders will conduct independent, thorough, and routine reviews of the Fisheries Program's effectiveness in implementing the Plan.

Evidence: Saving a System in Peril (Sep 2000) and A Partnership Agenda for Fisheries Conservation (Jan 2002), The Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council; ESPN/B.A.S.S. letter to Secretary Norton (see Q 1.2); Regional Strategic Plans from Service Regions 1-7 (see Q 2.1); Example of FONS Accomplishment from Region 6, reporting development of the Regional Strategic Plan; Draft National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008; Draft 8-Point Hatchery Reform Plan (2002).

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: An Evaluation Program for FTC's was established in 1995 to determine continued relevance of the program with NFHS priorities and aquatic resource conservation goals of the FWS, and to ensure the quality, integration, and productivity of center activities. The evaluation team is led by the Service's Research Coordinator and comprised of representatives of several program areas within the FWS as well as one or more representatives of aquatic research laboratories or partners outside of the FWS. Evaluation recommendations are used to improve FTC program performance and relevance. There is no assessment of program benefits or comparison, however, of potential benefits to other efforts that have similar goals.

Evidence: FTC Evaluation Protocol document; FTC Evaluation Reports (Bozeman FTC, Warm Springs FTC, Dexter FTC, Abernathy FTC draft report).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

2.RD2 **Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: For the Research and Development portion of the National Fish Hatchery System (NFHS), the Fish Technology Centers' (FTC) priorities have been developed. The FTC 'Tech Team', comprised of the Assistant Regional Directors for Fisheries, first established a list of priority work areas in 1994. The priority list is reviewed annually to ensure continued relevance and FTC projects must reflect relevance and need before being funded through competitive grants. The Fisheries Program also has established advisory groups in some Regions, which include personnel from the Service's Refuge, Endangered Species and Aquatic Nuisance Species divisions, to prioritize technology development projects. Projects from the Operations portion of the NFHS are prioritized at the Regional level, based on their assessment of the work required to meet Regional, National Fisheries Program, and Department Strategic Plan goals. High priority projects are selected from the Fisheries Operational Needs System database for inclusion in Federal budget justifications.

Evidence: FTC Priority Work Area List; FTC Advisory Committee Project Request Form and Meeting Minutes (LATEST); FTC Grant Proposal; Example of a Regional Advisory Group ' The Region 4 FTC Advisory Committee conducts an annual call for projects that extends to all Service Programs. The multi-project Advisory Committee reviews submitted projects based on Regional conservation needs and recommends projects for funding accordingly; Example of ranked FONS projects showing Regional priority ranking and the project as it appears on the FY 2004 Budget Justification.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Information collected annually from the Regions in the Fisheries Information System's Accomplishment Module is used for budget allocations, requests, justifications, and performance reporting. Program needs, including project design and requested budget, are captured annually in the Fisheries Operational Needs System. This information is used to reallocate effort as tasks are completed and to provide a prioritized list of projects, all linked to DOI and Fisheries Program Strategic Plans, from which to allocate funding. The Fisheries Information System Plans Module is nearing completion, which will automatically link Recovery and Fisheries Management Plans (tasks/objectives) and performance measures with each Fisheries Operational Needs System project and accomplishment report, greatly streamlining project development and reporting processes.

Evidence: FIS Plans Module Overview and Instructions; FIS Accomplishments Module Overview and Instructions; budget justifications; MOA for LSRCP (see Q 2.5); Example of the use of performance data to improve National Fish Hatchery System performance: the National Fish Hatchery System adjusted and reduced its striped bass production as the population was restored, adjusted its lake trout stocking programs from Lake Superior to Lake Michigan and Lake Huron as the population was restored in Lake Superior, and adjusted from shore stocking to reef stocking in response to evaluations made by other programs.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: In an August 2003 memorandum to the Service's Regional Directors, the Fish and Wildlife Service Director's Office mandated that beginning in FY 2004, Personnel Performance Plans for Fisheries Program Managers and supervisors down to the Project Leader level will include requirements for meeting specified performance targets. Currently, field managers are held accountable for appropriate levels of their performance relative to supporting Work Activity Guidance and/or Performance Plans, however specific performance targets are not delineated. Service Region 5 has nearly completed the stepdown of performance measure accountability to individual performance plans.

Evidence: Memo from Director to Regional Directors assigning accountability for meeting performance targets down to the Project Leader level; Examples of Personal Performance Plans from ARD, Fisheries Supervisor, and Program Leader; Draft Region 5 documents - Regional performance target accountability to managers and field level supervisors; Fisheries Information System Accomplishment Module reporting templates for general project activity and performance targets met.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?

Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Review of the previous 2 years of Office Management Reports show that funds have been under spent, leaving carryover balances in excess of 15%.

Evidence: FY 2004 Detailed Allocation Table; FY 2002 and 2003 End of Year Office Management Reports

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The National Fish Hatchery System has collected data on a rainbow trout efficiency measure for the past two years. The seven Fish Technology Centers were established to assist the National Fish Hatchery System substantially reduce costs, enhance fish quality, and improve overall fish culture operations. Innovative applied research has resulted in many improved efficiencies which directly impacts achievement of program goals through increased survival rates, improved condition factors, and increased production. At the direction of the Secretary and Service's Director, the Service is currently working on contract documentation to compete the functions of GS-level Biological Science Technicians and WG (wage-grade) Animal Caretakers at National Fish Hatchery facilities. A Service Workgroup analyzed the potential of grouping facilities and other administrative cost saving possibilities and found that 80% of the Service's Fisheries Program field stations are complexed/colocated.

Evidence: Report entitled Complexing and Collocating US Fish and Wildlife Service Fisheries Program Field Stations, August 2002; Memoranda from the Secretary and Asst. Secretary and FWS Director Order # 159 - directing the Service to undertake the competitive sourcing initiative for Biological Technicians and Animal Caretakers; Memo from Deputy FWS Director notifying field personnel of the competitive sourcing initiative; Chattahoochee Forest National Fish Hatchery Environmental Award; Draft National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The National Fish Hatchery System collaborates and coordinates with Federal and State agencies/programs, Tribal Councils, and private entities to enhance and improve our Nation's aquatic resources. Some examples include: working with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the Tennessee Valley Authority to mitigate the adverse effects of federal water development projects; collaborating with the United States Geologic Survey and the National Marine Fisheries Service on aquaculture practices; working with the Service's Refuge program to restore native fish populations and provide fishing opportunities; and coordinating with the Service's Endangered Species program to accomplish and support Recovery Plan strategies. Recent efforts include: working with the White Mountain and Jicarilla Apache Tribes and the State of New Mexico to recover the endangered gila and Apache trout; and working with the State of Ohio, Southern Illinois University, and a private hatchery to help recover the shovelnose sturgeon in the Scioto River, among many others.

Evidence: Interagency agreement with BOR on Leavenworth and Coleman National Fish Hatcheries; US v. Oregon Interim Spring/Summer Management Agreement; Participation on the Joint Subcommittee on Aquaculture; ESA recovery plans; National Wild Fish Health Survey and Database; INADS; AADAP; SFBPC Sept. 2000 Report, Saving a System in Peril, pg. 23; From the Edge, Oct. 2000 Draft, pg. 47-48; Recovery Procedures Cooperative Agreement for FWS, CO, UT, and WY; April, 2000, N.J. Dept. of Environmental Protection Testimony concerning Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act; Conservation exchange between FWS and MT (above is same evidence for FY2002 PART Q 2.4); Lower Snake River Memorandum of Agreement, Exhibit 'C' (see Q 2.5 for document); Outdoor Central.com article on Shovelnose Sturgeon; Around 505 article on NM trout recovery; CNN.com article on OK paddlefish; Outdoor Wire article on American Shad; FFF Conservation Watch article on Cutthroat conservation; ESPN Outdoor article on Native (Gila) trout; Oct 22, 2001 letter from State of Louisiana to R. Schulz

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Service employs sound financial management practices to administer its programs, including the National Fish Hatchery System. The Service received an unqualified audit opinion in the most recent independent auditor's report (October 31, 2003) on the Service's financial statements. Material weaknesses identified during prior audits related to security and controls over financial systems have been resolved to the point that they are no longer considered material weaknesses. The Service has specific system controls in place to minimize erroneous payments. Auditors found no significant problems with improper, duplicate, or erroneous payments by the Service during any of the past three audits.

Evidence: Independent Auditor's Report, KPMG, October 31, 2003

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Internal review of the NFHS via the 3As report established a baseline for identifying management deficiencies. Twenty management controls for program direction, facility needs, and hatchery operations are in place to monitor program activities. The Fisheries Operational Needs System is used to address deficiencies identified in areas such as recovery, restoration, mitigation, and Tribal trust responsibilities, to improve management of the National Fish Hatchery System. For example, Fish Health Center personnel standardized policies and procedures to ensure consistency and accuracy of fish health inspections. Comprehensive Hatchery Management Plans are tools to help integrate Service objectives and priorities with those of other agencies/programs and provide a foundation for future program and budget development and review (several hatcheries have developed plans to date).

Evidence: Adequacy and Appropriateness section of the 3As report. Management Control list update of August 8, 2002; FONS; MMS; Alignment Report and reduction of Non-aligned programs. For example, the 3As report identified the need for more project evaluations on management and performance (e.g. stocking schedules). Based on this need, projects to address priority evaluation needs are now included in FONS. Examples of management steps taken as a result of FIS/FONS; Fish Health Inspection Policies and Procedures; Final Draft Comprehensive Hatchery Management Plan for Spring Creek NFH (first 20 pages of the 106 page document).

3.CO2 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities? Answer: YES Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The Service participates on the Whirling Disease National Partnership's steering committee, which provides coordination, establishes research priorities and supervises a peer review process to select funded projects. Partnership and Whirling Disease Foundation contracts stipulate that annual financial and accomplishment reports be remitted to the Service, and the Partnership reports its activities to the Congress annually and presents accomplishments at an annual Whirling Disease symposium. An Interagency Agreement with the US Geologic Service requires annual financial and accomplishment reporting and quarterly invoicing. The Service's Contracting Officer Technical Representative (COTR) is in constant communication with the principals of each of these groups, to ensure coordination.

Evidence: Charter for the National Partnership for the Management of Wild and Native Coldwater Fishes; 2003 Partnership Annual Report; USGS Interagency Agreement

3.RD1 For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality? Answer: YES Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The Whirling Disease National Partnership is a consortium that emphasizes fish health, fishery productivity, fisheries ecology, and adaptive fishery management. The National Fish Hatchery System provides grant funds (matched by sponsoring agencies and private organizations) to pursue research and management activities consistent with the Partnership's charter. The Warm Springs Advisory Committee solicits project requests from state and federal project leaders, for assistance from the Warm Springs (GA) Regional Fisheries Center. Potential projects are evaluated using standardized protocols and ranked by the Advisory Committee for possible implementation. Fisheries Information Needs System projects related to research and development (Fish Technology Center projects) are prioritized by each Service Region on its relevance to the Fisheries Program's mission and its contribution to accomplishment of Regional and National Fisheries Strategic Plan goals. Annual accomplishment reports are submitted annually via the Fisheries Information System by each field station/Regional office.

Evidence: See 3.CO2 for the National Partnership Charter; Warm Springs Advisory Committee Research Request memorandum and project evaluation protocols; Examples of FONS projects with Regional rankings

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
80%	90%	71%	80%	

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Long-term targets are listed as 5-year objectives in the National Fisheries Strategic Plan. In April 2004, the Fisheries Information System was upgraded to include a Plans Module to gather task level information in order to gauge the Program's accomplishments as they contribute to approved management plans. Based on FY 2004 accomplishments, the program exceeded its target percentage of priority recovery tasks and met its target percentage of priority restoration tasks. Program targets for FY 2004 were ambitious and are on track to meet long-term goals. The Plans Module is scheduled to be further refined in December 2004. Long-term goals may be refined based on this update.

Evidence: National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan, FY 2004-2008; New Fisheries Program and NFHS long-term outcome goals developed during the 2004 PART.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Baseline targets established during the 2002 PART have been vetted through the Regions and as a result, FY 2004 targets were refined. The addition of the Fisheries Information System Plans Module during FY 2004 helped to more accurately quantify the numbers of approved Plans and tasks. Annual performance targets are achieved for some measures and not for others. Discrepancies between planned and actual accomplishments occur because: 1. New Recovery and Management Plans and tasks were quantified in the field after FY 2004 targets were set, 2. Data reporting deadlines in FIS Modules did not allow for the inclusion of some Plan tasks associated with field station accomplishments. Data validation of the FIS database has uncovered several issues where further modification is needed to bring about consistent reporting across regions. The program has already begun to address these issues. For example, the Regions have agreed to form a performance measure workgroup to analyze data collection methods and to implement effective monitoring strategies across Regions.

Evidence: National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan, FY 2004-2008; Example of FONS project with targets; Example of FIS Accomplishment module report.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Data on an efficiency measure developed during the FY 2002 Performance Assessment Rating Tool is being collected, and the Program is working with the Office of Management and Budget to improve the measure. Innovative applied research from the seven Fish Technology Centers (FTCs) has resulted in improved efficiencies that impact achievement of program goals. Installation of two high-efficiency heat pumps to provide water required to raise endangered pallid sturgeon at Garrison Dam National Fish Hatchery (SD), resulted in recovery of installation costs in one year (savings of $30,000), a decrease of 554,400 kW of electric power used, and associated reduction in air pollutants. A highly reliable non-fatal method of detecting calcein-marked fish was developed at Lamar FTC and patented. Abernathy FTC scientists developed a technique decreases pathogen identification time from 2-6 days to 6 hours. Lamar also piloted a heat exchange unit that would pay for itself in 1.4 years (based on cost savings analysis).

Evidence: FTC Mission/Vision Statement; Summary of Fish Technical Center Efficiencies and Advancements, including cost savings; FY 1999 Mora FTC/NFH Efficiency Award; Nomination announcement for Garrison Dam's Federal Energy and Water Management Award; Western Area Power Administration article (internet) on cost-savings realized at Garrison Dam; Lamar FTC - Thermal Performance of a Countercurrent Flow Spiral Heat Exchanger With Possible Applications for Aquaculture (Draft manuscript, 2004); Article: "Environmental Protection Does Save Money"; Letter to Phyllis Cook from Western Chemical Inc. and a Memorandum to Cathleen Short from Neil L. Mark on Lamar FTC calcein mark detection device; Journal of Aquatic Health: "Optimization of Nested Polymerase Chain Reaction...", and Paper: Estimation of the Repeatability and Reproducibility of Three Diagnostic Tests for Infectious Salmon Anemia (Lamar); Secretarial Order No. 3243; Memorandum dated March 12, 2004 - Service request for an exemption to Secretarial Order 3243 and approval to obtain patent processing activities via an interagencyagreement with the US Navy;

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: An in-depth draft rainbow trout cost comparison study indicates that the National Fish Hatchery System is the most cost-effective and efficient regional producer of rainbow trout, with few exceptions. A 1997 National survey of ten government agencies, Fishery Management Councils, and conservation organizations rated the Service as the overall best federal agency in achieving the fishery conservation goals of the Recreational Fishery Resources Conservation Plan. As evidenced by the efforts on the Wyoming toad at the Saratoga National Fish Hatchery, the Service provides superior refugia and propagation expertise and facilities to support the recovery of endangered and threatened species. Of the total mortality noted from 1997 to 2004 at all participating facilities (to date - n = 2125), Saratoga accounted for a mere 4% (n = 85). The Lamar Fish Health Center coordinated with multiple agencies to develop research/management strategies to prevent the spread of Infectious Salmon Anemia. Lamar provided the most sensitive detection method of all laboratories tested. Nevertheless, a 2002 study by the Northwest Power Planning Council of eight northwest hatcheries indicated a state hatchery is more cost effective in producing fall Chinook salmon compared to a NFHS hatchery.

Evidence: FWS Preliminary Benefit-Cost Analysis for the Competitive Sourcing of Rainbow Trout and Competitive Sourcing Plan and Model (in FY 02 PART Q 4.3); Independent Auditor's Report, KPMG, October 31, 2003 (FY 02 PART Q 3.6); Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council Report (SFBPC), A Partnership Agenda for Fisheries Conservation, January 2002; Sept. 2001 Letter from U.S. Army to Region 2 on poor quality of privately stocked recreational fish compared to recreational fish provided by National Fish Hatchery System; Wyoming toad summary (journal manuscript in development); Lamar NFH statement, Draft Manuscript of ISAV Lab Test Results, Emails (2) on Canada's request for Lamar NFH's ISAV lab protocols and data; FWS Comments on NWPCC draft report (see FY 02 PART Q 4.4)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**

Answer: SMALL EXTENT

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Service received an unqualified audit opinion in the most recent independent auditor's report (October 31, 2003) on the Service's financial statements, reflecting the quality and effectiveness of its financial operations. Thorough evaluations of Fish Technology Centers are accomplished every four years and find that Technology Center efforts are linked with the mission of the Fisheries Program and that the Centers are indeed, accomplishing expected results. The Fisheries Program evaluation process being designed by the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council will be accomplished on an annual basis.

Evidence: Independent Auditor's Report, KPMG, October 31, 2003 (FY 02 PART Q 3.6); Fish Technical Center; Fish Technology Center Evaluation Program Protocols; Executive Summary of the latest Abernathy FTC evaluation; Draft Abernathy FTC Evaluation document; GAO Report: "Authority Needed to Better Align Operations with Priorities (2000)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

Measure: Percent of NFHS priority recovery tasks implemented as prescribed in approved Recovery Plans.

Additional Information: Measures percentage of tasks identified in threatened and endangered species recovery plans. Measure includes production tasks and science and technology tasks. The tasks measured are specifically for the NFHS and are believed to help recover of the species.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2008	65%		

Measure: Condition of NFHS mission critical water management assets as measured by the FCI.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	TBD	0.19	
2005	0.19		
2006	0.19		
2007	0.19		
2008	0.19		

Measure: Pounds of healthy rainbow trout produced per dollar spent.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Efficiency
2004	.37lb/$1	.37lb/$1	
2005	.37lb/$1		
2006	.37lb/$1		
2007	.37lb/$1		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

2008	.37lb/$1	

Measure: Percent of survival targets, prescribed by approved management plans, met for hatchery stocks of imperiled species.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	39%	48%	
2005	48%		
2006	48%		
2007	48%		
2008	48%		

Measure: Percent of threatened and endangered aquatic species populations that become self-sustaining in the wild. (Targets under development.)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

Measure: Percent of survival targets, prescribed by approved management plans, met for hatchery stocks of imperiled species.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2008	48%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

Measure: Percent of NFHS priority restoration tasks implemented as prescribed in approved Fishery Management Plans.

Additional Information: Measures percentage of tasks identified in restoration plans. Measure includes production tasks and science and technology tasks. The tasks measured are specifically for the NFHS and are believed to help recover of the species.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2008	70%		

Measure: Percent of DOI watershed units with current wild fish health surveys.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2008	25%		

Measure: Percent of mitigation production targets met.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2008	42%		

Measure: Condition of NFHS mission critical water management assets as measured by the FCI.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2008	0.19		

Measure: Percent of NFHS priority recovery tasks implemented as prescribed in approved Recovery Plans.

Additional Information: Measures percentage of tasks identified in threatened and endangered species recovery plans. Measure includes production tasks and science and technology tasks. The tasks measured are specifically for the NFHS and are believed to help recover the species.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	45%	62%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

2005	65%
2006	65%
2007	65%
2008	65%

Measure: Percent of NFHS priority restoration tasks implemented as prescribed in approved Fishery Management Plans.

Additional Information: Measures percentage of tasks identified in restoration plans. Measure includes production tasks and science and technology tasks. The tasks measured are specifically for the NFHS and are believed to help retore the species.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	69%	69%
2005	70%	
2006	70%	
2007	70%	
2008	70%	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Percent of DOI watershed units with current wild fish health surveys.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2004	21%	25%
2005	25%	
2006	25%	
2007	25%	

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Fish Hatchery System
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	90%	71%	80%	Effective

2008	25%

Measure: Percent of mitigation production targets met.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2004	85%	42%
2005	42%	
2006	42%	
2007	42%	
2008	42%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Overall purpose is to preserve historic properties nationwide. Achieving that purpose requires a complex inter-governmental partnership that recognizes and seeks to influence critical historic preservation decisions by local groups and private property owners through grants, incentives, national recognition, and other non-prescriptive means.

Evidence: The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 sets out the overall purpose and intergovernmental structure. Components of the overall effort are addressed through other acts, such as the Historic Sites Act, the NPS Organic Act, the Archeological Resources Protection Act, the American Battlefields Protection Act, and various tax code provisions.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Problem is to serve the public interest in preserving historic structures of national significance, while respecting the dominant principle of private property rights. Continued interest in historic preservation can be seen through the growing popularity of historic sites; the annual additions to State's historic site inventories and NPS's National Register of Historic Places (National Register); the increasing number of preservation projects funded through the "Save America's Treasures" (SAT) grants and other sources; the Administration's 'Preserve America' initiative; the increase in Certified Local Governments (CLGs); and the growing private investment in tax-assisted historic rehabilitation projects.

Evidence: See the Historic Preservation Fund annual reports. First Lady Bush announced the Preserve America initiative on March 3, 2003. The National Register currently has 76,000 listings, compared to 71,000 in 1999. SAT grants elicited over 450 applications in 2003, up from 119 in 1999 when the program was established. Tribal assumption of SHPO duties on tribal land has grown from 12 initial tribes in 1996 to 37 in 2003. There are now 1,388 CLGs, up from 1,192 in 1999. Private investments in historic rehabilitation of commercial historic buildings encouraged through Federal preservation tax incentives has grown from $2.3 billion in 1999 to $3.2 billion in 2002 (over $28 billion in historic preservation activity has been stimulated through tax incentives since 1976).

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program design depends on efforts from a wide range of governmental and private agencies, organizations, and individuals. These efforts are complementary, not duplicative. For example, Federal grants help support State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs) to implement duties under both Federal and State laws. In effect, State agencies perform activities under a Federal statute in return for partial Federal funding. CLGs contribute by managing design and land use in a manner not appropriate for Federal or State governments.

Evidence: There are no duplicative programs. However, one indication of complementary efforts is the amount of non-federal funds leveraged by the program in FY 2001: $34m in HPF grants leveraged at least a matching amount of State funds; SAT grants leveraged at least $30 million; the rehabilitation tax credits stimulated $2.7 billion in private investment in historic preservation projects. Another example of complementary efforts is the coordination between SAT grants, tax credits, and listings on state and national inventories.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program design takes advantage of the various capabilities of the respective governmental and non-governmental partners. NPS carries out (or provides grants to SHPOs and THPOs to carry out) such governmental functions as promulgating regulations and standards, maintaining site inventories, approving National Register and National Historic Landmark (NHL) entries, and approving projects for compliance with Federal law. NPS also manages SAT grants. CLGs carry out zoning and project-specific reviews.

Evidence: The allocation of duties between Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments seems to be efficient, although there has been no cost-effectiveness study to confirm this. For example, SAT grants are targeted to avoid projects for which tax incentives or compliance regulations are the proper tool. SAT grants are competitively awarded to fill in gaps in historic preservation that are not adequately covered by Federal, State, or local programs. There are still opportunities to improve coordination between the current combination of mechanisms that make up this program.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Funds are effectively targeted to support SHPOs and THPOs in implementing Federal statues. NPS could promote effectiveness by providing incentives for SHPOs that perform well. Half of SAT grants are chosen through a rigorous competitive process, but the other half are determined through congressional earmarks, which may not go to the most meritorious projects.

Evidence: Competitive process ensures that SAT, tribal, and American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) project grants go to the most meritorious beneficiaries. State grants are distributed through a well-established formula process. Other Federal actions, such as accepting National Register and NHL nominations or approving projects for tax credits, follow well documented standards and guidelines. (See Secretary's Standards and Guidelines.)

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight 12%

Explanation: The program has multiple long-term performance measures, all keyed to the outcome of more historic properties protected outside the National Park System. The measures address different types of protection in different degrees as a result of various actions by all levels of government and the private sector.

Evidence: The long-term performance measures are specifically set out in the GPRA goals that appear in the DOI and NPS strategic plans.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight 12%

Explanation: The long-term targets are all quantified. Targets are established by analyzing previous performance and funding data to determine what is achievable, assuming level funding in the future.

Evidence: See GPRA goals cited above. Even with level funding, the targets call for an ever-increasing number of historic properties to be protected through program activities.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program's annual performance measures are established, quantifiable GPRA goals. They measure the various means for achieving protection of historic properties and so are directly tied to achieving long-term targets.

Evidence: See GPRA annual performance measures for cultural resources outside the National Park System.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Baselines have been established for annual measures by using cumulative data from previous annual reports. Annual targets, like long-term targets, are established by analyzing previous performance and funding data to determine what is achievable, assuming level funding in the future.

Evidence: See cumulative data calculations and annual GPRA goals. Annual targets call for an ever-increasing number of historic properties to be protected through program activities.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: All state and tribal program grant recipients must prepare, carry out, and report on scopes-of-work based on duties set out in statute. All of these scopes-of-work include quantifiable measures of activities directly tied to the program's annual and long-term goals. Recipients of preservation project grants, as well as tax credit recipients, must carry out their projects in accordance with the Secretary's Standards.

Evidence: The commitment of partners is documented in grant agreements and final reports, covenants, easements, agreements by local governments to assume CLG status, agreements by tribes to assume THPO status under Section 101(d) of the NHPA, agreements by ABPP grant recipients for permanent protection of battlefields, and plans for SAT and other project-specific grants. Historically Black Colleges and Universities have not done as well in meeting program goals, as shown by the slow obligations of grant funds.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: There have not been regularly scheduled, objective, independent evaluations of how well the program is performing. DOI should conduct (or authorize an outside entity to conduct) an independent evaluation.

Evidence: Although there have been no independent evaluations, NPS activities are regularly subject to scrutiny from state and tribal partners, outside groups (such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation, or NTHP), and other clients.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Program budgeting is not clearly based on performance goals. Instead, budget requests are based more on incremental changes from previous appropriations.

Evidence: Recent NPS budget request justifications do include performance measures, but they do not indicate how funding and policy decisions affect performance or why the requested mix of performance and funding is appropriate.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: NPS continues to work with SHPOs, THPOs, and CLGs to measure performance of day-to-day operations. NPS and DOI are looking for ways to better integrate budget and performance information, such as using the PART and other information to make FY05 budget recommendations. In response to question 2.6 of this PART, DOI should conduct (or authorize an outside entity to conduct) an independent evaluation to examine program effectiveness.

Evidence: NPS ensures that: (1) States have NPS-approved Comprehensive State Historic Plans (required by Section 101(b)(3) of the NHPA); (2) State Plans are updated with community involvement at least every 5 years; and (3) each annual grant application cross-references State Plan objectives and implements the Plan through grant-assisted activities (see Chapter 7 of the HPF Grants Manual; see Georgia State Plan for 2001-2006). The NPS strategic planning process has led to more refined performance measures each year.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program annually collects from States and Tribes performance data that are directly tied to the program's annual and long-term performance measures and targets. These data become the basis for determining future targets that are ambitious, but achievable. It also collects useful information on tax credits and ABPP. Better information is needed on the performance results of SAT grants.

Evidence: See sample End-of-Year reports. See also procedures for State Program Review. NPS used to conduct quadrennial, on-site reviews to confirm the accuracy of the annual data, but this process has been suspended for lack of funding. NPS will need to either reinstate these reviews or find other ways to verify the accuracy of the data.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: NPS requires States and tribes to set their specific performance targets (e.g., number of properties inventoried) and then report each year on actual performance versus targets and explain any significant deviations. Tax credit approval, Section 106 reviews, National Register listings and other activities have specific standards and timeframes that must be met to be approved. SAT grants must meet strict standards, including matching funds. In all of these cases, past performance by grantees is taken into account when making awards.

Evidence: See sample grant agreement and end-of-year report. See implementing regulations for National Register process (36 CFR 60), Section 106 process (36 CFR 800), and Tax Credit program (36 CFR 67) for timeliness measures. See 36 CFR 61 and the Secretary's Standards for quality of preservation work to be performed.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: NPS has a "use or lose" policy that ensures timely expenditure of grant funds for state and tribal programs. Project funding is obligated as soon as feasible following competitive selection. Operating funds for NPS program staff are one-year funds with no carry-over.

Evidence: See obligation rate data, grantee expenditure data, 'use or lose' grant condition, funds recapture data, WASO expenditure records. The program receives very few grantee audit reports under the Single Audit Act, because the dollar amounts are so small.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program has not yet established efficiency targets for grantees, as there is no current basis for determining optimal per-unit costs for mandated NHPA activities. However, some efficiency is provided through a "delegated" decision-making process that empowers front-line managers (i.e., SHPOs and THPOs) to establish and address specific preservation priorities in a manner that is most cost-effective for them. The program is reviewing options to improve IT security and efficiency.

Evidence: See organizational structure for program implementation, with many activities delegated to SHPOs and THPOs. Review of IT operations are part of a DOI-wide effort. DOI should examine options for providing incentives for SHPOs and THPOs to increase cost effectiveness.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: NPS collaborates closely with SHPOs, THPOs, CLGs and other groups in implementing NHPA activities. This is essential, given the decentralized structure required under NHPA. NPS also works closely with other groups, such as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, in implementing the Preserve America initiative. It coordinates with NEA, NEH, and IMLS in the review of SAT grant applications. The program regularly carries out cooperative projects with the National Conference of SHPOs and the NTHP.

Evidence: NPS performance measures, plans, grant announcements, and other documents are developed jointly by NPS and its partners. NPS reports are based on data collected by States and other partners. SAT grant application instructions show the level of multi-agency coordination in reviewing and approving those grants. NPS regularly provides training for Federal Preservation Officers in other agencies.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Management controls introduced in 1979 result in exceptionally high obligation and expenditure rates for HPF formula grants to States and tribes. Internal controls implemented by NPS for Historic Preservation grants minimize erroneous payments. Grantees must spend or obligate 75% of grant funds within the fiscal year of appropriation, and must spend all funds by the end of the following fiscal year. Competitively awarded project grants also have expenditure deadlines; recapture rates for unspent funds are low.

Evidence: No material weaknesses related to this program. NPS minimizes erroneous payments by requiring grantee Final Project & End-of-Year Reports to compare the NPS-approved budget with costs actually incurred. If grantee has erroneously billed, NPS requires repayment. SMARTLINK electronic payments both improve efficiency and avoid erroneous payments. Other controls include a "Use or Lose" policy (amounts over 25% of a State's grant that are carried over after the first year may be reapportioned to others) and a requirement to expend all funds by the end of the second year.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program has internal procedures for addressing program management deficiencies, such as when SHPOs do not obligate funds as planned or significantly fall short of annual performance targets. NPS is using SMARTLINK and other IT improvements to improve efficiency.

Evidence: See sample End-of-Year reports. See also procedures for State Program Review. To avoid backsliding on management efficiencies, NPS needs to either reinstate its on-site reviews to confirm the accuracy of annual data provided by SHPOs and THPOs, or find another way to verify the accuracy of the data.

3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program has reporting procedures for grantees to provide precise information on expenditures, FTEs, and products for each of the NHPA activities. The program has a strong relationship with its grantees and a high level of understanding of what they do, but it no longer has a regular process for reviewing the accuracy of data provided by SHPOs and THPOs.

Evidence: See sample End-of-Year reports. See also procedures for State Program Review. To avoid backsliding on management efficiencies, NPS needs to either reinstate its on-site reviews to confirm the accuracy of annual data provided by SHPOs and THPOs, or find another way to verify the accuracy of the data.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

3.BF2 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program collects meaningful annual performance data from grantees. The information is compiled, aggregated, and published in an easy-to-read annual report. Information on the performance of each grantee is maintained and available to anyone in easily accessible form, but it is not published as part of the brief annual report.

Evidence: See Annual Reports and more detailed compilations.

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 35%

Explanation: Long-term goals reflect an ever-increasing number of historic properties that are protected by some means. The program is on track to meet each of those goals.

Evidence: See GPRA results data.

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 35%

Explanation: Because annual goals are based on past performance and assumptions of level funding, abnormally high past performance (leading to unreasonably high expectations), or funding reductions can on occasion cause failure to meet an annual target. However, most annual targets are achieved, and use of a 3-year average mitigates unusual swings in performance.

Evidence: See GPRA Annual Reports.

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 15%

Explanation: Although the program lacks 'per-unit-cost" efficiency measures, it has been able increase the number of properties protected with level or slightly declining funds. Better efficiency measures would likely show that this decentralized process is relatively efficient in implementing a variety of preservation tools.

Evidence: NPS has rough estimates of the cost of giving an historic property a new designation or other level of protection. This measures is still a work in progress and needs to be used in making program decisions.

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: There are no other programs with the purpose of promoting historic preservation of private properties. Others may preserve their own historic properties, but no one else functions as coach, cheerleader, and referee.

Evidence: For the purposes of this PART, the SHPOs and THPOs that receive grants through this program are considered part of this program. These organizations are the only ones outside of NPS that have a similar responsibility for promoting historic preservation of private properties.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: NO Question Weight:15%

Explanation: There have not been regularly scheduled, objective, independent evaluations of how well the program is performing. DOI should conduct (or authorize an outside entity to conduct) an independent evaluation.

Evidence: None

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

Measure: Historic properties newly designated as National Historic Landmarks.

Additional Information: 2,227 NHLs in FY 1999.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2000	25	33
2001	25	31
2002	33	0
2003	25	
2004	10	
2005	10	
2006	10	
2007	10	
2008	10	

Measure: National Historic Landmarks in good condition.

Additional Information: Overall number of NHLs expected to increase slightly each year with new designations.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2000	90%	95%
2001	90%	90%
2002	90%	95%
2003	90%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

2004	90%
2005	90%
2006	90%
2007	90%
2008	90%

Measure: Number of historic properties annually listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Additional Information: 70,019 listings in FY 1999.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2000	1,300	1,402
2001	1,200	1,434
2002	1,400	1,454
2003	1,300	
2004	1,200	
2005	1,150	
2006	1,100	
2007	1,050	
2008	1,000	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

Measure: Percent of historic properties (i.e., potentially eligible for the National Register) that are currently protected by historic preservation programs.

Additional Information: Targets based on FY02 baseline of 3.0% (59,800 of 1,986,400). Percent may decline as the overall inventory of eligible properties grows faster than the number of listings and other protection.

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2000	2.8%	3.0%
2001	2.7%	3.0%
2002	2.8%	3.0%
2003	2.9%	
2004	2.8%	
2005	2.8%	
2006	2.7%	
2007	2.7%	
2008	2.7%	

Measure: Number of historic properties inventoried, evaluated, or officially designated by States, Tribes, and local partners per year.

Additional Information: Includes 59 States and territories, 35 Tribal Preservation Offices, and 1,350 Certified Local Governments.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2000	162,400	163,900
2001	185,400	260,600
2002	291,200	216,800
2003	212,800	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Historic Preservation Programs
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	75%	89%	75%	Effective

2004	215,700
2005	218,600
2006	218,700
2007	218,800
2008	218,900

Measure: Cost of giving an historic property a new designation or other level of protection.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2000		$15,800
2001		$13,200
2002		$16,500
2003	$16,500	
2004	$16,000	

Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Geography Program ensures access to a common set of current, accurate, and consistent basic geospatial and remotely sensed data and scientific information that describes the Earth's land surface to help inform decisions by policymakers, resource managers, researchers, citizens, and the private sector.

Evidence: USGS Budget Justification & Performance Information for FY05, p 149-216. Implementation Plan for The National Map, v 1.0 10/18/03. PART Improvement Action Plan for The National Map (FY04 2nd qtr update). EO 12906 Coord Geog Data Acquisition & Access: The NSDI 4/11/94 (providing access to geospatial data is a critical element for Fed agencies). OMB A-16, Coord of Geog Info & Related Spatial Data Activities, rev 8/19/02. (lead Fed agency for geospatial data themes p 17-19, 21). Land Remote Sensing Policy Act 1992 (15 USC chap 82 PL 102-555). DOI Strategic Plan 2003-28.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Nation has a need for high quality geospatial data and applications that are integrated, easily accessible, nationally consistent, and publicly available to meet a variety of decision-making needs. While there are many sources of geospatial data, the information is often dispersed, sometimes not publicly available, often out of date, or is proprietary and in formats that cannot be combined and integrated with other data for analysis. Reasons for this situation include markets being insufficient to cause the private sector to invest in data, organizations collecting data on a project basis and not subsequently maintaining them, and organizations concentrating on developing data for their jurisdictions and purposes and not providing for integration of data from neighboring jurisdictions.

Evidence: USGS, 2001, The National Map: Topographic Mapping for the 21st Century: Final Report, 11/30/01. Draft National Response Plan, 2/25/04. : DOI/USDA, Joint Fire Science Plan (6-agency partnership to develop land use information (p 7) & monitoring tools (p 13) for managers & specialists who deal with wildland fuels issues). Chair, JCS Contingency Plan 0500 Annex M (requires USGS to provide geospatial products & analytical support to Fed entities charted with preparing for & responding to natural or human-induced catastrophic events). NGA/USGS/FGDC MOU (USGS responsible for providing The National Map as the base geospatial data for homeland security applications). USFS fact sheet, Partnership for Development of High-Res NHD on USFS Lands, 8/7/03 (adopts NHD). EPA fact sheet, Announcing Ver 2.0 of the Watershed Assessment, Tracking & Environ. Results (WATERS) 6/02 (adopts NHD). Comm on Civil Applications of Classified Overhead Remotely Sensed Data charter, 1975 rev 2000 (coordination group established by Dir Central Intelligence Agency, Dir OMB, National Security Advisory to the President, & Secretary of Interior).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The USGS is the Nation's civilian mapping agency. It is the only source of topographic map content that is integrated, nationally consistent, and publicly available. The USGS' approach is to use existing geospatial data where they exist, and provide data for places for which data are not available, and so avoid duplicating others' work. Other organizations' mapping efforts focus on topics of limited thematic and geographic interest, are not maintained beyond the immediate needs of a project, or are not consistent over large areas. Through partnerships, The National Map brings together and integrates geospatial data from great numbers of Federal, State, and local agencies and the private sector, to ensure availability and integration of these data, promote the use of NSDI standards, and to prevent duplication of effort.

Evidence: USGS, 2001, Issues & Actions: The National Map, p 4-9. H. John Heinz III Center for Science, Economics & Environment, 2002, The State of the Nation's Ecosystems, p 10-13 (requirements analysis for indicators of ecosystem characteristics validating program land cover information). NRC, 2003, Weaving a National Map. OMB A-16, Coord of Geog Info & Related Spatial Data Activities, rev 8/19/02 (lead Fed agency for geospatial data themes, p 17-19, 21). USGS Partner Agreements supporting The National Map. FGDC, 1997, A Strategy for NSDI (USGS helping to achieve goal 3 to 'use community-based approaches to develop & maintain common collections of geospatial data for sound decision-making). MRLC MOU, USGS/EPA/NOAA, 3/10/95 (represents needs of 8 Fed agencies for nationally consistent remote sensing & land cover information). Land Remote Sensing Policy Act 1992 (15 USC chap 82 PL 102-555). US Commercial Remote Sensing Space Policy 2003 (White House policy to ensure maximum use of commercial remote sensing data in gov't-funded programs). USGS/USFS IAA for Production & Maintenance of Single-Edition Primary Series Quadrangle Maps 7/14/98.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Geography Program has been significantly strengthened through the development and use of The National Map Implementation Plan and by adopting previous PART review recommendations. To carry out the goals of The National Map Implementation Plan: CTM program coordinates the activities that ensure the development, maintenance, and availability of base geographic data layers; LRS program provides for the collection, archiving, and dissemination of remotely sensed data for use in applications such as LANDFIRE; and GAM program conducts geographic research and analysis and develops applications to address rates, causes, and consequences of landscape change over time. The Landsat satellites have been developed satellite by satellite causing uncertainty of the effort as the end of life as each satellite neared. USGS is working with partners to develop a long-term plan operational plan to provide continuity for Landsat type data.

Evidence: Implementation Plan for The National Map, v 1.0, 10/18/03. USGS Buyout Justification, 9/03 (enabled freeing up funds for partnerships, contracting, retraining the remaining workforce with new skills along with limited new hires). AmericaView Bylaws & Articles of Incorporation 2003 (enables consortium members to get near real-time imagery for remote sensing applications & technology). NRC/NAS, Review of The National Map Concept 10/1602. USGS, 2001, Issues & Actions: The National Map, p 4-9. USGS, 2004, Ex 300'Capital Asset Plan & Business Case for Landsat, FY04 1st & 2nd qtr report.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Geography Program resources are addressing not only the program's purpose but also reaching intended beneficiaries through competitively awarded partnerships with Federal, State, and local governments and academia. Through partnerships, the CTM program is ensuring the development and maintenance of base geographic information for the Nation. Through the LRS AmericaView program, participating States are acquiring satellite data from USGS and are making these data available at little or no added cost to researchers and educators. The goal of these grants is to advance the science of remote sensing and developing research projects and applications for public use. However the majority of LRS benefits have been to expert user communities and have not been as successful at making Landsat and other data sources used by land managers and decision makers. The GAM program is working closely with other USGS and DOI programs to synthesize and integrate geographic research activities in areas such as water quality and quantity, global change, and threatened and endangered species.

Evidence: Implementation Plan for The National Map, v 1.0 10/18/03. Comprehensive Urban Ecosystems Studies Draft Concept Paper, 2004, (provides framework & intent for linking all 7 study areas). US Commercial Remote Sensing Space Policy: Civil Agency Implementation Plan (IPWG includes 17 major agency users of civilian remotely sensed data). A-31: AmericaView Bylaws & Articles of Incorporation, 2003, (members & affiliates in 28 States). USGS, 2003, Program Guidance for FY 2004, memo from CTM, LRS, & GAM Program Coordinators. USGS, 2004, Preliminary Program Guidance for FY 2005, 3/25/04 memo from Chief Scientist. 2004 NSDI CAP Announcement 4/8/04 (reporting requirements stated in solicitation). MRLC MOU 1995 (consortium represents needs of 8 Fed agencies for nationally consistent remote sensing & land cover information). USFS fact sheet Partnership for Dev of High-Res NHD on USFS Lands 8/7/03 (adopts NHD). EPA fact sheet Announcing Version 2.0 Watershed Assessment, Tracking & Environmental Results (WATERS) 6/02 (adopts NHD). US Board on Geographic Names, PL 80-242, 1947. NGA/USGS/FGDC MOU (USGS responsible for providing The National Map as the base geospatial data for homeland security applications). USGS, 2004, Ex 300'Capital Asset Plan & Business Case for The National Map Reengineering Project, FY04 1st & 2nd qtr report. USGS, 2004, Ex 300'Capital Asset Plan & Business Case for Landsat, FY04 1st & 2nd qtr report.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The Geography Program has 5 of these types of specific long-term performance measures supporting the program's purpose and focusing on outcomes. They are key components of the DOI GPRA goal of 'Serving Communities.' Key strategic plan measures, bureau-specific measures, and FY 2004 PART measures are documented in the Bureau's FY 2005 Congressional Budget document. The USGS is working with DOI and OMB to refine a long-term performance measure for the Land Remote Sensing that reflects the contribution of this program.

Evidence: USGS Budget Justification & Performance Information for FY04, p 99-162. USGS Budget Justification & Performance Information for FY05, p 149-216. FY04 PART findings for The National Map. Implementation Plan for The National Map, v 1.0 10/18/03. Geography Discipline 5-Year Program Goals, Measures & Accomplishments, 2004. Geography Discipline 5-Year Program Plans. From Observation to Action'Achieving Comprehensive, Coordinated, & Sustained Earth Observations for the Benefit of Humankind: Framework for a 10-Year Implementation Plan (for improved observations of the Earth; USGS participation in & documentation & purpose of GEO). Geography Research Prospectus call, 2003 (for long-term USGS science & applications targets). Geography Research Prospectus call, 2004 (for long-term USGS science & applications targets). Priority Ecosystem Science (draft guidance for USGS long-term science & applications targets). Geography Discipline Science Planning Team Charter, 2004.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Measures in the FY 2006 PART reflect adjustments of previous goals and targets to better reflect the current direction of the program and its implementation.

Evidence: Implementation Plan for The National Map, v 1.0 10/18/03. USGS Budget Justification & Performance Information for FY04, p 99-162. USGS Budget Justification & Performance Information for FY05, p 149-216.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The USGS submits routine progress reports to DOI that measure incremental achievement of its metrics, including Exhibit 300 quarterly reports, PART Improvement Action Plan quarterly reports on implementing PART recommendations, and GPRA metrics semi-annual progress reports. In addition, there are several internal program documents, especially annual program guidance, that provide specific performance expectations. Performance measures are included in annual guidance documents and are tools used by USGS Program Coordinators during both informal (periodic) and formal (annual) program reviews.

Evidence: USGS Budget Justification & Performance Information for FY05, p 149-216. PART Improvement Action Plan for The National Map (FY04 2nd quarter update). USGS, 2002, Release of Annual Program Direction, 6/5/02 memo from Bureau Director. : USGS, 2002, FY03 Prospectus for the Geography Discipline, 6/7/02 memo from Chief Scientist. USGS, 2003, FY04 Research Prospectus for the Geography Discipline, 3/25/03 memo from Chief Scientist. USGS, 2004, Geography Discipline Annual Program Planning Process document & schedule, 2/12/04 memo from Chief Scientist (implemented for FY05 planning). USGS, 2004, Preliminary Program Guidance for FY05, 3/25/04 memo from Chief Scientist. USGS, 2004, Ex 300'Capital Asset Plan & Business Case for The National Map Reengineering Project, FY04 1st & 2nd qtr report. USGS, 2004, Ex 300'Capital Asset Plan & Business Case for Landsat, FY04 1st & 2nd qtr report. USGS, 2004, Instructions for CTM Reports, (internal document).

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Detailed baseline geospatial data coverage information is contained in USGS data holdings and in The National Map catalog for data held by partners that are made available through The National Map. With respect to remotely sensed data, targets are established for both the in-house components of the remote sensing program, such as NSLRSDA and Landsat data capture rates, and for external partners for whom USGS funding is made available. This applies to both mapping contractors and grantees (AmericaView).

Evidence: USGS Budget Justification & Performance Information for FY05, p 149-216. USGS, 2004, Preliminary Program Guidance for FY05, 3/25/04 memo from Chief Scientist. USGS, 2002, FY03 Prospectus for the Geography Discipline, 6/7/02 memo from Chief Scientist. USGS, 2003-04, Semi-annual CTM Report on Key Performance Measures. The National Map national & partner holdings (http://nmviewogc.cr.usgs.gov/viewer.htm). Completion of draft 2003 GOS Standards for Digital Orthoimagery, Elevation, & Hydrography. Geography Discipline 5-Year Program Goals, Measures, & Accomplishments, 2004. USGS, 2004, Ex 300'Capital Asset Plan & Business Case for The National Map Reengineering Project, FY04 1st & 2nd qtr report. USGS, 2004, Ex 300'Capital Asset Plan & Business Case for Landsat, FY04 1st & 2nd qtr report.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: USGS personnel services and CSCII contracts are designed to support the goals of the Geography Program including The National Map. CSCII awards are based on past performance rating factors such as quality, timeliness, and efficiency. Grants to the AmericaView consortium require reporting based on a SOW that derives its goals and measures from the LRS 5-year program plan and the DOI Strategic Plan. The USGS Partnership Fund and 'Category 6' of FGDC's CAP fund require that activities contribute to annual and long-term USGS goals, comply with applicable standards, and provide interim and final reports documenting outcomes against identified performance measures. In addition, USGS agreements with Federal, State, and local partners to collect data for The National Map require partners to adhere to the applicable NSDI standards (or national map standards when NSDI standards are not yet available). It is part of the normal USGS and FGDC processes to vet new standards with partners to gain consensus. USGS has two FACA-chartered Advisory Committees to help implement remote sensing goals. Research is performed in response to the Research Prospectus efforts & methodology, identifying research goals. USGS also coordinates & oversees MRLC 2001 progress with partner agencies.

Evidence: USGS EDC Personnel Services Contract. USGS Cartographic Services Contract II. 2004 NSDI CAP Announcement 4/8/04 (reporting requirements stated in solicitation). USGS/USFS IAA for Production & Maintenance of Single-Edition Primary Series Quad Maps 7/14/98. Sample agreements that support implementation of The National Map. USGS, 2003-04, Semi-annual CTM Report on Key Performance Measures. MOU's with NSGIC, NACo, & URISA (reference common goals). AmericaView SOW (includes report template).: MRLC Consortium MOU 3/10/95. National Satellite Land Remote Sensing Data Archive Advisory Comm charter. Land Processes Distributed Active Archive Center fact sheet.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: External advice is regularly solicited on major program initiatives through public reviews or external participation on study teams. Regular program reviews include information from outside parties through surveys and direct participation. In addition, Geography relies upon independent evaluations to evaluate program effectiveness. In 2002, USGS conducted a peer review of its program 5-year plans to ensure that each articulated program goals, priorities, outcomes, measures of success, products, and how they link to each other. In 2003, the Cost-Benefit Analysis of The National Map was peer reviewed.

Evidence: Great Lakes Science Plan. NRC, 1990, Spatial Data Needs: The Future of the National Mapping Program. NRC, 1993, Toward a Coordinated Spatial Data Infrastructure for the Nation. NRC, 1994, Promoting the National Spatial Data Infrastructure Through Partnerships. NRC, 1995, A Data Foundation for the NSDI. NRC, 1997, The Future of Spatial Data & Society. NRC, 2002, Research Opportunities in Geography at the USGS. NRC, Weaving a National Map (provided program direction & pointed out the need for an implementation plan for The National Map). RAND Corp, 2004, Mapping the Risks: Assessing the homeland security implications of publicly available geospatial information. National Satellite Land Remote Sensing Data Archive Advisory Comm charter. Land Processes Distributed Active Archive Center fact sheet. USGS, 2001, Issues & Actions: The National Map, p 4-9 (external review comments & suggestions on design of The National Map). NRC Comm on Licensing Geog Data & Services (study to be completed in FY04). Draft Proposal: Developing a National Digital Orthophoto Program Strategy (to externally evaluate the field of orthoimagery, roles & responsibilities; expected completion date 12/04). USGS State Cooperator Workshops sample report (regularly conducted by regions to gather external feedback & future directions about geospatial needs). Bernknopf, Richard, & others, 2003, A Cost-Benefit Analysis of The National Map. GAM Integrated Science Workshop Feedback Panel Comments, draft 11/03, (external feedback on science portfolio & research directions). GAM Customer Focus Group Report, Lead Alliance, 2002.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The FY 2005 budget justification provides clear links between performance measures that are significant to the program, including those used in the FY 2004 PART; and provides information on expected performance changes as a direct result of proposed budget levels.

Evidence: USGS Budget Justification & Performance Information for FY05, p 149-216. FY06 budget initiative (example). USGS, 2004, Geography Discipline Annual Program Planning Process document & schedule, 2/12/04 memo from Chief Scientist (implemented for FY05 planning). USGS, 2004, Preliminary Program Guidance for FY05, 3/25/04 memo from Chief Scientist.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The Geography Program has defined and adopted a systematic approach for moving from existing business practices to those necessary for accomplishing the vision of The National Map, including considerations relating to strategic planning. In the Implementation Plan, a systematic process (called the Unified Development Process) to guide this transformation is being instituted. The Program has acquired and installed a tool suite (the IBM Rational Team Unifying Platform) which includes a specific implementation of this process, the Rational Unified Process. The tool suite has been deployed and needed training begun. USGS identified a strategic planning deficiency in assuming a continuous flow of moderate resolution satellite imagery from Landsat 7. Interagency coordination has begun with the LDCM and the IWG for implementation of CRSSP. USGS recognizes a strategic deficiency in the lack of a backup to Landsat 7 and is pursuing options. The Geography Program has a long-term science team that will create a national strategy to define, organize, manage, and grow scientific activities.

Evidence: Implementation Plan for The National Map, v 1.0 10/18/03. USGS Geography Discipline Charge to the Science Planning Team 2/1/04.A-29: U.S. Commercial Remote Sensing Space Policy 2003. Land Remote Sensing Policy Act 1992 (15 USC chap 82, PL 102-555).

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The USGS recently completed a peer-reviewed Cost-Benefit Analysis for The National Map. Results indicate that effort will bring a net present value of benefits of $2.05 billion in 2001 dollars. The CBA measures the value of scientific applications that have utilized the geospatial data of The National Map.

Evidence: USGS, 2001, Issues & Actions: The National Map. USGS, 2001, The National Map: Topographic Mapping for the 21st Century: Final Report, 11/30/01. Bernknopf, Richard, & others, 2003, A Cost-Benefit Analysis of The National Map. NRC, 1994, Promoting the NSDI Through Partnerships, (recommend partnership-based approaches for USGS geospatial data). For examples of business partners alternate strategies for data distribution, see http://mapping.usgs.gov/partners/viewonline.html. NSLRSDA Advisory Committee report. LP DAAC Science Advisory Panel report.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

2.RD2 **Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: For strategic planning, the program operates under the broader context of DOI and the Bureau's strategic planning approaches. To improve planning integration across the organization, the Bureau developed and implemented a detailed 5-year program planning process and issues annual initiative guidance that ensures that long-term plans for individual programs are closely linked with strategic goals of the organization, and program implementation and performance measurement. The Geography Program has a planning process that mirrors that of the Bureau to ensure that Geography Program goals and targets feed the Bureau's strategic direction, goals, and timetable. As part of The National Map Implementation Plan, the program has undertaken the Federal Enterprise Architecture approach to program planning. As part of the annual planning process, Geography programs solicit prioritized project activities. As part of the FY 2005 budget process, USGS prioritized its funding initiatives to include an increase for partnerships to further enhance implementation of The National Map. Within the Geography Program, the SOI process is used to prioritize how partnership funds will be allocated.

Evidence: Implementation Plan for The National Map, v 1.0 10/18/03 (for Fed Enterprise Architecture process documentation). Geography Discipline 5-Year Program Plans. USGS Planning Model 2/4/04. USGS, FY04 Director's Annual Guidance. USGS, 2004, Annual Program Direction: Integrated Science Directions for FY05. USGS Office of Budget annual call for initiatives (sets Bureau priorities). USGS, 2003, Program Guidance for FY04, memos from CTM, LRS, & GAM Program Coordinators. USGS, 2004, Preliminary Program Guidance for FY05, 3/25/04 memo from Chief Scientist.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?

Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The Geography Program collects internal performance information semi-annually and combines it with that contained in BASIS+ in annual program reviews, project planning, execution, and reporting. Quarterly reports are received from AmericaView member universities and the Consortium's semi-annual meetings provide input for USGS from the AmericaView Board of Directors. The remote sensing program routinely collects customer service statistics to improve performance. The USGS routinely tracks contractor performance for various types of contractual activities. For example, under CSCII, as paper maps or digital databases are updated, records are kept of quality and timeliness of output. Customer surveys are also an important source of program performance, including recipients of the 'Category 6' funds in CAP. Results of those surveys directly influence the direction and management of the program. USGS chartered a team in 2003 to do an in-depth analysis of its financial and workforce structure and determined the need to decrease the overall size of the government workforce and transition to new skills needed to meet future requirements. Results of the analysis provided the foundation for the USGS early out/buyout action for 2004. Geography needs to improve collection of user data for Landsat type (medium resolution) data, in order to accurately assess demand and justify options for managing this type of data.

Evidence: Customer Satisfaction/Outcome Survey on The National Map 4/8/04. USGS, 2001, Issues & Actions: The National Map Report. USGS Eastern Region Geography State Cooperators Forum report 11/12-14/02. USGS/NSGIC Listening Sessions results 9/03. USGS, 2003, Annual Report of Data Sales (customer statistical compilations). USGS, 2004, Ex 300'Capital Asset Plan & Business Case for The National Map Reengineering Project, 1st & 2nd qtr report for FY04. USGS, 2004, Ex 300'Capital Asset Plan & Business Case for Landsat, 1st & 2nd qtr report for FY04. USGS, 2003-04, Semi-annual CTM Report on Key Performance Measures. Responsibilities of the USGS COR & COTR for the CSCII & EDC contracts. 2004 NSDI CAP Announcement 4/8/04 (reporting requirements stated in solicitation). GAM, 2003, FY04 Program Reporting Structure & Requirements. GAM Integrated Science Workshop Feedback Panel Comments, draft 11/03. AmericaView SOW (includes report template). USGS EDC Quarterly Project Status Report template. USGS Preliminary User Assessment Survey form for NSLRSDA vendors. USGS 2003, Geography Discipline Workforce Plan 9/3/03 (supported the FY04 buyout)

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The FY05 planning process is documented and makes the Regional Geographers and Program Coordinators responsible for final decisions of specific annual objectives. The SES Performance contracts hold them responsible for execution of the plan. USGS personnel services and CSCII contracts have the requisite performance and incentive clauses. The solicitation for 'category 6 CAP' grants includes the requirement to provide information about past performance. In addition, IA's and AmericaView grants define roles, responsibilities, and deliverables.

Evidence: SES Performance Contract sample (used to hold USGS program managers personally accountable for achievement of program results). USGS EDC Personnel Services Contract. USGS, 2004, Geography Discipline Annual Program Planning Process document & schedule, 2/12/04 memo from Chief Scientist (implemented for FY05 planning). USGS Cartographic Services Contract II. USGS Planning Model 2/4/04 (Bureau Program Planning Committee). Customer Satisfaction/Outcome Survey on The National Map, 4/8/04.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The Geography program planning process establishes specific deadlines for the review and approval of the annual program of work through the SOI process. Upon approval from the Bureau, funds are authorized into BASIS+ for all approved projects. Project chiefs and management officials monitor monthly the status of funds. PC's extract obligation status from FFS and discuss status at monthly telecoms with Regional managers and at Quarterly Meetings with Geography Senior Staff. For contracts, certified COTR's are responsible for overseeing and certifying that contract funds are spent for their intended purpose. For AmericaView and CAP grants, USGS uses the HHS payment system for direct payment of grant funds to grantees.In FY03, Geography's obligations accumulated as follows: Oct 7.5%, Nov 16.3, Dec 22.3, Jan 28.8, Feb 45.9, Mar 54.2, Apr 61.0, May 75.7, June 80.0, July 86.6, Aug 86.6, Sept 100.0For FY04 to date, Geography's obligations accumulated as follows: Oct 5.5%, Nov 14.1, Dec 25.6, Jan 34.4, Feb 40.2, Mar 52.4.

Evidence: FFS report of obligations/expenditures for Geography programs & facilities, 4/20/04. USGS, 2004, Geography Discipline Annual Program Planning Process document & schedule, 2/12/04 memo from Chief Scientist (implemented for FY05 planning).

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Estimates for production-related activities provided with annual guidance are based on unit cost estimates. Internal activities are funded on the basis of competing proposals (SOI's and research prospectus) to achieve specific program goals. This includes competition between researchers that is based not only on scientific merit but also on leveraging resources with other programs. Semi-annual reporting from organizational units includes cost information. Awards of external cooperative agreements are competitive. The government is benefiting from partnerships and successfully leveraging funds, and so resources are being added to this approach. Also, BASIS+ is designed to help achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness. The Department has streamlined the IT procurements for all IT acquisition and licensing agreements.As an incentive example, by making joint funding available, USGS was able to garner State and Federal partners sharing a common interest in mapping the Nation's watersheds, thus enabling the creation of a successful high-resolution follow-on to the medium-resolution NHD. http://nhd.usgs.gov.newsletter_list.html

Evidence: USGS, 2003, FY04 Research Prospectus for the Geography Discipline, 3/25/03 memo from Chief Scientist. USGS, 2004, Geography Discipline Annual Program Planning Process document & schedule, 2/12/04 memo from Chief Scientist (implemented for FY05 planning). DOI Software Licensing Agreements. NHD partnership

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Collaboration & coordination is an important tenet of The National Map & involvement with other organizations in the geospatial community. Ex include: DOI high priority (collaborating to determine highest priorities for data collection among bureaus); Civil Applications Comm (collaboration among Fed agencies on the collection of geospatial data from classified sources); the FS Single-Edition Program (FS collects data to USGS specs, using no USGS funds); MRLC Consortium (acquires critical Landsat data for Fed partners); USGS Venture Capital Research (competitively awards interdisciplinary research); NHD (where FS, EPA, and DOI bureaus collaborate with USGS to provide funds & coordinate with other partners to develop one seamless hydrography database for the Nation); USGS leadership & support of IWG to implement the President's CRSSP ; GeoMAC program (a fire mapping website to coordinate & manage emergency fire response activities); NDOP (collaboration among Fed agencies & the NSGIC on national orthoimagery requirements); NDEP (collaboration among Fed agencies & NSGIC on national elevation requirements); & partnerships with State/local gov'ts for The National Map projects (partners may provide the Internet services, data collection, data integration, data maintenance or other in-kind services). The GAM prog. has 'affiliate' status with the UCGIS & sponsors research with consortium universities. It also collaborates with NRC to sponsor post-doc candidates conducting geographic research.

Evidence: USGS/USFS IAA for Production & Maintenance of Single-Edition Primary Series Quad Maps, 7/14/98. USGS/NASA MOU for Land Remotely Sensed Data Processing, Distribution, Archiving, & Related Science Support. MRLC Consortium MOU between USGS, EPA, NOAA, 3/10/95. GeoMAC Wildland Fire Support fact sheet. National Digital Elevation Program fact sheet. National Digital Orthophoto Program fact sheet. Shuttle Radar Topography Mission fact sheet (collaborative collection & distribution of dataset with NASA, JPL, NGA). US Commercial Remote Sensing Space Policy 2003 (White House policy to ensure maximum use of commercial remote sensing data in gov't-funded programs). Land Remote Sensing Policy Act 1992 (15 USC chap 82, PL 102-555). NGA/NASA/USGS IAA for verification/validation of commercial & civil satellite data. Committee of Earth Observation Satellites (international collaborations). Landsat Ground Station Operations WG, p 18-19 (international cooperation). USGS Partner Agreements that support The National Map. maps.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: USGS has: taken corrective actions for IT security (target date 6/30/04); taken necessary steps to ensure that all staff performing accounting functions comply with Circ. A-123; perform appropriate reviews of the financial statements; developed procedures to ensure accounting adjustments are handled properly; established policies and procedures for proper accounting for all property; established inventory controls to ensure compliance with SFFAS No. 3; and has in place a model for maintaining WCF investments. USGS exceeded DOI's goal for electronic funds transfer compliance, consistent with the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996, and promptly paid its invoices, again exceeding DOI's goal of 97% (consistent with the Prompt Payment Act). For the revenue cycle control issue, USGS has implemented a corrective action plan and is having monthly reviews conducted by cost center managers.No material internal control weaknesses exist related to USGS' Geography programs.

Evidence: Independent Auditors Report 12/9/03.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The USGS has taken significant steps to resolve management deficiencies such as improved IT systems controls resulting in better security and management of critical infrastructures. The Bureau has strengthened its financial management organization and practices as evidenced by the unqualified opinion on the FY03 Consolidated Balance Sheet, the ability to meet DOI and other Federal regulatory agency reporting schedules, improved management of its accounts receivable and deferred revenue, and hiring of key positions for its professional and administrative staffs.Consistent with the Implementation Plan's Stage I, USGS is making available via the Web the critical eight base data layers of geospatial data in addition to natural science, applications, and data derived from the use of these layers. Through the PART Action Plan, USGS has taken steps to improve the characterization of its program in relationship to others. The National Map Implementation Plan uses a systematic approach for moving from existing business practices to those necessary for accomplishing the vision of The National Map.

Evidence: Independent Auditors Report 12/9/03. USGS Status of FY02 Findings 9/30/03. Implementation Plan for The National Map, v 1.0 10/18/03.C-21: USGS Planning Model 2/4/04. USGS, 2004, Geography Discipline Annual Program Planning Process document & schedule, 2/12/04 memo from Chief Scientist (implemented for FY05 planning). USGS, 2004, Preliminary Program Guidance for FY05, 3/25/04 memo from Chief Scientist.PART Improvement Action Plan for The National Map (FY04 2nd quarter update).

3.RD1 **For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Program research funds are allocated through a number of processes and managed to ensure quality results. The program uses collaborative review of research project proposals both by teams in the Regional offices, and then a second level of HQ review by PC's and Chief Scientist to ensure that the best quality and highest priority projects are funded. BASIS+ is used in conjunction with the Bureau planning model to allocate funds to approved projects and review financial results to help maintain program quality. Research funds are allocated using a Prospectus process that has been in place for four years. Peer review of prospectus-funded research projects follows the NSF model. The program also supports the National Academies' Research Associate Program to help administer post-doc research awards. For research conducted under AmericaView grants, the USGS COTR has developed a performance requirement for the A/V corporate office to develop a grants administration policy and system that comports with Federal grant procedures.

Evidence: USGS, 2002, FY03 Prospectus for the Geography Discipline, 6/7/02 memo from Chief Scientist. USGS, 2003, FY04 Research Prospectus for the Geography Discipline, 3/25/03 memo from Chief Scientist. NSF Survey of Fed Funds for R&D (3/04). USGS Geography Discipline Charge to the Science Planning Team, 3/1/04. AmericaView project status report template.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Geography has made progress in achieving its long-term performance goals for this program for maintaining high and medium resolution imagery, implementing data standards, and updating the national land cover dataset. However, as stated in question 2.1, the program should have a measure to assess the long-term goal of the Land remote sensing archive and dissemination element of Geography. As this goal reflects one of the primary purpose of the program, the agency has received a "large extent" regarding its long-term progress.

Evidence: Geography Program 5-year plansImplementation Plan for The National MapPART Improvement Action Plan for The National MapUSGS, 2004, Summary list of CTM achievements towards long-term goals USGS, 2004, Summary list of GAM achievements towards long-term goals September 2003 NSGIC Listening sessions results documentation US Forest Service fact sheet, 'Partnership for Development of High Resolution National Hydrography Dataset on Forest Service Lands, August 7, 2003 [adopts NHD]EPA fact sheet, 'Announcing Version 2.0 of the Watershed Assessment, Tracking and Environmental Results (WATERS), June 2002 [adopts NHD]2005 USGS Budget Justification and Performance Information (see Activity Summary table, p. 156 to 159 for documentation of progress in achieving long-term performance goals)

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: USGS GPRA geospatial data coverage targets are met and the data are provided on the Internet. The National Map PART Action Plan has documented achievements in USGS annual performance goals, crafted as part of the FY 2004 PART review. GOS standards for othoimagery, elevation, and hydrography were developed on schedule. USGS employs open standards that have been accepted by industry and requires all partners to use these standards as a condition of participating in The National Map. Landsat data collection goals have been consistently met during the life of the mission, with the exception of the few weeks during FY 2003 when the collection activities were suspended as the agencies tried to solve the SLC malfunction. Images are still being collected, archived, and used. Science and application performance goals are met for the number of systematic analyses and investigations, peer-reviewed studies, and decision support systems that improve the science impact and synthesis of geographic data and information. Annual goals are set in annual program plans against which project managers bid for activity.

Evidence: 2003 Semi-annual CTM Report on Key Performance MeasuresThe National Map national and partner holdings (view through http://nmviewogc.cr.usgs.gov/viewer.htm) and other sites)Requirements that National Map participants use open standardsCompletion of 2003 GOS standards for imagery, elevation, and hydrographyGAM, 2003, FY 2004 Program Reporting Structure and RequirementsPART Improvement Action Plan for The National MapUSGS EDC statistical output reports

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Geography Program developed a cost efficiency measure for The National Map, involving costs avoided by making geospatial data available through its partnerships. The Geography Program has demonstrated other instances of reducing costs such as producing and distributing geospatial and imagery data. In FY04 USGS leveraged $1.0M in Federal funds with $1.58M in State and local funds to enable collection of high-resolution imagery over 13 critical urban areas. From August 2003 to April 2004, USGS has systematically documented the immediate delivery of over 3 million maps from The National Map catalog service at no cost to customers (this averages about 12,000 map images per day). The AmericaView project has increased the number of States that directly receive Landsat data (28 States) and has enabled satellite data to be made available at no added cost to researchers, educators, agencies, and the public, significantly reducing costs to end users. USGS reduced unit costs to produce high-resolution hydrography data. Consolidation of printing activities and staff with that of FAA, achieved in 2004, will improve cost efficiencies in later years.

Evidence: Geography Program 5-year plansImplementation Plan for The National MapPART Improvement Action Plan for The National MapUSGS, 2004, Summary list of CTM achievements towards long-term goals USGS, 2004, Summary list of GAM achievements towards long-term goals September 2003 NSGIC Listening sessions results documentation US Forest Service fact sheet, 'Partnership for Development of High Resolution National Hydrography Dataset on Forest Service Lands, August 7, 2003 [adopts NHD]EPA fact sheet, 'Announcing Version 2.0 of the Watershed Assessment, Tracking and Environmental Results (WATERS), June 2002 [adopts NHD]2005 USGS Budget Justification and Performance Information (see Activity Summary table, p. 156 to 159 for documentation of progress in achieving long-term performance goals)

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program did not receive an outright "yes" for this question because there are no known surveys or analyses that directly compare the performance of the Geography Program with other geography and mapping programs operated by other governmental or educational entities. Because the program is a recognized leader in topographic mapping, however, it warrants a score of "large extent." There are other programs that undertake large scale mapping activities such as NOAA which focuses on bathymetry. Other organizations that undertake mapping and remote sensing in state and local government, private sector (site specific) and in other agencies (federal, state and local) looks to Geography for direction and standards through cooperation.

Evidence: OMB, PART findings for The National Map CEOS/WGISS pamphletLand Remote Sensing Policy Act of 1992 (15 USC, Chap 82; PL 102-555)CRSSP of 2003

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: USGS has routine reviews by NRC, such as the detailed program analysis, 'Weaving a National Map.' External advice is routinely solicited on major program initiatives through public reviews and external participation on study teams. Routine program reviews include information from outside parties through surveys and direct participation, such as listening sessions. USGS regional offices conduct program reviews with key stakeholders. A March 2004 customer survey result shows that 81% of respondents are satisfied with USGS efforts to foster partnerships. Comments from partners and customers have been addressed by USGS, such as by establishing MPO's and co-locating staff closer to customers. The program has two FACA-chartered advisory committees which provide ongoing objective review and evaluation of the imagery archive and the USGS DAAC. USGS also receives external evaluations from and participates in other formal and informal advisory groups, including those with FGDC, GOS, and The National Atlas steering committee. A review of Geography research indicated that their research efforts could be improved through increased interaction with the academic community.

Evidence: NRC, 1990, Spatial Data Needs: The future of the National Mapping Program.NRC, 1993, Toward a Coordinated Spatial Data Infrastructure.NRC, 1994, Promoting the National Spatial Data Infrastructure Through Partnerships.NRC, 1995, A Data Foundation for the National Spatial Data Infrastructure.NRC, 1997, The Future of Spatial Data and Society.NRC, 2002, Research Opportunities in Geography at the USGS, 130 p.NRC, Weaving a National Map (provided program direction and pointed out the need for an implementation plan for The National Map)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

Measure: % of nation with Land cover data to meet land use planning and monitoring requirements (2001 Nat'l dataset ' 66 mapping units across the country)

Additional Information: Indicates the national availabilty of landcover information by ecoregion necessary for land use planning and monitoring.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	baseline	45%
2005	60%	
2006	75%	
2007	90%	
2008	100%	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: # of partnerships for the National Map (TNM) built with State and local governments that collect and maintain higher resolution, more current data

Additional Information: Indicates whether USGS is leveraging efforts at the state and local level to increase access to high quality and timely information.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	13	30
2005	27	
2006	27	
2007	27	
2008	27	

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

Measure: # of data standards used in implenting the National Map

Additional Information: Indicates whether information used to build the national map can be easily verified for its quality and content.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	17	17	
2005	22		
2006	22		
2007	22		
2008	22		

Measure: % of nation's surface for which hydrography, elevation, & orthoimagery are available through the NSDI clearinghouse and funded through partnerships

Additional Information: Indicates the % of essential geospaital information is easily accessible and cooperatively funded.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	68%	62%	
2005	83%		
2006	88%		
2007	93%		
2008	100%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

Measure: % of total cost saved through partnering for data collection of high resoution imagery

Additional Information: Indicates the degree to which leveraging data collection through partnerships provides savings

Year	Target	Actual
2004	40%	71%
2005	42%	
2006	44%	
2007	47%	
2008	50%	

Measure Term: Efficiency

Measure: % of nation with ecoregion assessments to meet land use planning and monitoring requirements (# of completed eco-region assessments divided by 84 eco-regions)

Additional Information: Indicates the national availabilty of ecological assessments information by ecoregion necessary for land use planning and monitoring.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	29%	31%
2005	38%	
2006	48%	
2007	58%	
2008	68%	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

Measure: Average % of coverage for 6 data themes in the National Map at medium resolution; does not measure currentness

Additional Information: Indicates the availability of the primary geospatial (mapping) data layers are available for the country at medium resolution (3-10 meters).

Year	Target	Actual
2004	67%	67%
2005	68%	
2006	70%	
2007	85%	
2008	92%	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Average % of coverage for 6 data themes in the National Map at high resolution; does not measure currentness

Additional Information: Indicates the availability of the primary geospatial (mapping) data layers are available for the country at high resolution (2 meters or less).

Year	Target	Actual
2004	42%	41%
2005	54%	
2006	62%	
2007	71%	
2008	78%	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

Measure: % of satellite data available from archive within 24 hrs. of capture

Additional Information: Indicates how quickly USGS is able to make satellite information availabe to the public after it has been received from a satellite.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	90%	90%
2005	90%	
2006	90%	
2007	90%	
2008	90%	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: % of studies validated through appropirate peer review or independent review

Additional Information: Indicates that quality of USGS is verified through peer review or independent review.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	100%	100%
2005	100%	
2006	100%	
2007	100%	
2008	100%	

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Mapping
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	80%	

Measure: Stakeholders reporting that information helped achieve goal

Additional Information: Indicates whether USGS provided information helps stakeholders to achieve their missions.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	90%	90%	
2005	90%		
2006	90%		
2007	90%		
2008	90%		

Measure: # of systematic analyses and investigations delivered to customers

Additional Information: Indicates the number of analyses provided to customers (usually takes 2 years to complete an analyses.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	75	75	
2005	75		
2006	75		
2007	75		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Cultural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	57%	53%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Purpose is to "conserve the . . . historic objects . . . as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Evidence: NPS Organic Act (1916). Antiquities Act (1906). National Historic Preservation Act (1966). Museum Properties Management Act (1955).

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Need is to protect and preserve park cultural resources for public benefit. Resources include historic strucutures, archeological sites, cultural landscapes, and museum objects.

Evidence: NPS Organic Act (1916). Antiquities Act (1906). National Historic Preservation Act (1966). Ex. Order 11593 (1971). Ex. Order 13287 (2003).

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: No other program has responsibility for protecting cultural resources in national parks. Increasing or decreasing funding for these programs has a direct impact on the condition of park cultural resources or NPS ability to monitor those conditions.

Evidence: NPS Organic Act (1916). Antiquities Act (1906). National Historic Preservation Act (1966; section 110). Archeological Resources Protection Act (1979). Ex. Order 13287 (2003).

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Program is free of major flaws. It is designed with a three-tiered approach: Washington Office sets polices and procedures; regional offices and centers establish priorities and distribute funds; and parks carry out day-to-day operations.

Evidence: NPS Management Policies (2001) on www.nps.gov/policy/mp/policies. NPS Director's Orders 24 (collections), 28 (cultural resources), and 28A (archeology).

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Program is generally designed well, involving a wide-range of NPS and non-NPS subject-matter experts, park managers, maintenance workforce, and consultation with State agencies. Procedures are well documented, although not always followed. Funding generally goes to objects most in need of conservation.

Evidence: NPS Management Policies (2001) on www.nps.gov/policy/mp/policies. NPS Director's Orders 24 (collections), 28 (cultural resources), and 28A (archeology).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Cultural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	57%	53%	

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: NPS has outcome measures that track the condition of items in the four cultural resource categories: historic structures; archeological sites; cultural landscapes; and museum objects. For museum objects, NPS assesses the condition of facilities housing collections as an indicator of the condition of the objects in the facilities.

Evidence: DOI-NPS Strategic Plan (FY 2004-2008). NPS technical guidance for GPRA goals. Strategic planning documents by resource type.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: NPS has set clear targets for improving conditions in all four categories. It is not clear, however, if these targets are sufficiently ambitious.

Evidence: DOI-NPS Strategic Plan (FY 2004-2008). NPS technical guidance for GPRA goals. Strategic planning documents by resource type.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: NPS has output measures that track progress in cataloging or inventoring resources in each of the four cultural resource categories: historic structures; archeological sites; cultural landscapes; and museum objects. (Only two shown in this PART.)

Evidence: DOI-NPS Strategic Plan (FY 2004-2008). NPS technical guidance for GPRA goals. Strategic planning documents by resource type.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: NPS has set clear targets for cataloging resources and improving conditions in all four categories. It is not clear, however, if these targets are sufficiently ambitious.

Evidence: DOI-NPS Strategic Plan (FY 2004-2008). NPS technical guidance for GPRA goals. Strategic planning documents by resource type.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Many partners contribute to annual goals by working with the program to protect, inventory, document, study, and preserve park cultural resources. Partners include contractors, researchers, permitees, and State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs).

Evidence: Programmatic agreement between NPS, ACHP, and State Historic Preservation Officers (1995). Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Unit (CESU) and other agreements for archeological work. All identify the need to inventory, document, and manage historic sites and resources.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Cultural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	57%	53%	

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Program lacks independent evaluations that examine how well the entire cultural resource program is accomplishing its mission and meeting its goals. Some reviews (e.g., IG report on performance measures and a financial audit on stewardship asset data) address program components, but none focuses on the effectiveness of the overall program.

Evidence: IG report on need for better GPRA measures (2004 draft). FY03 financial statement audit (2003). Outdated audits on museum collections (1985), artwork and artifacts (1990), and audiovisual records (1991) focused on narrow components and not on program effectiveness.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: NPS has not demonstrated that (1) resource allocation decisions are based on performance information, or (2) performance levels are affected by changes in funding or policies. Instead, NPS has consistently based funding decisions on prior-year allocations. NPS is establishing new systems (PMDS, ABC) that may help, but they have not yet shown how budget requests are tied to performance accomplishments.

Evidence: Performance Management Data System (PMDS) for FYs 2000-2004. Activity-based cost (ABC) management initiated in FY04. IG audit on FY03 financial statements. IG report on GPRA measures (2004 draft).

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Program has instituted steps to address deficiencies, such as establishing a database system to track inventory and the condition of cultural resources. The biggest challenge will be to implement procedures and plans already in place.

Evidence: Quarterly reports in response to FY03 audit. Summary of IT systems being implemented. NPS Director memos to field offices.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: NPS collects extensive amount of data, but has not demonstrated how it uses this information to adjust program priorities, allocate resources, or take other appropriate management actions. NPS provided no illustrative examples of recent top-level management actions based on performance information.

Evidence: DOI-NPS Strategic Plan (FY 2004-2008). DOI-NPS FY01 Annual Performance Report. NPS provided some internal memos that suggest some minor management actions were taken at lower levels, but did not describe how the agency uses performance information in managing the program overall.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Cultural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	57%	53%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: It is not clear whom in NPS is responsible for achieving key program results in cultural resource stewardship. Program officials at the Washington and regional levels are nominally accountable, but their success depends upon park superintendents and regional directors, who are often distracted by more pressing responsibilities.

Evidence: NPS provided no evidence that it has effectively used performance management contracts to incorporate program performance into personnel performance evaluation criteria. General references to broad goals is not sufficient.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Most funds are available for only one year and are obligated in a timely manner. Some no-year funds remain unobligated at the end of the year, but unobligated balances are declining in response to broader NPS efforts to improve fiscal and project management.

Evidence: SF-133 Report on Budget Execution and Budgetary Resources. PMIS Annual Accomplishment Report. Implementation of ABC systems should improve financial management, but results are not yet demonstrated.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: NPS has taken steps to improve efficiency, including new IT systems and competitive sourcing reviews. It has also developed an efficiency measure for cataloging museum collections. It still needs to develop efficiency measures for other areas and then use these measures to set targets for increasing efficiency in completing inventories and improving conditions.

Evidence: Competitive sourcing review of Southeast Archeological Center (2003) demonstrated that SEAC's services are efficient compared to contractors. Costs for cataloging museum objects has decreased from $1.99/per object in 1998 to $0.97/per object in 2003. IT investments include ABC/M, PMIS, CR-MAP, RAMS, and PMDS.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Program collaborates effectively with a broad range of government, academic, and private-sector programs. For example, NPS works with other museums on curatorial and archeological standards.

Evidence: Programmatic agreement between NPS, ACHP, and State Historic Preservation Officers (1995). Agreements with American Type Cultural Collection (2003) and Library of Congress (2004). CESUs and other agreements and contracts for archeological work.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Cultural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	57%	53%	

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: Auditors found "significant deficiencies in internal control over . . . Required Supplementary Stewardship Information", much of which involves cultural resources. Auditors also found reportable conditions on financial reporting controls NPS-wide.

Evidence: FY03 financial statement audit (2003). NPS concurred with the findings, noting NPS finance and program offices will work together "to ensure internal controls are in place and procedures are implemented that will document ans support stewardship asset activity." NPS has not yet provided evidence that this has taken place.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: Program is taking steps to address deficiencies by planning to use performance data in making management decisions and hold managers accountable for results.

Evidence: NPS human resources guidance on integrating performance measures into SES performance plans. Plans to implement ABC management, Resource Activity Management System (RAMS), and Cultural Resources Management Assessment Program (CR-MAP) should help to set priorities, compare costs, and track results.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: All resource categories demonstrate progress in achieving goals, yet the targets do not appear ambitious. For example, NPS's target is to catalog less than half of its museum objects. Yet, as the NPS Director noted in a 2001 letter on an earlier material weakness, a "bureau that has only 50% of its collections cataloged, even if it has policies in place and is making progress on reducing the backlog, has a major accountability problem."

Evidence: DOI-NPS Strategic Plan (FY 2004-2008). NPS technical guidance for GPRA goals. Strategic planning documents by resource type. Memo from NPS Director in response to call for museum program information (January 2001). Analysis of collections cataloging, including cost efficiencies.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: NPS meets most annual targets, but it remains unclear how these targets are used to make budget and management decisions.

Evidence: DOI-NPS Strategic Plan (FY 2004-2008). NPS technical guidance for GPRA goals. Strategic planning documents by resource type. Memo from NPS Director in response to call for museum program information (January 2001).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Cultural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	57%	53%	

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: SMALL EXTENT

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: NPS generally has not demonstrated how it has improved efficiency over the prior year, although it has taken some steps (e.g., IT investments and competitive sourcing) that should make some improvements. One of this review's key findings is the need to achieve and demonstrate greater efficiency in completing inventories and improving conditions, especially if NPS is to achieve more ambitious targets with existing resources.

Evidence: NPS does not yet have efficiency measures or procedures in place to reduce unit costs. Some steps to improve efficiency in the future include IT investments to track inventories and a competitive sourcing review of the Southeast Archeological Center to identify operational savings. Museum management appears to show a decrease in per-unit costs for cataloging objects.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: YES

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: NPS is a leader among public agencies and private institutions in managing prehistoric and historic structures, archeological sites, museum collections and cultural landscapes.

Evidence: NPS Archeological sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places at over twice the rate of the next agency. NPS has at least partly surveyed 9% of acreage, second only to Forest Service. Presidential Award for Design Excellence to cultural landscape program (2000). Since 1990s, American Association of Museums cites NPS technical guidelines as museum industry standard.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: SMALL EXTENT

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Program lacks independent evaluations that examine how well the entire cultural resource program is accomplishing its mission and meeting its goals. Some reviews (e.g., IG report on performance measures and a financial audit on stewardship asset data) address program components, but none focuses on the effectiveness of the overall program.

Evidence: IG report on need for better GPRA measures (2004 draft). FY03 financial statement audit (2003). Audits on museum collections (1985), artwork and artifacts (1990), and audiovisual records (1991) are useful, but somewhat outdated, narrowly focused, and not aimed at program effectiveness.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Cultural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	57%	53%	

Measure: Percent of historic and prehistoric structures in good condition

Additional Information: 11,765 of 26,531 in the List of Classified Structures were in good condition in FY 2003.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		44.3%
2004	45.0%	45.5%
2005	45.5%	
2006	46.0%	
2007	46.5%	
2008	47.0%	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Percent of preservation and protection standards met at park museum facilities.

Additional Information: 76,967 standards tracked by over 310 NPS units for over 1,800 facilities (2003).

Year	Target	Actual
2003	69.3%	69.5%
2004	70.7%	70.7%
2005	71.9%	
2006	73.1%	
2007	74.3%	
2008	75.5%	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Cultural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	57%	53%	

Measure: Percent of recorded archeological sites in good condition.

Additional Information: 11,891 of 24,895 (47.8%) archeological sites with condition assessments were in good condition at the end of FY 2003.

Year	Target	Actual
2003	46%	47.8%
2004	50%	49.4%
2005	50%	
2006	51%	
2007	52%	
2008	53%	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Percent of cultural landscapes in good condition.

Additional Information: 45 of 148 landscapes in the Cultural Landscapes Inventory in good condition as of the new FY 2003 baseline.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		30.4%
2004	31.0%	33.3%
2005	31.5%	
2006	32.0%	
2007	32.5%	
2008	33.0%	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Cultural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	57%	53%	

Measure: Percent of historic and prehistoric structures that have complete and accurate inventory information.

Additional Information: 6,120 of 26,531 (23.1%) in the List of Classified Structures inventory have complete and accurate information (2003).

Year	Target	Actual
2003		23.1%
2004	33.3%	34.5%
2005	50.0%	
2006	66.6%	
2007	83.3%	
2008	100%	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Percent of museum objects catalogued and submitted to the National Catalog.

Additional Information: 50 million out of 105.3 million objects in the collections of 350 parks have been catalogued by the end of 2003.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		47.5%
2004	48.3%	TBD
2005	49.1%	
2006	49.8%	
2007	50.5%	
2008	51.1%	

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Cultural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	57%	53%	

Measure: Average cost to catalog a museum object.

Additional Information: NPS catalogs about 2.9 million museum objects each year, at $0.85 per object (2003).

Year	Target	Actual
2002		$0.93
2003		$0.97
2004	$0.95	$0.95
2005	$0.95	

Measure Term: Efficiency

Measure: Condition of all NPS historic buildings as measured by a Facility Condition Index. (FCI score of 0.11 or lower is acceptable.)

Additional Information: FCI of 0.11 or lower means that this group of assets is in acceptable condition on average. (This threshold is still under review.)

Year	Target	Actual
2004		0.21
2005	0.21	
2006	0.21	
2007	0.21	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Purpose is to provide safe and sustainable facilities for park visitors and staff, as part of the dual NPS mission of serving visitors and protecting park resources.

Evidence: Since 1916, NPS has managed facilities to "provide for the enjoyment" of visitors in national parks and to protect resources "unimpaired for . . . future generations."

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Need is to manage and maintain the national park facilities that serve 300 million visitors annually.

Evidence: NPS has inventoried 40,000 assets and 12,000 miles of roads. It is now assessing the priority of these assets for the park mission.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: These programs maintain the facility infrastructure within national parks. Increasing or decreasing funding for these programs has a direct impact on the condition of that infrastructure. No other Federal or non-Federal funding sources are available for this purpose.

Evidence: All funding for park facilities comes from NPS maintenance ($379m in FY04), construction ($327m), recreation fees for maintenance ($75m), and FHWA's Federal Lands Highway Program ($300m).

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: These capital asset programs are free from major design flaws. They are the only programs that address the Federal responsibility of federally owned facilities within national parks.

Evidence: NPS has clear responsibility for managing park assets. NPS and FWHA have an effective working relationship on park roads, which are solely a Federal responsibility. (Roads that serve other Federal lands are often a State responsibility.)

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The programs are generally designed well, with most construction work performed through contracts. NPS is working to become more efficient in conducting maintenance operations.

Evidence: NPS contracts out most construction, design, and road repair work. Only a small amount of NPS maintenance is done through contracts, but DOI and NPS are initiating competitive sourcing efforts.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS can now measure its performance in maintaining regular assets by using a Facility Condition Index (FCI). It can also measure an asset's importance to the park mission by using an Asset Priority Index (API). By combining these two, NPS can target funding to improve the condition of priority assets.

Evidence: See initial FCI and API estimates. NPS now has baselines and targets in place, with annual condition assessments done for 96% of regular assets. It still needs to complete comprehensive assessments for over 80% of assets, but make more progress on concessions facilities.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Same as 2.1

Evidence: Same as 2.1

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS has a multi-year plan to complete condition assessments, implement a Facility Maintenance Software System (FMSS), and verify FCI and API measures. As NPS proceeds in completing these near-term output goals, it will shift toward meeting outcome goals based on FCI and related measures.

Evidence: See annual goals under the measures tab. Now that NPS has identified key milestones for establishing FCI and API performance measures for regular assets, it will need to establish similar milestones for concessions.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Same as 2.3

Evidence: Same as 2.3

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS leadership has placed great emphasis on getting park managers to assess facility conditions and prepare FCI performance measures. Park managers, in turn, work with contractors and other partners to ensure they support these goals. NPS generally does well in building consensus and support, but it will have to use more performance-based contracts for construction contractors, concessioners, and facility operators.

Evidence: See NPS Director and Deputy Director memos to parks on condition assessments. See also examples of communications with partners. NPS provided examples of construction contracts with performance specifications, but few of these incorporated performance-based incentives. It will also need to incorporate more performance-based incentives into concessions contracts. FHWA, the key partner for park roads, effectively uses a performance measure (Pavement Condition Rating, or PCR) to identify priorities for park road repairs.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS uses a Development Advisory Board (DAB) for independent review of individual construction projects. (DAB reviewed 174 projects in 2002.) Larger projects are also reviewed through DOI's Capital Planning and Information Control (CPIC) process. Booz Allen Hamilton (BAH) and PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PWC) have been contracted to verify and validate condition assessments for NPS-operated and concessions-operated facilities, respectively.

Evidence: See DOI's CPIC guidance and NPS's DAB guidelines. See BAH and PWC contracts. Although these project-by-project reviews are helpful, NPS would benefit from an independent review of the facility management program overall. One part of this program -- construction management -- was reviewed by the National Academy of Public Administration in 1998 and 2002. The 2002 review indicated that NPS has made significant progress in addressing concerns raised in the 1998 report.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS has not yet shown how budget requests link to particular performance targets. Nor has it documented how different funding levels would achieve different results. NPS may be able to do so next year, however, if it can continue to make progress in establishing performance measures, implementing FMSS, and introducing Activity-Based Costing (ABC).

Evidence: NPS provided some evidence of life-cycle cost estimating for individual assets, but it has not yet shown that it can estimate changes in outputs (i.e., facility conditions) based on changes in inputs (i.e., funding). This will require not just estimating future costs, but tracking actual expenditures in maintaining and constructing assets.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NPS has made across-the-board improvements in facility management, including better construction project management, service-wide condition assessments, implementation of a new maintenance management system, and establishment of FCI performance measures.

Evidence: See information on condition assessments, FMSS, FCI, API, DAB and CPIC reviews, and construction management reforms. See also draft Director's Order #80 on asset management program and 1998 NAPA report.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

2.CA1 **Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: NPS regularly conducts value analysis and value engineering to identify potential cost savings. It also uses capital asset plans for major projects, although it is struggling to use earned value management properly. NPS has created a new facility planning model to prepare size and space standards for major facilities, as recommended by the 1998 NAPA report.

Evidence: See DOI's CPIC guidance and NPS's DAB guidelines. See BAH and PWC contracts. See value analysis and value-engineering reports. See Capital Asset Plans presented to DAB and CPIC. See presentations on Facility Planning Model.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: NPS is close. It has built a foundation to collect high-quality performance data, but it cannot yet document how it regularly uses such data to adjust program priorities, allocate resources, or take other management actions. NPS has also made progress on capital asset plans, but it needs to show more clearly that the plans properly track earned value. NPS could reach a Yes answer next year if progress continues.

Evidence: NPS is close to obtaining credible and timely performance data from FMSS, but has not yet documented that the system can generate the information needed to manage the program. NPS will also need to describe how it uses performance measures, with examples of recent management actions based on performance data. One example could be incorporating FCI measures into the NPS process for identifying construction project priorities.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: NPS has begun to hold individual park managers accountable for facility conditions, but more work is needed. NPS leadership has allocated certain maintenance funds to parks on the basis of their progress in completion of condition assessments. Park superintendents' performance evaluations are based on program performance, although these could be tied more closely to specific FCI targets. DAB reviews hold superintendents accountable for specific construction projects. Construction contractors have to meet minimum performance thresholds, although NPS needs to make greater use of performance incentives.

Evidence: See 3/4/03 memo from NPS Deputy Director on allocating FY03 maintenance funds. See background information on DAB reviews. See examples of superintendent performance reviews and concession contracts with performance thresholds.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: NPS has made progress in increasing its annual obligations for construction, but it continues to carry over large unobligated balances. NPS also has large unobligated balances in recreation fee receipts, although this has stabilized as the program has matured. NPS should prepare year-end spending reports that compare planned and actual expenditures by construction project or program element. NPS also needs better ways to report on recreation fee expenditures.

Evidence: Unobligated balances for NPS construction have grown from $277m at the end of FY00 to $378m after FY01 and $395m after FY02. This is despite NPS efforts to increase obligations from $297m in FY01 to $370m in FY02. Higher obligations in FY03 should start to bring down the carryover balances. NPS still carries over too much in recreation fee receipts; it carried over nearly $300m from FY02, which is double the amount of annual collections.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: NPS has focused on completing condition assessments and establishing output measures using FCI, but now it must look for ways to measure efficiency improvements. Ongoing competitive sourcing efforts should help NPS identify the most efficient operation, whether in-house or by contractor. DOI should help NPS by reinvigorating its Facility Metrics Working Group.

Evidence: NPS has begun to identify efficiency measures, but it has not yet begun to track them. For maintenance, this may depend upon full implementation of FMSS. For construction, it will require better tracking of actual costs against estimated costs. Competitive sourcing should start to show results by next year.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: NPS collaborates closely with DOT's Federal Highway Administration in the management of park roads. The two agencies jointly develop performance goals, planning documents, and resource allocation decisions.

Evidence: See NPS budget justifications, planning documents, and maintenance guidelines. Although NPS works well with FHWA, it could work more closely with other DOI bureaus. DOI could help by reinvigorating its Planning, Design, Construction and Maintenance Council.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: NPS traditionally has weak financial management practices. It is one of the key players in two DOI-wide material weaknesses: inadequate department-wide maintenance management capability, and inadequate controls over property, plant, and equipment.

Evidence: See DOI's FY02 Annual Report on Performance and Accountability.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS has made across-the-board improvements in facility management, including better construction project management, service-wide condition assessments, implementation of a new maintenance management system, and establishment of FCI performance measures.

Evidence: See information on condition assessments, FMSS, FCI, API, DAB and CPIC reviews, and construction management reforms. See also draft Director's Order #80 on asset management program and 1998 NAPA report.

3.CA1 Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NPS has used its DAB process as an Investment Review Board under CPIC. This has forced project sponsors to specify up-front their objectives and milestones, and has given NPS leadership a way to monitor performance in meeting those goals. DOI oversees this with its own CPIC process. NPS uses value analysis and value engineering to avoid costs and improve performance.

Evidence: See information on DAB reviews. Out of 174 projects reviewed in 2002, 10 were rejected, 37 required responses or changes, and 26 were approved with conditions. NPS reports that its value analysis helped avoid $24m in costs in FY02, while in other cases it kept projects within planned budgets.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: NPS will soon be able to demonstrate progress in achieving long-term goals, but first it must establish baseline conditions and targets. NPS gets some credit, however, for working with FHWA to make progress in meeting long-term goals for park roads.

Evidence: NPS has just established long-term performance goals for regular assets, so next year it should be able to demonstrate progress in achieving those goals. NPS gets some credit for meeting goals for park roads, based on FHWA's Pavement Condition Rating.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: NPS met its annual goals for completing condition assessments, implementing FMSS, and establishing FCI and API measures. All but four parks have completed their condition assessments by the end of FY03, and all but one will be done by the end of FY04.

Evidence: See measures tab for annual targets and results. NPS still needs to document progress for concessions and other "non-regular" assets, such as archeological ruins.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: NPS is just now turning to efficiency measures, so it cannot yet demonstrate improved efficiency. NPS is conducting a couple of A-76 competitions in maintenance functions, which should produce results next year.

Evidence: No evidence provided to show improved efficiency. DOI should help NPS by reinvigorating its Facility Metrics Working Group to identify suitable benchmarks in other agencies and in the private sector.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition | Missing 2nd Program Type | Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?
Answer: LARGE EXTENT | Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: NPS has gone from a laggard to a leader in facility management. In the mid 1990s, it was regularly criticized for cost overruns and no priority-setting process; now it has good cost controls and a five-year list of priorities. Only a few agencies have better FCI performance measures. NPS has been acknowledged as a leader in value analysis.

Evidence: The 2002 NAPA report concluded that the NPS construction program has addressed most of the concerns raised in the 1998 NAPA report. NPS generally recognized by colleagues as a leader in value analysis. Other bureaus are now turning to NPS for help in implementing a facility management system.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?
Answer: LARGE EXTENT | Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: The 2002 NAPA report indicated that the construction program has addressed most of the concerns raised in the 1998 NAPA report. In April 2002, GAO reported that NPS was making progress in developing a new asset management process, but its success could not yet be demonstrated. GAO testified in July 2003 that NPS continues to make progress. DOI has started a CPIC process to complement NPS's DAB process for approving and monitoring individual projects.

Evidence: See 2002 NAPA report. See 2002 GAO report. See July 2003 GAO testimony. See DOI's CPIC guidance and NPS's DAB guidelines.

4.CA1 Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?
Answer: LARGE EXTENT | Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: NPS has done well over the past year in meeting its annual goals for completing condition assessments, implementing FMSS, and establishing FCI measures. NPS has also submitted to Congress its five-year construction priority list. In contrast to the 1990s, when a number of NPS projects had cost overruns, most NPS projects have met cost, schedule and performance goals. The main slippage has been in cases (such as Yosemite, Everglades, and Olympic) where legal challenges or other external constraints have slowed the process.

Evidence: See information on condition assessments, FMSS, FCI, API, DAB and CPIC reviews, and construction management reforms. See also five-year construction priority list and 2002 NAPA report. NPS still needs some way to systematically demonstrate program accomplishments, such as through an annual report that compares targets and results for FCI measures, capital asset plans, unobligated balances, and efficiency measures.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

Measure: Condition of all NPS regular assets as measured by a Facility Condition Index (score of 0.14 or lower is acceptable)

Additional Information: Facility Condition Index (FCI) of 0.14 or lower means that this group of assets is in acceptable condition on average.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2003		0.25	
2004	0.23		
2005	0.21		
2006	0.2		
2009	0.14		

Measure: Condition of all NPS buildings as measured by a Facility Condition Index (score of 0.10 or lower is acceptable)

Additional Information: Facility Condition Index (FCI) of 0.10 or lower means that this group of assets is in acceptable condition on average.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2003		0.16	
2004	0.15		
2005	0.14		
2006	0.13		
2007	0.12		
2008	0.11		
2009	0.1		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

Measure: Condition of priority NPS buildings as measured by a Facility Condition Index (score of 0.05 or lower means portfolio is in good condition on average)

Additional Information: Facility Condition Index (FCI) of 0.05 or lower means that this group of 200 assets is in good condition on average.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2003		0.13	
2004	0.12		
2005	0.08		
2006	0.05		
2007	0.05		
2008	0.04		
2009	0.04		

Measure: Facility operations and maintenance costs per square foot (buildings only). Maintenance costs per square foot.

Additional Information: NPS inventory has 40,341 assets (as of 09/17/03) that need condition assessments.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2003	96%	96%	
2004	100%		

Measure: Percent of assets with comprehensive condition assessments (96% of initial assessments are already done)

Additional Information: NPS inventory has 40,341 assets (as of 09/17/03) that need condition assessments.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2003	16%	16%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Facility Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition Missing 2nd Program Type Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	90%	50%	56%	

2004	40%
2005	70%
2006	100%

Measure: Percent of assets that are fully documented in the Facilty Maintenance Software System (FMSS)

Additional Information: Fully documented assets (out of 40,341 as of 9/17/03) means: (1) all required data fields are populated; (2) all available specification templates are populated; and (3) representative work types are utilized for planning and reporting of work.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	50%	
2005	70%	
2006	100%	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Facility operations and maintenance costs per square foot (buildings only). Maintenance costs per square foot.

Additional Information: Includes both facility maintenance (activities that sustain the life of an asset) and facility operations.

Year	Target	Actual

Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)

Measure: Percent of assets with approved schedules for preventive maintenance and component renewal.

Additional Information: NPS inventory has 40,341 assets (as of 09/17/03) that need approved schedules for preventive maintenance activities.

Year	Target	Actual
2003	0%	
2004	0%	
2005	50%	
2006	100%	

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Purpose is to protect natural resources in national parks "unimpaired for . . . future generations." These resources are the main reason national parks were created.

Evidence: NPS Organic Act of 1916.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Need is to establish a science-based framework for measuring the condition of park resources and taking steps where possible to restore park ecosystems to an unimpaired condition.

Evidence: National Research Council's Science in the National Parks (1992, 1993). GAO 1997 report (T-RCED-97-76). Richard Sellars' Preserving Nature in the National Parks (1997). NPS Action Plan for Preserving Natural Resources (1999).

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: No other program has responsibility for protecting natural resources in national parks. Increasing or decreasing funding for these programs has a direct impact on the condition of park natural resources or NPS ability to monitor those conditions. Program balances NPS knowledge of park resources with non-NPS scientific and subject-matter expertise.

Evidence: National Research Council's Science in the National Parks (1992, 1993). GAO 1997 report (T-RCED-97-76). Richard Sellars' Preserving Nature in the National Parks (1997). NPS Action Plan for Preserving Natural Resources (1999). Interagency Agreement with USGS to provide Park Oriented Biological Support (POBS). Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Units Network Annual Report 2002 (10/02). Funding for the Natural Resource Challenge Fiscal Year 2002 (Draft 5/03).

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Program design is free of major flaws. It is designed to balance NPS knowledge of park resources with non-NPS scientific and subject-matter expertise. The Natural Resource Challenge was initiated to improve natural resource preservation through research support and management to establish condition baselines, monitor changes, detect unnatural influences, and develop and implement appropriate management actions and programs. The Challenge has made NPS natural resource stewardship more effective and efficient overall.

Evidence: NPS Action Plan for Preserving Natural Resources (1999). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (1/03). Funding for the Natural Resource Challenge FY 2002 (Draft 2003). FY 2000 House Interior Appropriations report language.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Program is generally designed well, using a broad-based, multi-disciplinary approach, with a wide range of NPS and non-NPS researchers, resource professionals and park managers. The Challenge has allowed the natural resource program to address deficiencies in baseline natural resource inventories and monitoring, and to pursue innovative approaches to national park needs (e.g., Exotic Plant Management Teams, Vital Signs Monitoring Networks).

Evidence: FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Biological Resource Management Division Annual Report FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Exotic Plant Management Team Annual Report - FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Water Resource Division FY 2002 Annual Report (Draft 2003), FY 2002 Geologic Resource Division Annual Report (Draft 2003). Air Quality in the National Parks, Second edition (2002). NPS FY 2004 Budget Request (pp. ONPS-9 - ONPS-17).

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight 12%

Explanation: NPS has had various output measures to track natural resource stewardship. Until the Natural Resource Challenge, however, it lacked a framework for measuring the desired outcome of natural resources protected unimpaired for future generations. The Challenge is now building off of NPS's first set of performance measures to establish baseline inventories, implement effective monitoring strategies, and make initial improvements to national park natural resource conditions. It will eventually identify vital signs that better measure the outcomes of natural resource stewardship.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for FYs 2003-08 (draft 2003). NPS strategic goals (with actuals and targets) for natural resources FYs 1999-2005 (2003). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Vital Signs Monitoring Network - Status and Timeline (Draft 2003). Exotic Plant Management Team Annual Report - FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Biological Resource Management Division Annual Report FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Water Resource Division FY 2002 Annual Report (Draft 2003), FY 2002 Geologic Resource Division Annual Report (Draft 05/03). Air Quality Actions Implementing NRC Funding (2003). Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Units Network Annual Report 2002 (2002).

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight 12%

Explanation: Same as 2.1

Evidence: Same as 2.1

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The Natural Resource Challenge has established ambitious annual baselines and timeframes to complete natural resource inventories and implement complex monitoring strategies. Annual milestones are laid out for acquiring specific inventory data sets, restoring disturbed lands, controlling exotic species, improving populations of T&E species, monitoring air and water quality, improving the condition of fragile geologic resources, and identifying vital signs to measure overall ecosystem health.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for FYs 2003-08 (draft 2003). NPS strategic goals (with actuals and targets) for natural resources FYs 1999-2005 (2003). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Vital Signs Monitoring Network - Status and Timeline (Draft 2003). Exotic Plant Management Team Annual Report - FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Biological Resource Management Division Annual Report FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Water Resource Division FY 2002 Annual Report (Draft 2003), FY 2002 Geologic Resource Division Annual Report (Draft 05/03). Air Quality Actions Implementing NRC Funding (2003). Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Units Network Annual Report 2002 (2002).

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Same as 2.3

Evidence: Same as 2.3

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: NPS has many partners within the Natural Resource Challenge that have shown commitment toward long-term resource stewardship goals. NPS uses a network of Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Units (CESUs) to partner with USGS, EPA, and other bureaus, as well as state, local, and non-profit entities. All have been committed to using national parks as reference points for broader environmental measures.

Evidence: See MOUs with USGS, EPA, USFS, BLM, BOR, NRCS, USFWS, DOD, DOE, NASA, universities and researchers, particularly through the Learning Centers and CESUs. Partners and contractors must agree to certain performance standards before agreements are executed. See Funding for the Natural Resource Challenge FY 2002 (Draft 2003), and Cooperative Ecosystems Studies Units Annual Report 2002 (2002).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?

Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The National Research Council (NRC) reports in 1992 and 1993, and Richard Sellars' pivotal book, Preserving Nature and the National Parks (1997), identified long-standing shortcomings in NPS natural resource stewardship. These provided an impetus to begin the Natural Resource Challenge as an attempt to address the need for better outcome measures and science-based resource stewardship. Although NPS conducts narrow, area-specific reviews, there has not been a recent independent evalution of either the Natural Resource Challenge or NPS natural resource stewardship overall. NPS should pursue more systematic and integrated reviews that use expertise tailored to the disciplines being evaluated. The NPS Advisory Board has begun a review of the Challenge, but DOI is encouraged to initiate or support a more independent review by the IG, NRC, or other appropriate body.

Evidence: NRC's Science in the National Parks (1992, 1993). GAO 1997 report (T-RCED-97-76). Richard Sellars' Preserving Nature in the National Parks (1997). National Academy of Sciences' Ecological Dynamics on Yellowstone's Northern Range (2003). NPS Advisory Board Report on the Natural Resource Challenge (draft report in progress). See also NPS Peer Review Guidelines (Draft 2003) and NPS natural resource program evaluation strategy (Draft 2003).

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?

Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: For natural resource programs, NPS can link specific budget requests to various output performance targets. During the FY 2004 budget process, NPS was able to show changes in various output targets in response to changes in estimated funding. NPS still has more work to do to report all the costs needed to achieve specifc outcome performance targets.

Evidence: NPS 2004 Budget Request (pp. ONPS-29 - ONPS-31). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (1/03). Funding for the Natural Resource Challenge FY 2002 (Draft 2003).

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?

Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The entire Natural Resource Challenge is, in effect, a long-term plan to address the most significant deficiencies in strategic planning for natural resource stewardship -- that is, the need for comprehensive outcome measures to track ecosystem health in national parks. The Challenge lays out a series of logical steps to address long-term deficiencies in understanding, monitoring, and managing natural resources in national parks. Each successive NPS strategic plan has contained better measures for natural resource stewardship. The next NPS operational plan and DOI strategic plan will integrate pre-Challenge output goals with the outcome measures under development.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for FYs 2003-08 (draft 2003). NPS strategic goals (with actuals and targets) for natural resources FYs 1999-2005 (2003). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Vital Signs Monitoring Network - Status and Timeline (Draft 2003). Exotic Plant Management Team Annual Report - FY 2002 (Draft 2003). NPS Action Plan for Preserving Natural Resources (1999). Funding the Natural Resource Challenge FY 2002 (Draft 2003). NRC's Science in the National Parks (1992, 1993). Richard Sellars' Preserving Nature in the National Parks (1997).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?

Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The program regularly tracks progress in completing inventory data sets and monitoring plans, individual resource management projects, threatened and endangered species status, disturbed land restoration, invasive species control efforts, and a large number of individual projects in parks. In addition, each network, subprogram, or individual project must document its performance annually.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for FYs 2003-08 (draft 2003). NPS strategic goals (with actuals and targets) for natural resources FYs 1999-2005 (2003). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Vital Signs Monitoring Network - Status and Timeline (Draft 2003). Exotic Plant Management Team Annual Report - FY 2002 (Draft 2003). Funding the Natural Resource Challenge FY 2002 (Draft 2003).

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Park managers are held accountable for performance through a number of means. Before funds are released, they must identify planned cost, schedule and performance results in Detailed Implementation Plans (DIPs). Each program has quality control standards for an initial phase of an activity (such as establishing monitoring networks) that a manager must meet before funding is released for subsequent stages. Performance is monitored throughout the year, both through the Performance Management Database System (PMDS) and annual reports. Program field staff are also accountable for performance specified in annual work plans. Individual projects are not funded until a DIP is approved and performance must be relatively consistent with the DIP schedule. For non-NPS program partners (e.g., other bureaus, contractors or cooperators), accountability is based on performance costs, schedules and results specified in contract or agreement instruments executed with the partner.

Evidence: See examples of project-specific Detailed Implementation Plans (DIPs). See also examples of contracts and interagency agreements. Other evidence includes Inventory and Monitoring product specifications and a CESU master agreement. See also NPS guidance requiring an annual accomplishment report before funding is released for multi-year projects. This program has been willing to reprogram funds to other high-priority needs if an activity or project is not likely to achieve the intended results or unreasonably deviates from approved schedules. For example, soil maps to be done in partnership with USDA's NRCS have fallen behind schedule, so NPS is exploring alternatives, including contracting out this activity.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?

Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: One-year funds have been obligated annually. In addition, the program has required annual accomplishment reports to provide confidence that funds are expended for their intended purposes.

Evidence: See examples of annual accomplishment reports, including the FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003), the Biological Resource Management Division Annual Report FY 2002 (Draft 2003), and the Water Resource Division FY 2002 Annual Report (Draft 2003).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: NPS contracts out much of the research and data collection to universities, other bureaus, and private organizations. Inventories (e.g., bird species) for multiple parks are routinely consolidated into a single contract or agreement. NPS uses CESUs, with low fixed overhead rates, to secure university-based scientific expertise. NPS will also deploy in FY 2004 a new IT system, the Resource Activity Management System (RAMS), that is designed to capture park natural resource management actions, regardless of funding source, and compare planned and actual cost information to improve understanding of costs per unit and competitive-sourcing efficiencies.

Evidence: See information on CESUs, which negotiate in advance overhead rates of 15%, compared to regular university rates of 25-65%. CESUs also allow NPS to obtain low-cost technical support through student interns and Student Conservation Association resource assistants. The Alien Plant Control and Monitoring (APCAM) IT database captures information on costs to treat exotic plants by the Exotic Plant Management Teams (EPMTs).

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The program is designed to collaborate and coordinate with other programs with professional expertise and institutional knowledge in natural resources. The program optimizes available non-NPS scientific and subject-matter expertise in other Federal, state, local and private entities through interagency partnerships, CESU networks with academic institutions, and cooperative agreements with non-profit institutions. Although NPS has sole responsibility for monitoring and managing natural resources in national parks, it must coordinate with others in the development of scientific protocols, the mapping of vegetation, and overall research on natural resource conditions.

Evidence: See the NPS Action Plan for Preserving Natural Resources (1999) for a description of the coordination with a wide range of external programs. These include the USGS and universities, which have the lead in designing protocols and conducting biological research, and the CESUs, which provide new opportunities for obtaining scientific expertise across departmental, bureau and academic institutional lines. See also: Interagency Agreement with USGS to provide Park Oriented Biological Support (POBS); MOAs and other agreements with other bureaus/departments; and CESU Network Annual Report 2002 (10/02). The program also collaborates with other NPS programs through a series of Technical Advisory Groups, including the Contaminants TAG (CTAG), Fire TAG (FTAG), Monitoring TAG (MTAG), and Restoration TAG (RTAG).

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The program is free of material internal control weaknesses. NPS overall still has financial management weaknesses, but they do not have a direct relation to the program. In fact, the program is developing capabilities (e.g., RAMS) to compensate for NPS-wide weaknesses.

Evidence: See DOI's FY02 Annual Report on Performance and Accountability. See also information on the pilot park deployment in FY 2004 of a new NPS information system, RAMS, designed to capture park natural resource management actions, regardless of funding source, and compare planned and actual cost information to improve understanding of costs per unit and competitive-sourcing efficiencies.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Natural Resource Challenge is, in effect, a comprehensive collection of steps aimed at addressing a long-term deficiency in understanding and tracking natural resource conditions in parks.

Evidence: NPS Action Plan for Preserving Natural Resources (1999). Funding the Natural Resource Challenge Fiscal Year 2002 (Draft 5/03). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (1/03).

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight25%

Explanation: NPS has demonstrated good progress in establishing and achieving long-term output goals and tracking results. This includes both the pre-Challenge goals (such as acres of disturbed land restored) and the Challenge goals (such as number of data sets completed). A full yes, however, would require that DOI finalize its Strategic Plan and NPS establish long-term outcome goals that use vital signs to measure park lands with ecosystems in good or fair condition. Suitable performance goals are under development for the next 5-year period, but await completion of the DOI Strategic Plan.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for FYs 2003-08 (draft 2003). NPS strategic goals (with actuals and targets) for natural resources FYs 1999-2005 (2003). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Vital Signs Monitoring Network - Status and Timeline (Draft 2003).

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight25%

Explanation: NPS has consistently demonstrated good progress in achieving its annual goals. The Natural Resource Challenge established ambitious goal baselines and targets for natural resource inventories, and the development and implementation of often complex monitoring strategies for national park natural resources. Performance against those goals, much of it continued funding-increase dependent, has been consistent and easily interpreted.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan for FYs 2003-08 (draft 2003). NPS strategic goals (with actuals and targets) for natural resources FYs 1999-2005 (2003). FY 2002 Annual Report Inventory and Monitoring Program (2003). Vital Signs Monitoring Network - Status and Timeline (Draft 2003).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: NPS has done a good job finding creative solutions (e.g., CESUs, integrating monitoring program designs, and military engineering resources) to procure efficient research and resource management services from academia, other bureaus (i.e., USGS), and other partners. The NPS is also pursuing non-traditional solutions such as a Native Plant Corps under development with an NGO partner that will further increase its exotic plant control capabilities. It continues to improve tracking of costs per unit for activities, such as exotic plant treatment by EPMTs. It still needs to do more to track costs per unit for other activities, but planned improvements and the anticipated RAMS IT system should help in this regard.

Evidence: See CESU agreements and brief on Native Plant Corps. See also information on USGS/NPS water quality partnership and RAMS pilot. NPS estimates that EPMT costs averaged $451 per acre in 2002. EPMT tamarisk cut stump control costs were significantly lower than other agencies ($394 vs. $3,000 per acre), even with the added environmental requirements of operating within national parks. For urban parks, EPMT costs were cheaper than contractors ($298 vs. $2,000 per acre). EPMT effectiveness is shown by the interest of other organizations in adopting this practice. Other efficiency improvements include cost-sharing I&M data preparation, integrating design and planning of monitoring programs (i.e., vital signs and water quality), coordinating work with partners (e.g., aerial photography and LIDAR data), partnering with National Guard and Army Reserve military engineering resources for restoration work in parks, and consolidating natural resource inventories for multiple parks into a single contract or agreement.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight 10%

Explanation: The program does not yet have sufficient benchmarks to compare its overall effectiveness to other programs, but it can make anecdotal comparisons. For exmple, the adoption by other agencies of EPMTs indicate a favorable comparison. Similar NPS practices that have spread include the use of herbicides and management activities in wilderness areas, the techniques required to treat specific exotic plant species/populations, and performance strategies. Nevertheless, it is difficult to make useful comparisons between natural resource agencies that have different primary missions, objectives and requirements (e.g., preserve natural ecosystems vs. manage natural resources to optimize commodity production). Yet, there are too many similarities to warrant a "Not applicable" rating, so the question was retained, but the weighting reduced.

Evidence: NPS may be able to demonstrate its program compares favorably to others, once it has outcome measures firmly in place. In the meantime, it must compare outputs, which differ between natural resource agencies with different missions and goals. Anecdotal examples that NPS resource stewardship compares favorably include: the interest of FWS and others in adopting EPMTs; vegetation mapping costs that are comparable to other Federal, state, and local agencies; recognition by The Nature Conservancy (TNC) before an international consortium of NPS's progress in wildland weed management; reduced purchase costs for I&M inventories. See EPMT handbook on nps.gov; John Randell, TNC, Weeds Across the Border (2002); Inventory and Monitoring Program data; FY02 Funding the Natural Resource Challenge Report (2003). NPS is currently developing a natural resource program evaluation strategy that should future comparison results.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: SMALL EXTENT

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The National Research Council (NRC) reports in 1992 and 1993, and Richard Sellars' pivotal book, Preserving Nature and the National Parks (1997), identified long-standing shortcomings in NPS natural resource stewardship. These provided an impetus to begin the Natural Resource Challenge as an attempt to address the need for better outcome measures and science-based resource stewardship. Although NPS conducts narrow, area-specific reviews, there has not been a recent independent evalution of either the Natural Resource Challenge or NPS resource stewardship overall. The NPS Advisory Board has begun a review of the Challenge, but DOI is encouraged to initiate or support a more independent review by the IG, NRC, or other appropriate body.

Evidence: NRC's Science in the National Parks (1992, 1993). GAO 1997 report (T-RCED-97-76). Richard Sellars' Preserving Nature in the National Parks (1997). National Academy of Sciences' Ecological Dynamics on Yellowstone's Northern Range (2003). NPS Advisory Board Report on the Natural Resource Challenge (draft report in progress). See also NPS Peer Review Guidelines (Draft 2003) and NPS natural resource program evaluation strategy (Draft 2003).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

Measure: Acres of disturbed park lands prepared for natural restoration per year.

Additional Information: Number of acres that have been prepared for natural restoration each year, out of 235,000 acres of disturbed park land identified in 2003.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2003	11,500		
2004	4,700		

Measure: Percent of parks that have identified their vital signs for natural resource monitoring

Additional Information: 270 national parks with significant natural resources are required to identify the vital signs they will use to monitor the condition of park ecosystems. (Targets based on networks funded at FY04 levels.)

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2001	13%	13%	
2002	17%	17%	
2003	40%		
2004	56%		
2005	80%		
2006	80%		

Measure: Percent of parks containing ecosystems in good or fair condition.

Additional Information: Vital signs are used to measure the percent of park lands containing ecosystems (watersheds, landscapes, or marine resources) that are in good or fair condition.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

Measure: Percent of parks with unimpaired water quality.

Additional Information: 288 parks are required to have criteria for impaired water quality.

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2001	56%	56%
2002	64%	64%
2003	65%	
2004	65%	
2005	66%	

Measure: Percent of completed data sets of natural resource inventories.

Additional Information: In 1999, NPS identified 2,767 data sets that are needed to inventory the natural resources in parks.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2001	30.4%	30.7%
2002	44.4%	52.1%
2003	59.3%	
2004	74.5%	
2005	87.2%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Park Service Natural Resource Stewardship
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: National Park Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	88%	100%	68%	Effective

Measure: Average cost of treating an acre of park land disturbed with exotic plants.

Additional Information: Average cost per acre fluctuates, depending on the types of plants treated in a given year. Costs range from $70/acre for herbaceous trees in Florida to $950/acre for tamarisk.

Year	Target	Actual
2001	$400	$312
2002	$400	$451
2003	$400	
2004	$400	

Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	50%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 established that the "mission of the [National Wildlife Refuge] System is to administer a national network of lands and waters for the conservation, management, and where appropriate, restoration of the fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans." The Act states that "it is the policy of the United States that -- each refuge shall be managed to fulfill the mission of the System, as well as the specific purposes for which that refuge was established [and that]... compatible wildlife-dependent recreation is a legitimate and appropriate general public use of the System, directly related to the mission of the System ..."The 1997 Act defines wildlife-dependent recreational uses as "a use of a refuge involving hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, or environmental education and interpretation" and a "compatible use" as "a wildlife-dependent recreational use or any other use of a refuge that, in the sound professional judgment of the Director, will not materially interfere with or detract from thefulfillment of the mission of the System or the purposes of therefuge." Further, the 1997 Act provides that "in administering the System,the Secretary shall . . . ensure that the biological integrity, diversity,and environmental health of the System are maintained." Numerousother laws directly impact the operation of the National Wildlife Refuge System (NWRS). The Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS or theService) is responsible for administering and managing the NWRS.

Evidence: Mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System; National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997; National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Act; National Wildlife Refuge System Volunteer and Community Partnership Act of 1998; Legislation Dealing with Management of the National Wildlife Refuge System; Refuge Recreation Act, Primary Statutory Compliance Issues Affecting Management of the National Wildlife Refuge System: Service Manual Chapters on Refuge Planning (602FW1 - Refuge Planning Overview, 602FW3 - Comprehensive Conservation Planning Process, 602FW4 - List of Potential Step-Down Management Plans); Draft Service Manual-Policy on the NWRS Mission and Goals, and Refuge Purposes

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The NWRS helps to conserve a growing number of aquatic and terrestrial species that are declining at alarming rates. Approximately one-third of the Nation's mammal and bird species are declining or presumed extinct. Forty percent of our reptiles and 80 percent of our amphibians are in decline. Loss or degradation of habitat is a leading cause of the decline in Federal trust species populations (i.e., migratory birds, interjurisdictional fish, threatened and endangered species). For example, nationwide, 53 percent of all wetlands have been lost, 90 percent of native prairie is gone, 70 percent of riparian habitat has been lost, and 3.6 million miles of streams have been degraded. The 542 refuges and 37 wetland management districts in the NWRS protect 260 endangered species, and safeguard breeding and resting habitats for millions of migratory birds. Wildlife managers on refuges have helped restore once depleted populations of whooping cranes, elk, wild turkeys, crocodiles, wood ducks, antelope, Aleutian Canada geese, key deer and other species. As the world's human population continues to grow and attendant stresses on the environment continue to cause the decline of wildlife and associated environmental attributes, the NWRS will increase rather than decline in value.

Evidence: Fulfilling the Promise-Visions for Wildlife, Habitat, People, and Leadership; Annual Report of Lands Under Control of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Fish & Wildlife News - Special Edition on National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial; Wetlands and the National Wildlife Refuge System Protecting and Restoring Wetlands; U.S. Wetlands of International Importance - Under the Ramsar Convention; Status and Trends of Wetlands in the Conterminous United States 1986 to 1997; Endangered Species Bulletin Jan/Feb 2003; Shorebird Migrations - Fundamentals for Land Managers in the United States

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	50%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Refuge System occupies a unique niche in the management of public natural resources. The Refuge System is the only federal land base devoted specifically to the conservation and management of fish, wildlife, and plants. Other federal land management agencies have land and species conservation programs, however, their missions are different. For example, the National Park Service's mission is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife within. The Bureau of Land Management is charged with sustaining health, diversity, and productivity on the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations. The Forest Service's mission emphasizes land management in a sustainable manner to meet the diverse needs of people. While complementary to the NWRS, none of these other federal land management agencies has a mission that places wildlife first. State conservation land systems also often play a complementary role to the NWRS but their purpose is more geographically restrictive and in some cases do not share the "wildlife first" mission of the NWRS.

Evidence: America's National Wildlife Refuge System, Celebrating a Century of Conservation; A Collaborative Approach for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks to Communities and the Environment - 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy - Implementation Plan May 2002; Fulfilling the Promise-Visions for Wildlife, Habitat, People, and Leadership.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 changed News from a collection of sites with varying practices guided by local goals to a unified System. The past six years have been virtually free of any serious GAO corrective actions, Congressional Oversight Hearings and multi-refuge litigation. The Inspector General's (IG) request for more Maintenance program documentation and one law suit (regarding hunting-related NEPA decisions) have been the only opposition to System's operations and maintenance decisions since the Act. Also, NWRS is efficiently leveraging public funds: Partners/Service spending ratio is 2.5 to 1; 20% of all staff work done is by unpaid volunteers; more than 230 community-based organizations exist to support goals of the NWRS. One possible design flaw is that individual refuge purposes take precedence over the mission of the refuge system over all.

Evidence: Biological Needs Assessment; Refuge Law Enforcement Reform - Interim Strategies March 27, 2003; FWS Deployment Modeling Work Group April 30, 2003; Strategic Growth (Draft Memorandum: Review of Draft Interim Guidance on Strategic Growth of the NWRS, Agenda for May 29 and 30, 2003 stakeholders meeting "The Next 100 Years of Conservation-Charting the Future Growth of the NWRS").

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The NWRS effectively targets funding to directly address the program's purpose of conserving wildlife by restoring habitat, carrying out specific management actions to improve populations, and by educating people about the various fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats throughout the nation.

Evidence: RONS and RCAR Measures and Definitions - April 2003; FY 02 Refuge Comprehensive Accomplishment Report (includes Volunteer summary); Maintenance Management System Handbook; FY 2004 Budget Justification - Refuge Operations and Maintenance, Five Year Maintenance and Capital Improvement Plan, March 2003; Handbook - Writing Refuge Management Goals and Objectives, March 2003.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	50%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The NWRS has taken a number of strategic planning steps including producing the "Fulfilling the Promise" document which presents a vision for the NWRS and a number of recommendations to help accomplish the vision. The recommendations, however, are not specific enough to be considered as long-term goals for the PART. In the Fall 2001, the Department of the Interior began developing a Department-wide Strategic Plan. In April 2003, the Refuge Program developed new draft long-term and annual output performance goals as part of a DOI directive to construct a FWS Operational Plan to support the DOI Strategic Plan. During the PART assessment these goals were further refined and outcome based long-term and annual goals were developed for the program.

Evidence: Fulfilling the Promise, 1999; FWS FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan/FY 2001 Annual Performance Report; Draft Strategic Plan - National Wildlife Refuge System - April 24, 2003

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Baselines and ambitious targets have not yet been developed for the long-term outcome goals developed during the PART assessment.

Evidence:

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The specific and measurable annual goals have been developed recently through the FWS efforts to devise measures for their Operational Plan to step up to the Department's Strategic Plan as well as through the PART process. Many of these measures are output oriented.

Evidence:

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Baselines and ambitious targets have not yet been developed for many of the annual measures. The initial first year effort for some of the new goals will be to establish baselines and then set FY 2008 long-term targets and FY 2005 annual performance targets.

Evidence: RONS and RCAR Measures and Definitions - April 2003; FY 02 Refuge Comprehensive Accomplishment Report (includes Volunteer summary); FY 02 Public Education and Recreation Totals; Refuge Operating Needs System data entry screen, Maintenance Management System data entry screen, Real Property data entry screen

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	50%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Common goals and measures are developed for many partnership activities. Examples include a Memorandum of Agreement with the Park Service and USGS on restoration of the Everglades, and work with the National Invasive Species Council to develop a cross-cut budget initiative to control adverse impacts of invasive species on natural resources. Additionally, the NWRS has extensive support through a large network of volunteers and Friends Groups that all commit and work towards accomplishing the goals of the NWRS. Nearly 20% of the hours worked on NWRS field stations is done by volunteers who work directly on priorty natural and cultural resource management activities and visitor service programs consistent with goals of the NWRS. The Cooperative Alliance for Refuge Enhancement, CARE, a coalition of major national conservation organizations has provided strong support for helping to ensure the NWRS is able to accomplish its goals by pushing for increased Refuge Operations and Maintenance funding.

Evidence: FY 2004 Interagency Invasive Species Performance Budget; Everglades Restoration MOA; National Wildlife Refuge System Volunteer and Community Partnership Enhancement Act of 1998; Refuge Support Group (Friends) Directory; Fiscal Year 2001 Volunteer Report Feb 10, 03; Challenge Cost Sharing; Refuges and Climate Change, Cooperative Grant program with National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (National Wildlife Refuge Support Groups Program[Friends], Take Pride Centennial Refuge Legacy, and The Nature of Learning); Cooperative Alliance for Refuge Enhancement - Shortchanging America's Wildlife, A Report on the National Wildlife Refuge System Funding Crisis.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: A number of evaluations of select parts of the NWRS have been conducted over the past five years, however, they do not, independently or taken together, meet the requirements of the question that the program have regularly scheduled objective, independent evaluations that examine how well the program is accomplishing its mission and meeting its long term goals.

Evidence: Protecting the National Wildlife Refuge System - Law Enforcement Requirements For the 21st Century; Recommendation to the Secretary for Implementing Law Enforcement Reforms; Deferred Maintenance, US Fish and Wildlife Service - Audit Report 00-I-226 - March 2000; GAO Audit RCED-00-52, Feb 2000, FWS Agency Needs to Inform Congress of Future Costs Associated with Land Acquisitions; Science-Based Stewardship: Recommendations for Implementing the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act -- Oct. 1998.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Budget requests identify increases on a project by project basis for the most part and deferred maintenance funds are prioritized and planned for in a 5-year plan that is submitted annually. However, the linkage to achieving performance targets is not always clear, particularly where outcome based long-term goals are absent. Recent efforts to link performance and budget in budget justifications are improvements and reflect a transition towards integrating performance-planning and budget-planning such that annual and long-term performance goals drive budget requests.

Evidence: Operational Priorities - Prioritization Process for the Refuge Operating Needs System [RONS]; FY 2004 Budget Justification - Refuge Operations and Maintenance.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	50%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The NWRS began efforts to address strategic planning deficiencies with a System-wide conference in October of 1998. This conference led to a report (Fulfilling the Promise) that looked at where the System has been, reviewed its current situation, and stated a vision for the future. Numerous vision statements and 42 recommendations for improving the NWRS were included in the report. More recently, as part of the FWS effort to develop a new operational plan to step down a draft Department of the Interior strategic plan, the NWRS met over two days to develop output goals. The NWRS will continue to refine the goals to develop long-term outcome goals, further refine efficiency measures, and baselines and targets for both long-term and annual goals. In response to GAO and IG reports of deficiencies, the FWS has developed a five year maintenance and capital improvement plan, implemented MAXIMO, and developed a process for assessing the conditions of refuge facilities.

Evidence: Draft Strategic Plan - National Wildlife Refuge System April 24, 2003; Deferred Maintenance, US Fish and Wildlife Service - Audit Report 00-I-226 - March 2000; Visitor Satisfaction Survey: Data Analysis and Report; Service Asset and Maintenance Management System memorandum and pilot test report, Feb 19,2003; Memorandum-Completing the Real Property Inventory and Validating Data Entries April 3, 03; Memorandum - Draft Strategic Plan April 24, 03.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Performance information is collected from a variety of sources. Information collected through condition assessments provides a baseline for facility maintenance needs. The Refuge Management Information System is used to document current status, adjust program priorities, and allocate resources. Information collected annually in the Refuge Comprehensive Accomplishment Report provides a baseline of activities being carried out within the Refuge System. Activities are quantified for both our own staff as well as the large volunteer contingent that contributes to effectiveness of refuges. Annual budget increases for Refuge Operations are drawn from the Refuge Operating Needs System which provides an annual listing of priority needs that are identified by field station managers each year. These projects include performance measures and projects are prioritized based on most urgent contribution of the project to the Refuge System mission. Each year funding increases requested in the Budget Justification are selected and listed by project after an analysis was made to determine the highest-priorityneeds of the System.

Evidence: Annual Report on Performance and Accountability FY 2002; Refuge Management Information System (RMIS) modules: FY 02 Refuge Comprehensive Accomplishment Report (includes Volunteer summary), FY 02 Public Education and Recreation Totals, Refuge Operating Needs System, Maintenance Management System, Real Property Inventory database

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	50%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: While SES level managers have GPRA annual goals incorporated into their annual plans, Refuge supervisors and Refuge managers do not yet have performance standards incorporated into their performance plans linking that individual's performance to the achievement of program goals. It is important, however, to note that Regional Directors have line authority over the Refuge Managers who routinely work with the public and trust resources. Regional Directors can not succeed in their performance unless their subordinates produce the products required by the Regional Director's standards. Regional Directors' ratings are linked to GPRA annual goal and other performance management contract achievements (such as the Realty contracts).

Evidence: Refuge Operating Needs System Accomplishment Reports for budget increases in FY 2002; FY 2002 report of accomplishments for deferred maintenance projects; sample Employee Performance Plan and Results Report

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Although the allowed time span for expenditure of Refuge appropriated funds is 2 years, the expenditure rate is consistently 95%-99% at the close of the first year in which the funds are available. An obligation rate of 95% in the expenditure of maintenance funds are due to the need for permits, design and large-purchase procurement procedures. The program's funding expenditure has received independent audit review and financial transactions met standards. The FY 2002 financial audit was qualified due to insufficient documentation of values of real property assets. Corrective action is currently underway.

Evidence: Initial Budget Allocations - Fiscal Year 2002 (BAS Report 2002-1) Dec 19, 01; Refuge Operating Needs System Accomplishment Reports for budget increases in FY 2002; FY 2002 report of accomplishments for deferred maintenance projects; Expenditure rates for Refuge Operations and Maintenance Accounts FY 2000, 2001, 2002; Completing Real Property Inventory and Validating Entries

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The NWRS has a wetlands efficiency measure developed as part of the Administration's common measures activity. Efficiencies are sought through competitive sourcing reviews such as that of the GS-326 Series (secretarial services) and through consolidation of purchase power and standardization of equipment specifications, such as the consolidated IT contracts. The management structure is delayered, each Regional Refuge Supervisor having an average of 20 staffed stations to supervise. Field stations follow national and regional policies but operate quite independently on daily activities. The NWRS also has achieved efficiencies through "complexing" (or combining the administration of many refuges into one central refuge office) and by selectively not staffing refuge units (refuges and wetland management districts) based on biological and other considerations.

Evidence: National Park Service Interagency Acquisition Agreement for uniform program; Reimbursable support agreement for Department-wide purchase of MAXIMO software to support maintenance program; SOW Competitive Sourcing Review 326 Job Series; IT Enterprise Licensing Agreement

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	50%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The Refuge System works effectively with a wide variety of programs within the Fish and Wildlife Service and with state, federal, and private partners. Examples of these programs include working with the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) Joint Ventures, assessing and cleaning up contaminants problems affecting refuges, undertaking a variety of Fisheries projects and by using Refuge heavy equipment to support achievement of the goals in the Partners for Wildlife program.

Evidence: Conserving America's Fisheries; The Service Protects and Restores Wetlands; Biological Report 89 - Ecology and Conservation of the Endangered Least Bell's Vireo; Endangered Species Bulletin; Endangered Species Table; Celebrating a Century of Conservation - Regional Refuge Events Involve, Commemorate, Inspire; FY 2003 Refuge Cleanup Proposals; Fisheries/Refuges Cooperation; Habitat Based Conservation Goals Proposal; Integrating HCPs with National Wildlife Refuges; Cooperative Strategic Conservation Planning Proposal

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: FY 2002 financial statements identified a number of material weaknesses including one specifically related to the NWRS. The weakness was related to the processes, controls, and financial reporting related to buildings, structures and construction work in process. In response, the FWS is initiating appropriate corrective actions in FY 2003 to correct this and other cited deficiencies. Additionally, a Department-wide Federal Managers' Financial Integrity material weakness of inadequate Departmentwide maintenance management capability directly relates to the NWRS.

Evidence: Independent Auditor's Report on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Financial Statements for Fiscal Years 2002 and 2001; Independent Auditor's Report on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Financial Statements for Fiscal Years 2001 and 2000;Independent Auditor's Report on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 2000; Fiscal Year 2003 General Annual Guidelines for the Management Control Program; Completing Real Property Inventory and Validating Entries; U.S. Department of the Interior Annual Report on Performance and Accountability, FY 2002.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	50%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Management challenges are given serious attention as evidenced by recent efforts to analyze and implement recommendations identified in the Fulfilling the Promise document. Numerous action teams have been assigned and the Promises Implementation team consisting of NWRS leadership and regional field representatives meets twice annually to manage progress against these goals which include a full range of management programs to include addressing shortages in biological programs, refine refuge law enforcement programs, implement Comprehensive Conservation Plans for field units, be more strategic in growth of the Refuge System, provide for quality wildlife dependent recreation and education programs, and provide for strong leadership and organizational management. Many changes have occurred in the maintenance program to refine and improve management of equipment and facility resources; a new condition assessment process has been initiated and a five year budgeting process is now in place. Also, a new commercial maintenance management software is being implementedthroughout the country to systematically track and manage acomprehensive maintenance program. Also, a number of GAO and IG audit reports provide recommendations that are being applied to improve management activities.

Evidence: Fulfilling the Promise Briefing Statements; Final Report-Pilot Test Results and Recommendations for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Asset and Maintenance Management System, 2/19/03; Protecting the National Wildlife Refuge System - Law Enforcement Requirements For the 21st Century and Recommendation to the Secretary for Implementing Law Enforcement Reforms; Comprehensive Conservation Planning (CCP) (Draft Strategic Needs Assessment for CCPs, CCP Accomplishments, and CCP status April-June 2003); Strategic Growth (Draft Memorandum: Review of Draft Interim Guidance on Strategic Growth of the NWRS, Agenda for May 29 and 30, 2003 stakeholders meeting "The Next 100 Years of Conservation-Charting the Future Growth of the NWRS"); Semi-Annual Audit Follow-up Progress Report

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:20%

Explanation: New long-term goals for the NWRS were identified by the PART team and will implemented in FY 2005, therefore, there is no data to measure performance. Past NWRS performance toward progress in achieving previous FWS GPRA long-term goals is available and demonstrates achievement of some long-term goals. The projected cumulative amount (through 2003) of acres enhanced by controlling aquatic and terrestrial invasive species on NWRS land is 1.1 million acres. This exceeds the previous 2005 target of 850,000 acres. The old long-term target for annually managing/enhancing NWRS lands is 3.2 million acres. Through 2003, the Refuge Program has managed/enhanced 3.3 million annually. The previous long-term 2005 target for restoring NWRS wetlands is 850,000 acres; the actual restored acres is projected to be 850,000 acres. The goals for the number of interpretive, educational, and recreational visits as well as the number of volunteer hours, however, may not be met. While these old goals were adequate at the time of their creation to guide the NWRS, they are not outcome oriented or in some other way were not the best measures to track performance of the NWRS, and, therefore, new goals were crafted. The initial first year effort for some of the new goals will be to establish baselines and then set FY 2008 long-term targets and FY 2005 annual performance targets.

Evidence: Annual Report on Performance and Accountability FY 2002; FY 2000 Annual Performance Plan - Performance Measure Commitment; FY 2001 Annual Performance Plan - Performance Measure Commitment; FY 2002 Annual Performance Plan - Performance Measure Commitment; FWS FY 2003 Budget Justification.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	50%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: New annual goals were identified for the NWRS by the PART team and will be implemented in FY 2005, therefore, there is no data to measure performance. Past NWRS performance toward achieving previous FWS GPRA long-term goals is available and demonstrates achievement of some of the annual goals. In FY 2002, the NWRS met or exceeded three of their old goals (number of acres enhanced by controlling invasive species; number of acres managed/enhanced; and number of new friends groups) but did not meet three other goals (number of acres restored; number of interpretive, educational, and recreational visits; number of volunteer hours). New goals were needed to align with new long-term outcome goals. The initial first year effort for some of the new goals will be to establish baselines and then set FY 2005 performance targets.

Evidence: Annual Report on Performance and Accountability FY 2002; FY 2000 Annual Performance Plan - Performance Measure Commitment; FY 2001 Annual Performance Plan - Performance Measure Commitment; FY 2002 Annual Performance Plan - Performance Measure Commitment; FWS FY 2003 Budget Justification.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: While accomplishment reporting indicates some goals are being met and others are not, there is no evidence that management practices have resulted in efficiency gains over the past year.

Evidence: Refuge Operating Needs System Accomplishment Reports for budget increases in FY 2002; FY 2002 report of accomplishments for deferred maintenance projects; FY 02 Refuge Comprehensive Accomplishment Report (includes Volunteer summary)

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: While the program is not duplicative of other programs, some of the activities conducted on refuges are also conducted by other programs such as restoring wetlands. Data collected for the wetlands common measures exercise indicates that the NWRS compares somewhat favorably to other FWS programs that rehabilitate and restore wetlands (this comparison excludes land acquisition for purposes of this PART). The Refuge Comprehensive Accomplishment Report indicates that in FY 2001 and 2002, the NWRS spent $17,559,000 to restore 92,804 acres of wetlands. This calculates to an average cost of $189 per acre or 5,291 acres restored per million dollars invested. A second area in which the Refuge System demonstrates effective accomplishment of goals is in the production of waterfowl. Data collected by the FWS show that the Refuge system has a disproportionately positive impact on waterfowl. Although waterfowl production areas, easements, and the National Wildlife Refuge system account for less than 2 percent of the landscape in the prairie pothole region, they are responsible for producing nearly 23 percent of thisarea's waterfowl.

Evidence: Wetlands Common Measures data

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	50%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Some reviews of this type have occurred; however, they tend not to be comprehensive in nature. In general an outside group reviews certain segments of the program and points out deficiencies which the NWRS then reacts to and attempts to correct where appropriate.

Evidence: Science-Based Stewardship: Recommendations for Implementing the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act; Cooperative Alliance for Refuge Enhancement - Shortchanging America's Wildlife, A Report on the National Wildlife Refuge System Funding Crisis.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	50%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

Measure: Percent of acres of NWRS lands and waters with habitat in good or better condition (based on classification to be developed).

Additional Information: Productive Habitats Measure••New classification index to be developed.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Long-term and Annual

Measure: Percent of populations of indicator species with improved or stable numbers.

Additional Information: Healthy Fish, Wildlife, and Plant Populations (excluding Threatened and Endangered Species) Measure

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Long-term and Annual

Measure: Percent of NWRS recovery tasks in approved Recovery Plans that are completed.

Additional Information: Threatened and Endangered Fish, Wildlife, and Plants Recovery Measure

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Annual

Measure: Number of NWRS acres affected by aquatic and terrestrial invasive species controlled.

Additional Information: This is the number of acres annually treated for invasive species.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Annual
2001	170,000	187,000		
2002	187,000	217,945		
2003	217,945			
2004	341,945			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Wildlife Refuge Operations and Maintenance
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	50%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

Measure: Percent of refuges meeting Federal or State standards for air quality, water quality, and contamination.

Additional Information: Healthy Ecosystem - Combined Air Quality, Water Quality, and Environmental contamination Measure••EPA and state standards to be used. More detailed measures will be below this level.•Baseline is 21 Wilderness Areas areas currently in NWRS.

Year Target Actual **Measure Term:** Long-term and Annual

Measure: Percent of Refuges that provide compatible wildlife-dependent recreation programs where compatiblity determinations indicate such programs can exist.

Additional Information: Wildlife-Dependent Recreation Measure Measured/judged by visitor surveys.

Year Target Actual **Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Percent of refuges with surface and groundwater resources protected necessary to fulfill refuge and NWRS purposes.

Additional Information: Healthy Ecosystem - Water Quantity Measure

Year Target Actual **Measure Term:** Long-term and Annual

Measure: Facilities are in fair or better condition as measured by the Facility Condition Index.

Additional Information: Infrastructure Measure (not equipment). Each facility type will likely have specific measures that help inform this composite number.

Year Target Actual **Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Acres of wetlands restored per million dollars expended.

Additional Information: Efficiency Measure (using operations and maintenance costs only, not land acquisition.

Year Target Actual **Measure Term:** Annual (Efficiency Measure)

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Research & Development Programs

Name of Program: Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Studies

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	MMS's mission statement is "To manage the mineral resources on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) in an environmentally sound and safe manner …" Resources include oil, gas, and other marine minerals. Currently, only oil, natural gas, and limited amounts of sand and gravel are extracted from the OCS. The Environmental Studies Program (ESP) provides the necessary environmental information for MMS decision makers and states, and local governments to ensure that offshore activities are conducted in an environmentally safe manner.	The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA) established policy for the management of the OCS natural gas and oil-leasing program and for the protection of marine and coastal environments: 1) establish information needed for assessment and management of environmental impacts; 2) predict impacts on the marine biota; and 3) monitor human, marine, and coastal environments to identify significant changes.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	MMS oversees energy and mineral extraction from the OCS. The ESP supports the MMS OCS leasing program by providing environmental information that is used by decision makers to develop Interior's 5-year OCS leasing program and other OCS activities without harming the environment. In the context of the DOI Strategic Plan (draft) for supporting a society *capable of responsibly meeting its resource needs to sustain a dynamic economy*, the ESP directly supports the Departments Goal of managing resources to enhance public benefit, promote responsible use, and ensure optimal value. Furthermore, the ESP supports the President's Energy Policy which directs the Secretary of the Interior to continue OCS oil and gas leasing and approval of exploration and development plans on predictable schedules.	The production of oil and gas on the OCS accounts for over 25 percent of both the Nation's annual oil and natural gas production. In addition, MMS estimates that in FY2003 they will collect nearly $4 billion in OCS revenues from leasing activities. The ESP's annually revised Studies Development Plan "publicly" outlines issues for proposed research for the next FY in its "Identification of Information Needs" section and strategically lays out potential future issues for FY+ 2 years and further out. The ESP focuses on the collection of information and conduct of research to address information needs of other Interior OCS oil and gas and marine minerals programs. The program activities and schedules (e.g. leasing schedule, development plans) are reviewed annually to establish the specific information needs that can be addressed through the ESP.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	The environmental studies program is unique because it is focused on oil, gas and marine mineral extraction on the OCS. MMS alone has the mandate to develop environmental assessment information in support of offshore oil and gas leasing and development activities. The OCSLA directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct the OCS offshore oil and gas program, and this responsibility has been delegated to the MMS. Furthermore, the President's Energy Policy directs the Secretary of the Interior to continue OCS oil and gas leasing and approval of exploration and development plans on predictable schedules. Other Federal regulatory agencies review and comment on MMS's environmental study findings. In addition, other Federal agencies study and monitor marine and coastal environments but have different missions. The ESP coordinates extensively with other Federal research programs to minimize duplication of effort and to maximize opportunities for collaboration and cost sharing.	The MMS conducts regular public meetings and workshops to: 1) identify current and future program issues -- emerging concerns, issues, and directions; and 2) identify the means with which to acquire the information and/or resolve the issues. Information needs or issues which cannot be resolved through other means (such as information from other sources/programs) are then developed as topics for research. To avoid the potential of performing redundant research, the ESP coordinates extensively with both stakeholders and researchers. Such coordination, for example, led to the MMS study "Research on Sperm Whales and their Responses to Seismic Exploration in the Gulf of Mexico". The study is being conducted cooperatively with several academic institutions, government agencies, and industry and is leading to the resolution of multiple aspects of an issue with numerous facets and with significant cost leveraging.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Over 90 percent of the research is conducted externally through competitive contracts, cooperative agreements and interagency agreements. The ESP coordinates extensively with other Federal research programs, states, and industry to: 1) minimize duplication of effort: 2) maximize opportunities for collaboration and cost sharing, and 3) to prioritize research efforts.	The scope of the interest or "problem" could be defined in the context of revenues received and energy produced from offshore oil and gas activities. Environmental research represents a relatively small but highly cost effective investment. MMS created an independent Minerals Advisory Board which provides a formal mechanism for consultation with affected states and other interested parities on all aspects of leasing, exploration, development, and protection of offshore resources. As part of this Board, the OCS Scientific Committee advises MMS on the feasibility, appropriateness, and scientific value of the ESP; reviews the information produced by the ESP and may recommend changes in scope, direction or emphasis; and reflects, through its membership, a balance of scientific and technical disciplines considered important to the management of the ESP.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5 (RD 1)	*Does the program effectively articulate potential public benefits?*	Yes	The ESP supports MMS's offshore oil, gas, and marine minerals program which provides multiple benefits to the public and does so in a safe and environmentally sound manner. It directly supports DOI draft Goal 2.1 *Manage Resources to enhance Public Benefit, Promote Responsible Use, and Ensure Optimal Value*. The ESP is one means by which the MMS demonstrates its commitment to environmental protection through the use of the highest quality science for decision making.	OCS program benefits are articulated in the 5 Year EIS, including its research. It is communicated through multiple meetings with stakeholders (e.g. Information Transfer Meetings, workshops, and web information). Publicly distributed documents such as the budget and GPRA publications articulate that activities on the OCS significantly contribute to our national energy supply. OCS activities provide more than 25% of the natural gas and oil produced in the United States and accounting for approximately $4 billion in revenue annually. MMS recently released a study on the 2000 assessment of conventionally recoverable hydrocarbon resources, reserves, production and geologic data. This study forecasts that over half of the oil and natural gas total endowment of the Gulf of Mexico, for example, remains to be discovered, The OCS has also provided 13.1 million cubic yards of sand for beach renourishment to the States of Florida, Maryland, Virginia and South Carolina. These statistics were recently provided in public testimony to the U.S. Commission on Ocean P	20%	0.2
6 (RD 2)	*If an industry-related problem, can the program explain how the market fails to motivate private investment?*	N/A	Although the oil, gas and marine minerals extraction industries use the OCS, and must meet environmental laws and regulation on their individual operations, the MMS is the steward of the Federal OCS lands. Before the extraction industries can use the OCS, the Federal government must determine if the extraction of oil, gas, and other marine minerals can be conducted in a manner that protects humane, marine, and coastal environments.		0%	
Total Section Score					**100%**	**100%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)						
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	Yes	Long term goals for the ESP are consistent with the OCSLA and the DOI Strategic Plan (draft). This long-term performance goal supports Goal 4.2 of the DOI Strategic Plan (Draft): advance knowledge through scientific Leadership and inform decisions through the application of science. To meaningfully implement Interior's goal, the ESP focuses on the needs of the overall OCS Program, by gathering information from all OCS regions concerning industry trends, leasing and development schedules and plans, environmental issues, and environmental information needs on a 5-year horizon.	The Five Year ESP Strategic Plan (1998-2002) and the annually revised Studies Development Plans The latest version documents the information needs to be addressed by the MMS ESP through 2005. Also, Goal 4.2 of the DOI Strategic Plan (Draft) articulates 3 Strategies, all of which are supported by the ESP: *expand the scientific knowledge base, enhance the quality and objectivity of DOI science, and lead and facilitate exchange and use of knowledge*.	11%	0.1
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	Yes	The ESP National Studies List is developed annually based on long-term goals articulated in OCSLA and other program documents such as the annually, revised Studies Development Plan. ESP uses the list to prioritize study efforts. The MMS is drafting goals to support the DOI Strategic Plan (draft), measures for improving assessment and information for decision making .	The National Studies List represents the short-term goals of the ESP. The DOI Strategic Plan (draft) establishes the measure for the use of ESP research in decision documents (Strategy 4.2.a).	11%	0.1
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	Yes	Partners (contractors) receive financial support for the sole purpose of carrying out MMS mission related research. Some partners (e.g. Coastal Marine Institutes and others involved in cooperative agreements associated with the ESP) may engage with MMS and revise their research plans to support MMS goals in an effort for both parties to effectively address mutual information needs.	The ESP does not enter into contracts, agreements, etc. unless they are supportive of annual (NSL) and long-term goals .	11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	There are no other federal, state or private sector organizations that have the same goals as articulated by OCSLA . However, the ESP takes advantage of mutual research interests and coordinates around those interests resulting in cost-sharing and leveraging of scarce financial resources.	Interagency Agreements, Memoranda of Understanding, Cooperative Agreements, etc. For example, noise in the sea is a complicated issue with various facets for multiple stakeholders. To avoid performing redundant research, the MMS ESP coordinated extensively with stakeholders and researchers leading to the study "Research on Sperm Whales and their Responses to Seismic Exploration in the Gulf of Mexico". The study is being conducted cooperatively with several academic institutions, government agencies, and industry at considerable cost-savings (leveraging).	11%	0.1
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	Yes	Periodically, MMS requests program/discipline reviews from the NRC/NAS. Annually the program is reviewed by the Scientific Committee of the MMS Advisory Board, individual program disciplines are reviewed/advised by Scientific Committee Subcommittees, and individual projects are reviewed by contractually mandated Scientific/Quality Reviewed Boards. Furthermore, OMM Strategic Plan (draft) articulates a strategy *to enhance the quality and objectivity of DOI science.*	NRC/NAS reports (1990, 1992, 1993), annual Scientific Committee letters to the MMS Director and Subcommittee Charters; and individual studies contract reviews by Scientific/Quality Review Boards; internal program reviews including two Alternative Management Control Reviews (AMCR) (1993, 1999) of the Environmental Studies Program which specifically focused on program effectiveness and studies management processes and procedures. The AMCR's included recommendations for program improvements particularly in the area of communicating with internal customers and several steps have been taken to address this issue.	11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	Yes	The program is research, and as such, cannot precisely measure the effect of small funding increases or decreases on overall program performance. However, annual budgets are based on assessments of needs developed through the annual public review Studies Development Plan and National Studies List processes. Funding affects the ability to conduct scheduled research necessary for informed decision making. Delays (financial, policy, or legislative) in leasing or development milestones could negatively impacts future energy production and revenue to the Treasury.	Historically the ESP budget declined as increased numbers of OCS areas were dropped from leasing consideration. However, funding increases have been made to support deepwater research in support of OCS development in the deepwater Gulf of Mexico. ESP funding has fluctuated and this can be associated with many factors including number of acres offered for leasing, advancement of leasing in frontier areas, and identification of new program demands such as beach renourishment (sand and gravel).	11%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	Regular discussions with internal and external program stakeholders are carried out to ensure that the process effectively considers all relevant research issues. Annually, the ESP develops its Studies Development Plan putting out for discussion with these stakeholders proposed research for the next FY and topics for research being discussed for the years to come.	Discussions with stakeholders held in conjunction with the development of the annual Studies Development Plan, Information Transfer Meetings, Workshops, meetings with both the Policy and Scientific Committees of the OCS Advisory Board and their various chartered Subcommittees, and making such materials and discussions available via the internet.	11%	0.1
8 (RD 1)	*Is evaluation of the program's continuing relevance to mission, fields of science, and other "customer" needs conducted on a regular basis?*	Yes	Accomplished through the annual Studies Development Plan Process and annual development of the National Studies List. Specifically to develop research to advance knowledge through scientific leadership and inform decisions through the application of science necessary to safeguard property and financial assets and improve quality of life for communities and trust beneficiaries (draft DOI Strategic Plan Goal 4).	Annual Scientific Review Committee meeting and HQ Memorandum (with guidance) to the OCS Regions to initiate annual Studies Development Plan process and subsequent correspondence between HQ and the Regions. The process emphasizes Strategy 3 of the DOI Strategic Plan (draft) Goal 4: Serving Communities: *Lead and Facilitate Exchange and Use of Knowledge.*	11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (RD 2)	*Has the program identified clear priorities?*	Yes	Research priorities are established through the annual Studies Development Plan (SDP) process and the annual development of the National Studies List (NSL); the SDP is the stakeholder input document and the NSL is the MMS senior management approval document. The process is accomplished through intensive discussions with the Scientific Committee of the MMS Advisory Board and its Subcommittees with additional input from other internal and external stakeholders. While the Program has an annual set of established "milestones", it also has the flexibility to address and respond "tactically" in the event of unanticipated information needs.	The annual Studies Development Plans, and the final annual National Studies List; and the publicly available annual Program Prospectus. An example of a more "tactical" issue was the accelerated industry activity in the deep and "ultra-deep" water of the Gulf of Mexico. To develop the appropriate research, the ESP coordinated the necessary input from both internal and external stakeholders through a public workshop, with peer-view provided by a Deepwater Subcommittee charted by the OCS Scientific Committee. More recently, with the public concern of mercury in the marine environment, the Scientific Committee chartered a Mercury Subcommittee to examine the issue and to provide MMS advice on any necessary new research.	12%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**100%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes, No, N/A)						
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	No	Overall, the ESP does collect timely and credible performance information, but it does not have a basic automated system to summarize project manager and research contractor performance that could be used by upper management, on a daily bases, to identify program problems before they become critical. On a project by project basis, information from contractors used to authorize the disbursement of funds. Individual projects frequently have Scientific/Quality Review Board reviews throughout the course of the research - projects can, and are, modified as appropriate.	Program summary information is developed manually causing a time lag. However, monthly/quarterly reports from contractors and final deliverables and reports from Scientific/Quality Review Boards are prepared and reviewed by management and corrective action is taken if necessary.	19%	0.0
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, sub grantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	Yes	An integral part of project management is financial and technical oversight to assure performance consistent with stated cost, schedule, and objectives.	Evaluation criteria for contract awards includes consideration of past performance.	9%	0.1
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	The ESP has consistently obligated funds in a timely manner with the exception of FY 2001. The procurement award process was disrupted by the events of September 11th and no-year funds were carried over into FY 2002. Program funds are obligated only for projects that have been approved by MMS's Associate Director of Offshore Minerals Management on the annual National Studies List.	MMS Annual Financial Reports.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	Yes	While the ESP uses a competitive procurement process for most of its contracted research, it strives to bring in new researchers. This is accomplished by frequent public meetings and workshops to inform potential researchers and to increase their familiar	Along with the MMS as a whole, the ESP is exploring components for competitive sourcing and is participating in the Bureau's e-Gov and Activity Based Costing development and implementation programs. These efforts support the electronic government initiative in the Secretary's plan for citizen centered government to use information technology to provide the public information uniquely available in the Department.	9%	0.1
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Although DOI complies with managerial cost accounting standards, it does not yet have a financial management system that fully allocates program costs and associates those costs with specific performance measures. This requirement might be met through Activity Based Costing (ABC), which DOI is adopting for each of its bureaus.		9%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	ESP has been reviewed and had been found to free of material internal control weaknesses. Although MMS has been cited for inadequate security and controls over information technology systems. This relates to ongoing Indian trust fund litigation. Procedures are in place to ensure that payments are made properly for the intended purpose. The Financial Management Branch Quality Assurance Program requires that a review be performed each month of all invoices paid in an amount equal to or greater than $250,000. The program also requires that a random sample of the remaining invoices paid during the month be performed. The purpose of the MMS quality assurance review is to: □ Ensure that invoices entered into the MMS Advanced Budget/Accounting Control and Information System (ABACIS), meet the criteria of 5 CFR Part 1315; □ Ensure that Federal resources are used consistent with agency mission; □ Ensure that the invoices recorded by MMS are both, accurate and timely; □ Ensure that interest was paid if an invoice was paid late; and □ Ensure the imaged document matches the original document.	The Minerals Management Service Financial Management Branch has written procedures that require persons responsible for scheduling payments of commercial invoices to verify the company name, address, and DUNs number prior to scheduling any invoice for payment. Once these items have been verified, the invoice is scheduled for payment. Prior to the schedule being transmitted to Treasury authorizing the disbursement of funds, the MMS Certifying Officer again reviews all invoices and payments to ensure accuracy. In addition to the above reviews, MMS has an established Quality Assurance Review Program that encompasses commercial payments.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	MMS uses Alternative Management Control Review (AMCR) on a recurring basis to evaluate program management activities. For example, the need to improve communication of program goals and objectives, scope and strategy to a diverse customer base within MMS was identified in the 1993 AMCR. Since that time the ESP has aggressively sought customer input from the many offices who are responsible for various facets of the offshore oil and gas and marine minerals program. Through its internet web pages the program office now communicates program information including goals, objectives, scope and strategy - not only to its internal customer base, but to the general public.	One deficiency identified through the AMCR's was the accessibility of Environmental Studies Program information. Over the last few years the ESP has launched web-based information for all active projects and has identified a goal of updating the web-information for all ongoing projects on a quarterly basis. In addition, the ESP has established a web-based repository for all reports so this information is freely available to the general public.	9%	0.1
8 (RD 1)	*Does the program allocate funds through a competitive, merit-based process, or, if not, does it justify funding methods and document how quality is maintained?*	Yes	Over 95 percent of the ESP research is conducted through a merit based award process and more than 90 percent is awarded through competitive contracts and cooperative agreements. The ESP utilizes a mix of funding to maximize achievement of program objectives through the use of competitive awards, cooperative agreements, interagency agreements and joint industry projects. Quality of research is maintained through establishment of Scientific/Quality Review Boards and encouragement of contractors to publish in the peer-reviewed literature.	All proposals considered for funding are subjected to merit review by MMS scientists, and sometimes scientists from other federal agencies and/or co-sponsoring industry partner.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (RD 2)	*Does competition encourage the participation of new/first-time performers through a fair and open application process?*	Yes	While the ESP uses a competitive procurement process for most of its contracted research, it strives to bring in new researchers. This is accomplished by frequent public meetings and workshops to inform potential researchers and to increase their familiarity with ESP goals, objectives, and procedures.	Many ESP awards are conducted via an open, advertised competitive process encouraging creativity. In recent years the ESP, in conjunction with the MMS Procurement Office, has conducted pre-RFP meetings to ensure that all potential researchers understand the specific issues to be addressed in an upcoming procurement. MMS also reviews planned acquisitions to determine whether any are suitable for set-aside for small and disadvantaged businesses to encourage participation of new businesses in the ESP. Finally, the ESP encourages senior researchers to use and mentor the next generation of scientists. For example during the first six years of the MMS/State of Louisiana Coastal Marine Institute cooperative agreement to jointly address information needs of the MMS and the State, 14 postdoctoral associates, 26 doctoral candidates, 22 master's candidates, and 38 undergraduate students were involved with, and supported by, 50 MMS/State of Louisiana research projects.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
10 (RD 3)	*Does the program adequately define appropriate termination points and other decision points?*	Yes	The ESP is predicated on the continuation of the offshore oil and gas and marine minerals programs. Individual ESP projects have set schedules and budgets with defined final deliverables specified in award documents. These schedules are established to ensure that the information is available for specific decision-making endpoints.	Delivery schedules are specified in individual contracts. The delivery of scientific information is critical to the mission of the ESP as its supports both the draft Department's Goal of *managing resources to enhance public benefit, promote responsible use, and ensure optimal value*. This timeliness is critical in light of the President's Energy Plan which includes the continuation of "...*OCS oil and gas leasing and approval of exploration and development plans on predictable schedules*."	9%	0.1
11 (RD 4)	*If the program includes technology development or construction or operation of a facility, does the program clearly define deliverables and required capability/performance characteristics and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?*	N/A			0%	
Total Section Score					**100%**	**72%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)						
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	Large Exten	Multiple program reviews have given the ESP high marks while offering constructive criticism. The goals of the ESP, as established by the OCSLA, are in direct support of the MMS in its role as manager of the Nation's OCS energy and nonenergy mineral resources. MMS's long-term strategy seeks to: assess the availability of OCS energy and nonenergy resources; determine, in consultation with affected parties, if the resources can be developed in an environmentally sound manner; and regulate all operations activities when leasing occurs to ensure safety and environmental protection. The rating reflects the lack of adequate quantification of measures. However, it is recognized that establishing practical and meaningful performance measures for research is inherently difficult.	Independent evaluations by the NRC/NAS and internal evaluations such as the PMAT and the AMCR provide the benchmarks by which the program has been assessing its progress in achieving its goals. The goals of the ESP were established by the OCSLA and include: 1) to establish the information needed for assessment and management of environmental impacts from OCS activities; 2) to predict impacts on the marine biota which may result form chronic, low level pollution or large spills associated with OCS production from drilling fluids and cuttings discharges, pipeline emplacements, or onshore facilities; and 3) to monitor human marine and coastal environments to provide time series and data trend information. Also, findings of adequacy of information available for resource management decisions demonstrates progress in achieving long term goals.	25%	0.2

Long-Term Goal I:	To establish the information needed for assessment and management of environmental impacts from OCS activities.
Target:	To provide the information needed to completed Agency NEPA documents, support agency and departmental decisions regarding the OCS program, and to address specific issues/questions as they develop during the course of the OCS program.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Multiple studies completed in all OCS Regions addressing those information needs identified by program stakeholders during the ESP planning process.
Long-Term Goal II:	To predict impacts on the marine biota which may result from chronic, low level pollution or large spills associated with OCS production from drilling fluids and cuttings discharges, pipeline emplacements, or onshore facilities.
Target:	To increase available information, and the availability of the information, on biological resources and fates and effects of impact producing agents.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	ESP Information System, web site, posters, reports available to the public, public meetings & conferences, continual encouragement of researchers to publish in the peer reviewed literature.
Long-Term Goal III:	To monitor human marine and coastal environments to provide time series and data trend information.
Target:	To identify significant changes in the quality and productivity of these environments and to identify the causes of these changes.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	MMS leads in developing state-of-the-art monitoring protocols and techniques as demonstrated by the highly successful Flower Gardens National Marine Sanctuary, Chemosynthetic Communities, Pacific Region's Marine Intertidal Team, and the Alaska Beaufort Sea Bowhead Whale monitoring programs.				
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	Large Exten	Performance goals are achieved through assessment and prioritization of information needs, execution of procurement award process (initiation of new research), and technical oversight of ongoing research. *The resulting research is specifically intended to advance knowledge through scientific leadership and inform decisions through the application of science necessary to safeguard property and financial assets and improve quality of life for communities and trust beneficiaries (DOI Strategic Plan Goal 4). The rating reflects the lack of adequate quantification of measures. However, it is recognized that establishing practical and meaningful performance measures for research is inherently difficult.*	Annual establishment of research priorities through the Studies Development Plan (SDP) process; development of the National Studies List for Senior MMS Management review and approval; and finally, the awarding/initiation of new research (primarily through an open competitive procurement process).	25%	0.2

Key Goal I:	Perform annual assessment of information needs with stakeholders leading to the development and finalization of the NSL
Performance Target:	Hold annual discourse with stakeholders of the OCS oil and gas and marine minerals programs regarding the most pressing information needs.
Actual Performance:	Discussions are completed and final approval of the National Studies List by the Associate Director OMM reflects stakeholder needs and priorities.
Key Goal II:	Complete detailed project designs and procurement award activities
Performance Target:	Timely design of individual research projects reflecting the needs and priorities of the approved National Studies List and their award through the Procurement Process.
Actual Performance:	Successful award of projects reflecting the information needs of the approved National Studies List.
Key Goal III:	Maintain the technical and financial oversight of ongoing research efforts and ensure dissemination of results from completed efforts.
Performance Target:	Proper contract financial and technical oversight ensuring that contract performance is consistent with stated cost, schedule, and objectives of award. Disseminate all final deliverables received.
Actual Performance:	Timely and accurate receipt of project information such as monthly and quarterly reports in order to disburse obligated funds. Where necessary, modifying contracts as appropriate.

Complete detailed project designs and procurement award activities

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	Large Extent	This is not easily demonstrated in the context of conducting research. However, the ESP disseminates information on its research program including proposed research areas. In some cases, entities conducting related research will propose to partner with MMS to share resources thereby reducing costs to both. Also, MMS thoroughly reviews existing research from all sources to identify information gaps, to avoid duplication of effort. The rating reflects the lack of adequate quantification of measures. However, it is recognized that establishing practical and meaningful performance measures for research is inherently difficult.	Increasing our use of the internet to disseminate information on the ESP, public meeting, Science Committee, etc.	25%	0.2
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	N/A	The environmental studies program is unique because it is focused on oil, gas and marine mineral extraction on the OCS. MMS alone has the mandate to develop environmental assessment information in support of offshore oil and gas leasing and development activities. The OCSLA directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct the OCS offshore oil and gas program, and this responsibility has been delegated to the MMS. Furthermore, the President's Energy Policy directs the Secretary of the Interior to continue OCS oil and gas leasing and approval of exploration and development plans on predictable schedules. Other Federal regulatory agencies review and comment on MMS's environmental study findings. In addition, other Federal agencies study and monitor marine and coastal environments but have different missions. The ESP coordinates extensively with other Federal research programs to minimize duplication of effort and to maximize opportunities for collaboration and cost sharing. The rating reflects the lack of adequate quantification of measures. However, it is recognized that establishing practical and meaning measures for research is inherently difficult.		0%	

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	Yes	The GAO review of the ESP (1988) found that customers were satisfied with the usefulness, timeliness, and quality of the program studies. In 1986 the MMS requested that the NAS undertake a review of the ESP which lasted six years, cost approximately $1 million and produced six reports on various technical disciplines, information adequacy for certain OCS areas, and ESP program management. The NAS (1993) review included the following conclusions/recommendations: (1) The ESP has provided important and useful information to inform decisions about the OCS and has contributed significantly to the accumulation of knowledge about the continental shelf; (2) MMS should strengthen the role and place more importance on advice from the Scientific Committee; (3) MMS should increase emphasis of post-lease studies and consider increasing the priority for studies in the Gulf of Mexico; (4) MMS is commended for increasing academic involvement in the ESP, and is commended for its cooperative programs with other federal agencies.	GAO review (1988), NAS/NRC reviews (1990, 1992, 1993), letter to the MMS Director from the OCS Scientific Committee of the MMS Advisory Board on the excellent progress concerning ESP activities in initiating deepwater studies; findings of two Alternative Management Control Reviews (1993, 1999). Evaluations by the Scientific Committee (1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002) indicate commendations for information technology initiatives and continued support for ESP efforts which synthesize existing information. The full Scientific Committee endorsed the MMS Deepwater Studies Plan (1998-99) and endorsed the continued development of new starts for the 1999-2000 plan providing additional endorsement of the ESP. The Scientific Committee conducted a review of MMS responsiveness to the NAS recommendations at its 1995 meeting and passed a resolution indicating satisfaction with MMS progress towards addressing those recommendations.	25%	0.3
6 (RD 1)	*If the program includes construction of a facility, were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?*	N/A			0%	
Total Section Score					**100%**	**75%**

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Direct Federal Programs

Name of Program: PARTNERS FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The Partners program purpose is to provide technical and financial assistance to private landowners who voluntarily wish to restore fish and wildlife habitat on their lands. Fish and wildlife habitat restoration projects are limited to habitat for Federal trust species by law. There is no specific legislative declared purpose for the Partners Program (the program is authorized under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956); however, the program's purpose, as described in Partners' program policies, has consensus among interested parties. The program purpose is not to acquire interests in the land but to facilitate private land treatments that have a durable impact on Federal trust fish and wildlife species.	**Legislation:** Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 gives the Service general authority to conduct fish and wildlife projects, **FWS Policy:** Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife **Service Manual Chapters** (interim operating draft since 1997) (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, 504 FW 10) . **Federal Trust Species:** A wide range of federal legislation and executive orders provide the Service with principal trust responsibility to protect and conserve migratory birds, threatened and endangered species, certain marine mammals, and inter-jurisdictional fisheries (see authorizing statutes pages 26-34 of FY2003 budget justification). **Solicitor's Opinion on Private Lands:** May 29, 1996 Memo from Director to Directorate transmitting to the field the Solicitor's Opinion on authorities permitting FWS to obligate public funds for private land habitat restoration projects.	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Loss or degradation of habitat is a leading cause of declining Federal trust species populations (i.e., migratory birds, inter-jurisdictional fish, threatened and endangered species). For example, nationwide 53% of all wetlands have been lost, 90% of native prairie is gone, 70% of riparian (streamside) habitat has been lost, and 3.6 million miles of streams have been degraded. Additionally, there are water quality and supply problems, invasive species, habitat fragmentation, and declining watershed health which all lead to declining population health due to limited available habitat. With over 70 percent of our Nation's land in private ownership, most of the Federal trust species the FWS is charged with conserving for future generations live on or use private lands. Fortunately, many private landowners are interested in providing fish and wildlife habitat on their own lands. The Partners Program provides one-on-one technical assistance and financial assistance (cost-sharing) to private landowners who undertake habitat restoration projects on their land.	**Scientific Documentation of Degraded Habitats: e.g.,** Status and Trends of Wetlands in the Conterminous US 1986-1997. United States Shorebird Conservation Plan 2001. Status of the States: Innovative State Strategies for Biodiversity Conservation 2001. Our Natural Legacy Delaware's Biodiversity Conservation Partnership 2001, Stream Steward Restoration Guide, U.S. FWS Waterfowl Population Status 2002, The State of Our Environment Commonwealth of Massachusetts 2000, Kentucky Alive Report of the Kentucky Biodiversity Task Force 1995, The Landscape Project NJ Endangered and nongame Species Program, The North American Bird Conservation Initiative in the United States: A Vision of American Bird Conservation 2000. **WAITING LIST:** Over 2000 landowners on the waiting list each year show public interest in the program.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	The Partners program plays a significant part in efforts to restore habitat on private lands that are used by federal trust species. This significant impact is a direct reflection of the programs ability to successfully leverage program funds with private land owners' financial and in-kind contributions. By meeting and exceeding Partners goal of leveraging of Federal dollars one-to-one with private landowner contributions, the Partners program has a significant impact on habitat restoration on private lands. Without the Partners Program, private landowners would not have access to state-of-the-art restoration expertise and custom-made restoration plans and they would not have the financial means to restore habitat. The thousands of individual on-the-ground restoration projects contribute significantly to the achievement of the project's output goals as well as long-term outcome related habitat restoration goals.	**Leveraging**: The program is designed to focus funds and resources on habitat restoration on private lands; the program works with landowners and other contributing partners to leverage funds and resources. Program has maximum flexibility to cost-share with multiple parties on any project. **FWS Policy:** Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program, Fish and Wildlife Service Manual (Chapter 640 FW 1) establishes goal of at least 50 percent cost-share and in-kind services. No funds are released to the landowner until the project is certified complete and correct. FY 2001 Partners **Accomplishment Report:** 1:1 cost-share goal achieved (value of $25 million in partner funds and in-kind contributions); 3,036 landowner agreements entered into during year; 48,800 wetland acres restored/enhanced; 335,000 uplands restored/enhanced; 1,022 miles of riparian and instream habitat restored/enhanced.	20%	0.2
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	No	There are a handful of programs within the Federal government that help private landowners restore and conserve habitat on their lands including the FWS Coastal Program, USDA Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program (WHIP), and the USDA Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP). The Partners program avoids duplication of effort by prohibiting the expenditure of restoration funds on Federal and State lands, prohibits replacing USDA funds with FWS restoration funds on joint projects, and doesn't do compensatory mitigation. None of the other similar programs have been able to successfully recreate the high level of technical expertise, program flexibility, or the very critical one-on-one relationship with the private landowner associated with the Partners program. The WHIP program is the most similar with a goal of "providing cost-sharing assistance to landowners developing habitat for upland wildlife, wetland wildlife, threatened and endangered species, fish and other types of wildlife." Landowners seek out the Partners Program because of the program's expertise in fish and wildlife habitat restoration, minimal response time, track record of successful projects, and personal commitment of the program reps. Unlike most State-sponsored programs, the Partners Program does not require public access to restored sites.	**Other Conservation Programs:** Currently WHIP offers some of these services but the program applicant must be knowledgeable about restoration techniques in order to prepare the application and there are limits on partnerships. WRP 10-year agreements offer some of these services but only for wetlands and only if your land has an agricultural history. **Related Program Appropriations for FY 2002:** Partners=$37M ($26M excluding earmarks), WHIP=$15M, Coastal program=$11M. Other relevant programs include WRP and CRP. State Summaries: Each State describes their unique methods of working with landowners to restore habitat. **Testimonials:** Private landowners have written letters and emails to the Service indicating that they preferred working with the Partners Program rather than the USDA programs. **Waiting List:** Accomplishment reports identify unmet need (i.e., waiting list).	20%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	The current flexible, cost-shared program design has proved to be a logical method for encouraging habitat restoration and conservation on private lands while ensuring accountability and performance. When the program was first created in the 1980s many states wanted the program to be designed as a grant program to the states. After more than 15 years, however, the cost-share design has proved to be logical and successful. Great care is taken to design restoration on working lands. Decades of biological expertise and track record of restoration enables the program to tailor restoration to the site, the landowner's needs, and the ecological community.	**FWS Policy:** Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife Service Manual Chapters (interim operating draft since 1997) (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, 504 FW 10). Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program, Program Activities: **State Summaries** identifying the tailoring of projects. **Monitoring report** for Wisconsin: Survey of program participants in Wisconsin indicated that 89% of the landowners intended to maintain the restored habitat after the agreement period expired.	20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**80%**

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	Yes	The Program's goal is to facilitate the restoration of habitat on private lands in a sufficient quantity, quality and location to ensure that Federal trust species continue to exist for future generations. To achieve this outcome, the program has set 5-year output goals, and annual output goals described in terms of acres and miles of priority habitats to be restored through voluntary agreements. The 5-year goals appear to be overly ambitious as currently stated in FWS Strategic Plans. The program contributes substantially to DOI Outcome Goal 1.2 - Sustained biological communities on DOI managed and influenced lands and waters. As part of the Environment/Wetlands Common Measures activity, an efficiency-based goal may be developed. Output goals are used in part because of the difficulty in obtaining measurable outcome data.	**Strategic Plans:** U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Strategic Plan 9/30/1997 - 9/30/2002. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Strategic Plan FY2000-FY2005. **Annual Plans:** FY02 Annual Performance Plan & FY00 Annual Performance Report, FY03 Annual Performance Plan & FY01 Annual Performance Report. **PFW State Sheets:** show accomplishments by State and long-term goals by State. **GPRA Regional Targets:** breakout of performance targets and accomplishments for FY01 & FY00. See section IV, question 1 for goals.	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	Yes	The Program has annual performance measures stated in terms of acres and miles of restored wetlands, uplands, riparian, and in-stream habitat achieved through voluntary agreements. Annual targets are set each year based on previous year accomplishments. The program contributes substantially to DOI Outcome Goal 1.2 - Sustained biological communities on DOI managed and influenced lands and waters. As part of the Environment/Wetlands Common Measures activity, an efficiency-based goal may be developed.	**Strategic Plans:** U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Strategic Plan 9/30/1997 - 9/30/2002. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Strategic Plan FY2000-FY2005. **Annual Plans:** FY02 Annual Performance Plan & FY00 Annual Performance Report, FY03 Annual Performance Plan & FY01 Annual Performance Report. **PFW State Sheets:** show accomplishments by State and long-term goals by State. **GPRA Regional Targets:** breakout of performance targets and accomplishments for FY01 & FY00. See section IV, question 2 for goals.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	Yes	Landowners and NGO's that contribute to the projects support the long-term and annual goals of the program. All contributors (financial or technical assistance) are required to sign an agreement that specifically identifies by project the number of acres of miles, location, habitat type to be restored, timetable, and duration of agreement. NGO's have expressed their support for the goals by contributing to the projects and sending letters of support. Policy requires Landowner Agreements to include accountability information such as acres to be restored, funds committed, timetable for completion. Partners Policy requires all projects to be certified complete by the Partners biologist prior to the dispersal of any cost-share. Obligating documents refer to specific projects. Accomplishment reports are based on actual acres restored by a project not the anticipated acreage. Partners Policy requires monitoring periodically during the agreement period. The Habitat Information Tracking System (HabITS) includes obligating dates and project completion dates.	**FWS Policy**: Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife Service Manual Chapters (interim operating draft since 1997) (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, 504 FW 10). **Testimonials** from landowners and other partnering organizations. **Landowner Agreements**. **Cooperative Agreements. Memoranda of Understanding.**	20%	0.2
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	The Partners Program began in 1987 and has worked with 27,000 landowners and 100's of other contributing partners. One of our biggest partners is USDA which has numerous conservation programs. The Partners Program, through guidance, limits redundancy and strives for complementary activities when operating in the same watershed or site. At the state level, the program enters into arrangements whereby the Service, an NGO, and NRCS jointly hire an individual to deliver all three programs; that individual is able to use the most applicable program to the issue at hand.	**MOU with NRCS** for WRP delivery. **FWS Policy**: Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife Service Manual Chapters (interim operating draft since 1997) (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, 504 FW 10) describes in detail how Partners coordinates with NRCS and FSA to implement the conservation provisions of the Farm Bill. **Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002** PL 107-171 enacted May 13, 2002, also known as the "Farm Bill": WRP legislation and regulations identifies FWS role. **New York Reimbursable Agreement** between FWS and NRCS for WRP. Agreement between Wisconsin Waterfowl Assoc & NRCS & FWS for WRP. **Testimonials** from non-government organizations show support and coordination. **State sheets** showing partners.	8%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	No	The program does not have regularly scheduled objective, independent evaluations to examine how well the program is accomplishing its mission and meeting its long-term goals. Gaps in performance are generally addressed informally among program managers and FWS planning staff. However, this process doesn't appear to capture larger strategic planning issues that regular evaluations may have identified such as the program's overly ambitious 5 yr goal. The Partners program recently volunteered to undergo an in-depth program review of management and administration through the FWS's Management Control Review process during 2002. In 1997, the IG reviewed the Partners Program and found that it was accomplishing its goals. Recommendations for improving management and administration of the program have been written into policy or guidance and adopted.	**Management Control Review. IG Audit 1997.** Chemung County Soil and Water Conservation District Legislative Briefing (**Program Report Cards**), **Wisconsin-Assessment** of landowner Participation and Habitat Accomplishments, One Acre at a Time **Video** of landowner testimonials.	13%	0.0
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	While the implications on program performance can be determined based on various funding levels, budgeting and performance planning are not integrated. Annual budgeting for the program is not based on a determination of the level of financial resources needed to obtain annual and long-term goals. Since the program knows the costs of restoring habitats in different parts of the country, it can predict acreage accomplishments by habitat type based on available funding. Program budget requests to the FWS generally reflect an effort to achieve program output goals over an extended timeframe but not the current five year long-term goal.	**FWS Policy:** Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife Service Manual Chapters (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, & 504 FW 10) (interim operating draft since 1997) specifies that funding will be used only for restoration on private lands. **Allocation formulas** for funding increases. **Annual FWS Budget Justification.**	8%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	No	While the Service has informal procedures for adjusting targets for the long-term goals in its current strategic plan, the current long-term goal has not been adjusted to realistic program expectations. The initial long-term goal targets were set by Service management teams, who were program experts in the particular goal area. At the end of each reporting year, the Planning and Evaluation Staff reviews the final year data and compares it to the long-term goal targets to determine if the targets are attainable. Recommendations for adjusting the long-term targets are discussed with the appropriate program manager, who reviews the suggestion with senior management who has responsibility for the goal. However, during the PART process it became obvious that this process was not working as expected as it was acknowledged that the current LT goal target is overly ambitious, unlikely to be attained, and not consistent with the Program's expectations. Recent actions will likely help to address this deficiency (e.g. incorporating performance goals/measures into SES managers performance plans). Also, the Partners Program is currently undergoing an indepth review of program management and administration via the Service's Management Control Review process.	The Program exercises close coordination with the FWS Planning Office and provides or confirms planning activities and annual accomplishment targets. The Program conducts Regional and Field Office reviews of the program on a regular basis. The Program is currently undergoing a Management Control Review. The FWS conducts stakeholder meetings and sends out questionnaires to stakeholders every 3 years to identify stakeholder priorities and concerns and to incorporate them into strategic planning.	13%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**68%**

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	Yes	Annual accomplishment reports quantitatively and qualitatively describe program accomplishments by region. Tables and narrative explanations explain the benefits and significance of the projects. All accomplishment reports identify partners and their contributions and performance. The performance reports are used by the Program to adjust priorities and activities in a watershed. Once a habitat goal is met in one watershed, the Program moves on to another watershed. Landowner agreements are very specific with respect to performance. The program uses the information to adaptively manage the program by adjusting priorities based on accomplishment of goals in a watershed. For example, the Program has shifted invasive species funds from Alaska (which doesn't have many opportunities) to another Region with better opportunities and replaced Alaska's funds with fish habitat funds (for which they do have opportunities).	**Annual Partners Program Accomplishment Reports. Habitat Information Tracking System** (a web-based data system that allows field personnel to enter project data into the national database any time). **Landowner Agreements. Allocation formulas.**	14%	0.1
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	While SES level managers and landowners are held directly accountable for performance results, field managers are not. Recently, the FWS included GPRA performance goals/measures in the performance plans of all SES managers. This provides a layer of accountability for setting and accomplishing long-term and annual performance goals. Field managers, however, are simply charged in their official Performance Plans to administer the Partners Program to optimize accomplishments and cost efficiencies. While these field managers must submit accomplishment reports there are no criteria or processes to ensure cost, schedule, or performance results are accomplished. Landowner & cooperative agreements contain specific performance measures (acres and miles of habitat to be restored), costs, timetables, and agreement duration. Landowners are not issued the cost-share until the project is certified complete by the Partners biologist. Landowners who remove the restoration before the end of the agreement period are required to refund the cost-share to the government.	**Landowner Agreements, Cooperative Agreements, SES Managers Performance Plan; Program Manager Performance Plans**	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	For FY 2001, the Partners program unobligated balance at the end of the year was roughly 3%. FWS allocates funds to the 7 Regions within 30 days of the Interior appropriations bill being signed. The Regions allocate these funds to the Field Offices within 30 days of receiving them (60 days from the Interior appropriations bill being signed). The Partners policy states that at least 70% of the habitat restoration funds must be used for on the ground habitat restoration work and no more than 30% for overhead and support. Regional Partners Coordinators review financial system statements and accomplishment reports to ensure that funds are being used by the field appropriately. Cost-sharing funds are released to the cooperator as soon as the project is certified complete and according to standards and specifications.	**Appropriated funds status reports** show Partners (1121) funds are obligated in a timely manner, M**anagement Control Review** evaluated Regional fund allocations and expenditures. **Financial reports** indicate low unobligated balances. **Financial reports and accomplishment reports** help verify funds are spent on intended purposes.	14%	0.1
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	Yes	The program has de-layered the management structure and has enabled field offices to make on-the-spot decisions on funding. The program has a cost-share goal of 50% nationwide. The program requires annual reports on accomplishments and leveraging. Program is designed to partner with almost anybody or any organization in an effort to reduce program costs and focus skills and resources on community selected projects. Program flexibility allows field offices to use the most effective methods for accomplishing restoration (e.g., in-kind services). New common measures efficiency goal may assist program in improving efficiencies and cost effectiveness.	**FWS Policy:** Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife Service Manual Chapters (interim operating draft since 1997) (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, 504 FW 10). **Common Measures Efficiency Goal.**	14%	0.1
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Although the Department of the Interior complies with managerial cost accounting standards, it does not yet have a financial management system that fully allocates program costs and associates those cost with specific performance measures. This requirement might be met through Activity Based Costing (ABC), which DOI is adopting for each of its bureaus. While the FWS has a cost allocation methodology to ensure that general administrative costs are allocated in a consistent manner to all activities and all appropriations of the FWS, this still does not cover the full costs of the program. The FWS is scheduled to begin implementing ABC in FY 2004.	**FWS Budget Justification, FY 2003.**	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	No	While the FWS generally employs sound financial management practices to administer all of its programs, including the Partners Program, a January 2002, independent auditor's report identified four material internal control weaknesses and one reportable condition. Of these, two apply to service-wide processes and systems that the Partners program uses. The first applicable weakness cited was untimely and inaccurate financial reporting. The second weakness was inadequate security and controls over financial Management Systems. The FWS financial management system has specific system controls in place to minimize the risk of erroneous payments. In addition, the Regional Partners Coordinators review payment transactions recorded in the financial system to ensure that they are in accordance with the program's goals and objectives. The auditors found no significant problems with improper, duplicate or erroneous payments.	**Audit Report:** U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Shared Commitments to Conservation 2001 Accountability Report of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Independent Auditors' Report, KPMG, January 21, 2002; **FWS Policy:** Financial Management System, FWS policy. Division of Finance - General Operations Budget Fiscal Year 2001 vs. Fiscal Year 2002.	14%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	The Partners Program has taken action to correct management deficiencies identified in the 1997 IG report. Additionally, Partners Program managers requested the program undergo an in-depth program management and administration review by the FWS's Service's Management Control Review process to help identify additional deficiencies.	**2002 Management Control Review is underway. FWS Policy**: Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program Fish and Wildlife Service Manual Chapters (interim operating draft since 1997) (Chapters 640 FW 1, 504 FW 1, 504 FW 2, 504 FW 4, 504 FW 5, 504 FW 10). **IG Audit** 1997. **FWS memo** addressing IG Audit. For example, FWS provided Regional and Field staff with guidance that (1) ensured that cooperative agreements are prepared and signed for all program projects, (2) ensured that project files contain adequate documentation to fully support project expenditures, and (3) clarified the types of costs that are considered when calculating cost-share.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**57%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	small extent	Based on trend analysis of historic and current Partners' program targets and results, the Partners program will not achieve its long term goals. While annual goal are routinely exceeded, even these actual accomplishment levels would fail to achieve the long term goal targets. Data for common measures exercise is being collected and may lead to an efficiency goal.	FY02 Annual Performance Plan, FY03 Annual Performance Plan, FY00 Annual Performance Report, FY01 Annual Performance Report, PFW State Sheets showing accomplishments by State, Regional breakout of targets and accomplishments FY01 & FY00.	20%	0.1

Long-Term Goal I: Improve fish and wildlife populations by restoring wetlands, uplands, and riparian and stream habitat.

Target: FY01-FY05 targets = restore 330,000 acres of wetlands, 900,000 acres of uplands, and 4,900 miles of riparian and stream habitat.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Accomplishments through FY2002 = 103,309 acres of wetlands, 441,782 acres of uplands, 1,414 miles of riparian and stream restored.				
	Long-Term Goal II:	Improve fish and wildlife populations through efficiencies as evidenced by acres of wetlands established, re-established, rehabilitated, enhanced, or protected/maintained per $1 million in total costs.				
	Target:	Targets currently being determined as part of the common measures exercise.				
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:					
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	large extent	The Program exceeded its annual targets in FY 2001 but only met two of its three targets in FY 2002. In FY 2001, the Program greatly exceeded its target for upland restoration because of unprecedented partnerships in Regions 2 and 6 and a great demand for better range management. Based on trend analysis of targets and recent program results, the annual targets are not being set high enough to achieve the long term goals. Annual goals are set annually and not based on a strategic plan to achieve long-term goals.	FY02 Annual Performance Plan, FY03 Annual Performance Plan, FY00 Annual Performance Report, FY01 Annual Performance Report, PFW State Sheets showing accomplishments by State, Regional breakout of targets and accomplishments FY01 & FY00.	20%	0.1

Key Goal I:	Improve fish and wildlife populations by restoring wetlands, uplands, and riparian and stream habitat.
Performance Target:	FY01 targets = 39,700 acres of wetlands, 65,979 acres of uplands, 324 miles of riparian and stream restored.
Actual Performance:	FY01 accomplishments = 45,787 ac wetland, 283,606 ac upland, 888 miles of riparian and stream.
Key Goal II:	Acres of wetlands established, re-established, rehabilitated, enhanced, or protected/maintained per $1 million in total costs.
Performance Target:	Targets currently being determined as part of the common measures exercise.
Actual Performance:	
Key Goal III:	
Performance Target:	
Actual Performance:	

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	large extent	Annual accomplishments have continued to increase because of a concerted effort by the program to increase the number and scope of the partnerships and to better leverage funds and resources. The program is flexible enough to incorporate new techniques and materials to lower costs. Program leverages funds and uses in-house expertise to deliver on-the-ground projects. The Program is flexible enough to skip over project sites that are unsuitable for restoration. Decision-making at the field level, with respect to project selection and design, enables the program to make the best possible fit of resource management and restoration techniques for the specific site. Partners Program representatives receive training to maintain skills and understanding of state-of-the-art restoration techniques. Periodically the program coordinators meet to exchange success and failure case studies to pass on lessons learned to other coordinators. New common measures efficiency goal may help manage for more efficiencies. The "Large Extent" is provided rather than a "Yes" because of lack of evidence of leve cost efficiencies.	**Performance:** FY02 Annual Performance Plan, FY03 Annual Performance Plan, FY00 Annual Performance Report, FY01 Annual Performance Report. **PFW State Sheets** showing accomplishments by State, Regional breakout of targets and accomplishments FY01 & FY00. **Monitoring:** biological results based on monitoring reports. **Testimonials** from landowners working in more than one Federal conservation program. Wisconsin-Assessment of landowner Participation and Habitat Accomplishments. **Habitat Information Tracking System**. **Document**s showing Washington Office expenditures covering training of Field personnel for stream restoration techniques.	20%	0.1
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	large extent	FWS provided data as part of the wetlands common measures exercise, however, no other agency in the exercise provided data so we cannot say how the Partners program compares to others performing similar wetlands activities. There is not a comprehensive evaluation or documentation comparing similar habitat restoration programs, such as USDA programs such as Wildlife Habitat Improvement Program or Wetlands Reserve Program, however, the FWS has testimonials that indicate users believe the Partners program is better than similar USDA programs.	**Performance**: FY02 Annual Performance Plan, FY03 Annual Performance Plan, FY00 Annual Performance Report, FY01 Annual Performance Report. **PFW State Sheets** showing accomplishments by State, Regional breakout of targets and accomplishments FY01 & FY00. **Monitoring:** biological results based on monitoring reports. **Testimonials** from landowners working in more than one Federal conservation program. Wisconsin-Assessment of landowner Participation and Habitat Accomplishments, One Acre at a Time Video of landowner testimonials. Monitoring reports. Testimonials from non-government organizations.	20%	0.1
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	Yes	In 1997, the IG reviewed the Partners Program and found that it was accomplishing its goals. Recommendations for improving management and administration of the program have been written into policy or guidance and adopted. Through the Service's Management Control Review process the Partners Program is currently undergoing an in-depth review of program management and administration.	Management Control Review, IG Audit 1997, OMB review 2001, Chemung County soil and Water Conservation district Legislative Briefing (Program Report Cards), Wisconsin-Assessment of landowner Participation and Habitat Accomplishments, One Acre at a Time Video of landowner testimonials. Monitoring reports. Testimonials from non-government organizations.	20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**67%**

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Partners for Fish and Wildlife
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	68%	57%	67%	

Measure: Acres of wetlands enhanced or restored through voluntary agreements to help improve fish and wildlife populations

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2005	330,000		

Measure: Acres of wetlands enhanced or restored through voluntary agreements to help improve fish and wildlife populations

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2001	39,700	45,787	
2002	33,395	57,522	
2003	39,074		
2004	41,158		

Measure: Acres of upland habitat enhanced or restored through voluntary agreements to help improve fish and wildlife populations

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2001	65,979	283,606	
2002	179,467	158,176	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Partners for Fish and Wildlife
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	68%	57%	67%	

2003	160,979
2004	197,457

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Project Planning and Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
68%	11%	75%	27%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 23%

Explanation: The Water Management/ Supply-Construction program supports Reclamation's mission by planning and constructing water supply storage facilities and conveyance systems. These projects provide service for agricultural and municipal and industrial uses, in those project areas where a federal role has been defined through planning studies, Departmental and OMB reviews, and congressional and administration action.

Evidence: Reclamation Act of 1902 and supplemental authorizations (both Reclamation-wide and project specific)

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 23%

Explanation: The program addresses a need for continued reliable water supplies in the Western United States to support existing economies, sustain production of agriculture, provide water for municipal and industrial purposes, and where consistent with other project purposes, flood control.

Evidence: The existing problems are evident with the rapid population growth and areas of the West where water is already scarce; frequent drought and water shortages are experienced; and there are increasing conflicts over limited supplies. Additional data provided at http://www.doi.gov/water2025/.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: NO Question Weight 10%

Explanation: Both the planning and construction elements of the program are similar to what is done by other federal, state, local, and private entitites, therefore the design duplicates what others are doing. When the program was initiated in the early 20th century, only the federal government had the capacility to undertake large water development projects; that is no longer the case. It should be noted that the U.S Army Corps of Engineers and Reclamation construct water resource projects; but, the Corp focuses on navigation and flood control, whereas Reclamation focuses on providing water for irrigation and, to a lesser extent, municipal, residential, and industrial supplies. Beside differences in project purposes, there is a clear distinction between Reclamation's and the Corp's service areas. Reclamation focuses on the 17 Western States and all project areas, for both agencies, are prescribed through legislation. The NRCS also has a water resources development capability; but, their activities are designed for on-farm improvements to serve individual farmers.

Evidence: Much of Reclamation's design and construction work is contracted out to the private sector, or is done in consultation with state or local governments. Many of these activities could be done by other entites, although Reclamation does have extensive experience managing large projects, which few others can match.Reclamation has been assigned with a variety of lead and participatory roles in several activities that must be considered during its planning and construction activities, including: Colorado River Operations; Quantification Settlement Agreement with California (www.saltonsea.water.ca.gov/crqsa/index.cfm): international issues related to Mexico and Canada; Coordinated Operating Agreement between the Federal Central Valley Project and State Water Project; interstate and interbasin issues; water transfers, such as the Fryingpan-Arkansas Project and Colorado Big Thompson Project; and Indian trust activities. In all of these activities, Reclamation has a clearly defined role.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Project Planning and Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
68%	11%	75%	27%	Demonstrated

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 23%

Explanation: Comprehensive policy guidance on construction program processes and procedures was put in place within Reclamation during the last 30 years. This included guidance for appraisal & feasibility studies, definite plan reports, value engineering, peer reviews, and oversight, construction controls, and other QA/QC measures to control quality, cost effectiveness, and project accomplishment. However, sunsetting of policy guidance and major shifts in roles within Reclamation for managing projects that occurred in the mid-1990's have limited the effectiveness of this program. As a result of an ALP review, roles and responsibilities are being re-defined. Also, processes are under review to ensure that Reclamation's P.L 638 activities are efficient and effective. New procedures are being developed to ensure construction cost estimates are current. Other issues, outside of Reclamation's direct involvement are that feasibility study and construction proponents have sometimes worked independently with Congress. These activities can circumvent established Reclamation-DOI-OMB processes.

Evidence: Historic changes presented in "Blueprint for Reform." Processes are underway to develop new Policies and Directives and Standards for this program. These documents will address issues that were identified in "Animas La-Plata Project Construction Cost Estimates," report to the Secretary of the Interior, November 2003 and additional analyses that are being made within Reclamation.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 23%

Explanation: With respect to the project planning and construction program, there is evidence that project benefits do in fact reach project beneficiaries: completing planning or construction is in this case synonymous with delivering benefits. Project benefits and beneficiaries are clearly outlined in planning documents that are presented in support of authorizing legislation. A key element of a feasibility study is to determine the beneficial use (unmet needs), evaluate data on resource demands and potential uses of water, and develop a gap analysis or needs assessment for specific project purposes and beneficiaries. Contracts and operating agreements also ensure that benefits are targeted to the appropriate audience; this latter issue will be addressed more fully in the PART on project Operations and Maintenance.

Evidence: Project beneficiaries, purposes, and service areas are identified during the planning process and are approved as part of the authorization process. This work is accomplished in accordance with the "Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies." These activities and legislative language prescribe the receipients of all project benefits. Contracts for repayment and water delivery provide further assurance that the resources are targeted at the intended beneficiaries.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Project Planning and Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
68%	11%	75%	27%	Demonstrated

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: OMB and Reclamation have reached preliminary agreement on some long-term performance goals for the construction aspect of this program, although data is not available to establish baselines for those measures. A critical measure, regarding the use of earned value analysis, is not adequately developed enough to merit a 'yes' answer. There is no agreement on adequate performance measures for project planning. Reclamation has a variety of measures that relate to meeting its long-term outcome of making water available. Most of these are closely tied to completing project planning and construction. Although some of the measures proposed show promise, the program still lacks solid measures that can help show, in a transparent manner, what progress is being achieved with taxpayer funds.

Evidence: Strategic plan, feasibility studies, construction authorizations, and agreements with project sponsors relate to this goal. Specific performance measures are also integrated into SES performance requirements.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: OMB and Reclamation have reached preliminary agreement on some long-term performance goals for the construction aspect of this program, although data is not available to establish baselines for those measures, and targets have not been established. A critical measure, regarding the use of earned value analysis, is not adequately developed, although discussions are moving in the right direction. Although Reclamation generates and uses, to a certain extent, measures to track progrss on a project-by-project basis, these measures are generally not conducive to tracking progress toward reaching desired programmatic outcomes, are not transparent, and do not help management of the program as a whole.

Evidence: The DOI Strategic plan is used to establish long-term performance measures; however, there is no clear linkage between these performance measures and estblished programmatic outcomes. Also, feasibility studies and construction authorizations provide long-term schedules and cost data that are used to establish project purposes, schedules, and costs.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: OMB and Reclamation have reached preliminary agreement on some performance goals for the construction aspect of this program, although data is not available to establish baselines for those measures, and targets have not been established, therefore it is not possible to track progress toward achieving these long-term goals. A critical measure, regarding the use of earned value assessments, is not adequately developed, although discussions are moving in the right direction.OMB and Reclamation have not reached agreement on this program's performance measures. Reclamation's annual measures are inadequate to merit a 'yes'. Reclamation measures annual progress towards acheiving the goals through 3 means: (1) sets annual GPRA targets to measure increases in acre-feet;(2) Establishes schedules and activities that are consistent with feasibility studies and authorizations.; (3) Works with partners/contractors to develop and track schedules using project planning tools, such as Critical Path Methods. Because projects take years to complete, this program contributes to the GPRA goal when a project is completed, rather than annually. Instead, Reclamation measures activities and schedules on a project by project basis. This does not contribute to either transparency in budgeting, show a clear linkage between performance and budgeting, nor help management of the program as a whole.

Evidence: Construction budgets and schedules, construction progress reports, "Watch Lists" of key programs that can impact Reclamation's budgets, and other activities are all used to establish and monitor program performance on a project by project level.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Project Planning and Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
68%	11%	75%	27%	Demonstrated

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: OMB and Reclamation have not yet reached agreement on annual performance measures. Reclamation evaluates its annual performance against specific targets to determine its progress in meeting GPRA goals. Because construction of reservoirs takes several years, it is possible that the annual performance reporting shows no new capacity produced in many years, but substantial new capacity in one year, when a reservoir is completed. New performance measures, using Regional/Area office data that are already being developed to track the progress of each project may be appropriate to measure accomplishment annually at the program level. Feasibility Studies and individual construction activities are evaluated by area and Regional office staff to ensure that work is completed in accordance with project sponsor agreements and authorizing legislation. "Watch lists" are under development to monitor progress on specific projects that could significantly impact Reclamation's budgets and other resources.

Evidence: Agreements with project sponsors, and planning and construction budgets and schedules are extensively used to establish annual goals for each project. "Watch Lists" of key programs that can impact Reclamation's budgets and other activities are being developed. GPRA annual goals may not be adequately representative of annual accomplishments because this program only contributes to the goal when a project is completed.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Project partners often attempt to circumvent the project planning process, therefore they do not support the program's goals for planning. Because partners have a large investment in planning and construction, once a project is under construction, they do support those goals on a project-by-project basis, for their own project. They do not necessarily support Reclamation's overall goals (based on meeting performance measure targets for water storage, for instance), for if their project contributed little to meeting the target, it would not likely be a priority for funding. Generally, the projects are designed to resolve major water related issues in a project area and sponsors understand that projects cannot proceed to authorization without full participation by all affected parties. Frequently, Reclamation project sponsors provide cost share funding to support construction and are responsible for repayment. Therefore, they are committed to project completion from a project's inception, through planning, and eventually construction.

Evidence: Cost-sharing agreements, repayment contracts, agreements with project sponsors, congressional testimony by project sponsors contribute to an understanding and commiitment by all parties to a common goal of completing the authorized project at the least cost. Value Engineering, Peer review, and consultant participation in design and construction activities compliments Reclamation efforts to reduce project costs, which is a goal of those project sponsors who have repayment responsibilities.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Project Planning and Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
68%	11%	75%	27%	Demonstrated

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Reclamation has not conducted any program level evaluations; what evaluations have been conducted do not meet the standards for a 'yes'. Reclamation claims that a report to the Secretary outlines plans to review planning and construction including the P.L. 638 processes, but this has not been submitted to OMB as evidence. The agency is reviewing its construction processes and guidelines to improve internal management and oversight of construction projects, but it has not yet identified any changes from that review. Additionally, Reclamation has approached the National Research Council about reviewing its project planning process. While this may meet the standards for independent reviews of sufficient scope necessary for a 'yes', that effort is in its infancy. Despite these programmatic shortcomings, Reclamation does review individual projects, and areas for improvements are applied to other projects.

Evidence: Beginning in FY2005, projects with multi-year funding greater than $10M will be reviewed, and will include consideration of the Project Cost Estimates. Reclamation's recent experience with the Animas La Plata estimated cost increase raises the question of whether the present suite of review processes are sufficiently independent and far-reaching to catch potential problems. Evidence indicates that an independent Consultants Review Board reviewed components of the Animas La Plata project in 2002, yet this board failed to mention any of the problems that just a year later resulted in revised cost estimates that were 48% above original projections. Reclamation has also established peer reviews to ensure project/program quality; these processes include the Design and Construction Coordination Team; Project Specific Management Teams; Reclamation Leadership Team; and Value Engineering Processes.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The budget does not show any clear linkage between levels of funding and performance. This is partially because performance measures have historically been lacking. Through Reclamation's current budget/planning process, budget requests describe the dollars requested per project and the planned accomplishments to be achieved that year. However, the linkage between actual accomplishments and changes in budget level is not clear. The budget also describes "completion data," the scheduled timeframe to complete the project and an estimated percent completion. The budget request and accomplishments are based on past performance and are a part of ongoing discussions on the budget with OMB, DOI, and Congress. Generally, these discussions take place on an individual project basis. The project budget requests include all direct and indirect costs. In addition to current processes, starting in FY 2006, Regions and offices will also tie their project budget request to the strategic plan outcomes and strategies.

Evidence: Budget request/justifications and Strategic Plan data will be considered in any efforts to establish linkages.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Project Planning and Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
68%	11%	75%	27%	Demonstrated

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program has taken some steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies, but the lack of connection between performance and budget, and the absence of strong performance meaures, are major areas of deficiency that remain to be addressed. Although some of these issues have been identified for some time (such as the inadequacy of equating performance with the percentage of authorized funds expended for individual projects) , it is not clear that Reclamation is taking meaningul action to address them. The agency is addressing program deficiencies, but not in a systematic fashion. Starting in FY 2006, Regions and offices will also tie their project budget requests to the strategic plan to demonstrate support of outcomes and strategies.

Evidence: Report to Secretary of the Interior, committing Reclamation to implement changes in its planning and construction program activities, including P.L. 638 contracting procedures. There are working groups established to work on program performance measures, but they have not made any recommendations.

2.CA1 **Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Each proposed construction project must undergo an assessment of the Federal interest, alternatives, and project cost estimates. Peer review and value engineering are also used to ensure cost effectiveness. The results of these assessments guide recommendations for future actions on proposed construction projects. This process may not necessarily apply to Congressional write-ins.

Evidence: In general, individual project reviews that take into account alternatives, trade-offs, cost, etc. are a normal part of planning, construction, and the authorization processes. This work is accomplished in accordance with the P&Gs (as mentioned in question 1.5). Reclamatoin recently analyzed the Animas La Plata project to determine the specific issues that affected that project's cost estimates. The results of that analyses are being used to develop new procedures for the entire Water Management/Supply-Construction program. A recent report to the Secretary oulines many of the problems associated with ALP activities.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Reclamation does not collect performance information that is useful for program management, although it does collect and use information that is helpful for indivual project management. It does not appear that Reclamation uses an earned value management system, which is important for capital asset programs such as this. Reclamation collects and reports data from projects and program partners on performance measures including % of authorized dollars expended, milestones met, and dollars obligated. Each construction project and planning study has a specific performance plan and schedule. States, Water Districts, and Native Americans, who share financial responsibilities for program accomplishment, use these data to provide oversight of Reclamation activities. These data are used by both Reclamation and project sponsors to track specific projects, identify and address concerns, and develop budget proposals.

Evidence: Under 638 contracts, Reclamation and the tribal community negotiate specific requirements for schedules, reports, and other items that relate to project implementation from planning through construction. Reclamation regional staff prepare documents as required by these agreements.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Project Planning and Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
68%	11%	75%	27%	Demonstrated

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Through the cost-sharing agreements, performance expectations and requirements are established for project sponsors and Reclamation. In construction contracts, there are provisions for damages when construction contractors miss scheduled deadlines. Funding can be withheld in extreme cases where performance is out of compliance with established project requirements. The incentives for project sponsors to meet requirements and schedules is that they are the primary recipient of projects benefits; however, local sponsors may try to avoid their shared responsibility and foist off any cost-increases on the taxpayers. For Reclamation staff, starting in FY 2003, each SES was required to include at least 1 GPRA goal and specific program/project objectives in their performance agreements, some of which may include construction projects. Reclamation will also include at least one GPRA goal or a related performance measure that ties to the strategic plan in every employee's performance agreement.

Evidence: Reclamation has increased efforts to ensure accountability in Construction program management. A significant increase in the 2003 total estimated cost to complete construction of the Animas La-Plata project resulted in major changes in construction management responsibilities within Reclamation and realignment of the federal and sponsor Project Coordination teams. Other changes, pending reviews, may impact P.L 638 construction contract processes. Individual employee performance agreements and annual performance evaluation processes are being revised to relate to GPRA. Cost-share and repayment agreements are established and monitored for compliance with the objectives of the project(s). Progress Reports are prepared to present information on % accomplishment and expenditures. Performance reports for each contract are done at the end of the construction contract. These specific project reports are considered by Reclamation staff, which has responsibility for project completion, and by project sponsors who share financial responsibilities.

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: 98% obligation rate for Reclamation overall. Reclamation reports actual expenditures and obligations in its annual reports. Some program expenditures may require modification during the fiscal year, and Reclamation has guidelines to follow to support reprogramming requests that exceed a certain threshold and require Congressional notification.

Evidence: Periodic and year-end spending reports (annual financial reports; http://www.usbr.gov/main/library)

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Planning processes require consideration of project costs and alternatives. Peer reviews, value engineering processes, maintenance of core design and construction staffing and capabilities, and A/E professional services also help ensure efficiencies and cost effectiveness. Performance ratings for key staff reflect requirements to meet GPRA goals for the program.

Evidence: P&G processes, Value engineering, A/E contracts, GPRA, Performance Plans for employees, PEER reviews, ALP construction cost tracking by Project Construction Engineer support this determination.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Project Planning and Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
68%	11%	75%	27%	Demonstrated

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Reclamation, through this program, collaborates with stakeholders, cost-sharing partners, the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (Reclamation approves irrigation elements of Corps' projects; Corps approves flood control on Reclamaton projects), states, and individual water districts.

Evidence: Federal Advisory Committee Act groups, and activities with Corps of Engineers, Central Valley Project, Central Arizona Project Indian Distribution Systems, are examples of coordination activities.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The Federal Finance Accounting system is used to track expenditures against each project on a monthly basis, and more frequently when necessary. Tracking includes auditing categories of expenditures to ensure consistency with project intent. As appropriate, every contract has a financial plan supervised by the COTR and the Contracting Officer. The COTR certifies that the information is accurate and timely. The CFO assures that Reclamation systems meet all legal and financial requirements.

Evidence: Strong program financial management practices are fully documented in an Independent Auditors' Report on Reclamation's Financial Statements for FY 2003 and FY 2002 (December 8, 2003 Memorandum from the OIG to Reclamation). The Technical Services Center has a budget group that monitors spending. Various offices in Reclamation have Budget Staffs who monitor expenditures through the Federal Financial System.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Reclamation submits quarterly progress reports to DOI on the Animas La-Plata project. Also, new directives and standards are being developed to address roles and responsibilities and the 638 processes. A "watch list" has been developed (as previously mentioned). Projects exceeding $10 million will be continually monitored by Reclamation staff. The list is for projects that are in addition to Animas La Plata.

Evidence: Reclamation established Project Management Teams that use the Earned Value Analysis procedures to ensure design efficiencies. Reclamation implemented project specific reporting requirements for construction. Also, Reclamation redefined roles and responsibilities through development of: (a)Reclamation Policy-Design and Construction; (b) Reclamation Directive-Maintenance of Design and Construction Technical Capabilities; (c) Reclamation Directive-Construction Activities; and (d) Reclamation Policy-Cost Estimating.

3.CA1 Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Program deliverables are not always clear. Activities are underway to better define oversight roles, cost estimating processes, and 638 construction contracting. Recommendations to the Commissioner are scheduled to be completed during the summer of 2004. Reclamation is also reviewing policy guidance for construction management of planning and construction phases to identify and implement changes that will improve overall management. These reviews will consider all aspects of the planning and construction program, including design and specifications, and requirements for project schedules, range of dollars, QA/QC measures, milestones, periodic assessments of accomplishment and expenditures.

Evidence: Evidence is Reclamation's assertion of ongoing studies.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Project Planning and Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
68%	11%	75%	27%	Demonstrated

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: OMB and Reclamation have reached agreement on some long-term performance goals for the construction aspect of this program, although data is not available to establish baselines for those measures. A critical measure, regarding the use of earned value analysis, is not adequately developed. There is no agreement on adequate performance measures for project planning. In general, Reclamation has had an established history of constructing its projects in a timely fashion and within budgets, but its performance measures are inadequate for tracking progress on either planning or construction. Since FY 2001, Reclamation has used a single measure to quantify its performance: acre-feet of water (water availability). While the overall Reclamation target was met when compared against FY 2005 data, the goal included information from the Rural Water and Title XVI programs. A clearer measure of performance would be based on the progress of individual projects, however there is not an adequate measure to assess this kind of progress in a general fashion.

Evidence: Program goals, including Title XVI and Rural water, are included in the FY 2003 Annual Performance and Accountability Report, Goal 1BOR2. Project specific progress reports are prepared on monthly or annual basis for use in Regional offices to manage construction activities.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: OMB and Reclamation have reached agreement on some performance goals for the construction aspect of this program, although data is not available to establish baselines for those measures. Annual performance goals have not yet been set. A critical measure, regarding the use of earned value analysis, is not adequately developed, although discussions are moving in the right direction. There is no agreement on adequate performance measures for project planning. Reclamation has tracked one GPRA goal related to completing construction projects (including Title XVI and Rural Water) and has met the goal for FY 2003. Substantial additional tracking of individual projects and commitments to project sponsors indicates that Reclamation is meeting annual performance goals.

Evidence: FY 2003 DOI Performance and Accountability Report (http://www.doi.gov/pfm/par2003/index.html)

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Although the program utilizes value engineering, with an annual report on savings, it cannot demonstrate that it has improved efficiency over time. Starting in FY 2004, the program will collect cost data on 2 ABC activities related to planning/feasibility studies and construction that will show costs for those activities; however, that information is not yet available; even if it were, it would only be establishing a baseline in its first year. The program does not have an efficiency measure, which could also be used to assess improvements in efficiency.

Evidence: Ongoing VE annual reporting and future reporting under the ABC process will be used in demonstration of cost efficiencies.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Project Planning and Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
68%	11%	75%	27%	Demonstrated

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Comparisons would be extremely expensive and difficult on a program or project level due to significant variation in project and program size and scope of activities. Also, some program activities are focused on resolving issues that are interstate, sometimes international, and frequently characterized by conflict. Therefore, comparisons can only be made on an specific activity, labor rates, or in general terms regarding how Reclamation conducts its activities.

Evidence: Reclamation uses comparable labor rates and the latest technologies, standards, practices to ensure that it is compares favorably with activities that would be conducted by A/E firms, States, or other governmental agencies. These technologies include: electronic survey equipment and software, GIS, CADD, engineering and scheduling software, Construction Specification Institute, codes and standards, manufacturing and construction methods, contracting methods, claim and dispute resolution, and engineering registration requirements. They also encourage memberships in technical and professional societies and technical workshops to ensure that staff is familiar with new and effective construction technologies. Contracts are used to obtain A/E assistance when workload and schedules cannot be met using Reclamation staffing. Evaluation of these costs indicates that they are comparable to Reclamation costs for similiar level staff activities. Reclamation is proceeding with a contract with the National Research Council to benchmark certain contsruction activities and determine Reclamation program performance.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Reclamation conducts independent, technical reviews of project activities as needed, e.g. Animas La Plata (ALP). The ALP review, regarding the significant increase in construction cost estimate of $162 million in 2003, identified problems with Reclamation requirements for construction oversight and its processes to ensure adequate cost estimates. This type of review is project specific, but identifies concerns related to Reclamation processes, program effectiveness, and the program's ability to achieve anticipated results. Also, Reclamation reviewed P.L 638 activities, and determined that further, more in-depth reviews, would be appropriate. Reclamation is beginning discussions with the NRC to initiate a comprehensive study to evaulate our construction activities.

Evidence: A report to Secretary of the Interior commits Reclamation to implement changes in its planning and construction program activities and its definitions of roles and responsibilities. The report also commits Reclamation to review its P.L. 638 contracting procedures.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Project Planning and Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
68%	11%	75%	27%	Demonstrated

4.CA1 **Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Reclamation has planned and constructed many water infrastructure projects throughout the American West, and has generally achieved its program goals. Reclamation projects are usually constructed in a timely fashion and within authorized construction cost ceilings. However, Reclamation has billions of dollars worth of authorized projects that are not undergoing construction, and will likely never be built. It is difficult to argue that these projects were constructed within established schedules. The program does have instances of projects being far off schedule and over budget (e.g., Animas La-Plata).

Evidence: Project expenditures, goals, and schedules generally conform to authorizing legislation. However, this is misleading; if projects run up against their authorized ceiling, Congress generally amends the project authorization to increase the cost ceiling. Increases in fund requirements requires agreements with project sponsors who must repay their allocated project costs and new legislation to authorize project cost increases. Therefore, strict controls afforded by these processes help ensure that the programs are completed in a timely manner and within the approved funding.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Project Planning and Construction
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
68%	11%	75%	27%	Demonstrated

Measure: Number of authorized and funded feasibility studies underway, consistent with P&Gs as issued by the Water Resources Council

Additional Information: The measure looks at the number of studies to show the level/potential for future construction projects that lead to an increase in acre-feet of stored water and cfs-miles of conveyance systems. Intent is to have a minimal level of studies underway to meet program goals.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	Baseline		
2005	5		
2006	5		
2007	5		
2008	5		

Measure: Acre-feet of storage made available by projects that have been completed (baseline and targets under development)

Additional Information: Similar to GPRA goal, but breaking out Title XVI and Rural Water. Measure includes both surface and ground-water storage. Actual vs. Forecasted. Measure relates to a significant element of Reclamation's construction program.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2004	Baseline		

Measure: CFS-Miles of Conveyance systems made available each year (baseline and targets under development).

Additional Information: Measure relates to a significant element of Reclamation's construction program. Actual vs. forecasted will be reported.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2004	Baseline		

Measure: Use earned value analysis to track progress of project construction.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Realty and Ownership Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	38%	86%	42%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The BLM administers 262 million acres of public lands mostly in western states and an additional 350 million acres of subsurface mineral estate on other federal, state, and private lands. BLM's Realty and Ownership program plays a significant role in managing these lands and consists of three major components. The first is land tenure adjustments, such as acquisition of fee title or interests in private lands (through purchase or exchange) and the disposal of fee title or interests in public lands (through sale, grant, or exchange). Substantial resources are devoted to conveyance of lands in Alaska to individuals, native corporations, and the State of Alaska. The second component provides various public and private entities with permission to use public lands for: 1) Right-of-Way (ROW) authorizations for pipelines, electric transmission lines, roads, communications sites, etc; and 2) use and development of public lands through easements, permits, leases, etc. Finally, the cadastral survey component provides land survey services on Federal and Indian lands, maintains the Public Land Survey System (PLSS), and provides leadership on cadastral data management to other Federal agencies pursuant to OMB Circular A-16.

Evidence: Primary laws and regulations: The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of October 21, 1976, as amended, (P.L. 94-579); Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.); Alaska State Grant Act (72 Stat 339-343); Title II of Public Law 106-248 (43 U.S.C. 2301-2306) the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act (Baca Bill); 43 CFR parts 2200, 2300, 2520, 2530, 2540, 2560, 2620, 2640, 2650, 2710, 2720, and 2740, 2800, 2880, 2920; Mineral Leasing Act (MLA) of 1920 as amended (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.; Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act (P.L. 95-153); 43 U.S.C § 2. Duties concerning public lands; 25 U.S.C. § 176. Survey of reservations.Note: Lands transferred under the 1872 mining law are managed through a different program that will be evaluated at a later date.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Realty and Ownership Program performs basic, ongoing functions critical to BLM's role as a land manager. The program assists in promoting more effective resource management by disposing of lands needed for development or other public objectives and acquiring other lands for environmental or open space needs; patenting lands to States, Native corporations, and individual allotees in Alaska; authorizing ROWs on Federal lands, withdrawing Federal lands from mineral entry for various purposes, or transferring them to other Federal agencies for their use; and authorizing other leases and permits for terms ranging up to 3 years for permits and 20 years for leases; maintaining the PLSS; and upholding the Secretary of the Interior's fiduciary responsibilities in Indian country.

Evidence: Public Land Statistics 2002 and 2003, showing the lands patented for various purposes, the lands acquired to benefit public programs either through exchange, purchase, or donation and use authorizations (ROWs, withdrawals, permits); BLM Annual Work Plan for 2002 and 2003. BLM Energy plan, especially items 22-31. Inventory of cadastral survey needs for 2002.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Realty and Ownership Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	38%	86%	42%	

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Realty and Ownership program is not duplicative of any other Federal, state, local, or private program. FLPMA authorizes BLM to dispose of or acquire land, or interests in land; process ROWs, leases, and permits; and process withdrawal and revocation actions with Department of the Interior's (DOI) Assistant Secretary approval. No other agency has authority to authorize FLPMA uses for public lands. Under other laws, BLM has authority to dispose of lands for other purposes, including AK land disposal, for which no other entity has the legal ability to perform. Federal agencies within DOI and the Department of Agriculture often work under BLM's survey authority. BLM is responsible for approving cadastral surveys performed by other agencies. The Interagency Cadastral Coordination Council facilitates interagency communication and cooperation.

Evidence: FLPMA, and other authorities as identified in Question 1.1. 43 U.S.C § 2. Duties concerning public lands. 25 U.S.C. § 176. Survey of reservations. Interagency Cadastral Coordination Council Charter (ICCC).Interagency Agreement Number AG2000K039 Modification 09 Between BLM and BIA.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: There is no evidence of redundancy or flaws indicating that another mechanism would be more effective in meeting the goals of the program. However, the program is hindered by a lack of adequate cost recovery in some areas. Most of the activities performed through the Realty and Ownership program are demand-based, and there is a general expectation among public land users that BLM will respond to changes in demand in a timely manner. In some cases, such as ROW processing, this has not been the case, and a substantial backlog of permits has developed. One problem is the reliance of the program on appropriated funding, which must often be estimated well in advance of the actual need. BLM is working to partially address this problem by updating its cost recovery regulations, but these regulations have not yet been finalized.In addition, the Alaska conveyance portion of the program operates in a morass of complicated Federal statutes, regulations, and case law. The resolution of conflicting claims has been prolonged as statutes have been enacted, amended, and reinterpreted, often causing completed conveyances to be reopened or survey work to be redone.

Evidence: See laws and regulations identified above in sec 1.1. BLM manuals and handbooks include specific disposal and land acquisition methodologies. Task Force Report on the exchange process, and the Secretarial Order establishing a Departmental Appraisal Group. Regulations in 43 CFR parts 2800, and 2920. BLM Annual Work Plans for fiscal years beginning in 1991, manuals and handbooks identified in the 2800 and 2920 series.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Alaska conveyance work represents a substantial and growing component of the Realty and Ownership program. The Alaska Conveyance procedures are such that only intended beneficiaries (allottees, Native Alaskan village and regional corporations, and the State of Alaska) receive land as mandated by statute. However, due to the complicated nature of the laws, regulations, and legal interpretations surrounding often-conflicting claims, the agency is challenged in effectively targeting its conveyance resources. These factors have repeatedly pushed back anticipated conveyance completion dates, and as a result, a significant portion of these funds are likely being wasted on time-consuming, inefficient processes.

Evidence: BLM Annual Work Plans for 2003 and 2004; See laws and regulations identified in 1.1 and at 43 CFR parts 2300, 2800 and 2920, SF Form 299 (see BLM website). Cost Management Review; CARS priority rating sheet (entitled "Prioritization of Cadastral Survey Requests BIA Definition Sheet"); sample list of surveys chosen to be completed in 2004.Alaska Land Transfer Program Sunset Plan (2001-2004), January 2001.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Realty and Ownership Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	38%	86%	42%	

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The BLM has developed several new performance measures and goals for the Realty and Ownership program to replace certain existing measures and complement others. While not perfect, these measures represent a substantial improvement in terms of a focus on outcomes, which in this program primarily relates to meeting customer demand. The agency will continue to work with OMB to refine and/or supplement these measures as appropriate.

Evidence: See attached list of measures.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Most of the measures are new and targets have not yet been established. In addition, for the few existing measures, it is questionable whether the targets and timeframes are ambitious. DOI and OMB are working together to establish ambitious targets and timeframes for these measures.

Evidence: N/A.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: BLM has developed annual performance measures that tier directly to the new long-term performance measures for this program. As with the long-term measures, the annual measures are not perfect but represent a substantial improvement from the past. The agency will continue to work with OMB to refine and/or supplement these measures as appropriate.

Evidence: See attached list of measures.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: As with the long-term measures, most of the annual measures are new and targets have not yet been established. For the few existing measures, it is questionable whether the targets and timeframes are ambitious. DOI and OMB are working together to establish ambitious targets and timeframes for these measures.

Evidence: N/A.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Realty and Ownership Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	38%	86%	42%	

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Work is completed through and with contractors and partners in performing program tasks, but these partners are often not held accountable for their contribution to the program's broader performance goals, in part because the program has lacked good performance measures. However, specific problems exist in some areas. Alaska conveyance work is one example where, as program partners, the State of Alaska and native corporations are often reluctant and/or slow to make their land selections as provided for in statute. This creates a substantial burden for BLM in completing conveyance work in a timely and efficient manner. Another challenge involves processing ROWs across several federal land management boundaries. Often other federal agencies have different priorities, making BLM's effort to process these ROWs more difficult and time consuming. BLM has taken steps to improve coordination and priority setting with other bureaus, but problems still remain.

Evidence: BLM Land Acquisition Handbook series, Land Exchange regulations (43 CFR part 2200), Data Sharing Agreement between the Forest Service, MMS, and BLM.NTIA Linear ROW report.President's National Energy Policy (NEP).

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Independent evaluations have been completed on an ad hoc basis for various components of the program, but no evaluations of sufficient scope and quality are completed on a regular basis for all parts of the program.Two recent external evaluations of components of the program have been completed recently. An assessment completed by the Appraisal Foundation in FY2002 recommended land exchange and appraisal program improvements, and BLM is in the process of implementing a number of changes based on the review. In FY2003, the Office of Trust Risk Management (an office within the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians) conducted a review of all BLM cadastral survey offices to examine how well these offices meet the Secretaries fiduciary responsibilities to manage Indian Trust assets on lands. Recommendations from the report are being implemented to improve the program.Although, BLM has established a series of regular internal program reviews, these reviews do not meet the test of independence and the scope and rigor of the analyses can vary substantially.

Evidence: Appraisal Foundation Report dated October 9, 2002. Fiscal Year 2003 Management Control Review Report, Cadastral Survey Services, BLM's New Mexico and Montana State Offices -- testing MCPA submitted by OST, and OST memorandum initiating the control review.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: In most cases, BLM can predict relatively well its marginal costs of achieving additional outputs in program subcomponent, but budget requests do not report the indirect costs (such as program overhead) of achieving these outputs.Also, because good performance measures have been lacking, budget requests have typically focused on reporting program outputs (such as the number of acres to be disposed of or acquired, the anticipated number of ROWs to be authorized, the number of leases and permits, etc.) without putting these outputs in a context that demonstrates the agency is moving toward achieving its long-term performance goals. BLM is working steadily to improve the link between program budgets and performance.

Evidence: FY2004 and FY2005 BLM Budget Justifications, project budget sheets.FY 2003 and FY2004 BLM Planning Target Allocation analysis.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Realty and Ownership Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	38%	86%	42%	

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Working with OMB, the agency has developed a number of performance measures that improve the program's focus on outcomes. The agency is in in the process of establishing baseline data and targets for these measures.The agency has also been proactive in specific areas. For example, BLM has been working with other agencies to establish new ROW corridors and areas for production of renewable energy. BLM is working with the Western Utility Group in the development of potential corridor maps. BLM is coordinating with the Forest Service in the development of corridors through FS lands. This upfront planning should help improve future coordination in processing ROWs and should allow BLM to make better progress in achieving its program goals.

Evidence: See attached list of measures.Instruction Memorandum No. 2003-061 ' Right-of-Way (ROW) Corridors, ROW Use Areas, Land Use Planning.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: BLM tracks and collects data for the Realty and Ownership program through its Legacy Rehost 2000 (LR2000) and Management Information System (MIS) databases. LR 2000 tracks the number of authorizations by acreage for land disposals and acquisitions, and number of authorizations for ROW's, leases and permits, and lands withdrawn or revoked. MIS tracks cases (and acres beginning in FY 2005) and ties program outputs to expenses. Quarterly outputs by state are reviewed at mid-year, third quarter, and at year-end, and program priorities and resources are adjusted throughout the year based on state office accomplishments.

Evidence: MIS reports and LR 2000 data, including data reported in BLM's annual Public Land Statistics reports.BLM Mid-Year report -- "Review of Key Program Elements for FY 2004 MYR".NM and NV GCDB performance-based contracts.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: BLM managers are held accountable through BLM's personnel appraisal system to accomplish assigned tasks (including those accomplished through contractors) and to obligate appropriated funds, but appraisals are not linked to broader program goals. Program performance is assessed bi-annually through MIS and LR2000.

Evidence: EPPR format, and review of annual performance of managers and staff; FY 2004 Annual Work Plan; Planning Target Allocations for FY 2003 and FY 2004.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Realty and Ownership Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	38%	86%	42%	

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Program funds (appropriated and cost reimbursable) are obligated properly and in a timely manner. Funds are obligated for the various use authorization activities, according to established criteria and program direction.BLM has established a guideline for its offices to allow no more than 2% carryover. In 2002, the Realty and Ownership program carried over 1.2% of available funding and in 2003, the program carried over 0.5% of its funds. Internal quarterly reviews are also used to ensure that funds are spent for the intended purpose.

Evidence: FY2003 and FY2004 Annual Work Plans, General Directives MIS and LR 2000 reports. FY 2003-2004 Appropriations language, Planning Target Allocation analysis for FY2003. Wind Energy plan of development (POD). Cost Management Review.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The BLM uses its MIS to track the performance and unit costs for all programs. An annual performance analysis is conducted to compare offices in achieving reduced unit costs and maximum output. BLM is a leader in the Department of the Interior in implementing IT solutions to improve management processes. BLM's Activity-Based Costing (ABC) system and MIS are being used as templates for other bureaus as DOI works to develop an integrated Department-wide system.MIS inputs provide data on costs for processing various types of land tenure and use authorization actions. BLM has authority for and is increasing the use of cost reimbursement for processing ROWs. Application forms for many types of applications are provided to customers on BLM's website. Through E-Gov initiatives, BLM is developing systems so applications can be filed and bill payments can be made electronically. Competitive sourcing/contracting is being used to complete cadastral survey work that has been deemed commercial in nature. The program also recently created standards for the use of global positioning systems (GPS) in completing cadastral surveys, a technology that could significantly improve efficiencies in the program.

Evidence: GAO Report 03-503 identifies BLM's performance budgeting system as an example that may be duplicated by the Forest Service in order to improve accountability.FY2003 and FY2004 Annual Work Plans, MIS and LR 2000 reports.The Cadastral Survey Program recently created standards for the use of global positioning systems (GPS).

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The various aspects of the Realty and Ownership program require continuous coordination with other BLM programs (e.g., cultural, wildlife, recreation programs) as well as other components of the Realty program (e.g., the Alaska conveyance workload is inextricably tied to the availability of survey plats generated by the cadastral survey group). BLM enters into a wide variety of agreements with industry, state governments, and other federal agencies which have jurisdiction and/or interest in BLM realty actions.Federal agencies within DOI and the Department of Agriculture often work under the survey authority of the BLM, and the Interagency Cadastral Coordination Council, which is part of the cadastral survey program component, facilitates interagency communication and cooperation.

Evidence: Sample Letters of Intent; ICCC Charter; Data Sharing Agreement between the Forest Service, MMS, and BLM.BLM Legacy Rehost 2000 System Internal Service Level Agreement (July 2004).Interagency Agreement Number AG2000K039 Modification 09 Between BLM and BIA.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Realty and Ownership Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	38%	86%	42%	

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: BLM has received seven consecutive unqualified audit opinions, of which the realty and ownership program is a significant component. Key to its success has been the availability of timely and accurate financial information made available to all employees through its MIS. BLM has also met or exceeded its goals under the Prompt Payment Act and goals to reduce or eliminate erroneous payments.A GAO Audit conducted in 2000 (GAO RCED-00-73) found a significant error in the use of escrow accounts to allow processing of several land exchanges involving one proponent. To resolve this issue, BLM offices were instructed to immediately stop using such escrow accounts and treat each exchange as an independent action. Of the program reports reviewed to date, none show any improprieties. There are no current material weaknesses identified in the program.

Evidence: Status of Pending Office of Inspector General Audits (May 1, 2004), MIS data, recent audit reports, 2004 BLM Planning Target Allocation Cost Management Review, GAO report RCED-00-73.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Management reviews and monitoring trips are performed to address and correct management deficiencies as they are identified. BLM is also in the process of linking individual performance evaluations to program performance goals and measures. The agency is working to address a longstanding management problem in one area of the program. Numerous GAO and IG reports over many years have pointed out problems with BLM's land exchange process. More recently, an assessment completed by the Appraisal Foundation in 2002 identified specific problems with BLM's land appraisal process and recommended changes to ensure the integrity of the program. The Department recently took a major step to address these problems by establishing a separate Departmental appraisal office distinct from BLM's other realty responsibilities. BLM is also working to address other deficiencies identified by an internal working group as a result of the Appraisal Foundation report.Problems have also been identified in BLM's land sale program and while more still needs to be done, BLM is taking steps to address these problems. For example, BLM expects to soon publish a proposed rulemaking that would update the Desert Land Entry regulations to increase cost recovery for processing these applications.

Evidence: Appraisal and Exchange Workgroup Final Report (May 2003). 2004 BLM Planning Target Allocation Cost Management Review.GAO Report 01-882 'BLM and the Forest Service; Federal Taxpayers Could Benefit More From Land Sales; DOI Response to GAO report ' Letter to House Committee on Government Reform (May 2002);IM 2002-260 ' Policy, Guidelines, and Procedures for Processing Color-of-Title Claims.IM 2002-197 ' Alternative Methods for Monitoring Compliance on Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) Act Leases and PatentsIM 2002-143 ' Competitive Sale of Public Lands; and IM 2003-259 ' Non Competitive Sale of Public Lands.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:25%

Explanation: Previous performance measures were inadequate in determining program performance. New measures have been developed, but baseline data and targets are not yet available for some measures, so progress is difficult to assess for many program components.However, the Realty and Ownership program is an established program with, at a generic level, fairly straightforward goals related to meeting customer demand. Even though BLM's past performance measures have not focused sufficiently on outcomes, the link between the outputs that BLM does track and the broader program outcomes is relatively clear.Based on the output data that BLM does collect on a regular basis, it appears the agency is making some progress toward its outcome goals. Thus, the program receives partial credit for this question.

Evidence: See attached list of measures, 2004 and 2005 Budget Justifications, MIS, Public Land Statistics, Year end reports on acreage for Alaska.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Realty and Ownership Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	38%	86%	42%	

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 25%

Explanation: As with BLM's long-term goals, previous performance measures were inadequate in determining program performance, but based on the output data available, it appears the agency is making some progress toward its outcome goals. Thus, the program receives partial credit for this question.

Evidence: See attached list of measures, 2004 and 2005 Budget Justifications.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 25%

Explanation: Improved efficiencies to the Realty Use Authorization program include: identification of additional ROW corridors and the use of master agreements (e.g., Master Agreement with Nevada Power) between ROW applicants and BLM. New wind energy ROW policy provides guidance on processing wind energy ROW applications. The Cadastral Survey Program has achieved efficiencies through contracting, and IT studies at the State level identify which survey research methods provide the best value. The Cadastral Survey Program employs technological advances such as global positioning systems, survey-based geographic information systems, and the geographic coordinate database to increase performance. While some efficiencies are obvious, the program could do a somewhat better job at documenting how program improvements have increased efficiencies and/or cost effectiveness.

Evidence: IM 2003-060 and changes 1 and 2. FY 2005 Budget Justification. FY 2004 Annual Work Plan; FY2004 Planning Target Allocation Cost Management Review; Master Agreement with Nevada Power.BLM analysis of cost savings from use of GIS in cadastral survey program (May 2000).

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: A few other Federal land management agencies have authorities for acquiring lands and authorizing land uses, but these authorities vary so much from BLM's broad authorities that they are not readily comparable. No known studies comparing such processes have been completed to our knowledge. The BLM, as authorized by Congress, is the only agency in the Federal government that can perform official surveys on Federally-managed lands. Similar authority does not apply to the private sector.

Evidence: Relevant statutes as identified in Question 1.1.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Realty and Ownership Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	38%	86%	42%	

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: SMALL EXTENT

Question Weight 25%

Explanation: Because the program lacks independent evaluations of sufficient scope, quality, and regularity covering all parts of the program, BLM cannot fully demonstrate that the program is meeting this requirement.Most independent evaluations of the Realty and Ownership program have focused on parts of the program where problems were already known to exist. Numerous GAO and OIG reports over the years have highlighted problems with BLM land exchanges and related issues. Although these reports indicated clear deficiencies, BLM has addressed or is in the process of addressing some of the most pressing problems.GAO and OIG reports emphasizing ROW processing concentrated on two issues: the need to improve cost recovery and the collection of rents for ROWs on public lands. Cost recovery regulations, which will update cost recovery category fees, are in the final stages of preparation. BLM has been prohibited by Congress from preparing any studies related to the updating of ROW rentals.

Evidence: Agency actions to respond to prior OIG and GAO reports (as previously identified); Appraisal Institute Report and response prepared by the team assigned to make recommendations to correct deficiencies.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Realty and Ownership Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	38%	86%	42%	

Measure: Percent of land conveyed to the State and Alaskan Native Corporations as required by statute. (Targets under development.)

Additional Information: Measures the extent of BLM progress in meeting its statutory responsibilities to convey certain lands to the State of Alaska and Alaska Native Corporations as required under the Alaska Statehood Act and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (as amended by the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act). Targets will be established to assess both annual and long-term performance.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2003			
2004			
2005			
2006			

Measure: Percent of total acreage of land sales offerred by competitive or modified competitive means.

Additional Information: Measures the extent to which BLM is using competitive processes in the sale of public lands. Competitive bid processes are generally viewed as providing the best return to the government (and by extension the taxpaying public).

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2003			
2004			
2005			
2006			

Measure: Percent of high priority Federal and Indian lands with completed modern brass cap cadastral surveys as identified in the Cadastral Survey Three-Year Plan.

Additional Information: Measures BLM progress in achieving the survey goals identified in the agency's Five-Year Plan.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2003			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Realty and Ownership Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	38%	86%	42%	

2004			
2005			
2006			

Measure: Percent of cadastral surveys completed within 18 months of being funded.

Additional Information: Measures the timeliness of the program in meeting the needs of cadastral survey customers.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2003			
2004			
2005			
2006			

Measure: Number and percent of pending cases of right-of-way permits and grant applications in backlog status.

Additional Information: Measures BLM progress in eliminating its ROW backlog.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2003	NA	1740	
2004	NA	1007	
2005	UD	NA	
2006	UD	NA	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Realty and Ownership Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	38%	86%	42%	

Measure: Average cost to process a minor category right-of-way permit or grant application. (Major types of rights-of-way reported separately. Targets under development)

Additional Information: Measures the cost efficiency with which BLM processes various types of ROWs (as defined as "minor" ROWs in 43 CFR 2800).

Year	Target	Actual
2003		
2004		
2005		
2006		

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Average length of time required to process a minor category right-of-way permit or grant application. (Major types of rights-of-way reported separately.)

Additional Information: Measures the timeliness with which BLM processes various types of ROWs (as defined as "minor" ROWs in 43 CFR 2800).

Year	Target	Actual
2003		
2004		
2005		
2006		

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The purpose of Reclamation's Hydropower Program is to generate and provide low-cost, reliable power and ancillary services for the citizens of the 17 Western States in Reclamation's service area: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Evidence: The primary authorizing legislation is the Reclamation Act of 1902. Subsequent authorizations (The Town Sites and Power Development Acts of 1906, The Federal Water Power Act of 1920, the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and individual project authorizations) have continued to authorize power development on Reclamation Projects.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program addresses a major portion of the need for power generation in the Western U.S. The program is an integral part of the interconnected electric system, the grid of power generating and transmission facilities that generate and move power around the country. Reclamation was instrumental in supporting the system during the recent California power crisis.

Evidence: Reclamation provides power for about 2.5 million megawatt-hours of project use and 40 million megawatt-hours to other power customers annually. Reclamation also provides system support services such as load-following, voltage regulation, spinning reserve, standby reserve, and black start capability.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Congress authorized Reclamation to reclaim arid and semi-arid western lands, with hydropower generation as a byproduct of its other facilities. At that time (early 1900s), there was no competition from the private sector in western hydropower production. Although other public and private entities generate hydropower, Reclamation's role is unique in that it was one of the leaders in developing western hydropower capacity, thereby establishing its facilities as central to western hydropower generation. The inclusion of power in project purposes allowed for development of water projects by repaying part of project costs and also by directly supporting irrigation by paying part of the costs allocated to irrigation.

Evidence: Reclamation provides about 10 percent of electrical capacity and 23 percent of hydropower capacity in the western U.S., and plays a crucial role in the stability and flexibility of the West's electrical grid. Power produced at Reclamation's 58 hydropower facilities is also used for pumping water on Reclamation's projects (Reclamation-Wide Power Performance for Fiscal Year 2001; Bureau of Reclamation Power Resources Office, Business Plan, January 2002). Reclamation's powerplants annually generate over 42 billion KWh of hydroelectric energy, enough to meet the annual residential needs of 14 million people (Reclamation's Power Program, agency flier).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Reclamation's hydropower program was not designed as an integrated unit, although many of its components are operated in close coordination with each other. While it was not designed in an integrated fashion, it does not have any significant problems that inhibit effective operations and functions.

Evidence: There have been no significant findings or recommendations identified by any groups including the IG or OMB suggesting that the program has problems. Program personnel meet regularly with power customers to assure that potential problem areas are addressed in a timely manner. In addition, the program meets regularly with Federal Power Marketing Agencies (PMAs), other Federal power producers, and other regulatory agencies to assure continued compliance with existing system regulations, requirements, and needs.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program effectively meets the needs of beneficiaries, which include project users and also power customers that benefit from the surplus power.

Evidence: Reclamation project beneficiaries directly benefit from the power that is generated to meet project needs. Surplus power is marketed by the PMAs. PMA marketing is directed at public non-profit entities (such as public utilities) to ensure widespread beneficial use. PMAs and Reclamation track the amount of power delivered to customers to confirm that delivery obligations are met. Revenues pay for the portion of power repayment allocated to power which helped the initial project by directly paying for a portion of project capital costs. In addition surplus power is sold to benefit water districts, municipalities, and other not-for-profit groups, with a portion of these costs used to repay some irrigation costs that are beyond the irrigators' ability to pay. The power is also used to support the Western electrical system on a daily and emergency basis. Reclamation works closely with the PMAs to coordinate and manage the multipurpose project operations to enable effective marketing, generation, and delivery of electric power.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight 11%

Explanation: The long term goal for the hydropower program is to operate and maintain the multi-purpose hydro system to provide reliable and efficient power to project users and preference customers through the PMAs. The program has recently developed new long term goals that address the ability of the powerplants to meet energy demands during peak demand periods, and to improve the overall condition and long-term viability of power facilities.

Evidence: The two new 10 year goals align with Reclamation's and the Department's strategic goals. The first goal is designed to increase unit availability during summer peak demand times when the interconnected electrical system demands are highest. This also increases the value of the various ancillary generation products and also increases the system's ability to avoid and/or recover from system emergencies. The second goal addresses long term powerplant condition by decreasing the amount of major generating components rated in poor condition. At present there are over 500 components in use that are beyond their expected useful lives with an additional 200 components reaching that point in the next ten years. In recent years the rate of upgraded or replaced components has been only 20-25 per year. An increase in this rate will likely be required to decrease the number of poor components being added to the list. See the revised Power Program Business Plan.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program goals are ambitious in that they seek to increase the unit availability to very high levels when compared to typical industry availability. In addition, the long term goal is to decrease the number of power generating components rated in poor condition, even as more of these components meet their design life. This will require making the large capital expenditures in support of an aggressive maintenance and replacement plan.

Evidence: The program goal to increase peak demand period availability increases availability during peak periods from the present 92 percent to 94 percent. This is very significant since average unit availability in the hydroelectric industry is around 88 percent. There is significant risk that this goal could be missed if a couple of large units were taken out of service for any reason. As an example, a worker leaving a wrench inside a unit after a repair caused damage resulting in the loss of 600 megawatts of capacity for over one year. The other goal of decreasing the amount of generating components that are in poor condition is also ambitious because funding depends on convincing customers that these expenditures are necessary.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program is changing its long-term goals to better document improvements in program performance. Existing annual goals and procedures can show progress toward reaching the new long-term goals. These existing annual goals will be supplemented with new annual goals.

Evidence: The present forced outage goal fits very well into achieving the new long-term goals of increasing peak demand period availability and also is a good indicator of facility condition. The present cost per megawatt goal also fits into the goal of improving facility conditions while keeping costs competitive, and will put a premium on prioritization of program expenditures. New annual goals are also being added to measure annual progress toward meeting the long-term goals of increasing unit availability during peak demand periods and also measuring improvement in facility condition.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The previous goals, although ambitious in their own right did not demonstrate that the program was making long-term improvements. The new annual goals will demonstrate program improvement. Baselines have been established for unit availability, facility condition, and annual costs.

Evidence: The goals are found in the Power Resources Program Business Plan for 2003. Each of these goals includes some key initiatives on which progress is tracked annually. They are also reflected in Reclamation's Strategic Plan and GPRA Plan. Some of the GPRA goals are to maximize power generation and efficiency by maintaining power production costs at a level comparable to the most efficient and lowest cost sector of the hydropower industry and forced outage below the industry average. In anticipation of an open market in ancillary services Reclamation has formed a hydropower optimization team that is starting to look at the hydropower optimization issue.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The Regional Power offices all participate in extensive planning meetings with the Power Marketing Agencies (PMAs) and power customers. The two PMAs in the Western U.S., Bonneville and Western, set production and maintenance goals for the year in concert with Reclamation and have ongoing meetings and discussions to set goals all the way down to as little as an hourly time goal.

Evidence: Bonneville and Reclamation agree on performance goals and incentives for Reclamation power production and outages and a capital expenditure plan. These are tracked closely and reported monthly. During the recent California power crisis Glen Canyon and Hoover powerplants were called upon to produce emergency peak hourly power to meet system emergencies that were above the planned generation schedules.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Reclamation works with the outside consultant firm of Hadden-Jackson which is known as the main player in doing hydropower assessments. This firm has an extensive database of costs and facilities of private and public hydropower plants, and conducts annual in-depth surveys and evaluations on members to determine best practices for various aspects of hydropower operations and conducts annual workshops with participants to identify weaknesses and offer suggestions for improvements.

Evidence: Reclamation has worked with Haddon-Jackson, an independent consultant generally regarded as the leader in benchmarking hydroelectric plants in North America, since 1996 and has evaluated operations at Reclamation facilities which represent almost 90 percent of Reclamation's capacity. Last year Reclamation's Parker and Davis powerplants were evaluated as the best performers in terms of performing operations and maintenance at the lowest costs of all plants in the Haddon-Jackson study. Power reviews of operations and maintenance at individual plants are conducted regularly by teams from outside the plant.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The expenditures are fully tracked by the power customers and they participate in decision making for these expenditures. By looking at long term trends it is possible to show that when facilities are neglected for lack of funding the reliability of the units is noticeably reduced.

Evidence: Budgets are reviewed and negotiated with PMAs and power customers to determine spending priorities. The forced outage rate for Reclamation's generating facilities was at much higher levels in the early 90s when funding for maintenance was not sufficient. The PMAs also negotiate on capital expenditures at individual plants and develop capital expenditure plans, which the PMAs then track.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program has changed its long-term goals to more effectively demonstrate that the program is continuing to improve. The program undertook an extensive reinvention effort in past years and worked with Reclamation stakeholders to identify how the Program could improve itself and identified areas of improvement and also identified what later became strategic goals. Also, the Reclamation Power Resources Office annually updates and publishes its strategic business plan where upcoming issues and solutions are identified.

Evidence: The Power Business Plan is updated annually in consultation with the Regional offices and other stakeholders. The new long term performance measures which will increase powerplant performance are being added. The Power Management Laboratory received the Golden Hammer Award for its work on the National Performance Review Power Management Laboratory. Reclamation meets monthly and annually with power customers to discuss upcoming problems such as major replacements and operating plans.

2.CA1 **Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program has a process that analyzes the costs and benefits of maintenance and repairs versus the risk of failure and the impact to operational costs. Major replacements and maintenance are scheduled with customer coordination to keep the price of energy stable. Although the program has not undergone an overall cost-benefit analysis, such an undertaking would not contribute much if anything to program operations, since the focus of operations is at the level of individual facilities, not the overall program.

Evidence: The program produces annual reviews that detail each facility's performance and costs. The program also has the power industry's foremost specialist, Haddon-Jackson, conduct annual audits on powerplant performance, which measure and quantify how Reclamation plants compare to other plants within the industry and identify possible program shortcomings. Reclamation also works closely with the power marketing agencies to meet scheduled power delivery requirements and works closely with power customers to evaluate plans for operations and maintenance improvements. Reclamation is involved with Hydro Quebec and the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers on developing a comprehensive risk analysis methodology to prioritize capital expenditures. This work forms the basis of Reclamation's new long-term goals.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The program closey tracks performance information, which is closely scrutinized by program partners, and used to both plan future work and to assess past performance. Data is collected on power generation, outages, and individual maintenance for all its generation units. The program collects all production cost data and collates that data into an annual performance report.

Evidence: Reclamation publishes its annual "Databook" with individual and Reclamation-wide powerplant costs and reliability with industry wide comparisons. Reclamation has recently established new baselines for its two new long-term performance measures based on five years of data for peak availability. The baseline data has recently been established for measuring progress on the new long term goals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The program and its managers continue to be under close scrutiny from power customers who monitor and participate in major operating and spending decisions. In addition, program managers now have the program goals written into their performance standards.

Evidence: Program goals are written into each Regional Director's and project manager's performance standards. Power customers continuously monitor project performance through meetings and monthly and annual performance reports. Capital and operating and maintenance expenses are also negotiated as to timing and need. Bonneville Power Administration has set performance goals for Reclamation powerplants which have a direct linkage to employee results. There is a cash incentive program whereby PMAs may make an additional cash payment to Reclamation for meeting certain targets.

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Most of Reclamation's funds are obligated and spent on schedule and very little funding carries over from one year to the next.

Evidence: Obligation rates for Reclamation have consistently been in the 95-97% range, and this is also true for the Hydropower Program.

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: An annual report is produced showing performance for each powerplant for which Reclamation has operation and maintenance responsibilities.

Evidence: The annual "Databook" report is produced showing performance for each powerplant for which Reclamation have operation and maintenance responsibilities. The performance of each powerplant is compared internally and externally with plants of similar size. Of the 25 hydroelectric powerplants over 500 megawatts in capacity, Reclamation plants ranked 1,2, 3, and 10 in lowest cost/megawatt of capacity in FY 2002.

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: The program works very closely with its power customers and especially the power marketing agencies to ensure that costs and expenditures remain as low as possible and that powerplant performance meet contracts and power system requirements.

Evidence: The program has many different Reclamation groups that meet regularly with the power marketing agencies and power customers. Some of these groups, especially those related to meeting power delivery schedules are in daily and even hourly contact to meet changing power system conditions. The program also meets with and participates within diverse industry groups such as the North American Energy Reliability Council (NERC), to establish and monitor standards that assure system reliability. In addition Reclamation meets regularly with the Corps of Engineers and Hydro Quebec, an industry partner and worldwide leader in the hydropower industry.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: All power costs are tracked in the Federal Financial system and reported annually. These costs are entered in accordance with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) accounts.

Evidence: Outside consultants evaluate and compare Reclamation operations procedures and costs with other private and public power producers. In addition, the costs of the program are reviewed during the rate setting process, which is in turn reviewed by FERC. Power customers and the PMAs continuously participate with Reclamation in the decisions related to major expenditures for operations and maintenance and capital expenditures. Reclamation has also established a working group with the Corps, Hydro Quebec, and the PMAs to coordinate facility condition assessments.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Reclamation has developed a comprehensive review program (the Power Review of Operation and Maintenance (PROM) program), which does annual and in-depth plant reviews on a regular basis. These in-depth and annual reviews reset the way operations are done and identifies maintenance priorities.

Evidence: A detailed assessment tool has been implemented which categorizes deficiencies in terms of priority of urgency and has a tracking mechanism to ensure that recommendations are implemented.

3.CA1 Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: As a provider of deliverables, Reclamation regularly meets with customers to define the amounts and timing of power production including other electrical products that support the interconnected electric grid. As a purchaser of equipment Reclamation has very tightly defined standards for performance. Reclamation has projections of long-term costs including replacement of aging equipment. These replacements are scheduled with customer coordination to keep the price of energy stable.

Evidence: As an example of Reclamation as a power provider, the Mid-Pacific Region is part of a standing technical group with Western and power customers that meets monthly to discuss maintenance schedules and has oversight responsibilities to access the "Rapid Return to Service" fund for addressing unanticipated problems. For equipment purchases Reclamation has guarantees of performance and testing to verify that contract specifications are met. Reclamation publishes its annual "Databook" with individual and Reclamation-wide powerplant costs. These costs are compared with industry-wide production costs to determine where Reclamation costs are compared to similar sized plants. In addition, Reclamation works with Hadden-Jackson to confirm that its costs are within industry norms and to point out where Reclamation could make improvements.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:16%

Explanation: The long-term goals were changed this year to reflect the changes required to achieve a 'yes' on question 2.1. Therefore there is no identifiable progress on the goal. Some of the existing annual measures can be used to indicate progress toward achieving the goal concerning long-term facility condition, but these measures have not yet been reformulated to track progress on the specific aspects of facility conditions that the new long-term measure considers, namely reducing the amount of generating components rated 'poor'. However, the new measures are a strong step in the right direction, and hopefully annual measures will show progress toward this goal in the near future.

Evidence: The program has various betterment programs underway at several powerplants and can be expected to improve future performance and condition assessment ratings. Assessment ratings of Reclamation facilities are a regular part of the existing maintenance program. However, the new long-term measures will focus on an aspect of long-term maintenance that was not previously targeted, namely reducing the amount of generating components rated 'poor'. Bonneville and Reclamation have a working team which plans and implements activities to better optimize power production at Reclamation facilities.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: The program has met its existing annual goals and will be adding new annual performance goals. The previous goals of keeping the forced outage better than the industry average will be kept. The goal of keeping the cost per megawatt in the lowest quartile will be modified to fit with the new goal of keeping costs competitive.

Evidence: The program has consistently met or exceeded its annual goals of being a low cost provider of power and also keeping forced outages below the industry average, see annual GPRA reports. New annual goals are being added this year to complement the new long-term goals of increasing daily peak power availability and improving the overall condition of Reclamation power facilities.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: The program has consistently been within budget and has been very good at meeting contract goals and responding to support the interconnected system during system emergencies, and also helping the system to quickly recover from failure.

Evidence: Reclamation has consistently met its performance goals, see annual GPRA reports. Reclamation has consistently exceeded these goals since they were first instituted. The program has experienced a significant trend in reducing forced outages. In addition, there has been a significant increase in management attention to costs now that the costs are monitored and published.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: Reclamation hydroelectric power costs are consistently among the lowest in the U.S. Reclamation compares favorably with other Federal programs, such as the hydropower program of the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers. It is not clear how Reclamation's hydropower program fares in a comparison of long-term goals, although the establishment of new long-term goals is a strong step in the right direction. The hydropower programs of both Reclamation and the Corps both face the challenge of how to set long-term goals for programs that are mature and have met the long-term goals as the programs were originally envisioned.

Evidence: Reclamation has consistently had a forced outage rate lower than the industry average of 2.5 percent. Costs/megawatt of capacity has been in the lowest cost quartile since the measure was instituted in 1998.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: The PMAs, independent contractors, and customers report on Reclamation performance and compare it with other public and private power producers. Reclamation facilities generally fare well in these comparisons.

Evidence: Contractor reports from Hadden-Jackson have outlined where plants ranks in terms of performance and made recommendations for adopting best practices.

4.CA1 Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules? Answer: YES Question Weight:16%

Explanation: The program is generally successful at achieving its program goals within budgeted costs and established schedules. One reason for this is the intense scrutiny Reclamation Operations and Maintenance activities receive from outside entities. Regional offices work with the PMAs and other power customers to establish projected outlays for operations, maintenance, and capital expenses. The costs associated with these outlays are closely tracked on an annual and long-term basis. The general goal is to meet established production goals and keeps costs within budget.

Evidence: Reclamation has consistently met its target goals since they were instituted in 1998. Reclamation annually reports on cost and outage performance of each powerplant and benchmarks it against plants of similar size. In addition, regular customer meetings establish goals for performance. As an example, the Pacific Northwest Region works closely with the Bonneville Power Administration to establish annual goals and incentives for performance which includes power production and costs. These goals are tracked closely and a report is published monthly.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

Measure: Percentage of time Reclamation hydroelectric generating units are available to the interconnected Western electrical system during daily peak summer demand periods. Long term goal is to increase from the present baseline average of 92 percent to 94 percent over the next 10 years.

Additional Information: The peak period is defined as Monday thru Friday between 7AM to 7 PM during the months of June through September. The availabililty will be calculated using a 5-year rolling average beginning with years 1998 through 2002.

Year	Target	Actual
2002	92%	92%
2003	92.2%	91%
2004	92.4%	
2005	92.6%	
2006	92.8%	

Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)

Measure: Improve the overall condition and long-term reliability of Reclamation powerplants by reducing the total amount of generating capacity that has a major generator/turbine related component rated in poor condition from the present 46 percent to 40 percent over the next ten years.

Additional Information: The major components include the unit penstock, control gate, exciter, generator, turbine runner, breaker, and tranformer.

Year	Target	Actual
2002	46%	46%
2003	45.8%	45.4%
2004	45.4%	
2005	44.8%	
2006	44.2%	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

Measure: Maintain a forced outage rate on hydropower units that is lower than the industry average for similar units. In Fy 2003 attain a 3 percent or lower rate for Reclamation hydropower units.

Additional Information: This goal is designed to keep Reclamation better than the industry average. The goal changes based on the latest industry average which is now down to 2.5.

Year	Target	Actual
2001	<3.0	1.62
2002	<3.0	1.03
2003	<3.0	1.5
2004	<2.5	
2005	<2.5	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Reclamation power production costs will be kept in the cheapest quartile of the industry for comparable hydroelectric plants (above 75%).

Additional Information: This measure will track the cost efficiency of Reclamation hydropower generation. The 1st percentile would be the most expensive hydropower generation, while the 100% percentile would be the most cost efficient, or cheapest.

Year	Target	Actual
2001	75%	86%
2002	75%	84%
2003	75%	77%
2004	75%	
2005	75%	

Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Reclamation Hydropower
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	83%	

Measure: Perform annual condition assessments at all power facilities.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2003	100	100
2004	100	
2005	100	
2006	100	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Perform comprehensive review assessments of every hydropower plant once every six years.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2003	new process	
2004	28	
2005	7	
2006	13	
2007	12	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: While the core mission of the program is clear, program authorization provides inadequate guidance to the agency as to how it should manage facilities for which is cannot provide a managing partner. Program authority states that Reclamation should get partners to manage its recreation facilities, yet there is no clear direction for what Reclamation should be doing in those instances where it cannot find project partners, or where partners have returned management back to Reclamation. Reclamation staff maintain that the purpose of the program is to (1) provide minimum recreation facilities which are required for public health, safety and accessibility; (2) provide the opportunity for others, such as managing partners and concessionaires, to provide and promote activities on Reclamation areas at little or no cost to Reclamation; and (3) minimize the risk of turn back of Reclamation recreation areas by existing managing partners. Reclamation reservoirs attract recreationists, yet the provision of recreation facilities is not part of its core mission.

Evidence: Reclamation will revise its policy statements and directives and standards covering the construction and management of recreation facilities to reflect the purposes listed. There are many project-specific legislative authorities authorizing the construction of recreation facilities; e.g. Section 8 of P.L.84-485 Colorado River Storage Project (43USC 620g): P.L.105-277, Title X, The Canyon Ferry Reservoir, Montana Act: and Title IV of P.L. 93-493 for Lake Berryessa, and general recreation legislation such as P.L. 89-72 as amended by Title XXVIII of P.L. 102-575 (16USC 4601-31). Presently Reclamation has 57 areas with minimum facilities. There are 126 management agreements with non-Federal partners and 28 with Federal partners to manage over 275 recreation areas located in Reclamation projects.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Reclamation's recreation facilities address the fact that the public flocks to the reservoirs and surrounding lands associated with BuRec water storage facilities. The program reflects the intent under section 3 of P.L. 89-72 that absent a cost sharing/managing partner, Reclamation's responsibility is limited to providing "minimum facilities for the public health and safety." In recognition of the growing demand for water-based recreation in the West, Reclamation aggressively seeks partners to assume the cost and management of recreation facilities. (A national survey conducted by the Forest Service concluded that water-based sports and activities are among the four most popular outdoor recreation activities in the U.S. and interest is growing.) Reclamation reservoirs are a magnet for those wishing to swim, fish, or boat. Recreation-related improvements, including features that are accessible to persons with disabilities, are critical to providing recreation opportunites for all people.

Evidence: From 1990 to 2000, the population of the 17 Reclamation states increased by 15 million people. Reclamation reservoirs, including those managed by Reclamation and the managing partners, are among the most popular travel destinations, attracting 90 million visits a year. Forty-six percent of these visits are to areas managed by Reclamation or non-Federal partners. Many Reclamation facilities are close to major urban areas and provide substantial recreation benefits. As a macro-estimator of potential recreational demand growth, a Forest Service Study estimates the total projected recreational activity trips in the United States per year to increase from 1.5 billion in year 2000 to 1.8 billion in year 2020. Reclamation and its partners provide opportunity for about 225 commercial concessions on Reclamation lands to provide a wide range of outdoor services and facilities for water-related and open-space recreation uses. Comparison of Population in 17 Western States.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Other entities provide recreation opportunities, and Reclamation's strategy for managing its recreation facilities is predicated on the assumption that others may be able to do a better job of managing its recreation facilities. In terms of physical excludability, the program is not redundant; e.g., there is only one Lake Mead, and only one agency can manage it. Even when others develop areas in proximity to Reclamation projects, Reclamation's facilities are still unique to the area. However, other agencies have recreation as their core mission recreation, and many other entities, governmental and non-governmental, are capable of managing Reclamation's recreation facilities. Of Reclamation's 300-plus recreation areas, only about 50 are directly managed by Reclamation. The program design could be improved, possibly by making another federal entity (such as the Park Service of Bureau of Land Management) responsible for managing Reclamation's recreation facilities.

Evidence: Where possible, the recreation facilities are turned over to other Federal, State, or local public entities to manage. For example, the 57 recreation areas managed by the Forest Service are adjacent to or within a National Forest. The Fish and Wildlife Service manages 11 areas as National Wildlife Refuges and the National Park Service has jurisdiction over 10 areas as National Recreation Areas. More than 200 areas are managed by the States as State Parks.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The recreation program design is flawed (although the concessions program design is well-designed because concessions provide the types of facilities and activities the public wants, investing private dollars for construction and activities that would otherwise be taxpayer funded). Recreation on Reclamation projects is tangential to Reclamation's core mission, therefore it has not been a high priority for funding; as a result, the quality and extent of recreation facilities varies from project to project. The extent of recreation facilities is often not aligned with demand; for instance, Reclamation may not have the resources to provide the facilities demanded, or project partners may overbuild recreation facilities, then find they do not have the financial resources to operate and maintain them; the facility is then turned back to Reclamation for management. When there is inadequate oversight of the partner by Reclamation, the facilities may become deteriorated and the partner not able or willing to make repairs. That may also result in the turn back of the area to Reclamation.

Evidence: Twenty nine recreation areas have been returned to Reclamation from State or local entities due to deterioration of facilities, inability to meet current building and safety codes, or insufficient funding. Failure to closely hold managing partners to the terms of the managing agreements contributes to this problem. When areas are returned, Reclamation often assumes the management of the resource including hiring staff and funding 100% of the recreation O&M costs. It is not feasible to close some areas because they are often adjacent to dams with interstate traffic or because, without constant law enforcement patrols, the public would continue to use the water and adjacent lands. The major reason that areas are turned back to Reclamation is that the non-Federal partner elects not to renew an expired contract, because facilities are inadequate and/or have deteriorated and upgrades will cost too much. The non-Federal partner does not want to pay for the upgrade because of limited budgets and lack of revenues generated from the facility to offset development costs. List of Areas Turned Back

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Although the program mission is unclear in terms of Reclamation's strategy and goals, the program design is effectively targeted in terms of reaching project beneficiaries. When completing Resource Management (Land Use) Plans (RMP's), local needs and the public's desire for recreation are determined before changes in management direction are considered. Reclamation has recently completed the "Resource Management Plan Guidebook" that provides direction for developing, monitoring, and updating Resource Management Plans. Reclamation has completed 31 RMP's, 19 are ongoing and 32 are planned. Reclamation managers seek out managing partners to cost share the expense of minimum facilities and to operate and maintain the facilities in the future. Often the managing partner is an entity that already manages resources in the area. Management agreements are for a specific amount of time and are renewable. Reclamation has adopted a 10-year plan to comply with universal accessibility standards by retrofitting the appropriate facilities, including Reclamation-managed recreation facilities, to provide accessibility for all persons.

Evidence: RMP's are prepared for each Reclamation area. There is extensive public involvement in this process through public meetings and opportunities for submission of written comments before final decisions are made. Before any recreation construction can begin, a written agreement or letter of commitment with a non-Federal entity must be in place including all cost-sharing requirements. Commercial Services Plans (CSP) are prepared for new concession operations and for existing operations with expiring concession contracts. There is public involvement in this planning process. Once the CSP is completed, a prospectus is developed and issued through a competitive bid process. All new concessions contracts are reviewed by technical experts. Assigned resources for improving access are tracked in the Accessibility Data Management System (ADMS) and monitored quarterly to ensure that measureable results are obtained. Resource Management Plan. Commercial Services Plan. Management Agreement. "Resource Management Plan Guidebook"

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight 11%

Explanation: Reclamation has outcome-oriented performance measures for this program. These measures link to Reclamation's goals to encourage cost sharing partners, prevent turn backs, and permit concessionaires to offer recreation services to the public; i.e., "Percent of recreation areas with community partnerships" and "Percent of concession activities with performance-based contracts." The latter measure is not an ideal long-term goal, because the infrequency of contract turnover does not allow for ready tracking of progress. The program also has long-term measures for handicapped accessibility, and customer satisfaction. All of these measures focus on outcomes.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The goals for the long-term measures are ambitious, given the low priority of this program and the difficulty of achieving these goals. The goal of maintaining the current level of partnerships is very aggressive given the economic pressures facing State and local entities across the West. Achieving performance goals for concessions contracts is delayed until the contract is renewed and is established at 39% of concession activities in FY 2008. The long-term goals for accessibility are similarly ambitious. For customer satisfaction, this is a new measure that is still establishing its baseline.

Evidence: The annual performance plan for 2005 and beyond is stated in the FY 2005 Budget Justifications. Reclamation is working on a draft "Operating Plan" to meet targets included for FY 2004-2008 as stated in the FY 2005 Budget Justifications. Reclamation has designed a computer data base called the Accessibility Data Management System (ADMS) and uses that system to track inventories, assessments, retrofits, and the recreation sites/components in compliance with accessibility standards. The Accessibility Program's 10-year plan established interim targets and detailed guidance for calculating percent compliance of area components. Improving access to recreation uses specifically targeted resources to directly benefit the public. The program focuses on three steps: (1) Evaluation of facilities to determine where barriers exist, (2) preparation of action plans to estimate costs and scheduling required retrofits; and (3) budgeting for and completion of retrofits. Contracting office and recreation planners will review the current concession contracts to determine the extent of performance-based elements.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The program has some solid annual performance measures that link to the long-term measures, several of which it shares with other Interior recreation programs. The program has an efficiency measure associated with the Recreation User Fee Demonstration Program. Two measures reflect the purpose of the program to provide minimum recreation facilities required for public health, safety and accessibility; i.e., "Percent of universally accessible facilities in relation to the total number of recreation areas" and " Facilities are in fair to good condition as measured by the Facilities Condition Index." This latter measure is still undergoing baseline development. For universal accessibility, the FY 2008 target is ensuring accessibility at 34% of Reclamation recreation areas. For the facility condition measure, the FY 2008 target will depend on targets set in the 2004 baseline, which is not yet established.

Evidence: The annual performance measures are shown in the DOI Strategic Plan and the FY 2005 Budget Justifications. The target for FY 2005 for universal access is 21% of Reclamation recreation areas. The target for FY 2005 for facilities condition will depend on the baseline presently being established.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Assesement of baseline data and targets for this program yields mixed results. The program has established baselines for some measures, but has not completed them for others, some of which are new. Because this program is a low priority for funding, the targets for facility condition and accessibility are reasonably ambitious. Collection of baseline data for the Facilities Condition Index is underway.

Evidence: Non-Federal Partners Study. ADMS Inventory/Data Base. Commissioner's Annual Report on the Status of Reclamation's Universal Accessibility Program.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?**

Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: All partners and concessionaires are committed to the goal of providing at least a minimum level of facilities. In addition, in most instances, the partner's goal is to provide more facilities and services to serve their public and recoup their expenses. However, some management agreements still provide for Federal cost sharing of recreation enhancements. Management agreements typically range from 25 years to 40 years. Existing concession agreements do not contain performance elements. Concession agreements range from 5 years to 50 years depending on the scope of operations and the concessionaire investment. The agreements and contracts reflect Reclamation's goals for recreation at the time they were executed but often do not reflect current goals. Because project partners are motivated by their own financial interests, they do not necessarily agree with Reclamation's goal to get project partners to manage facilities.

Evidence: Management Agreement. Concession Contract

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Although the program has had some reviews of its operations, these do not meet the standards necessary for a 'yes'. Evaluations of the concessions program have been done by the Inspector General and GAO and changes have been made in concessions management as a result; however, these evaluations are not periodic, and do not regularly assess program performance. They also only apply to concessions, not recreation. Field staff receives feedback from managing partners and the public as part of the public outreach efforts or in preparation of Resource Management plans or Commercial Services Plans; while these may be useful planning tools, they are neither objective nor regularly scheduled, and do not meet the standards for a 'yes'. Accessibility follow-up compliance reviews are conducted to verify and validate work accomplished as an accountability measure and for reporting quarterly. These latter reviews may be useful for assessing whether the program is meeting a certain subset of its goals, but they are not independent.

Evidence: Reclamation periodically performs recreation reviews, in conjunction with the managing partners and other stakeholders (i.e. water user entities) at each reservoir area. The overall goal is to visit each reservoir area every 3 to 5 years for such in-depth reviews, which address recreation management, basic facilities condition, land issues such as trespass and fencing needs, sensitive and endangered species (if any), invasive species and water quality. Concession reviews include OIG audits in 1995, 2000, and 2004 (ongoing). Health and safety reviews are conducted by county health services, fire marshals, and private consulting firms (such as that done on Lake Berryessa). Follow-up compliance access reviews are conducted after retrofits are completed. OIG audit reports. Reclamation reviews of managing partners and concessionaires. ADMS Action Plan.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Recreation budget requests are submitted in the overall Reclamation project budget, and not identified as a specific line item for recreation in total; there is no clear linkage between budget requests and performance. However, recreation funds are requested and allocated to meet the primary goals for recreation: provide minimum facilities, encourage partnerships, and take measures to prevent the risk of facility turn back. Starting in FY 2006, project funds will be tied to the strategic plan outcomes and strategies, demonstrating project linkages and support of recreation outcomes and strategies. Funds are requested for the completion of Resource Management Plants (RMPs) in specific project line items. Reclamation requires performance schedules from cost sharing partners as part of the budget process before requesting the Federal cost share portion. Progress is reviewed to ensure funds are being spent in accordance with schedules and funds are shifted elsewhere if performance goals are not being met.

Evidence: Strategic Plan Outcomes and Strategies are: Improve Capacities to Provide Access to Recreation -Manage Recreation Activities Seamlessly -Enhance Quality of Recreation -Promote Quality Service FY 2005 Budget Estimates. FY 2005 Budget Justifications.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Interior has taken meaningful steps to correct strategic planning deficiences, including establishing three new goals in the DOI Strategic Plan to address some of Reclamation's deficiences. Procedures are being put in place to try to stop the number of turn backs and the percent of areas managed by State and local partners is being tracked. The non-Federal Partners Study will identify the conditions that may result in a project being turned back; this might lead to providing some relief to the partner. There was no measurement of the number of performance-based concession contracts nor was there any measurement for the condition of facilities. Efforts are now in place to gather baseline data on the condition of facilities under Reclamation management. This information will be used to prioritize needs and prepare budget requests. In the past, there were no consistent facility design standards, resulting in design duplication and failure to meet accessibility guidance. This problem was remedied by the production and distribution of the "Recreation Facility Design Guidelines."

Evidence: In addition to the Non-Federal Partners Study to identify possible projects being considered for turn back, Reclamation has tried to negotiate some kind of assistance to managing partners to encourage them to stay. An example in the PN region is Potholes Reservoir which was/is managed by the State of Washington. The State was losing money (not covering their O&M costs) at the area but they were also not collecting any use or entrance fees (as their policy is not to collect entrance fees at any of their parks). Reclamation required that they collect fees in an amendment to their agreement with us. Throughout the Resource Management Plan process, local entities are approached as possible managing partners but are evaluated more thoroughly before acceptance. U. S. Department of the Interior Strategic Plan, Fiscal Year 2003-2008. FY 2005 Budget Justifications and Performance Information. 10-Year Plan for Universal Accessibility. "Recreation Facility Design Guidelines". "Sign Guidelines"

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

2.CA1 **Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity?** Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Alternatives have been assessed on a project-by-project basis, but not program-wide. When recreation developments or accessibility improvements are made they result in some capital asset construction, but not at the level which would require large, meaningful credible analyses. Alternatives are weighed when different levels of recreation development are considered (cost, number and length of trails, campground or number of campgrounds), but the ability of the prospective partner to provide the long-term financial and managerial resources for construction and O&M is not considered. New management agreements require an RMP to be done by Reclamation, the managing partner, or jointly. There has been no analysis of different ways to meet Reclamation's recreation goals. Although analyzing alternatives may not appear to apply to Reclamation's core recreation mission of finding project parnters to manage the facilities, it should apply to those facilities that Reclamation must manage itself.

Evidence: Management Agreement

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Reclamation regularly collects information from its managing partners and concessions and uses it to manage the program and improve performance. Reclamation collects information about recreation demand and use. The Non-Federal Partners Study will identify factors that result in projects being turned back to Reclamation for management. The Recreation Use Data Report collects information from managing partners and concessions on the facilities and opportunities available at the area, the fees charged and the revenues collected, and the annual visitation. Where existing management agreements provide for cost sharing, internal budget procedures require that Reclamation work with its partners to identify needed maintenance activities and potential enhancements, and to develop the priority of those actions at each site. The Reclamation activity/program manager develops a request as part of the internal budget process for the work justified. This request is further reviewed and, if approved, eventually becomes part of the request to the Department.

Evidence: Progress information on accessibility measures and other GPRA performance goals is collected quarterly. Reclamation collects and reports data on four DOI Strategic Plan recreation goals quarterly. Management reviews performance results and makes adjustments to programs/priorities to ensure targets are met or informs upper management that targets will not be met. In addition to budgeting for the routine operational costs and in collaboration with area offices representatives, the program managers prioritize the potential projects with health, safety, and accessibility improvement and upgrades being the high priority. Recreation Use Data Report. Non-Federal Partners Study

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Program partners have not always been held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results; although this appears to be changing, many existing contracts still do not hold people accountable. For example, at Lake Berryessa, Reclamation constructed Monticello Dam in the late 1950's. The National Park Service produced a plan for recreation development but Napa County, the original managing partner, did not follow the plan and allowed long-term exclusive use. When the county turned the facility back in 1975, Reclamation continued this practice and is only now developing a long-term Visitor Services Plan for more equitable use of Lake Berryessa. Plans are underway to correct this type of situation. Senior level managers are responsible for accomplishing GPRA goals. SES performance agreements now require GPRA goals and, by June 2004, 25% of Reclamation employees will be required to link their performance to a GPRA goal; however, evidence does not indicate that such a linkage is in place for the recreation program. For the most part, recreation managing partners and concessionaires are held to management agreements and contracts. Usually, Federal cost sharing is only provided as work is accomplished.

Evidence: DOI Strategic Plan Goals. GPRA Employee Performance Results (PB No. 04-5(430). Concessions Policy and Directives and Standards.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?

Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Although the poorly-designed program purpose leads to challenges, the intended purpose of providing funds to particular projects, and to recreation beneficiaries, is clear. Based on this, funds are obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose. Reclamation managers work closely with partners to develop operating and action plans and identify the timing of funding needs. Reclamation only provides funds to other Federal partners through interagency contracts as authorized under FAR regulations. Standard cost-sharing agreements are included in the financial assistance guidelines. Reclamation uses templates for grants and cooperative agreements provided in the Financial Assistance Guidelines. This question is not applicable to concessions as there is no authority to financially assist or cost-share directly with concessionaires.

Evidence: Funds are obligated by an Interagency Agreement or through a Cooperative Grant. If the funds are provided through an interagency agreement to a Federal partner, funds are usually disbursed as the Federal entity requests reimbursement - generally on either a monthly or quarterly basis. If the funds are provided through a grant to a non-Federal managing partner, disbursement is made when the partner submits an SF-270 to Reclamation. The managing partner is required to provide the appropriate documentation for review to ensure that Reclamation is paying only the allowable costs as provided for in the agreement. For areas managed directly by Reclamation, funding is requested through the established budget and priority ranking system. Activity plans are developed and implemented. Less than 5 percent of Title 28 funds were available for carryover into FY 2004. FAR

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The program does not presently have procedures to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness, and the program does not have an efficiency measure. However, in meeting Reclamation's goals for its recreation and concessions programs, it is implementing several actions to achieve these goals. Before constructing minimum facilities, Reclamation will perform a demand analysis to ascertain the size, if, any, of the facility needed. Before accepting a partner, Reclamation will encourage competition among possible managing partners to obtain the best contract for the Government. Reclamation will also ensure the partner has financial and managerial capability to live up to the terms of the proposed agreement and that the partner does not build more facilities than demand requires. Budget reviews are done frequently to ensure the maximum use of limited resources. Starting in FY 2004, Activity Based Costing started tracking the cost of certain recreation activities.

Evidence: Four ABC recreation activities. ABC plan. ADMS Inventory and Quarterly and Annual Results. Recreation.gov data base at http://www.recreation.gov. Competively Bid Concessions Contracts.

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Reclamation collaborates and coordinates with its managing partners and concessionaires to provide a quality recreation experience to the public. Often, the project partners participate in the development of an RMP and use the information to help prepare the State Park Master Plan. For example, Reclamation is assisting the State of Nebraska Parks Department with the construction of boat ramp extensions, using Title 28 cost-share funding. The actions were considered as part of the reservoir RMP. Even though the greater part of the individual facility may be paid for, constructed and operated by partner or concessionaire, Reclamation retains an oversight and stewardship responsibility for the area. Reclamation collaborates with other DOI Bureaus, the Forest Service, and the Corps of Engineers to share resources and technical expertise related to accessibility, and for training. All concessions at partner-managed areas are provided by non-Reclamation contractors.

Evidence: Participation in various program such as the Tread Lightly! Inc land stewardship program; Take Pride in America, and National Public Lands Day events to obtain volunteer help for facility restoration and maintenance; and the Healthier US initiative to promote physical and mental health through recreation on public lands. Reclamation has agreements with non-Federal entities to manage natural resources such as wildlife management areas. Examples are Prineville Reservoir and Canyon Ferry Reservoir. Section 3 of P.L. 98-552 allows Reclamation to contract with other Federal regulatory or law enforcement entities in connection with resource protection and administration of the use and occupancy of land and waters within a project. This statute allows Reclamation to cooperate in the "enforcement of the laws or ordinances of such State or political subdivision", and to provide reimbursement for expenditures incurred with resource protection and administration.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Budget requests are initiated at the field level, reviewed by subject-matter expert teams and priortized as part of the Budget Review Committee process before submission to the Department, OMB, and Congress. Concessionaires file annual financial reports and Reclamation policy requires financial feasibility analysis for new concessions. Funds are monitored on a monthly basis to ensure obligations are made on a timely basis, that the funds available are adequate to cover anticipated expenditures, and that other financial requirements such as accurals of contract earnings are identified and costs recorded appropriately. In addition, periodic internal financial reviews of agreements are conducted as well as periodic procurement reviews to ensure the financial assistance agreements have been written in accordance with FAR and that agreement terms are being honored.

Evidence: Unqualified Financial Audit Opinion. Annual Financial Reports for Concessions. Department Accounting Manual

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Reclamation has taken numerous actions to address previously identified management deficiencies. Reclamation continues to update recreation and concession-related Directives and Standards and guidance. New management agreements now require the partner to provide Reclamation a two-year notice of intent to turn the facility back instead of the previous 30-90 days. This permits Reclamation time to consider relief, seek a new partner or include funds in the budget request to Congress for project operation. Alternative managment control reviews recommended the development of RMP's. Fifty RMP's have been done or are underway. The OIG audit found that no inspection of concession operations was being performed, and these have begun. Oversight reviews of new concession contracts have begun in accordance with the OIG audit direction. Accessibility reviews are ongoing. Area office representatives make site visits during the planning, construction and ongoing management of the project, including visits to verify in-kind services. Reclamation also reviews compliance with building, health and safety codes.

Evidence: The 2000 OIG concession audit revealed that there was no oversight of new or amended concession contracts in Reclamation to ensure compliance with existing 1998 Concession Policy and Directives and Standards. Newly revised Concession Policy and D&S meet the requirements of the 2000 audit. The audit also required inspections of concession operations and the new Policy and D&S require annual inspections. Updated Directives and Standards. Resource Management Plans

3.CA1 Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Consistent with existing management agreements, Reclamation requires performance schedules from cost sharing partners as part of the budget process before requesting the Federal cost share portion. Progress is reviewed to ensure funds are being spent in accordance with schedules and funds are shifted elsewhere if management agreement conditions are not being met. Partners bill Reclamation for work completed and Reclamation sends funds to them. Depending on what the program manager has negotiated, there may be performance measures that are required and agreed upon. Each agreement is handled differently as the scope of work is different for each. Cost share terms are set by negotiation with the partner. Cost-share contracts are standardized with the exception of the negotiable terms.

Evidence: GPRA goal for performance-based contracts. Established Reclamation Budget Review Committee procedures and process for funds transfers during fiscal year. Concessions and Managing Partner agreements.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: There is some data that indicates progress toward reaching long-term goals; however, as many of those long-term goals have recently been revised, this is of limited relevance. The Criteria for Facility Condition Reviews are being reviewed before they can be implemented. The Accessibility Program is completing action plans and retrofits for FY 2004 have been initiated to the extent that resources are available to make progress towards the long-term goal. One concession contract modification is underway now to include performance-based standards. The Non-Federal Partners Study will be used to obtain advance warning of projects slated to be turned back so that available preventive measure can be taken. Any prevention of turn backs will help strengthen the goal for community partnerships. When RMP's are contemplated, Reclamation approaches State or local entities to determine possible interest as managing partners.

Evidence: Draft Facility Condition criteria. ADMS Action Plans Inventory

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program largely achieved its annual performance goals in FY 2003, although some of the annual performance goals were inadequate, and have been revised during the PART process. The annual goal/performance measure for accessibility was "By the end of FY 2003, provide access for the disabled by ensuring that Reclamation's recreation and public areas meet accessibility standards"; the target was 7 percent and the result was 12.8 percent. However, the target was exceeded because it was set based on incomplete baseline data, which was still being gathered during FY 2003. For the goal of completing recreation management reviews to establish baseline data on facility condition at all recreation facilities, Reclamation achieved 98 percent of the performance target (157 reviews). This was a cumulative goal and included the number of reviews completed between FY 2000 and FY 2002. Reclamation also exceeded the performance target to implement corrective actions on deficient facilities by completing over 95 improvements to address accessibility and maintenance issues. Three new goals have been established for 2004-2008. In FY 2004, Reclamation is evaluating facilities it operates with a "Facility Condition Index" as "poor", "fair", or "good", and is setting goals for maintaining/obtaining community partnerships and creating performance-based concession agreements. Because FY 2004 will be the first year Reclamation has measured goals on community partnerships, facility conditions, and concession performance-based agreements, no data exists yet.

Evidence: Concessions Directive and Standards. FY 2003 GPRA Annual Performance Accomplishments

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Reclamation has made some changes that will result in improved efficiency; it does not have a baseline for its new efficiency measure. Use of BLM's Sign Shop by Reclamation may ultimately result in savings that exceed $1 million every three years. Reclamation has joined the National Recreation Reservation System on-line campground service at New Melones, which will reduce time spent in taking reservations. Concession training has been held to cover evaluation of concessions and issuing RFP's for better bids. A Marina Management class covered the administrative and operational aspects of managing a marina. Negotiations are underway with the National Association of State Park Directors to develop methods to manage recreation at 200+ Reclamation areas more efficiently. Recreation-related accessibility program efforts collaborate with other Federal agencies and State, city and county governments in providing training and expertise. This has resulted in efficient sharing of resources and completion of evaluations and access improvements with managing partners.

Evidence: One of the National Recreation Lakes Leadership Council pilot projects was the development of the Water Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (WROS), a tool to allow planners and managers a framework and procedure for making better decisions for conserving high quality and diverse water recreation opportunities. WROS is being used by other Federal agencies such as the BLM and Forest Service. Memorandum of Agreement with the BLM for Construction of Signs. Concessions Policy. WROS Guidebook. Service Agreement with BLM for Accessibility Services.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: This question is not applicable for this program, because the principal goal for this program is to transfer management responsibilities of these facilities to others to manage. There has been no comparison done for those facilities that Reclamation is forced to manage because it cannot find managing partners.

Evidence: Of the 300+ designated recreation areas, only about 50 are currently managed by Reclamation and 29 of the 50 are those which were originally managed by others, but were turned back to Reclamation.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Evaluations have been of insufficient scope and quality to determine whether the program is effective and achieving results. There is some improvement associated with concessions performance, based on OIG audits in 1995 and 2000. An OIG audit of the accessibility program related to Deferred Maintenance in 1999 conveyed that the program was on track.

Evidence: OIG Accessibility Audit. Concession policy

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

4.CA1 **Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Program goals were achieved within the funds allocated through the budget process. Performance goals in 2003 were exceeded for increasing access to recreation areas. For the goals for recreation reviews, Reclamation achieved a 98 percent of performance target. Thirty-one RMP's were budgeted and all but one were completed within budgeted costs and within deadlines. Facility condition criteria are being developed now. The measures and actuals reported in the Meaures Tab do not indicate that program goals were achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules.

Evidence: Area office representatives reconcile the managing partner expenditures at the time Reclamation is billed, usually 2 to 3 times during the life of the project. Less than 5% of Title 28 funds were available for carryover into FY 2004.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

Measure: Customer satisfaction with value for fee paid

Additional Information: Measures customer satisfaction relative to the price of the recreation experience.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2005	Baseline		

Measure: Percent of fee revenue obligated to maintenance projects

Additional Information: Tracks the allocation of revenues from the recreation user fee program.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2005	Baseline		

Measure: Percent of universally accessible facilities in relation to total number of recreation areas.

Additional Information: Tracks how many facilities meet accessibility standards of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	16%		
2005	21%		
2008	34%		

Measure: Percent of recreation areas managed by partners.

Additional Information: Tracks the number of recreation areas run by non-Federal managing partners.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2004	66.6%		
2005	66.6%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

2008	80.0%	

Measure: Facilities are in fair to good condition as measured by the Facilities Condition Index (baseline and targets under development).

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	Baseline		
2005			
2008			

Measure: Percent of concession activities with performance based contracts

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2004	75%		
2008	100%		
2008	100%		

Measure: Percent of universally accessible facilities in relation to the total number of recreation areas.

Additional Information: Tracks how many facilities meet accessibility standards of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2008	34%		
2012	75%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation and Concessions
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
80%	44%	75%	33%	

Measure: Percent of concession activities with performance based contracts

Additional Information: Tracks how many concession contractors have contracts incorporating performance standards.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Annual
2004	75%			
2005	90%			
2006	95%			
2007	100%			
2008	100%			

Measure: Percent of recreation users satisfied with the quality of their recreation experience

Additional Information: This measure tracks the satisfaction of users with their recreation experience.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Long-term
2004	Baseline			

Measure: Percent of Recreation Fee receipts spent on fee collection (baseline and targets under develoment).

Additional Information: This measure tracks the efficiency of the fee collection program.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**	Annual
2005	Baseline			

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BLM is responsible for providing opportunities for outdoor recreation to the American public as part of its multiple use mandate under FLPMA. All of BLM's recreation activities support the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) strategic plan goal of providing opportunities for environmentally responsible recreation.BLM has prepared several recreation strategies to provide additional clarification for balancing recreation with other uses of the public lands as well as balancing between different types of outdoor recreation.

Evidence: BLM's authorizing statute, the Federal Land Management Policy Act of 1976 (FLPMA), clearly sets out recreation as one of BLM's multiple use goals.BLM recreation strategic planning documents including Recreation 2000, the Recreation 2000 Update, and BLM's Priorities for Recreation and Visitor Services (BLM Work Plan Fiscal Years 2003-2007) provide specific direction and purpose for managing recreation on the public lands.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The need for a variety of open space and outdoor recreation opportunities is well recognized by Congress and the American public, and the types and locations of recreation BLM provides would not otherwise be addressed by the market. BLM is the steward for managing the landscape character of over 262 million acres of land, many of which provide outstanding recreation opportunities in a variety of landscape settings.BLM public lands attract over 55 million visitors annually. These visitors are drawn to what has been characterized as 'the remnants of the American Frontier'. In many areas, BLM lands provide the best, and sometimes the only, venue for self-directed, dispersed recreation.

Evidence: Annual visitation statisics and national recreation surveys.BLM's collaborative land use planning process uses extensive public input to identify issues requiring resolution in land use plans. These plans provide much of the specific direction in managing recreation and visual resources on specific parcels of public lands.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BLM exclusively manages 262 million acres of public lands, many of which are highly valued for recreation. BLM is the only agency responsible for providing recreation access to these lands. Many of these lands provide unique and special landscapes not found elsewhere in the United States.BLM provides different recreation opportunities than those provided by the other major federal land management agencies (National Park Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, USDA Forest Service, Army Corps of Engineers, etc.) focusing on dispersed recreation, which tends to be resource-based and, therefore, less facility-dependent. Since the BLM mission differs from other agencies, BLM is able to accommodate recreation activities not permitted elsewhere.

Evidence: FLPMA Section 102 (10).BLM's National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands. (Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 require BLM to designate lands for appropriate types of Off-Highway Vehicle use.)Interagency partnerships among BLM, National Park Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and USDA Forest Service such as the Leave No Trace program to implement educational efforts and promote responsible use of public lands.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BLM faces a continuing balancing act in meeting public demand for recreation while providing for other uses of the public lands, such as energy and mineral production, grazing, etc. However, from planning through implementation, the recreation program has been designed to address and respond to this issue.While the lack of more uniform user fee practices could be considered a design flaw, BLM is, in many cases, challenged in its ability to charge recreation users for costs directly associated with providing recreation opportunities. BLM does charge fees in its more popular recreation areas, but for many dispersed recreation areas, the cost of collection is prohibitively high.

Evidence: FLPMA Section 102 (10).BLM's National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands.BLM recreation strategic planning documents (Recreation 2000, Priorities for Recreation and Visitor Services - 2003-2007 Work Plan).

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Through public participation in the land use planning process, BLM, in large part, responds to specific public demands for recreation opportunities. This process also recognizes specific local needs and tailors programs to meet these needs.BLM recreation programs emphasize 'resource-dependent recreation opportunities" such as driving for pleasure, hiking, boating, trail riding, education and interpretive activities, and OHV use. While most BLM recreation use is dispersed, BLM also provides specific access through developed recreation sites and trails, visitor centers and facilities. BLM manages this use using a variety of tools such as the issuance of Recreation Use and Special Recreation Permits.There may be limited situations where resources are not effectively targeted due to program design issues. For example, because recreation fees are only collected in certain areas, some users are arguably paying less than they should be relative to other users and/or the impacts of their activities on natural resources on BLM lands.

Evidence: BLM internal guidance requires that recreation fees be re-invested at the site of collection to ensure that those paying the fees receive the benefits from improved facilities and services at the site where the fee was paid.Educational and interpretive activities have resulted in improved public awareness concerning resource values and appropriate recreation behavior.BLM's National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands shows that BLM is placing increased management emphasis and funding on dealing with the rapid growth in OHV recreation. These efforts include route designations, signing and fencing, and educational activities including the Tread Lightly program.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight 15%

Explanation: Under the existing BLM Strategic plan, the GPRA Program Activity Goal: Provide Opportunities for Environmentally Responsible Recreation has four long-term and annual performance goals: - Percent of physical facilities in Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) in good or fair condition;- Percent of physical facilities in SRMAs that are universally accessible;- Percent of recreation users satisfied with the quality of their recreation experience; and- Percent of recreation users satisfied with the BLM's interpretation and environmental education in SRMAs.While improvements could be made to these goals, the goals generally focus on desired program outcomes. BLM should continue to work with OMB to improve and/or expand upon these goals. Specifically, the program would benefit from the use of an efficiency measure, such as the cost per visitor.

Evidence: BLM Annual Performance Plan, 2003 and Annual Performance Report, 2001.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Baselines have been established for all the annual performance measures in the recreation program, but the accuracy of the data is unclear as is the ambitiousness of the agency's targets.

Evidence: BLM Annual Performance Plan, 2003 and Annual Performance Report, 2001.Budget Justification and Performance Information, 2004.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:15%

Explanation: Currently, the BLM uses 4 annual performance measures for recreation. These may be modified somewhat upon adoption of a new Department Strategic Plan.

Evidence: Annual Performance Measures for the Recreation Management program are shown in the 2004 Budget Justifications.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Baselines have been established for all the annual performance measures in the Recreation program, but again data accuracy is an issue and the targets may not be ambitious.

Evidence: BLM Annual Performance Plan, 2003 and Annual Performance Report, 2001.Budget Justification and Performance Information, 2004.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: BLM has specifically structured its partnership arrangements to ensure that high priority recreation work is being accomplished. BLM would be unable to meet it targets without the help of partners and volunteers. Reported accomplishments include partner contributions.

Evidence: BLM enters into partnerships with other federal, state, and local agencies and private partners to leverage resources and avoid duplicative efforts. About 2/3 of all BLM's partnerships are in the recreation program with over 500 partnerships nationwide.One example is the interagency partnership among BLM, NPS, FWS, and USDA Forest Service to work with the Leave No Trace Center to implement educational efforts to promote responsible use of the public lands.Case studies of Partnerships in BLM, July 2002.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: NO Question Weight:15%

Explanation: BLM conducts a variety of annual and periodic evaluations to ensure program effectiveness and improvements, but these evaluations do not appear to meet the independence and scope criteria.

Evidence: Periodic audits of commercial operations authorized under Special Recreation Permit authority.Recreational Fee Demonstration audits.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:15%

Explanation: Program requests have traditionally been based on broad assertions of need, rather than being tied to specific performance goals and related data.

Evidence: BLM Congressional Budget Justification, 2004.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: BLM has for a number of years placed strong emphasis on developing plans and strategies for addressing recreation issues to ensure that high priority work is being accomplished that will meet both present and future needs.

Evidence: BLM recreation strategies include Recreation 2000 and BLM's FY 2003-2007 Workplan. These documents provide specific direction and purpose for managing recreation on the public lands. BLM's National Off-Highway Vehicle Strategy also recognizes the unique challenges in managing this particular type of recreation use.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:25%

Explanation: Each BLM field office regularly reports accomplishments into the Management Information System (MIS). State Offices and the Washington Office review these accomplishments against targets at several points in the year. Budget allocation adjustments and corrective actions are taken after these reviews are completed.BLM uses customer surveys to obtain user feedback on BLM performance. These surveys include the on-site surveys at developed recreation sites that provide input into the two customer satisfaction performance measures and the periodic survey administered to commercial Special Recreation Permit holders.

Evidence: 2003 Midyear Review and subsequent adjustments.Annual recreation program cost analysis conducted pursuant to Instruction Memorandum No. 2003-122. Annual report of contributed volunteer hours.Annual visitor surveys.Annual reporting of contributed funds leveraged through the Challenge Cost Share Program.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: BLM evaluates the work performance of all employees annually. Senior level managers' performance is reviewed quarterly. Where appropriate, field manager evaluations include key recreation management goals. Many elements within an employee's annual evaluation are tied to agency output measures.BLM tracks performance on 4 specific objectives related to recreation. Each objective has an assigned senior manager with lead responsibility for tracking/reporting completion or implementation progress, as well as the current status of each objective. There is also an established target date for completion or implementation.The Director's Tracking System presents the Director with the ability to track key recreation measures. The Director can see in real time what has been reported compared to targets for key output measures such as the numbers of recreation permits issued. The report also shows costs by program element.

Evidence: BLM's Employee Performance Plan and Results Reports.BLM's Management by Objectives System.Director's Tracking System.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:17%

Explanation: The BLM has established a guideline for its offices to allow no more than two percent carryover with no overspending for the fiscal year. In the recreation management programs, one percent of available funding was unspent at the end of 2001 and 2002. The major exception to these fiscal constraints is that Bureau policy allows for recreation fees collected and deposited to be retained until sufficient funding has accumulated and is available for use on significant projects to correct deferred maintenance deficiencies.Internal reviews are also used to ensure that funds are spent for the intended purpose.

Evidence: MIS report on Year End Carryover, 2000-2002 (MIS reports, which are linked to the agency's financial system, indicate that overall BLM spent 99% of appropriated recreation management funds, although a few offices deviated by more than the target of 2% carryover.)Annual Recreation Fee Demonstration Program Report to Congress.Annual recreation program cost analysis.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The BLM uses its MIS to track the performance and unit costs for all programs. An annual performance analysis is conducted to compare offices in achieving reduced unit costs and maximum output.The BLM is cooperating with DOI to provide a standard source for recreation information under the Recreation One-Stop initiative linked to the federal 'E-Government' effort.Facility accessibility data are being developed using the Accessibility Data Management System in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation.

Evidence: Annual recreation program cost analysis.Recreation.gov and the National Recreation Reservation System are the first website-based products in the federal 'E-Government' effort. The BLM continues to operate the Recreation MIS as the central repository for recreation-related information. This system is being linked to the Collections and Billing System and other automated systems as a means to avoid redundant data entry.Accessibility Data Management System inventory annual results.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: BLM coordinates with other federal agencies and offices (NPS, FWS, USDA Forest Service, Army Corps, etc.) to achieve efficiency and coordination in the recreation program, including, where possible, joint recreation program management. Program coordinates internally with the National Landscape Conservation System Office and other resource groups to assure consistency in application of policy and management actions across all BLM lands.

Evidence: Interagency Fee Council participation to implement the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program.United States Bureau of Reclamation coordination concerning facility accessibility.Participation with the National Association for Interpretation to provide interpretive training.Participation in various programs including the Leave No Trace and Tread Lightly land use stewardship program.Joint BLM-USFS Service First operations.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The BLM has received seven consecutive unqualified audit opinions, of which the recreation program was an integral component. Key to its success has been the availability of timely and accurate financial information made available to all employees through its MIS. The BLM has also met or exceeded its goals under the Prompt Payment Act and goals to reduce or eliminate erroneous payments.

Evidence: Independent audit evaluations and unqualified audit opinions.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: BLM has developed strategies to address a number of deficiencies, including the recent development of plans for improving OHV management, though much work remains in actual implementation. BLM has also used the Rec Fee Demo authority to improve priority recreation facilities.Nevertheless, BLM could potentially improve its ability to maintain more recreation sites and provide better visitor services through a more systematic evaluation of user fee practices and improved cost recovery.

Evidence: National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands and National Mountain Bicycling Strategic Action Plan.Annual Recreational Fee Demonstration Program Report to Congress.ADMS facility inventory and implementation plans to make access improvements.GAO Report (02-10), November 2001: Recreation Fees - Management Improvements Can Help the Demonstration Program Enhance Visitor Services.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:30%

Explanation: Data on long-term performance goals is spotty, but does not indicate progress is being made in meeting key goals such as visitor satisfaction. This is a result, in part, of BLM's lack of good information on the baseline status for some measures. In other cases, such as visitor satisfaction, the baseline seems to have shifted based on changing methodologies for collecting performance information. In one instance, visitor satisfaction information was not collected at all due to problems in implementing the survey instrument. One of the keys to improving long-term performance information is to ensure consistency in performance data collection over time.

Evidence: See measures worksheet.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 25%

Explanation: Annual goals for facility conditions have been met regularly, although targets may not represent stretch goals. Vistor satisfaction goal was met in 2000, but not in 2001. The same baseline problems exist for BLM's short-term and long-term goals.

Evidence: See measures worksheet.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight 10%

Explanation: Sufficient evidence has not been presented to indicate actual improvements in efficiency or cost effectiveness. However, BLM's Management Information System allows for depicting the cost per unit of output, thus allowing comparison from one year to the next. BLM indicates that states are sharing best management practices from one state to another, thereby allowing for improved efficiencies.

Evidence: Annual recreation program cost analysis. This analysis served as the basis for a report to management concerning planned versus actual accomplishments and the average unit cost per office. BLM reports that field offices are using these data to adjust operations and improve efficiency. Accountability is also being improved as offices strive to correct past reporting errors. The analysis indicated that variation among states is being reduced by more accurate and consistent reporting and by efforts to streamline standardized processes.Recreational Fee Demonstration Program Site Evaluation.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 30%

Explanation: Visitor satisfaction scores are reasonably comparable to those of other recreation agencies such as NPS and the Forest Service. BLM must also deal with a higher degree of unique challenges (e.g., dispersed recreation, OHV use) and does so within a smaller budget relative to some other programs.

Evidence: Cost per visitor data. Comparison of visitor satisfaction rates.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 5%

Explanation: Few current independent evaluations exist. Those that do exist have not identified major problems with BLM's Recreation program, but have identified some areas in need of improvement.

Evidence: GAO Report (02-10), November 2001: Recreation Fees - Management Improvements Can Help the Demonstration Program Enhance Visitor Services.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

Measure: Percent of recreation users satisfied with the quality of their recreation experience.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the satifaction of users with their experience

Year	Target	Actual
2000	94%	94%
2001	94%	90%
2002	92%	
2003	92%	
2004	94%	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Percent of physical facilities in Special Recreation Management Areas (SMRAs) that are universally accessible.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the % of accessible facilities in SMRAs

Year	Target	Actual
2001	10%	3%
2002	5%	5.1%
2003	7%	
2004	9%	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Percent of physical facilities in Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) in good or fair condition.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the condition of physical facilities in SMRAs either in good or fair condition.

Year	Target	Actual
2000	81%	84%

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Recreation Management
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	100%	32%	

2001	81%	84%
2002	81%	87%
2003	82%	
2004	84%	

Measure: Percent of recreation users satisfied with the BLM's interpretation and environmental education in SRMAs

Additional Information: This measure track the satisfaction of users in the interpretation and environmental education programs in SRMAs

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2000	84%	76%
2001	76%	66%
2002	70%	No Data

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Through legislation enacted in 1977, the Office of Surface Mining (OSM) was charged to establish a nationwide program to protect society from the adverse effects of surface coal mining, strike a balance between protection and the Nation's need for coal as an essential source of energy, and to assist coal mining states and Indian Tribes, through grants, to develop, administer and enforce SMCRA programs. Currently, twenty-four States (92% of the 26 States with active coal mining) have chosen to take 'primacy', i.e., responsibility for regulating surface coal mining and reclamation operations within their borders. No Indian Tribes have yet assumed primacy.

Evidence: The Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA). Specifically, Sections 102, 705 and 710(i).

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Prior to 1977 there was no nationwide program regulating surface coal mining activities. In 1972, there was a large surface coal mining disaster on the Buffalo Creek, West Virginia. Failure of a coal company sludge pond led to a flood which killed 125 people and left about 4,000 people homeless. Passage of SMCRA in 1977 has not eliminated the risk of surface mine failures but it has significantly reduced it.During active mining, there is always risk for safety and environmental hazards both on and off the permitted mine site. There are also complex technical challenges. The State regulatory programs, incorporating SMCRA requirements cover every aspect of coal mining operations. OSM provides oversight and technical assistance to its state partners to reduce the adverse impacts of coal mining on society and the environment.

Evidence: 1) 'The Buffalo Creek Disaster' by Gerald M. Stern.2) In SMCRA, section 101 (c), (e), (f), and (g).3) Legislative history of SMCRA: Senate Report No. 95-128, May 10, 1977, pages 49-53. 4) Legislative history of SMCRA: House Report No. 95-218, April 22, 1977, pages 57-60.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: SMCRA is the only Federal statute specifically directed toward regulation of the environmental impacts of coal mining. Its coal regulatory program is based on a cooperative partnership between States and OSM SMCRA established that States should be the primary regulatory authority because of the physical diversity of lands. OSM's role is to approve State regulatory programs and amendments, monitor and oversee program implementation, and provide technical and other assistance to the States.EPA and Army Corps of Engineers regulatory programs also regulate coal mining activies, but their progams work to control water pollution and disturbances to surface waters; they do not consider non-water problems, such as blasting, subsidence, and land reclamation after mining. Another Federal agency that regulates mining is the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA). MSHA governs miner safety, but not the safety and health of other coalfield citizens nor protection of the environment. While other agencies touch on aspects of mining, OSM's program covers the complete mining cycle.

Evidence: 1) SMCRA, sections 501, 502, 503, 517, 521 and 705.2) Examples of State-OSM performance agreements (Alabama FY 2003 and West Virginia FY 2002 and 2003) to demonstrate the respective roles of OSM and the State.3) West Virginia DEP Office of Mining and Reclamation Permitting Handbook

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrate

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: There are no apparent "major" flaws in the program design or suggested alternative designs that would substantially increase the program's effectiveness or efficiency. The structure of State primacy with Federal oversight to maintain national standards, is working. The program continues to deal with significant issues, such as mountaintop mining and operator bonding, which sometimes involve litigation. In addition, the Federal grants require a 100 percent match from the receiving state. The major constraint on the program is funding -- if States do not receive the Federal grant or the State match funding they need, OSM's ability to meet the goals of SMCRA may be lessened.

Evidence: 1) The most recent audit was DOI IG Survey Report, No. 97-1-56, State Reclamation and Regulatory Grant Programs, 1996. 2) Management Control Reviews conducted on the State Oversight Program (1998) and Grants Program (1997). 3) Annual Independent Auditors' Reports for OSM (Contracted by DOI Inspector General Office to KPMG, LLP, an independent certified public accounting firm). 4) DOI IG Evaluation of State Operated Coal Regulatory Programs - work began on June 17, 2003.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The State regulatory program is designed to balance citizen safety and environmental protection with coal production in a time of continued reliance on coal as a major source of energy to the Nation. As Congress intended, OSM's programmatic efforts and grant funding are primarily directed at the States because they are the primary regulatory authorities in most cases. In addition, having a national program ensures that competition in interstate commerce does not undermine OSM's and states' ability to maintain adequate standards on coal mining within their borders.OSM resources and grant awards are allocated on the basis of need, and the extent, type and scope of mining operations in each State. OSM's Annual Report lists the distribution of regulatory grant funds among program States.

Evidence: FY 2001 OSM Annual and Accountability Report, page 22, Table 11.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight 11%

Explanation: See 'PART Performance Measures' provided by OSM. These measures are "outputs." They do not cover the full scope of the program; they do not reflect the total purpose of the program in a meaningful way, and include no efficiency measure. Although there are two specific long-term output goals that are useful in assessing the program progress in a limited way, there is no outcome goal assessing how well individual states are reviewing permit applications and if state approvals comply with SMCRA requirements, the main reason for the SMCRA legislation. OSM and the regulated states will be reviewing these measures during June 2003.

Evidence: 1) OSM Strategic Plan FY 2000-2005. 2) FY 2003 Performance Plan and FY 2001 Annual Performance Report. 3) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004. 4) Reg. 8-OSM Directive on Oversight of State Regulatory Programs5) Meeting Scheduled for June 23, 2003 with the regulated states to begin revising the performance measures.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The PART instructions require a "NO" rating if the program received a NO rating in Question 2.1.

Evidence:

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: See 'PART Performance Measures" provided by OSM. There are three annual performance measures. The annual goal measurements provide data on the protection of the environment during mining, impacts of surface mining on citizens, and the status of reclamation of mined lands.

Evidence: 1) FY 2003 Performance Plan and FY 2001 Annual Performance Report. 2) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: OSM has established baselines and targets for the measures it has developed. For example, to measure off-site permit compliance, OSM uses an off-site measure. The measure looks at off site impact to water quality, blasting, etc. The target is that 94% of coal mine sites will be free of off-site impacts per year. The baseline is calculated by dividing the number of inspectable units by the number of off-site impacts occurring. The target is ambitious considering the nature of mining and that it would be impossible to achieve 100%.

Evidence: OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The States are an integral part of achieving the goals for the Surface Mining Program. In an effort to track the progress toward meeting OSM's annual and long-term goals, OSM receives data annually from its State and Indian Tribe partners. In June, OSM and 11 state partners will meet to develop common performance measures for the program.

Evidence: FY 2003 Performance Agreement for Alabama and West Virginia and FY 2002 Performance Agreement for West Virginia.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrate

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: The OSM program evaluation system is an ongoing process of assessing program accomplishments and communicating those assessments to management. Information obtained through oversight and annual evaluation reports made pursuant to SMCRA requirements contribute to developing an accurate picture of progress in accomplishing OSM's mission. The Program evaluation system includes Management Control Reviews, Alternative Management Control Reviews (conducted in compliance with the Inspector General Act), audits done under the auspices of the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, and annual state program evaluations.

Evidence: 1) DOI IG Survey Report: State Reclamation and Regulatory Grant Programs-Report No. 97-I-56, October 1996. 2) DOI IG Evaluation of State Operated Coal Regulatory Programs - work began on June 17, 2003. 3) Annual Independent Auditors' Reports for OSM (Contracted by DOI Inspector General Office to KPMG, LLP, an independent certified public accounting firm). 4) Single Audit Reports on States performed by State Auditors and/or contracted to Independent Auditors (32 performed in the last 5 years). Listing provided. Alabama and West Virginia included as examples.5) State Oversight Reports completed each year by OSM in conjunction with its State Partners each year. 6) Management Control Reviews conducted on the State Oversight Program (1998) and Grants Program (1998 and 2000).

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: OSM's 2003 and 2004 budget requests included the integration of planning and performance. OSM can demonstrate the probable effects on individual state regulatory programs with various levels of funding.

Evidence: 1) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2003 and 2004.2) OSM study of 2001 regulatory grant funding (1999).3) OSM study of regulatory grant funding (2003 Draft).

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: OSM has identified deficiencies in its program performance measurement, and is in the process of exploring the re-design of its strategic goals and measures in cooperation with its state and Tribal partners.

Evidence: OSM initiated meetings with its state and Tribal partners in late FY 2003.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

2.RG1 **Are all regulations issued by the program/agency necessary to meet the stated goals of the program, and do all regulations clearly indicate how the rules contribute to achievement of the goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:11%

Explanation: Regulations implementing this program generally address one of five major program components required by SMCRA: designation of areas as unsuitable for mining; performance standards; permitting requirements and procedures; performance bond; and inspection and enforcement requirements. Federal final rule preambles cite the authorizing SMCRA section or other authorizing event, e.g., court decision. The first Federal final rules were published March 13, 1979, and addressed all SMCRA regulatory requirements. Changes to these Federal rules occur as a result of passage of law that directly or indirectly affects SMCRA requirements, court decisions affecting the interpretation of SMCRA requirements or the changing nature of technology. Approved primacy State regulatory programs must be no less stringent than SMCRA and no less effective than the Federal implementing regulations. OSM reviews any changes to the Federal rules to determine whether a State must amend its program to be in accordance with SMCRA and consistent with the Federal regulations.

Evidence: 1) SMCRA 2) Rule preambles.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: States regularly report on the status of their programs through the grant reporting process, and OSM conducts annual evaluations of each State program. OSM's primary role with respect to State programs is to monitor the State program to ensure that it maintains the capability to fulfill its responsibilities under SMCRA. To further the reporting of end results and on-the-ground success, the oversight strategy was redesigned in 1995-1996 to evaluate and report State-specific and national findings for off-site impacts and reclamation success. OSM is in the process of exploring the re-design of its strategic goals and measures in cooperation with its state and Tribal partners. Meetings are scheduled for later in this fiscal year.

Evidence: 1) 1997 Hammer Award for Reinventing Oversight.2) Oversight guidance (OSM Directive REG-8, 'Oversight of State Regulatory Programs.'3) State Oversight Reports (Alabama and West Virginia for FY 2002.4) State/Federal performance agreements (Alabama and West Virginia for FY 2003; West Virginia FY 2002.5) Book on the implementation of four environmental programs (surface mining, radon, drinking water and asbestos), by Denise Scheberle, Professor, Public and Environmental Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: OSM and States determine performance goals in annual performance agreements. OSM field managers and their staff plan and conduct oversight activities, including inspections, independent reviews and technical analyses, and prepare related documents and reports, including an annual evaluation report for each State. The OSM oversight reports focus on whether the public protection requirements and environmental protection standards of SMCRA are being met, with primary focus on end results and on-the-ground success in meeting SMCRA's environmental protection goals. Timetables and schedules are part of the oversight process, e.g., annual submission of program data by States.

Evidence: 1) Performance Agreement for Alabama and West Virginia for FY 2003; West Virginia for FY 2002.2) Oversight guidance, OSM Directive REG-8, 'Oversight of State Regulatory Programs.'3) Annual OSM oversight reports (Alabama and West Virginia - (FY 2003).4) Amendment submission timetable in accordance with 30 CFR 732.17.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: Deobligations as a result of grantees not expending all awarded funding during the fiscal year are low. OSM reviewed regulatory grant funding in 1999; the report stated that the unexpended grant balances declined from 6.9% in FY 1994 to 2.2% in FY 1997. A review of subsequent deobligation history is currently underway. In addition, OSM monitors state-match contributions to ensure that states are also obligating state funding at the same rate as the Federal grant.

Evidence: 1) OSM's 1999 review of 2001 regulatory grant funding. 2) Annual budget submissions.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: The State Regulatory program is non-competitive; the use of incentives is not applicable. However, most States have sophisticated, well-established systems to measure and achieve efficiencies. Annually, States submit a wide variety of program performance data, e.g., program staffing, number of site inspections conducted, number of enforcement actions issued. Comparative program performance data for States can be reviewed through their year-to-year data submissions. OSM continues to use and implement IT improvements and use of E-gov, where possible. Progress includes: 1) electronic permitting initiative to encourage and assist States with developing and implementing electronic permitting; 2) Technical Innovation and Professional Services (TIPS), an analytical tool to assist the States with hydrologic assessments, quantifying potential effects of coal mining, etc. OSM is continuing to implement activity-based costing, which will enable it to fully cost its program accomplishments.

Evidence: 1) Brochure, ' 2003 Excellence in Surface Coal Mining Reclamation Awards, Call for Nominations' ' includes rating criteria and point system for evaluation of entries.2) OSM Annual and Financial Accountability Report for FY 2001.3) Electronic permitting initiative: ' 'Enhanced Computer Software Applications for Mining and Reclamation,' paper prepared by William L. Joseph, June 2000' Page 25-26, FY 2001 Annual and Financial Accountability Report (OSM Annual Report). ' Information Collection Package: 'Supporting Statement for Reporting and Recordkeeping for 30 CFR Part 779,' question 3.' Alabama currently receiving approximately 50% of its permits electronically. Record of Telephone Conversation, Jean O'Dell, OSM-Birmingham Field Office and Dr. Randy Johnson, Director of the Alabama Surface Mining Commission, June 9, 2003.' West Virginia currently is beta-testing an electronic permitting submission system. Permit application forms are available for downloading from the State's website.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: OSM, State regulatory programs, and other Federal and State programs do collaborate and coordinate effectively to avoid duplication and seek solutions to common problems. With programs like the Coal Symposium, OSM held its largest event ever with government, industry, citizen and environmental groups to foster a mutual understanding of current government programs affecting the coal industry.OSM and the States routinely conduct forums and workshops on a number of technical and programmatic issues. OSM also meets several times a year with the Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC) and the Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB), organizations that represent more than 20 of the State regulatory authorities. Recently, OSM co-sponsored a benchmarking session with the IMCC on a critically important permitting issue. Proceedings Notes on CD from technical forums are made available on the OSM website, in hard copy, and on CD.

Evidence: 1) "Feds Who Get It,' Governing Magazine, November 1999, byline: Jonathan Walters2) Proceedings Notes on CD.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: OSM's Division of Financial Management has received clean audit reports for the last 12 years. OSM was the only bureau in DOI to receive a 'clean opinion' in all three areas: financial statements, reports on internal controls and compliance with laws and regulations. Detection of erroneous payments is part of OSM's program management function carried out by grants specialists through on-site reviews with the States. For OSM program activities, OSM uses activity based costing. This assists management in identifying costs for each defined activity. Codes and outputs are under review for FY 2003 data.

Evidence: 1) FY 2001 Annual and Financial Accountability Report 2) Drawdown review on West Virginia and Alabama.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: Currently, neither the General Accounting Office (GAO) nor Interior's Office of Inspector General has identified any major performance or management challenges that limit OSM's effectiveness in carrying-out its mission. OSM is In compliance with the Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA).

Evidence: Independent Auditors' Report on the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement's Financial Statements for Fiscal Years 2002 and 2001 (No. 2003-I-0022).

3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: The Annual Performance Agreement for each grantee is the basis for oversight. The Agreement includes on-site reviews, review of expenditures, and program and performance review. One to two reviews per grantee are conducted annually, focusing on internal controls and management of the program.

Evidence: 1) Grant Performance Reports, Alabama FY 2002 and West Virginia FY 2001 cooperative agreements.2) FY 2003 Annual Performance Agreements for Alabama and West Virginia. FY 2002 Annual Performance Agreement for West Virginia.

3.BF2 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: OSM collects, compiles and disseminates grantee performance information through the OSM Annual Report (this report is distributed in hard copy and is available on OSM's website) and the grantee programmatic report.

Evidence: 1) OSM's FY 2001 Annual and Financial Accountability Report .2) FY 2003 Annual Performance Agreements for Alabama and West Virginia. FY 2002 Annual Performance Agreement for West Virginia.

3.RG1 Did the program seek and take into account the views of all affected parties (e.g., consumers; large and small businesses; State, local and tribal governments; beneficiaries; and the general public) when developing significant regulations? Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: OSM is required to do so in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act. When as a result of changes in law, court decisions or other precipitating events the Federal SMCRA regulations must be revised, such revisions are finalized through publication in the Federal Register (FR). Every final rule published in the FR contains a section regarding how OSM obtained and considered public input on the final rule. In addition to publication in the FR, public hearings are held if requested, and OSM maintains a distribution list of individuals, groups, etc. who have requested that they be forwarded a copy of any final rule or final rules pertaining to specific subjects. OSM also often conducts outreach when proposing significant revisions to the Federal regulations. In the final rule, OSM explains its consideration of alternatives and the disposition of all comments received. State program and amendments approvals follow FR procedures and States regulations must also comply with State rule publication process, similar to the FR process.

Evidence: 1) Proposed and final rule preambles [VER and 522(e)]. 2) documentation of outreach [stream buffer outreach plan]. 3) public hearings [FR notices for VER and 522(e)].

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

3.RG2 **Did the program prepare adequate regulatory impact analyses if required by Executive Order 12866, regulatory flexibility analyses if required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act and SBREFA, and cost-benefit analyses if required under the Unfunded Mandates R**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: OSM's rules comply with Executive Order 12866.

Evidence: 1) Rule preambles [VER and 522(e)] and2) Supporting documentation [for VER and 522(e): EIS, Economic Analysis.

3.RG3 **Does the program systematically review its current regulations to ensure consistency among all regulations in accomplishing program goals?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: OSM reviews Federal regulations for consistency with the entire Federal program throughout the regulatory revision process leading to publication of the final rule. Part of this review involves consideration of the effect of changes approved in the final Federal final rule upon State regulatory programs. If the Federal change will require amendment of the State regulatory program(s), OSM notifies the State(s). In addition, OSM reviews all its regulations every 3 years as it re-examines the information collection burden posed by individual Federal requirements. Finally, OSM has reviewed its regulations (on the average of) every 5 years to determine and remove regulations that are no longer necessary.

Evidence: 1) Record of Compliance (contains an economic analysis) [VER and 522(e)].2) Information Collection Package (30 CFR Part 779) Supplementary statement dated March 25, 2003.3) Regulatory Review of Rules, March 23, 2000.

3.RG4 **Are the regulations designed to achieve program goals, to the extent practicable, by maximizing the net benefits of its regulatory activity?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 7%

Explanation: The regulations are designed to provide the minimum threshold of requirements with which compliance is necessary. While each coal-producing State has been encouraged to accept primacy so it may incorporate and address circumstances unique to that State (e.g., climate, vegetation) in its regulation of surface coal mining operations within its borders, OSM's responsibility under SMCRA is national in scope. OSM guards against uneven regulation of surface coal mining operations by ensuring that regulation - whether done by the individual States or by OSM as regulatory authority or in providing States with any needed assistance - meets the national requirements' threshold minimum, while maintaining a level playing field that enables industry to meet the need for mining the Nation's most abundant and essential source of energy. In addition to ensuring a level playing field, the Federal regulations must not impose an undue burden upon the regulated entity.

Evidence: 1) Paper on 'Enhanced Computer Software Applications for Mining and Reclamation'2) Information Collection, Supporting Statement, Question 3 (For 30 CFR Part 779)

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?**

Answer: NO Question Weight20%

Explanation: The PART instructions require a "NO" rating if the program received a NO rating in Question 2.1..

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: See 'PART Performance Measures' as provided by OSM. For the measures developed by OSM, the program consistently exceeds its measure for Phase I and II bond release. This is important because Phase I and II bond releases are precursors to the future results of the Phase III bond release. OSM has consistently been close in maintaining an off-site impact rate of 94%. The most OSM have missed the target by is 1.2% in FY 2002. The Phase III bond release measure has been met in one of the past 3 years. However, OSM is still making adequate progress toward the long-term measures it has developed.

Evidence: 1) FY 2003 Performance Plan and FY 2001 Annual Performance Report. 2) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: OSM has no efficiency performance measures. However, OSM has anecdotal evidence that is improving program efficiencies and cost effectiveness. Examples include OSM's IT and E-Gov initiatives and OSM has established an activity based costing system to assist management in identifying costs per activity. Cost codes and outputs were modified in FY 2003 and are currently under review.

Evidence: 1) FY 2000, 2001 and 2002 OSM Annual Budget Justifications and Performance Information. 2) FY 2003 Performance Plan and FY 2001 Annual Performance Report. 3) OSM Budget Justifications and Performance Information for FY 2004.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The SMCRA regulatory program is a unique program with state regulatory programs being a component of that program. Therefore, OSM has no basis for comparison.

Evidence: NA

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: IG audits have been initiated, but only one completed, and States and Tribes provide their assesments of the program at various meetings and conferences throughout the year. OSM has not been audited by an independed entity. However, it has been reviewed by two outside entities. The first is through a book being written on the implementation of four environmental programs (surface mining, radon, drinking water and asbestos), University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. A second was through the article 'Feds Who Get It,' Governing Magazine, November 1999. OSM has also been reviewed by the IG once. State Reclamation and Regulatory Grant Programs-Report No. 97-I-56, October 1996. The IG was unable to determine whether Surface Mining Grant programs were administered efficiently and effectively due to an OSM reorganization that occurred. The IG recommended improving controls over the monitoring of regulatory grant funds and timely closure of grant agreements. OSM implemented the recommended solution.

Evidence: 1) DOI IG Survey Report: State Reclamation and Regulatory Grant Programs-Report No. 97-I-56, October 1996. 2) Book on the implementation of four environmental programs (surface mining, radon, drinking water and asbestos), by Denise Scheberle, Professor, Public and Environmental Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. (Work in progress, as described in a March 26, 2003 email.) 3) 'Feds Who Get It,' Governing Magazine, November 1999, byline: Jonathan Walters

4.RG1 Were programmatic goals (and benefits) achieved at the least incremental societal cost and did the program maximize net benefits?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: As shown in the agency annual report(s), OSM and its partners, the State regulatory authorities, continue to make progress in encouraging the surface coal mining industry to avoid and reduce the incidence of off-site impacts and to reclaim affected land. Through the Federal requirements, OSM ensures the existence of a minimum national program to protect society from the adverse effects of surface coal mining operations, while assuring that the coal supply essential to the Nation's energy requirements continues. For instance, OSM's December 17, 1999, interpretive rule concerning subsidence due to underground coal mining balances the interests of surface owners and industry; maintains stability in SMCRA implementation; promotes safety; acknowledges existing property rights; and creates no regulatory gaps. (64 FR 70847-70847)

Evidence: 1) Annual Agency Report (FY 2001).2) OSM Individual State Oversight Reports (Alabama and West Virginia for FY 2001).3) Final Rule: 522(e): 64 FR 70838, 12/17/1999.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

Measure: Outcome measures under development

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

Measure: Increase the number of acres released from Phase III performance bonds

Additional Information: These are the number of acres that have been fully reclaimed from current mining operations, meet the performance standards, and released as useful and productive restored land. This performance measure is the acreage of land that is released every year by active coal mine operators (and is dependent on the operator filing application for release). This is done through a series of bond releases. The bonds are required to assure that funds are available for reclamation in case the operator fails to reclaim the mined land.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2005	400,000		

Measure: Maintain the percentage of sites free of off-site impacts

Additional Information: Protecting the environment, people and property is measured by the number of times incidents occur outside the boundaries of the permitted areas being mined. These are known as off-site impacts and ideally the goal is to not have any incidents occur. It is inevitable that some impacts will occur-100% compliance is not realistic. The impacts are damaging effects that would occur as a result of blasting, land stability, hydrology, encroachment, etc., that would affect people, land, water, or structures outside the permitted area of mining operations.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2005	94%		

Measure: Number of acres released from phase III performance bonds

Additional Information: These are the number of acres that have been fully reclaimed from current mining operations, meet the performance standsrds, and released as useful and productive restored land. This performance measure is the acreage of land that is released every year by active coal mine operators (and is dependent on the operator filing application for release). This is done through a series of bond releases. The bonds are required to assure that funds are available for reclamation in case the operator fails to reclaim the mined land.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2000	75,000	63,071	
2001	75,000	81,853	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Regulation of Surface Coal Mining Activities
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Office of Surface Mining
Type(s): Regulatory Based Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
100%	78%	100%	54%	Demonstrated

2002	75,000	73,407
2003	70,000	
2004	70,000	

Measure: Percentage of coalmining sites that are free of off-site impacts, such as damage caused by blasting, landslides, water quality effects on streams, etc.

Additional Information: Protecting the environment, people and property is measured by the number of times incidents occur outside the boundaries of the permitted areas being mined. These are known as off-site impacts and ideally the goal is to not have any incidents occur. It is inevitable that some impacts will occur-100% compliance is not realistic. The impacts are damaging effects that would occur as a result of blasting, land stability, hydrology, encroachment, etc., that would affect people, land, water, or structures outside the permitted area of mining operations.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2000	94%	94%	
2001	94%	94%	
2002	94%	93%	
2003	94%		
2004	94%		

Measure: The Surface Mining Program will reclaim 100,000 acres in Phase 1 and II Performance Bonds.

Additional Information: Phase I and II bond releases are necessary prior to final release at phase III.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Measure Under Development

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual (Efficiency Measure)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Resource Evaluation and Leasing Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	86%	67%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Minerals Managment Service (MMS) is the nation's ocean resource expert charged with overseeing nearly two billion acres of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). The program offers access to OCS resources to best meet national energy needs while safeguarding the environment; considering stakeholder comments; preserving free competition; and receiving fair-market value for the government.

Evidence: The OCS Lands Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to provide access to OCS mineral resources, subject to a number of environmental and economic considerations. Additionally, MMS offers rights-of-way access for pipelines and noncompetitively negotiates rights to OCS sand, gravel, and shell resources.' Secretarial Order 3071 Establishes MMS' Congressional Justifications

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program offers access to the resources of the OCS. MMS contributes to domestic energy supplies by providing access to OCS lands for oil and natural gas exploration, development, and production by means of a Five-Year Program. MMS conveys sand and gravel resources for public works projects and offers pipeline rights-of-way.

Evidence: The Energy Information Administration, the National Petroleum Council, and the National Energy Policy all cite America's increasing demand for energy resources. The Offshore Minerals Management (OMM) program contributes to domestic energy supplies as authorized under the OCS Lands Act.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: MMS is the only entity authorized to permit access to the OCS for energy and non-energy mineral resource. Additionally, the program collects and analyzes OCS geological and geophysical proprietary information. Though other entities produce resource estimates, they rely on MMS data.

Evidence: The OCS Lands Act, the Submerged Lands Act, Departmental guidance, and inter-agency memoranda of understanding clearly delineate jurisdictional boundaries (whether geographic or functional).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Resource Evaluation and Leasing Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	86%	67%	Effective

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The nonenergy mineral and oil and gas lease sales are free of major flaws. However pursuant to the OCSLA, MMS can only offer access to sand, gravel, salt, sulphur, oil, and gas. Currently, no clear authority exists for the Federal government to comprehensively review, permit, and provide appropriate regulatory oversight for renewable energy projects such as wind, wave, and solar'as well as projects of a more traditional nature such as facilities to handle liquefied natural gas and compressed natural gas. Instead, current authorities appear to be either non-existent or limited in scope. MMS has the capacity to manage these resources, but their mandate is too narrow. In order for the Federal Government to manage OCS resources effectively and avoid ambiguity and confusion over the responsible Federal permitting agency, MMS is seeking statutory authority to provide access to the Outer Continental Shelf.

Evidence: The OMM program is free of flaws that would improperly allow access without regard to environmental considerations. The oil and gas component employs a rigorous process of consultation with stakeholders and affected parties in developing the Five-Year Leasing Program and conducting lease-sales. The sand and gravel component coordinates development of marine mineral resources through partnerships with 14 coastal States. Both components are supported by geologic information and environmental studies. The evidence below outlines the procedures to access OCS resources:' Bid Adequacy Procedures and Bid Evaluation Diagram.' OCS Leasing Program 2002-2007 Bid Adequacy Procedures and Bid Evaluation Diagram.' Guidelines for Obtaining Offshore Sand

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The Program's resource is access to resources of the OCS. Benefits include: contributions to national energy security; OCS revenue stream; environmental research of the OCS; and regional economic developments including employment. The sand and gravel component provides resources for public works projects.

Evidence: Responsible development of OCS resources contributes about 30 percent of the Nation's domestic oil supply and 23 percent of its natural gas production. From 1995 to 2003, MMS fulfilled every request for sand, conveying rights to nearly 20 million cubic yards of OCS sand for shore protection and coastal restoration projects, protecting billions of dollars of property. The below outline MMS leasing process and guidelines that enable resources to reach intended beneficiaries:' OCS Leasing Process' OCS Leasing Guidelines' Guidelines for Obtaining Offshore Sand for Wetlands Protection and Beach Restoration Projects' National Environmental Policy Act' Coastal Zone Management Act' Sustainable Fisheries Act

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight 13%

Explanation: The program offers environmentally sound access to the most promising resource areas of the OCS. The Five-Year Plan is a framework for MMS to offer access. Additionally, MMS developed (and is always modifying) measures that indicate the percent of resources offered and the rate at which leaseholders actively pursue resource exploration.

Evidence: Offshore Minerals Management (OMM) program monitors national trends in the oil and natural gas industry. The below indicate performance goals aside from PART: ' DOI Strategic Plan 2003-2008' MMS Logic Model' National Assessment 2000' MMS FY 2005 Budget Justification (performance chart)' OCS Leasing Program 2002-2007

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Resource Evaluation and Leasing Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	86%	67%	Effective

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Timeframes associated with the long-term measures are tied to the Five-Year Leasing Program. The combined targets of the measures are ambitious. They represent the highest percentages of acreage offered attainable given industry interest. In addition, MMS is developing measures that assess if these leases are being explored.

Evidence: Oil and gas prospects in the United States compete for exploration dollars in a global market. While the U.S. has a stable regulatory environment, the overall maturity of oil and gas development means smaller hydrocarbon accumulations are available as exploration targets compared to untapped fields in other countries. Therefore, maintaining interest in leasing on the OCS is difficult and ambitious goals are set through the OCS Leasing Program five-year plan.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The program has annual performance measures that demonstrate progress towards providing access to OCS lands to best meet the energy needs of the nation. Measures address: meeting milestones to achieve timely sales; the acreage and resources offered in each sale; the efficiency of bid analysis; and the impact of bid adequacy procedures and leasing incentives.

Evidence: In addition to the PART measures, MMS monitors a suite of GPRA measures related to the DOI Strategic Plan. DOI assesses the overall success of the program based on the completion of lease sales and the continued attainment of fair market value. OMM also tracks numerous output measures through its Activity Based Costing system. Evidence includes:' MMS Logic Model' Offshore Minerals Management (OMM) Program Strategies and Tactical Plans 2003 Closeout Report' OMM Program Strategies and Tactical Plans, 2004-2008' ABC performance data (ABC reports)

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The program has collected trend data since its inception, and used the results of data analysis to reallocate resources and justify requests for resource increases. Additional measures/targets reflect the program's attempts to improve timeliness of consultation processes, to improve timeliness of bid evaluation, and to determine whether bid adequacy procedures and leasing incentives are producing the intended effect of increasing bidding. MMS measures should focus on how well the program is performing in helping to best meet the energy needs of the nation. However, not all measures are ambitious: often they are continuation of a previous baseline. Furthermore, some measures do not reflect the program, but analyze the environment in which the program is operating (e.g. percent of OCS acres offered in lease sales is indicative of industry interest rather than program performance)

Evidence: OCS planning areas vary significantly in terms of infrastructure, operating conditions, and political sensitivity. It is more likely that political, environmental, and multiple-use considerations will lead to deferrals of acreage, or that market conditions will constrain industry interest rather than failure of MMS to offer a lease sale. Studying the reasons for falling short of the targeted levels of performance (should this prove to be the case) may provide management information for setting terms and incentives for future lease-sales.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Resource Evaluation and Leasing Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	86%	67%	Effective

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: MMS achieves goals, including adherence to a timely OCS lease sale schedule, through cooperation of partners. In the 2002-2007 Program, all partners met milestones, allowing five sales as planned. The program works closely with Federal, State, and local governments that require those resources from the OCS. Additionally, states and other entities share geologic and geophysical information with MMS to assist in the leasing process.

Evidence: Evidence of mutual commitment to program goals includes: regular consultation with States and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on coastal zone management issues; numerous cooperative agreements for environmental studies and marine minerals matters; discussions of multiple-use issues with the Department of Defense and the National Marine Fisheries Service; and various data-sharing agreements.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The Program is subject to regular review by the public, environmental groups, industry, states and federal agencies, as guidelines mandate external review and comment. Furthermore, federal advisory committees and outside groups such as the National Academies of Science periodically review technical and policy aspects of the program.Two current reviews, by the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy and independent contractor Booz Allen Hamilton, are particularly comprehensive assessments of the program's impact and management.

Evidence: The U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy is conducting a comprehensive assessment of national ocean policy, addressing issues ranging from ocean governance to the stewardship of marine resources. The Commission's preliminary report addresses the full spectrum of OCS leasing issues, from State involvement in decision-making to environmental issues and production and revenue trends. MMS commissioned a comprehensive study, with independent contractor Booz Allen Hamilton, for a review of the program's core business processes. The project is divided into functional phases over the 2004-2008 period. The first phase, addressing the leasing program, has been completed.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The program's budget request links budget dollars and staffing levels to DOI mission goals and the related performance measures and Activity-Based Costing (ABC) end outputs. Since 1985, the program has realigned resources to support performance goals and mission priorities.

Evidence: Recent (FY2004) resource shifts include reductions in FTE and IT expenditures, to offset increased funding related to gas hydrates and infrastructure security. Long-term trends reflect steadily increased investment in the Gulf of Mexico region, offset by the closure of the Atlantic office and reductions at Program Headquarters and other regions. Annual Budget Justifications elaborate on how budget requests are tied to performance.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Resource Evaluation and Leasing Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	86%	67%	Effective

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The Program has always met GPRA requirements for strategic planning and performance measurement. Additionally, MMS established Program Strategies and Tactical Plans'2002 to 2007 (updated in FY 2004), a compilation of strategies that describes issues, desired outcomes, and explains tactical plans over a five-year period, to guide the agency. Furthermore, constant review of data helps MMS make adjustments to the program as necessary.

Evidence: OMM managers and staff routinely reference the program strategies, prioritize their work with the tactical plans, and have critical results incorporated into their employee performance plans. The program's Activity-Based Costing system is aligned with the DOI 2003-2008 Strategic Plan.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The MMS collects vast amounts of information on the industry and market. MMS imposes reporting requirements on the oil and gas industry; facilitates the exchange of OCS-related information between stakeholders and provides information to stakeholders to manage the program and promote competitive bidding.

Evidence: The MMS considers bidding activity, geophysical/environmental factors, exploration and development results, market conditions, and stakeholder comments in making management decisions -- both for individual lease sales and in proposing the Five-Year Leasing Program. Consideration of these factors informs the OMM in offering access to the most promising OCS acreage, securing fair value, protecting sensitive environmental resources, and implementing innovative leasing incentives where appropriate. Last year, MMS acquired 3-D seismic information to define and assess potential oil and natural gas occurrences on a record 7,182 OCS blocks, bringing the bureau total to over 33,000 files of 3-D seismic information.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Performance plans for all OMM managers include goals that are linked to the program's GPRA and PART measures, tactical plans, or critical-action dates. The plans only recently incorporated these goals. MMS has not yet had the opportunity to evaluate managers by them. Older contracts tended to have vague performance goals that were difficult to measure performance by. Contracting officers assure the quality and timeliness of contracted work, and monitor expenditures. Additionally, MMS established an Evaluation Integration Council, developed a process to integrate risk assessment and to track internal and external program evaluation information

Evidence: The majority of OMM employee performance plans include critical results linked to GPRA or other mission outcomes. In support of the Evaluation Integration Council, a Coordinators and Liaisons Group has been established to monitor progress against all audit and program evaluation corrective actions.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Resource Evaluation and Leasing Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	86%	67%	Effective

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: MMS reviews the budget quarterly to identify unfunded needs, spending lapses, and unusual spending patterns. Budget controls, including signature authority limitation and contractor oversight, ensure MMS obligates funds timely and for the intended purpose. Additionally, MMS contractors are subject to oversight from award to completion.

Evidence: The program establishes formal agreements with program partners, including reporting requirements to ensure that work performed contributes to the bureau's performance goals. Cost centers are established to track program budget allocations, and specifically identify funding associated with Congressional earmarks and intent. Evidence includes:' Annual operating and financial plans' Quarterly review and analysis of spending' Monthly review of disbursements and obligations' Requests for reallocation of funds' End of year budget and/or finance reports' Evaluation criteria for contract awards (performance)

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: MMS uses competitive sourcing as a strategic tool to meet the organization's mission. MMS has studied all the functions it committed to study and saved approximately $2 million in costs over five years. Additionally, the Information Management Committee facilitates systematic reviews of IT contractors, equipment, and maintenance costs.

Evidence: Competitive sourcing studies determined the program's staff provides the best value to the taxpayer (avoiding over $2 million in cost over five years). MMS is re-engineering its business processes and acquiring IT components and web-enabled applications to improve its efficiency. Evidence includes:' E-Gov Baseline Report and E-Gov Benchmarking Report for Leasing' Report on Competitive Sourcing

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The oil and gas lease-sales are collaborated effectively with other related programs. The OCSLA and other statues mandate collaboration for maintaining the 5-year oil and gas-leasing schedule and providing access to non-mineral resources. Additionally, MMS works with the Coast Guard and Department of Transportation (to develop plans for deepwater LNG-ports) the USGS (to create methodologies for the National Resource Assessment), NOAA (to revise the Coastal Zone Management Act) Bureau of Land Management (to institute a coherent DOI Fluid Minerals Architecture)

Evidence: Processes for the oil-and-gas and sand-and-gravel programs provide for extensive consultation and coordination with interested and affected parties. Further, OMM's Program Strategies and Tactical Plans emphasize a number of collaborative efforts to improve interagency coordination. However, the Oceans Commission Preliminary Report indicates ambiguity over managing other resources on the OCS that have not been directly assigned to a specific agency.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Resource Evaluation and Leasing Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	86%	67%	Effective

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: An independent auditor determined MMS is free of material internal control weaknesses and has procedures to ensure charges are legitimate and payments, accurate. MMS reviews invoices greater than $50,000 and a sample of smaller invoices.

Evidence: The MMS has procedures in place for financial management, quality assurance, contractor oversight, and management control. They include:' Implementation of a Quality Assurance Review Program.' Required training for Contracting Officer's Technical Representatives' FY2003 Independent Auditors Report' MMS Finance Division written procedures on commercial payments

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The program annually conducts Alternative Management Control Reviews. MMS established a Coordinators and Liaisons Group to audit and evaluate program staff members to ensure follow-up. Through observed industry activity, OMM analyzes the results of sales and proactively take steps to develop terms and conditions for future sales that will encourage responsible bidding, exploration, and development with regard to the economic and geologic climate of the sale area.

Evidence: The OCS Policy Committee provides advice on implementation of the OCS Lands Act. Select subcommittees study issues from a variety of perspectives and develop recommendations to inform and improve OCS policy. In addition to strengthening coordination of audit and program evaluation efforts, the bureau is moving toward a risk assessment strategy to ensure evaluation efforts/resources are targeted effectively.Additional evidence includes:' DOI Management Control Handbook.' E-Gov Baseline Report and E-Gov Benchmarking Report for Leasing.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight:20%

Explanation: MMS has a history of providing the greatest access possible to OCS mineral resources as shown by their performance measures. This has enabled industry to produce about 143 trillion cubic feet of natural gas and 13 billion barrels of oil. Since 1995, the Sand and Gravel Program has conveyed approximately 20 million cubic yards of OCS sand, satisfying all requests. They have been successful in offering all available acreage and resources and tracking industry action. Their new measure should help MMS maintain vigilance to ensure that exploration is occurring on lands that are leased.

Evidence: In addition to updating GPRA status to the DOI at least annually, the bureau releases numerous fact sheets, reports, and statistics detailing the program's performance, related industry activity, and resulting revenues. Furthermore, the program monitors national trends in the oil and natural gas industry to see how their program is influencing industry activity.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Resource Evaluation and Leasing Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
80%	88%	86%	67%	

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: If 2.4 is no than 4.2 can only be small extent. The program achieves its annual goals. MMS satisfies critical action dates (for environmental considerations and stakeholder consultations), holds lease sales that secure fair market value, and offers land and resources to the greatest extent possible.

Evidence: The MMS releases sales summaries, bidding results and related analyses following each lease sale. These reports (some listed below) and statistics detail the acreage offered, the acreage leased, and information related to fair market value. MMS bid adequacy procedures have resulted in higher returns in subsequent sales for tracts that have had bids previously rejected on fair value grounds. For example, one year after MMS rejected combined bids of $11 million on two deepwater blocks in an area of the Green Canyon (Central Gulf of Mexico), the same blocks were re-offered and drew bids of more than $30 million each.' OMM Program Strategies and Tactical Plans ' 2003 Closeout Report' DOI FY 2003 Performance and Accountability Report' OMM GPRA Measures Report

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: OMM used competitive sourcing studies saving almost $2.5M in five years, launched a process review to examine policy and procedural changes and invested in technologies to improve program efficiency.

Evidence: OMM consistently implements organizational efficiencies. Since 1985, staff levels have declined by 25%, while the number of leases managed by the program increased by about 40%.' G&G Data Acquisition 2002, GOM G&G Data 2001' Competitive Sourcing Report' Blueprint Report: Manage and Administer Leasing Program Cluster

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: MMS is the only agency authorized to manage access to mineral resources on the OCS. A benchmarking study evaluating elements of the leasing program to comparable processes in federal, state, private, and foreign organizations found the program practices were on par with the field.

Evidence: MMS commissioned the benchmarking study in an effort to incorporate best practices into OMM's core business processes. The study found that OMM practices were superior in 13 of 14 comparisons to other public sector land leasing organizations. Additionally, the report concluded that MMS does use best practices in selected leasing processes, and recommended 21 methods for improving other leasing activities. Evidence: Benchmarking and Blueprint Report: Manage and Administer Leasing Program Cluster, March, 2004.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Resource Evaluation and Leasing Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	86%	67%	Effective

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Independent evaluations of varying scope found the program effective. In 1997, the National Academies of Science found that 'MMS' efforts 'resulted in the creation of novel collaborative processes, the resolution of several long-term disputes, and an increase in oil production...' More recently, the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy reported that "the OCS oil and gas program has a well institutionalized and reasonably comprehensive management regime' Though the report noted there is ambiguity over the management of some of the ocean resources.

Evidence: Independent evaluations come from Ocean Commission Preliminary Report, 2003 Independent Auditor's Report and Reports from the National Academies of Science and the OCS Policy Committee.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Resource Evaluation and Leasing Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	86%	67%	Effective

Measure: Percent of available OCS acres offered for leasing during the 5-Year Program compared to what was planned for leasing

Additional Information: This measure tracks the extent to which MMS is offering access to OCS acreage. A high percentage means the goals set in consultation with stakeholders were realistic and attainable.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
1997-2002	Baseline	59%	
2002-2007	58%	99%	

Measure: Percent of leases drilled annually for the first time. (First number is 5-year leases, second 8- and 10-year leases.)

Additional Information: Indicates new activity on undrilled leases. Shows that the program is leasing to companies that are actively seeking production to meet the energy needs of the country. First number is 5-year leases, second 8- and 10-year leases.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2000		7.2/1.6	
2001		8.3/1.9	
2003		8.0/1.5	
2002		6.7/1.3	
2004	7.5/1.7	7.5/1.7	
2005	7.5/1.7		
2006	7.5/1.7		

Measure: Percent of available OCS acres offered for leasing in each year's lease-sales. Years with low targets reflect the program's assumption that there will be no industry interest, and thus, no sale in scheduled ultra-frontier areas offshore Alaska.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the acres offered in a year's OCS lease-sales compared to the total acres in the applicable program areas.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
1997-2002	Baseline	87%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Resource Evaluation and Leasing Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	86%	67%	Effective

2002	99%	99%
2003	78%	78%
2004	57%	58%
2005	99%	
2006	99%	
2007	47%	

Measure: Percent of available OCS oil and gas resources offered in each year's lease-sales

Additional Information: This measure tracks the extent to which MMS is providing access to OCS oil and gas resources. The target means that the percentage of undiscovered resources offered will be greater than the percentage of available OCS acreage offered. The targets assume success in meeting Performance Measure two.

Year	Target	Actual
1997-2002	Baseline	85%
2006	>99%	
2003	>78%	78%
2004	>57%	89%
2005	>99%	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Percent of high bids on leases accepted or rejected within 60 days

Additional Information: This measure tracks timeliness of bid evaluation, impacting both industry access to the OCS and federal receipt of funds. 100% will be completed within 120 days. Targets here are for lease-sales with fewer than 600 tracts receiving bids.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		57%
2004	60%	63%

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Resource Evaluation and Leasing Program
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Minerals Management Service
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
80%	88%	86%	67%	Effective

2005	60%
2006	65%

Measure: Change in acres with leasing incentives receiving bids, compared to acres receiving bids without incentives in previous sales.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the effect of leasing incentives on bidding. MMS expects substantial increases during the two or three years following implementation of a new leasing incentive. MMS assumes that bids over the baseline are due to incentives.

Year	Target	Actual
2000	Baseline	1 M
2001	1 M	1.4 M
2002	1 M	1.1 M
2003	1 M	1.5 M
2004	1 M	1.8 M
2005	1 M	
2006	UD	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Percentage of tracts with high bids rejected in the previous lease-sale receiving acceptable high bids at the planning area's next lease-sale

Additional Information: This measure tracks the effect of MMS bid adequacy procedures on bidding and serves as a validation of MMS Fair Market Valuation.

Year	Target	Actual
1997-2002	Baseline	44%
2002-2007	50%	45%

Measure Term: Annual

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Capital Assets & Service Acquisition Programs

Name of Program: RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECTS

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	No	The program purpose is not clear because each individual project was authorized with its own goals, which may differ from those of other projects. Reclamation does not have a rural water program per se. The projects are not organized in any coherent plan to unite these projects toward a common goal. Although Reclamation does not have a rural water program, one of Reclamation's purposes is to deliver water in an environmentally responsible and cost-efficient manner. Congress has directed Reclamation to fund 11 rural water projects with differing requirements and cost sharing arrangements with the general purpose of providing potable water to communities, tribes, and areas of need. Reclamation serves as the oversight agency in each of these projects and approaches them in a similar manner: to provide the technical and administrative oversight needed to complete the planning, design, and construction of its projects.	In each rural water project in which it serves as the oversight agency, Reclamation enters into cooperative agreements with the project sponsors to provide funds for planning, designing, constructing, operating, maintaining, and replacing their respective systems. The cooperative agreements and Indian Self-determination Act (Public Law. 93-638) agreements with the project sponsors specify the responsibilities for Reclamation and the project sponsors.	20%	0.0
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Congress has chosen Reclamation to fill a void for projects which are larger and more complex than other rural water projects, and which do not meet the criteria of other rural water programs. Reclamation's involvement in rural water stems from its reputation as one of the few Federal agencies that has large project management skills as well as the capability to carry a large project to completion.	Congress is seeking to take advantage of Reclamation's 100 years of experience and expertise in providing administrative oversight over the design of most of the major water development and delivery systems in the West. The 11 rural water projects that Congress authorized for Reclamation involvement typically include more than one local entity, cover a large regional area serving multiple local utilities, cost from $100-400 million or more, and take 5 to 10 years to build.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Congress has chosen Reclamation to fill a void for projects that are larger and more complex than other rural water projects. These projects will provide an adequate supply of safe water to geographically dispersed communities and tribes.	Reclamation invests more Federal dollars in rural water projects of greater magnitude than any other Federal agency. Of the 11 rural water projects in which Reclamation is involved, 7 have combined estimated construction costs totaling $2 billion. The Federal contribution for each Indian component of a project is 100% and as much as 85% for non-Indian projects. For example, the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply Project has a total estimated cost of $400 million and ultimately will serve 50,000 people, including 40,000 Indians on 3 reservations. By comparison, programs of the Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Rural Utilities Service (RUS), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of Health and Human Services' Indian Health Service (IHS) serve smaller systems and have overall much lower costs.	20%	0.2
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	Congress has chosen Reclamation to fill a void for projects which are larger and more complex than other rural water projects, and which do not meet the criteria of other rural water programs. Reclamation's involvement stems from its reputation as one of the few Federal agencies that has large project management skills as well as the capability to carry a large project to completion.	Each of the 11 rural water projects that Congress authorized for Reclamation involvement serves a specific purpose and population. These projects are generally larger and more complex than rural water projects undertaken by other agencies. For example, the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply Project has a total estimated cost of $400 million and includes a water treatment plant, 4500 miles of pipeline, 60 booster pump stations, and 35 water storage reservoirs, and will serve 50,000 people, including 40,000 Indians on 3 reservations. By comparison, RUS, which assists rural communities to develop drinking water supplies and solid waste disposal, funds small projects limited to systems serving fewer than 10,000 persons. The RUS program is primarily a loan and grant program for individual systems with little technical assistance provided by RUS itself. Rural water programs at EPA and at IHS are typically quite small compared to the dollars spent and the number of people served by Reclamation projects.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	No	Reclamation's involvement in rural water is not optimally designed to take advantage of Reclamation's experience and expertise. Congress has directed Reclamation to fund individual projects with specific requirements and cost sharing arrangements which differ from traditional Reclamation projects, often without involving the Bureau in the design and planning phase of a project.	Reclamation's role in rural water has been dictated by Congress and project sponsors who are frustrated by current Reclamation law and policy, which requires project-specific authority for feasibility studies and construction, and full repayment of municipal water project construction costs with interest. As a result, project sponsors often pre-judge the analyses of alternatives and dictate the desired outcome. The resulting studies seldom undergo Reclamation and Administration review, and are not prepared in accordance with current Federal planning and engineering standards. As such, these studies provide a poor basis for the project planning, design and construction. Also, the Federal cost-share for current projects has been enacted without regard to the project sponsors' repayment capabilities. Further, the trend toward Reclamation covering all tribal operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of project infrastructure in perpetuity will have increasingly significant budget impacts well into the future.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**60%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning		**(Yes, No, N/A)**				
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	Reclamation does not have a rural water program, and does not have long-term goals adequate for managing its rural water projects in a comprehensive fashion. Although Reclamation has long-term performance goals to deliver water in an environmentally responsible and cost-efficient manner, they are not satisfactory for long-term management of a program whose goals and project purpose are unclear. Congress has directed Reclamation to fund 11 rural water projects designed with specific and different requirements and capabilities. Reclamation serves as the oversight agency in each of these projects and approaches them in a similar manner: to provide the technical and administrative oversight needed to complete the planning, design, and construction of its projects.	Congress has authorized 11 rural water projects for Reclamation involvement. Reclamation enters into cooperative agreements with the project sponsors to provide funds for planning, designing, constructing, operating, maintaining, and replacing their respective systems. The cooperative agreements and Public Law 93-638 agreements with the project sponsors specify the responsibilities for Reclamation and the project sponsors to furnish timely and reliable project performance information. Reclamation's oversight includes reviewing and approving reports, construction plans, specifications, work schedules, fund requests, and change orders. Project sponsors provide detailed schedules in support of fund requests to allow for effective tracking of expenses and budgets.	13%	0.0
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	Yes	Annual goals are established and performance measured based on construction contracts completed by the project sponsors under cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the project sponsors. These annual goals help guide program management, even though long-term goals for the program are inadequate.	The project sponsors develop the project work plan and schedule and are responsible for accomplishing the activities with the given amount of funding for that year. The construction contracts generally are fixed-price contracts with a specific completion date and specified performance requirements. Reclamation monitors the sponsors' progress in construction within the parameters of the cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the sponsors. Reclamation's approval of funding requests depends on the project sponsors' accounting of costs and project performance. Annual performance goals are: (1) Execution of all necessary cooperative agreements and obligation of appropriated funds; (2) Number score of satisfaction for rural water customers served by Reclamation; and (3) Percent of acre-feet delivered on time as defined in contracts.	13%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	No	All partners do not support program planning efforts. Reclamation's rural water program came into existence due to the successful efforts of project sponsors to circumvent Administration oversight of project development. Current Reclamation law and policy requiring project-specific authority for feasibility studies and construction, and full repayment of municipal and industrial water project construction costs with interest does not appear to be compatible with or responsive to the needs and expectations of rural water users. The water users circumvented these guidelines when they developed their projects. Additionally, there is no rural water program per se, and each project sponsor has its own agenda for long-term goals.	The Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and the Water Conservation and Utilization Act of 1939 require 100% repayment, with interest, of construction costs allocated to municipal water supply. The 1939 Act also requires that each proposed project be studied for feasibility as directed by Congress and then subsequently be authorized by a separate act of Congress. These and other Reclamation law provisions have led project sponsors to formulate projects and negotiate project financing terms with Congress in one step. The projects are justified through studies which are not prepared in accordance with current Federal planning and engineering standards and that do not consider ability-to-pay. The resulting authorizations provide as little as 15% cost-share for non-Indian project components, and no cost-share for tribes.	13%	0.0
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	No	The four agencies that have rural water programs (BOR, USDA, HUD, and EPA) do not effectively coordinate with one another.	USDA, HUD, and EPA signed a Joint Memorandum of Understanding to foster cooperation among rural water and wastewater programs at the Federal, State, and local level, which in turn will encourage more efficient use of funds and reduce administrative inefficiencies. Due to Reclamation lacking a formal authorized program, the other rural water agencies refused Reclamation's request to participate.	13%	0.0
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	Yes	The Department of the Interior's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and independent auditors review each project for appropriateness of costs charged. Project accountability and controls are included in the annual statement of accountability audit which is performed by an independent auditor.	Independent evaluations are performed on an as-needed basis. The OIG audited the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply Project and produced reports on the 4 project components in May-June 1999. Reclamation routinely performs Value Engineering studies to identify cost-saving measures related to project design. For example, Reclamation and the Lewis and Clark project performed a Value Engineering study and identified more than $10 million in savings.	13%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	Yes	As the project oversight agency, Reclamation develops master plans for each project that allows Reclamation to assess the collective impacts of changes in annual funding, policy or legislation. Annual goals for this program reflect impacts to performance due to changes in funding, policy, and legislation.	Master plans often indicate situations where funding shortfalls will have long-term repercussions. For example, there currently is an amendment pending before Congress to increase the construction ceiling and extend the authorized construction period for the Mni Wiconi Project. The amendment is needed due to increased construction costs prompted in part by successive years of annual appropriations which were less than anticipated in the project master plan.	13%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	Reclamation is working a proposal through the Department of the Interior intended to address concerns regarding project design, planning, and authorization.	The Reclamation proposal would address current and future needs for domestic and municipal water supplies in rural areas of the West. The program would provide the ability to conduct appraisal and feasibility level studies for proposed rural water supply systems, the development of common/suitable criteria and designs to guide the implementation of resulting projects, a mechanism for recommending the resulting proposals to Congress for construction authorization, funding strategies for construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement, and coordination between the many Federal, State, and other entities involved in rural water supply systems.	13%	0.1
8 (Cap 1.)	*Are acquisition program plans adjusted in response to performance data and changing conditions?*	Yes	Project sponsors adjust their goals for contracting for components of the project on a contract-by-contract basis based on the results of its competitive bidding process.	Project sponsors award construction contracts based on competitive bidding that provides for obtaining the required projects at the lowest price. As bids come in on the contract, project sponsors must adjust the Master Plan accordingly -- up or down. Reclamation will not approve contract awards unless project sponsors can demonstrate that letting the contract will not over-obligate funds which have been identified in the project master plan for a given year.	13%	0.1
9 (Cap 2.)	*Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule and performance goals?*	N/A	Project sponsors work with Congress to authorize projects without going through the normal Administration process of considering project alternatives. Alternatives to projects are normally considered as part of the authorization process, but once authorized it is not feasible to regularly reconsider alternatives. Reclamation routinely balances long-term funding requirements for all authorized projects against the potential for cost savings through accelerating completion of portions of construction for select projects.	As projects near completion of construction, Reclamation has increased funding allocations for those projects before starting construction on newly authorized projects. For example, the Mid Dakota project is 58% complete and has received about a 50% increase in funding in recent years.	0%	
Total Section Score					**100%**	**63%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	Yes	Reclamation serves as the oversight agency. Reclamation monitors the construction activities of the project sponsors on a regular basis as established in each project's cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the project sponsor. Operation and maintenance of the system is the responsibility of the non-Indian project sponsors and is not monitored. Operation and maintenance of the Indian systems is the responsibility of the Tribe and also is not monitored.	The cooperative agreements with the project sponsors and Public Law. 93-638 specify the responsibilities for Reclamation and the project sponsors to furnish timely and reliable project performance information. This occurs during the funding process with monthly payment requests being reviewed by Reclamation along with the construction progress of the project. Reclamation also has periodic progress meetings with the project sponsors. The project sponsors provide inspection reports and progress reports at specific intervals as specified in the cooperative agreement. Reclamation conducts site visits to monitor performance.	9%	0.1
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	Yes	Federal managers' performance evaluations generally include a rating based on the management and control of projects under their purview. Project funding is based, in part, on the project sponsors' progress in completing individual project components of the overall project.	The project sponsors develop the project work plan and schedule, and are responsible for accomplishing the activities with the given amount of funding for that year. The construction contracts generally are fixed-price contracts with a specific completion date and specified performance requirements. Reclamation monitors the sponsors' progress in construction within the parameters of the cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the sponsors. Reclamation's approval of funding requests depends on the project sponsors' accountability of the costs and project performance. Reclamation also monitors and audits the project sponsors' administration and overhead expenses.	9%	0.1
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Funding is dedicated to specific contract accomplishments achieved by the project sponsors. Annual funding for Reclamation's rural water projects is obligated through multi-year cooperative agreements and Indian Self-determination Act (Public Law. 93-638) agreements that specify what the funds will be used for by the project sponsors as they construct their projects.	To date, annual funding coming to Reclamation for the authorized rural water projects has not exceeded the construction capability of the project sponsors, therefore all funding has been expended in a timely manner. Expenditure of funds on individual projects on an annual basis depends on the ability of the project sponsors to plan, design, and award contracts. Overall, this process has occurred without major delays.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	Yes	Projects are reviewed and monitored to ensure cost efficient practices are employed by the project sponsors. Exceptional cases recognize statutory requirements for Indian Self-determination Act (Public Law. 93-638) agreements which Reclamation cannot control. This Act gives priority to tribal contractors to work on projects for tribal purposes.	Project sponsors award construction contracts based on competitive bidding, which provides for obtaining the required projects at the lowest price. Reclamation and the project sponsors regularly conduct Value Engineering studies on the projects and parts thereof to develop more cost effective construction of the systems.	9%	0.1
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Present cost accounting systems of the Department comply with Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board #4 - Managerial Cost Accounting. Full costs are reported at the segment level from the Departmental perspective and also from the bureau perspective. This includes full cost reporting by Department strategic goals in the Department's Annual Accountability Report and by bureau mission goals in bureau-level annual financial statements. Cost accounting at lower levels, as requested by individual PART reviews, does not currently accumulate full costs as defined in the PART instructions and OMB Circular A-11; for example, "the full employer share of the annual accruing cost of retiree pension and health benefits is not included."		9%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	Construction oversight and contracts management practices by Reclamation are in place and effective based on audit findings.	An audit conducted during May-June 1999 on the Mni Wiconi Project by the Inspector General found no material weaknesses in Reclamation's oversight capacity that directly related to the audit. The OIG recommended that the project sponsors undertake several actions in order to ensure that costs incurred by them were expended in accordance with Federal law, regulations, and funding agreements. Reclamation concurred or proposed acceptable alternative solutions in all of the recommendations. Reclamation also develops annual assurance statements on management controls and complies with all Department requirements on financial accountability.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	Reclamation is working a proposal through the Department intended to address concerns regarding project design, planning, and authorization.	The Reclamation proposal would address current and future needs for domestic and municipal water supplies in rural areas of the West. The program would provide the ability to conduct appraisal and feasibility level studies for proposed rural water supply systems, the development of common/suitable criteria and designs to guide the implementation of resulting projects, a mechanism for recommending the resulting proposals to Congress for construction authorization, funding strategies for construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement, and coordination between the many Federal, State, and other entities involved in rural water supply systems.	9%	0.1
8 (Cap 1.)	*Does the program define the required quality, capability, and performance objectives of deliverables?*	Yes	Reclamation provides quality control and oversight for all design and construction activities for its rural water projects in accordance with Federal law, regulations, and funding agreements.	The WEB, Mid Dakota, and Mni Wiconi projects are delivering water to project beneficiaries in compliance with Safe Drinking Water Act standards and consistent with industry standards. Other rural water projects are not as far along in the planning/construction stage (three are still studies), but each will be monitored according to project-specific construction and water delivery schedules.	9%	0.1
9 (Cap 2.)	*Has the program established appropriate, credible, cost and schedule goals?*	Yes	Reclamation dedicates funding to specific contract accomplishments achieved by the project sponsors. Multi-year cooperative agreements and Indian Self-determination Act (Pub. L. 93-638) agreements specify how the project sponsors will obligate annual funds as they construct their projects.	To date, annual funding coming to Reclamation for the authorized rural water projects has not exceeded the construction capability of the project sponsors, therefore all funding has been expended in the timely manner. Expenditure of funds on individual projects on an annual basis depends on the ability of the project sponsors to plan, design, and award contracts in a timely manner. Overall, this process has occurred without major delays.	9%	0.1
10 (Cap 3.)	*Has the program conducted a recent, credible, cost-benefit analysis that shows a net benefit?*	No	Congress has directed Reclamation to fund 11 individual projects with specific requirements and cost sharing arrangements which differ from traditional Reclamation projects often without involving the Bureau in the design and planning phase of a project. As a result, Reclamation cannot revisit the cost-benefit analysis after project authorization.	Reclamation's role in rural water has been dictated by Congress and by project sponsors who are unhappy with current Reclamation law and policy requiring project specific authority for feasibility studies and construction, and full repayment of municipal water project construction costs with interest. As a result, project sponsors facing Safe Drinking Water standard violations often pre-judge the analyses of alternatives and dictate the desired outcome to meet those standards. The resulting studies seldom have been developed with Reclamation's input, are not prepared in accordance with current Federal planning and engineering standards, and do not consider the project sponsors' repayment capabilities.	9%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
11 (Cap 4.)	*Does the program have a comprehensive strategy for risk management that appropriately shares risk between the government and contractor?*	Yes	Reclamation enters into cooperative agreements with the project sponsors to provide funds for planning, designing, constructing, operating, maintaining, and replacing their respective systems. The cooperative agreements and Public Law. 93-638 agreements with the project sponsors clearly specify the responsibilities for Reclamation and the project sponsors, and allocate risk accordingly.	The project sponsors develop the project work plan and schedule and are responsible for accomplishing the activities with the given amount of funding for that year. The construction contracts generally are fixed-price contracts with a specific completion date and specified performance requirements. Reclamation monitors the sponsors' progress in construction within the parameters of the cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the sponsors. Reclamation's approval of funding requests depends on the project sponsors' accountability of the costs and project performance.	9%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**82%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	The program does not have adequate long-term performance measures, therefore it has no basis for evaluating long-term progress. In particular, those measures it has lack clear timeframes. However, project data indicates that Reclamation is achieving results in delivering water in an environmentally responsible and cost-efficient manner.	Several projects are providing an adequate supply of safe water to the target population. The WEB Project is 100% complete. The Mid-Dakota Project is 58% complete. The Mni Wiconi Project is 43% complete. The Garrison Project is 61% complete. Other rural water projects are not as far along in the planning/construction stage (three are still studies), but each will be monitored according to project-specific construction and water delivery schedules.	17%	0.0

Long-Term Goal I:	Percent of targeted population served with reliable, safe drinking water.
Target:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.
Long-Term Goal II:	Percent of contracted water orders delivered.
Target:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.
Long-Term Goal III:	Cost per acre-foot of water delivered.
Target:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	Large Extent	Annual goals are established and performance measured based on construction contracts completed by the project sponsors under cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the project sponsors.	The project sponsors develop the project work plan and schedule and are responsible for accomplishing the activities with the given amount of funding for that year. The construction contracts generally are fixed-price contracts with a specific completion date and specified performance requirements. Reclamation monitors the sponsors' progress in construction within the parameters of the cooperative agreements between Reclamation and the sponsors. Reclamation's approval of funding requests depends on the project sponsors' accountability of the costs and project performance. Of the three performance measures listed below, Interior is developing Key Goals 2 and 3 as part of its new Strategic Plan. However, Key Goal 1 is not currently part of this process.	17%	0.1

Key Goal I:	Execution of all necessary cooperative agreements and obligation of appropriated funds.
Performance Target:	Annual obligations meet contractual requirements in each Fiscal Year.
Actual Performance:	
Key Goal II:	Number score of satisfaction for rural water customers served by Reclamation.
Performance Target:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.
Actual Performance:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.
Key Goal III:	Percent of acre-feet delivered on time as defined in contracts.
Performance Target:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.
Actual Performance:	To be developed as part of the Department's new Strategic Planning process.

3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	Small Extent	Construction schedules are modified where efficiencies and cost benefits can be derived by the modifications. Not all possible savings can be recognized due to shortfalls in funding.	In a May 1999 Audit Report, the OIG found that if the West River/Lyman Jones Rural Water System (part of Mni Wiconi) completed their portion as currently designed, their portion of the project would be $6.6 million less than the indexed costs projected by Reclamation.	17%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	Small Extent	Although project construction has proceeded as scheduled based on dollars appropriated, the magnitude of Reclamation's projects make comparisons with other programs with significantly smaller projects difficult. Reclamation's rural water projects were part of the common measures exercise for rural water projects. Based on the outcome of this exercise, Reclamation's rural water projects do not compare very favorably. However, Reclamation's project exist because they failed to meet the criteria of other rural water programs. Their poor performance seems to be from the nature of the projects that Congress authorizes, and not due to poor project management.	At first glance, Reclamation's rural water program does not compare favorably to the other programs compared in the common measures exercise. As part of the Rural Water Project Common Measures exercise, OMB compared the rural water programs of BOR, EPA's Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, RUS, and IHS, using two measures: Water Connections per $ million, and Population Served per $ million. Reclamation's project did not compare favorably for either of these metrics (21 connections per $ million for BOR vs. 212 (IHS), 649 (RUS), and 764 (EPA). For Population Served per $ Million the story was similar: 363 for BOR vs. 933 (IHS), 1779 (RUS), and 1655 (EPA). BOR's projects are generally larger and more complex than other rural water projects. RUS' program funds relatively small projects limited to systems serving less than 10,000 persons, with an average project cost for 87 projects in 38 states of about $1.8 million. Rural water programs at EPA and at IHS are typically quite small compared to the dollars spent and the number of people served by Reclamation pr	17%	0.1
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	Small Extent	Based on the independent evaluations performed, Reclamation is working with its project sponsors to improve project effectiveness. The Mni Wiconi Project is 43% complete and currently providing some project water to project beneficiaries in a relatively effective manner according to OIG auditors.	An audit conducted during May-June 1999 on the Mni Wiconi Project by the Inspector General found no material weaknesses in Reclamation's oversight capacity that directly related to the audit. The OIG recommended that the project sponsors undertake several actions in order to ensure that costs incurred by them were expended in accordance with Federal law, regulations, and funding agreements. Reclamation concurred or proposed acceptable alternative solutions in all of the recommendations. Reclamation also develops annual assurance statements on management controls and complies with all Department requirements on financial accountability.	17%	0.1
6 (Cap 1.)	*Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?*	Large Extent	Reclamation is achieving results in delivering water in an environmentally responsible and cost-efficient manner.	Several projects are providing an adequate supply of safe water to the target population. The WEB Project is 100% complete. The Mid-Dakota Project is 58% complete. The Mni Wiconi Project is 43% complete. The Garrison Project is 61% complete. Each are currently providing some project water to project beneficiaries.	17%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**39%**

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Reclamation's (BOR's) research program has a clear mission statement: facilitating the development and use of new scientific and technological solutions that contribute significantly to a safe, affordable, sustainable, and ample water and power supply. The purpose of the desalination research established by Congress is to develop more cost-effective, technologically efficient, and implementable means to desalinate water.

Evidence: Tab 1.1-1: Web page postings of Science &Technology (S&T) Program Goal Statement show a clear, focused program mission stated in two separate places at www.usbr.gov/research.1.1-2: Program PowerPoint slide that shows program mission goal that has been presented at recent National Water Resources Association (NWRA), Western Coalition of Arid States (WESCAS), and other conferences. 1.1-3: Replies from NWRA members showing strong support for S&T Program Goal.1.1-4: P.L. 104-298 (Water Desalination Act of 1996) states the purpose of the legislation.1.1-5: The home page of Reclamation's Desal website shows the purpose of the program on the first page. The website is located at <www.usbr.gov/water/desal.html>.The Reclamation Act of 1902, and Public Law 92-149 provides authority for research focused on BOR mission needs.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Growing shortages of water and escalating water conflicts pose many challenges for Reclamation water managers and water users. Research is customized to find innovative solutions focused on BOR core end outcomes of water and power deliveries and on the specific needs of our stakeholders (i.e., Reclamation resource managers and the external water managers and water users served by Reclamation project waters). The program is designed to ensure research is targeted to those problems, interests, and needs. The program has a multi-objective steering team that includes internal and external stakeholders, and serves to steer, validate, and prioritize program needs and direction. The desalination research also serves national water supply needs.

Evidence: Water supplies in the U.S. are becoming progressively more scarce. 1.2-1: US Census and USGeological Survey (USGS) data show the Western US has an exploding population base, and a fixed amount of fresh water. 1.2-2: WATER2025 initiative describes this problem. 1.2-3: BOR's prime focus is in West. 1.2-4: Program addresses unique problems and solutions, pg. 1. 1.2-5: National Research Council (NRC) (2001) reports water problems & research needs. 1.2-6: The S&T Roadmap guides research proposals and program decisions to focus on four main research areas. 1.2-7: Nested in the 4 research focus areas are 20 mission-specific R&D output areas, each with specific goals and objectives. 1.2-8: Sect. I.F, I.G, and VI of the proposal form shows that research is focused on problems specific to BOR challenges, needs, and responsibilities. 1.2-9: Letter from WESCAS. 1.2-10: Desalination R&D brochure; 1.2-11, 'Desalination and Water Purification Technology Roadmap', pp 8-28; 1.2-12: the Multi-State Salinity Coalition article; 1.2-13 & 14, two articles; and 1.2-15: Golden Workshop Report.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: No other Research & Development (R&D) programs are dedicated to developing solutions for Reclamation water managers/users and their water needs. The program was designed to focus on these needs (see response to Question 1.2 and 4.4). It uses multiple mechanisms to avoid duplication and catalyze collaboration and coordination with others involved in water resources research. Subsidized agricultural water market prices do not provide sufficient private sector incentive for the R&D necessary. Private sector investments in desal. focus on incremental change of specific products; profit margins are too thin to support the high risk and long development times for basic desal. research. The mission of desalination cost reduction is unique, but other agencies work with the same technologies as they relate to their military mission requirements of reliability and portability. To avoid redundant research and facilitate information sharing, the program manages an interagency consortium on desalination and has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with other research funding non-profits.

Evidence: 1.3-1: A federal research coordinating committee ensures no duplication of research activities and encourage collaboration. 1.3-2: Established a multi-agency and stakeholder steering team that helps avoid duplication, encourage collaboration, and identifies R&D entities having ability to compliment or support BOR efforts. 1.3-3: Notes summarize the unique niches served by BOR R&D as applied and focused on solutions to BOR problems, while the USGS focus is on more basic R&D plus water data collection and dissemination. 1.3-4: Collaboration planning document. 1.3-5: Section V of proposal form and proposal ranking factors avoids duplication by encouraging coordination with partners having similar objectives through resource leveraging. 1.3-6: A memo addressing collaboration with USGS and the National Institutes for Water Resources (NIWR). 1.2-8, Section I.G of proposal form and ranking factors avoids duplicative efforts. 1.3-7: Consortium minutes. 1.3-8: MOU for Research Task Force. 1.3-9: BOR desalination research plan. 1.3-10 Excerpts from proposals about the absence of possible funding from other sources.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program is efficient and produces considerable results with a very small budget. Management is 4% of program budget. Program established a competitive environment and funds intramural & extramural research in a timely manner. It has established means to spread awareness and application of results and has external peer review mechanisms. Effective business practice improvements focus efforts on current and future BOR water management needs and goals, promote resource leveraging, avoid duplication, and evaluate costs and benefits. One area for improvement is the lack of overarching cooperative agreement/grant authority for R&D. Such authority would facilitate easier, stronger collaborative efforts with researchers at other institutions; and further increase competition for research funding. Other agencies such as Corps of Engineers (COE), USGS, National Park Service (NPS), and Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) have such authorities. Another area for improvement is where power marketing agencies benefit from BOR R&D that lead to cheaper power,but do not fund BOR R&D.

Evidence: 1.4-1: New competitive call for proposals. 1.4-2: External award for Exceptional Process Improvement. 1.4-3: Western Coalition of Arid States letter shows stakeholder value/low cost. 1.4-4: 4% program management/admin costs based on actual expenditures. 1.4-5&6: Proposal form/guidelines ensure focus on needs & resource leveraging. New on-line system for efficient program workflow & progress reporting. 1.4-7: Proposals awarded with greatest potential; best benefits; high leveraging. 1.4-8: Reward innovative, high quality R&D at reasonable cost, penalize duplication of capabilities. 1.4-9: Independent steering team identifies R&D priorities. 1.4-10: Project partner list. 1.4-11: External reviewers ensure effectiveness. Ex: removal of a flaw: initially offered $25k coop. agreements for extramural desal. projects but efforts were too small to be effective, ensure completion, and the project admin. was a large percentage of costs. Increasing fed. share to $100k ensured useful R&D accomplished. See also 1.2-11 Desal Research Roadmap, pp 38-45. 1.4.12 Extramural desal. proposal process.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program targets Reclamation resource managers and the external water managers and water users served by Reclamation project waters. Since 2001, the S&T Program has been restructured to ensure maximum focus on program stakeholders and their priority needs, to involve them throughout the R&D process, and provide new R&D results. The program has also established program goals that measure performance in terms of the core values of stakeholders and their expected outcomes of water, power, and avoided costs. Internal & external stakeholders have stated support for program goals and practices. Since 1989, Reclamation has held desal workshops with stakeholders and conducted studies to identify needs and promising technologies. Reclamation used the information obtained from these activities to guide the program. Beneficiaries are targeted through the research solicitation process, which is competitive, merit-reviewed and cost-shared.

Evidence: 1.5-1: Steering team guides program direction & priorities. 1.5-2: Outreach workshop for stretching ag. water supplies & invasive species workshops demonstrate outreach & involvement of stakeholders.(also posted on BuRec website). 1.1-3 NWRA members show strong support for S&T Program Goal. 1.2-9: Letter from WESCAS states support for program. Both Steering & BOR Leadership Teams show strong support for program practices & management(see 2.6). 1.4-11: Stakeholders influence direction of efforts through relevancy review. 1.4-7, Relevancy proposal ranking criteria rewards proposals with greatest potential for high use of R&D outputs. Ranking process rewards proposals that work with stakeholders throughout the research process. 1.2-8, Sections I.F, I.G, & VI of the program proposal form shows that research is focused on problems specific to BOR. 1.2-6 & 1.2-7, S&T Program Roadmap, effectively targets proposals to support BOR's core mission. 1.5-3, 'Desalting Needs References,' shows how needs and beneficiaries are identified. 1.5-4, -5, -6 and -7, the current Broad Agency Announcements, describe how research projects are selected.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The program has 3 long-term outcome goals and measures : 1) Quantity of water liberated, 2) Kilowatts (kW) of power generated, and 3) avoided operational costs. The program contributes to safe, affordable, sustainable, and ample water and power supplies by developing and implementing solutions that liberate water for increased use, or more dependable beneficial use, for BOR stakeholders; solutions that contribute to increased power generation, and/or that reduce or minimize operational costs so program stakeholders can use their financial resources more effectively. All outcome goals try to achieve at least a 10:1 economic return of the federal S&T Program investment and include extramural desalination research contributions. Program efficiency measures are in terms of outputs that contribute to outcomes and pursue a 34% improved efficiency over 6 years. The desal. program has 3 additional long-term performance measures under review by the NRC: 1) Reduce the cost of desal. & water treatment; 2) Reduce environmental impact of facilitiy operations; and 3) Increase technology transfer and awareness.

Evidence: 2.1-1: Explains long-term outcome goals and measures; long-term goal reporting period is 6 years. 2.1-2, Section 1.1, the outcome goals of water liberated, power generated, and operational costs avoided support the program's goal and purpose. 2.1-3: Table demonstrates alignment of the 3 program outcome goals to Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) goals. 2.1-4, Section III.A explains the long-term efficiency measures in terms of two key outputs: (1) Resource leveraging measures the value others place on S&T efforts and also directs more resources and coordination toward issues shared by partners; (2) Production and dissemination of S&T Bulletins that target program beneficiaries and peers with relevant findings. 2.1-5: Slides explaining output efficiency measures have been presented at NWRA, WESCAS, Performance Institute, Department of the Interior (DOI), et al. 2.1-6: S&T Bulletin template and production flowchart. Objectives in the Broad Area Announcement (BAA) (Section A.2.2) can be found in Tabs 1.5-4 to 1.5-7. Tab 1.2-10, Table 1, page 11, has desal long-term performance measures.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Long-term goals have a 6-year timeframe. Outcomes target a minimum 10:1 economic return on the S&T investment in terms of outcomes that result from deployment of R&D outputs. Long-term output goals catalyze progress toward outcome goals. Output-based goals pursue greater levels (minimum 34% increase over 6 years) of (1) resource leveraging and (2) S&T Bulletins for more effective and timely transfer of new tools and knowledge to the end-user of the research outputs. Targets are ambitious considering the relatively small size of the program, diversity of R&D needs, and the fact that new research outputs must be put into use in order to achieve outcome goals. Desalination research targets described are ambitious. The desalination research roadmap has developed specific long-term (2020) targets that are very ambitious and are currently under review by the NRC. The approved desal roadmap targets will then become additional program targets.

Evidence: 2.2-1: Section II.A and III.B of S&T Program Goal document shows the specific, quantified program outcome targets and output targets over a 6-year reporting period (FY2005-10). 2.2-2: For the relatively small size of the program, achieving a 10:1 return on the R&D investment in terms of stakeholder outcome benefits achieved is considered ambitious. Likewise, a 34% increase over 6-years in the production efficiency of key program outputs is also considered ambitious. 2.2-3: Section II.E shows the established implementation schedule for program goals, baselines, and performance measures. Baselines for output measures are based on incremental annual improvements over the previous year. The FY2004 accomplishment will serve as the initial baseline for the FY2005-FY2010 reporting period. Establishing baselines for outcome measures are also scheduled by the end of FY2004. Tab 1.2-12, Table 1, p 11, specific needs-driven desal technology based targets and critical objectives were developed (i.e., long-term performance measures).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Annual performance measures are tied directly to annual budget proposals. To achieve the 34% long-term increase in the leveraging and knowledge transfer output goals requires a 5% annual increase in each measure. Output goal measures are normalized with respect to S&T Program investments to create an efficiency ratio that measures production vs. costs. Desalination research projects, partnerships, publications and presentations are required to address the measures stated in Question 2.1. The program management plan that stems from the desalination research roadmap will have annual performance measures based on critical research areas.

Evidence: 2.3-1: Section II.A and III.B of S&T Program Goal document shows the specific, quantified program annual outcome targets and output targets. 2.3-2: Section III.A of the S&T Program Goal document explains the program annual efficiency measures in terms of two key outputs 1) Resource leveraging that measures the value others place in program efforts and also directs more resources and coordination toward common issues shared by partners and 2) Production and dissemination of S&T Bulletins that target program beneficiaries and peers about relevant findings that can facilitate use of new solutions. 2.5-7 shows the evaluation form used. The stakeholder-driven desal research roadmap contains critical objectives based on needs, and matches technologies to address those needs. 2.3-3 shows an example of current efforts on development of one aspect (concentrate management) of the desalination research roadmap.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Annual outcomes target a minimum 10:1 economic return on the annual research investment in terms of outcomes that result from deployment of R&D outputs. Annual output-based efficiency goals pursue greater levels (minimum 5% increase over previous year) of (1) resource leveraging and (2) timely transfer of new tools and knowledge to the end-user of the research outputs. Targets are ambitious considering the relatively small size of the program and the fact that new research outputs must be put into use in order to achieve outcome goals. Now that goals are established, baseline data will be collected in 2004.

Evidence: 2.4-1: Section II.A and III.B of S&T Program Goal document shows specific, quantified annual outcome and output targets. 2.4-2: Both annual outcome and output targets are established to show continued improvement and progress toward meeting long-term targets so that timely corrective actions can be taken toward achieving the long-term goals. 2.4-3: Section II.E of the S&T Program Goal document shows the established implementation schedule for program goals, baselines, and performance measures. Baselines for output measures are based on incremental annual improvements over the previous year. The FY2004 accomplishment will serve as the initial baseline. Establishing baselines for outcome measures is also scheduled by the end of FY2004. 2.4-4: Since program goal development activities did not begin until FY2002, determining if the annual and long-term targets are achievable is based on an analysis of recent case histories. Case histories, in Section II.D of the S&T Program Goal document, indicate targets are achievable and serve as a baseline indicator.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Recipients of funding must demonstrate how their efforts will contribute to research mission, goals, and performance measures. Proposal ranking and funding decisions consider alignment, potential contribution to goals, and past success in meeting goals. Accepted proposals become performance contracts. Failure to perform in accordance with contract jeopardizes continued and future funding. Technical Service Center (TSC) management has committed to supporting program goals and measures. Cooperative extramural research agreements contains the BAA as well as the proposal as part of the "contractual document", thus incorporating program goals. External cooperative partners are informed that collaborative efforts contribute toward BOR mission and research goals and that success and continued funding depends on results toward these goals. Recipients of Cooperative Agreements work on the projects specified in their proposals and federal project managers monitor work to ensure it stays directed to the long-term goals of the program and the specific project goals.

Evidence: 2.5-1: Proposal, sections I.F & V, require demonstration of contributions to goals. 2.5-2: Presentation used with potential partners/contractors shows goals and passion we expect from program partners. 2.5-3: Program stipulates that proposers commit to work toward and report on progress toward goals. 2.5-4: Annual project progress report and guidelines. Progress report is generated for each proposal by an on-line system. All "contractors" must report on their project progress as well as their progress toward their committed contributions toward program goals. Annual resubmittal for project review of progress is required for continued funding and to ensure continued relevance. 2.5-5: TSC, the primary contractor for intramural R&D, has provided a signed agreement to commit to and work toward the S&T Program goals. 2.5-6: Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) form informs cooperating partners that collaborative efforts will contribute toward BOR mission. 2.5-7& 8 Pre- and full-proposal evaluation forms contain program objectives, page 4. See also 1.5-6, pgs 33 - 38

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Program steering team (external & internal program customers, stakeholders, peers) meets annually to provide strategic guidance, non-biased program evaluation, review & prioritize needs, assess progress, & review R&D projects. Periodic briefings on program practices & goals are provided to BOR's leadership & stakeholders with feedback requested. Annual, independent, technical & relevancy review of all new proposals and multi-year projects ensures high quality, a focus on BOR priorities, and progress. Annual reviews of multi-year projects ensures continued relevance & progress. Non-biased peer review groups used for certain cross-cutting R&D areas such as water operations and hydrologic process modeling. Independent peer reviews of the desalination R&D activities were done in 1993, 1995, 1998, & 1999. Presentations are made to critical audiences to get feedback. The 1998 peer review by NWRI was the most significant & forms the basis for the development of the desalination research roadmap, proposed facilitation role for the DOI and legislative concepts.

Evidence: Steering team roster (see1.3-2). 2.6-1: 2001 S&T steering team summary of issues & program responses. 2.6-2: 2001 S&T steering team reviews proposed program practice improvements shows support for practices. 2.6-3: 2002 S&T steering team evaluations & recommendations for improvements show strong support for new practices, focus, & accomplishments. 2.6-4: 2003 evaluations from steering team & BOR leadership show strong support for program management. 2.6-5: Existing & planned independent panels provide technical and user relevancy review of specific R&D areas. Each proposal is reviewed for mission relevancy and annual progress by independent BOR customers and program management (see 1.4-7 & 2.5-4). 2.6-6, 1998 NWRI desal R&D peer review contract; 2.6-7, NWRI peer document; 2.6-8, Changes planned or implemented in response to 1998 review. 2.6-9, Response from a committee member; 2.6-10; a less formal review in 1999. 1.2-11: Desal roadmap addresses program improvements & involved independent experts, and has NRC review underway. 1.3-9 shows planned improvements for desal R&D.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Budget requests are directly linked to program goals & show impact of funding levels on goals, although this level of detail is not always clear in OMB & Congressional requests. Annual output goal measures are based on production efficiency relative to program funding. Linking priorities to funding allocations identifies program impacts. Budget requests and cost reports include complete program costs and all direct and indirect costs are tracked and reported on each R&D project. BOR will start Activity Based Costing (ABC) in FY04 that will the numerous activities that support BOR GPRA goals. Desal budget requests are based on moving technologies from the proof-of-concept stage to piloting and demonstration. A promising new technology or process proven in a 1-year research/laboratory study ($100k maximum) in most cases would be funded at the pilot stage ($270k maximum) for 2 additional years. Funding to date has not allowed 2-year demo projects ($1M maximum). The desal roadmap & related management plan will better match budget requests to annual & long-term performance goals.

Evidence: 2.7-1: S&T Program Goal document includes a breakdown of program goals and budgets according to each of the four program focus areas. The goals, associated performance measures, and budgets are linked so that impacts and achievements with different funding levels can be clearly demonstrated. 2.7.2: The program steering team priorities with overlay of budget scenarios was used to show program impacts during BOR's FY05 budget formulation process. 2.7.3. Full Costing: Comments from the DOI response to 9/2002 GAO audit shows that the BOR cost accounting system is detailed and comprehensive and provides the full costs (direct and indirect) of its programs and activities and that full costs are reported in financial statements and budget reports. The program budget allocation pie chart shows the total costs of the program. Indirect costs are included in each category shown (1.4-4). The pie chart is used during annual budget formulation processes. 1.5.6&7 describe funding levels and task descriptions. 1.2-11, pg 29, Fig 10, desal roadmap has a very broad discussion of budget needs.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The Director of Research and S&T Program Coordinator were new to their positions in FY2000. At that time, program practices and capabilities were assessed through interviews with numerous researchers, BOR managers, and water users. While areas of research were relatively productive, the program management lacked essential elements. As a result, significant new program practices implemented during FY01-FY03 included clear definition of program mission, development of a S&T Program roadmap that puts a sharp focus on BOR stakeholder needs, based competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) & research selection on merit and relevancy, establishing program goals and measures, expanding steering team to include external stakeholders and other agencies, and having the steering team set priorities. The program uses the steering team & periodic briefings with program end-users to provide ongoing input on strategic planning improvements. Many of the corrective steps recommended in the 1998 peer review of desalination research have been taken or are in the process of being implemented.

Evidence: Assesment by new management in FY 2000 found some research areas to be productive but program lacked many essential elements including: priorities, assurance of relevancy, program goals and measures, accountability, clear focus on BOR customers, objective proposal peer review, broad competition for funds. Significant new program practices implemented during FY01-FY-03 to correct these deficiencies are explained in sections 1 & 2 along with associated evidence. Long-term reauthorization of extramural desalination research and steady levels of budget requests will facilitate development and implementation of a management plan that is being created from the desalination research roadmap framework. Evidence contained in the responses to Section 1.1.-1.5 and Section 2.1- 2.4 are relevant for this response, especially sections 1.4 and 2.1-2.4

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Type(s): Research and Development | Competitive Grant | Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

---

2.CA1 **Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: BOR currently has no authority to construct and operate research facilities. Congress directed that a new research facility be planned for desalination. As such, no programmatic alternative analysis was performed. To plan this facility, an Executive Committee of local stakeholders and technical experts was formed to conduct a systematic study of the potential roles for a Tularosa Basin desalination research facility. The study's draft Report to Congress (2.CA1-1) and Environmental Assessment contain recommendations based on alternatives analysis for the facility mission, location, conceptual design, site layout, anticipated costs, organizational structure, and accelerated design/construction process. The program is employing a performance-based design-build contract to reduce costs and eliminate unnecessary contracting delays.

Evidence: The Executive Committee met monthly from January 2002 through August 2002 in Las Cruces, NM and Alamogordo, NM to gather data, analyze alternatives, and select viable options for the development of the Tularosa Basin National Desalination Research Facility. 2.CA1-2, Minutes of Meetings. Site investigations and public meetings were also a part of the process to ensure the best possible product. In addition, BOR held two meetings of Denver technical divisions in April 2003 to validate the Executive Committee's recommendation for a performance-based design-build contract. They concluded that the private sector, performance-based contract was the best alternative for executing the construction of the facility when compared to in-house design-bid-build efforts by BOR or Sandia National Labs.

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The program generates significant research, and leverages significant funds for its size. Alternative R&D projects are identified through a BOR-wide call. Program reviews all proposals to see if BOR is best positioned to conduct/lead the research. Reclamation also evaluated the business practices and efforts of others such as NIWR, California Bay-Delta Program (CALFED), National Science Foundation (NSF), and Department of Energy (DOE) to develop and customize their practices to serve BOR-specific needs. Adopted best practices from NIWR and DOE. Other agencies performing desal. research have different goals and focus on mission needs (e.g., for the military, field reliability and portability are key factors in research rather than commercialization, cost reduction, and concentrate disposal). Reclamation periodically meets with other government agencies, the military and professional research organizations to compare efforts and leverage resources. Within the research roadmap framework, a proposed course of action was developed that currently optimizes benefits within the water community.

Evidence: BOR evaluated R&D business practices of other agencies through: talking to the President of NIWR & the Corps' R&D Director; touring the on-line CALFED proposal/review process; reviewing published literature on DOE; and talking with participants in these and other programs via the Water Resources Research Coordinating Committee (WRRCC). Annual RFP and proposal rating forms show the assessment and comparison of benefits, value, and other factors when selecting proposed efforts. The benefit to BOR's mission, costs, potential for broad application and use, and if BOR is best positioned to conduct or lead the proposed research are factors with the greatest weight. 1.3-7: At consortium meetings BOR compares programs with other federal agencies. 2.RD.1-1: Regular meetings with the reuse/desal research task force enables comparison of benefits/allocation of resources among participants. 1.2-11: the desal roadmap, pg 45, provides a mechanism for future comparison of efforts. 2.RD1-2. pg 2, contains a discussion of the NRC review. BOR's competitive process to compare proposals & select the most beneficial for stakeholders appears at 1.4.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

2.RD2 Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: S&T Program steering team reviews/adjusts priorities on annual basis. Funding targets for the four program R&D focus areas in the call for proposals and in the annual budget submitted to Congress are framed around these priorities. Program uses these priorities down to each of the 20 individual research output areas to guide proposal funding decisions. Proposal ratings, administration priorities and line item flexibility also influence funding decisions. Annual budget requests are directly linked to annual & long-term program goals/measures, and clearly show impact of funding levels on goals. Linking steering team priorities to funding allocations also identifies program impacts associated with funding and policy decisions. The prioritization (evaluation) process for desal is described in the answer to question 3.CO1.

Evidence: 2.RD2-1: Steering team prioritizes 20 R&D output areas on the S&T Program roadmap. The roadmap defines each output area. FY2003 funding allocations to each priority area show that priorities are being used and correlate reasonably well with priorities. Correlation anomalies with the priorities are the result of administration priorities and line item flexibility limitations that exists under the FY2003 program line item structure. 2.RD2-2: Survey of BOR managers on the primary causes of water conflict. This information will be factored into program priority updates; it is fairly consistent with steering team priorities. 2.RD2-3: RFP shows funding targets based on steering team priorities. Priorities are in all desal BAAs (1.5-4 thru 7, section A.2.2). Desalination research roadmap priorities 1.2-11: the desal roadmap, pg 45, provides a mechanism for future comparison of efforts. 2.RD1-2. pg 2, contains a discussion of the NRC review. Our competitive process to compare proposals & select the most beneficial for our stakeholders appears at 1.4

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Timely and credible performance data is collected via annual & long-term program goal performance reporting including an on-line system that allows realtime reporting. On-line outcome goal reporting capability is being developed. Progress report is accessible to the R&D contractor & program management so that progress can be reviewed to ensure credibility. Multi-year projects resubmit & annually update progress. Progress report requires 3rd party contact info to verify progress and demonstrated performance is an essential factor for funding. Progress report & program performance measures help identify best practices, provide insights on problems, and help identify corrective actions to take. The program steering team provides annual evaluation and input for program improvements. The Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) approves payment based upon actual accomplishment of deliverables. Extramural desal has proposed an annual peer review process of project accomplishment in relation to the program's goals and would help identify management deficiencies.

Evidence: Progress report template and progress reporting guidelines are documented under evidence section 2.5-4. Existing progress report template and progress reporting guidelines demonstrate system established to collect regular, timely, credible performance information. Steering team evaluations also provide annual program performance input which is used to manage the program and improve its performance (see sections 4.5 and 2.8). 3.1-1 shows an example of the COTR responsibilities to ensure credible and timely performance of extramural researchers. All extramural research projects require quarterly reports, a visit by the COTR, formal presentation, and final report. The proposed peer review process is described in Tab 1.3-9, pg 4.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The annual performance plans for the Director of Research and the S&T Program Coordinator incorporate program performance elements. Some managers in BOR's Technical Service Center (the primary S&T Program contractor) do not require performance related to research accomplishments; each desalination task area is assigned to a staff member who reports to the Group Manager and their performance as leaders and monitors is part of their interim and annual performance reviews. 3.2-3 Assignments are shown in the minutes of the DWPR meeting. Agency GPRA goals do not contain explicit performance related to incorporating new technologies and solutions into resource management practices. For extramural research, staff sit on the advisory boards of the program partners to guide the programs of these organizations. All partners and contractors are held accountable for their performance.

Evidence: 3.2-1: Annual performance plans for the Director of Research and the S&T Program Coordinator include achieving specific program results. Reviews have been stellar. 3.2-2: Primary program contractor is BOR's TSC whose performance plans include requirements to 'manage program accomplishments and provide quality service to clients'. All program R&D projects are required to annually submit a relevant progress report that demonstrates adequate progress toward program goals and key project tasks in order to be considered for continued funding (see section 2.5-4). Tab 1.5-5 section F.3.2 lists past performance as an award factor and section F.1.1 (b) evaluates the managerial capabilities of the proposer. Assignments of Task Leaders and individual project monitors are shown in the minutes of the DWPR meeting in Tab 3.2-3. Performance standards hold staff accountable (example at 3.2-4).

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Since 2001 BOR makes funding decisions and awards project funds by 10/01, contingent on appropriations action. Program annually obligates 100% of enacted budget. Proposals require a detailed task-based funding schedule. The progress report requires task-by-task tracking of progress. We use the Federal Finance Accounting system to track expenditures against each project monthly and more frequently when necessary. Tracking includes auditing categories of expenditures to ensure consistency with project intent and working with research contractor to correct inappropriate charges. As soon as the appropriation is received, a cost centered budget is developed for specific projects and is formally reviewed for accomplishment three times a year. Adjustments, generally modest, are made as the year proceeds and more accurate cost figures become available. As work is invoiced, the COTR matches accomplishments before recommending payment. At the end of the fiscal year, finances are monitored daily.

Evidence: 3.3-1: Funding approval notices show timely awards at start of FY. 3.3-2: Memo from TSC, primary contractor of program R&D, stating that awards have been consistently made at the beginning of the FY. 3.3-3: End-of-year carryover & accomplishment summary report for FY98-02 show good accomplishment & fund management with minimal carry over. 3.3-4: Sect. II & III of the program proposal form and Progress Report Sect. X.C and X.E show the required task-based cost and schedule plan. 3.3-5: Monthly and year-end spending reports at program and individual project level are used to track expenditures. 3.3-6: Federal Finance System report showing the detail of expenditure categories. 3.3-7: The desal budget plan for FY02 was spent for intended purposes: 57% for cooperative agreements, 32% for partnerships, 3% on technology transfer and 7.4% on program administration. 3.3-8 includes two examples (after 9 and 12 months) of monthly financial sheets showing expenditures by project. The final sheet indicates an unspent balance of $100 for FY02.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Program output measures reflect production/unit cost. Program admin is 4% of funding for research overall, and 7.4% for desal. Significant business process re-engineering has occurred over last two years including a competitive RFP process. Most intramural research is done by staff in the TSC which is subject to A-76 competitive sourcing requirements. IT improvements have been implemented with further modules underway to accomplish the program and streamline efforts. Automated, web-based system is speeding proposal submittal, peer review, and award processes and includes progress reporting and performance measure reporting for program goals (outcome goal reporting under devel). It enables others see what products are expected each year, attracts partners (which increases program cost effectiveness), & facilitates sharing of findings. Extramural desal research provides funds based on merit-reviewed, cost shared, and competitive cooperative agreements. Cooperative agreements permit revision as efficiencies are discovered. All proposals are reviewed for appropriateness of cost.

Evidence: BOR has de-layered management structure since 1994. Under A-76 competitive sourcing, TSC will convert 63 positions by 9/2003. BOR will convert additional 550 positions by FY06. Annual & long term program efficiency measures (2.1-4, 2.1-5, 2.2-3) are in terms of production/unit cost. Efficiency measures focus on key program outputs: 1) resource leveraging & 2) sharing information. 1.4-4: program cost categories w/ management/admin at 4%. 1.4 documents program business practice improvements implemented over past couple years. 3.4-1: Flow chart shows our online proposal process. System uses web-enabled data base for easy, efficient, effective entry, review, tracking progress, & dissemination of information. 2.1-6: On-line S&T Bulletin draft template & production flowchart. Template & process to be finalized by the end of FY03 & implemented as an on-line web-enabled data base. Award of program R&D projects at the start of the past prior 3 fiscal years (3.3-1 & 3.3-2). 3.4-2 Cost reasonableness is an evaluation factor on desal evaluation form and on S&T Program eval form(see 1.4-8).

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Meaningful and relevant coordination and collaboration is a fundamental tenet of the program with numerous mechanisms in place to encourage and accomplish effective collaboration. Program management coordinates desalination efforts within the federal community, professional research organizations, the military, and various water authorities through several distinct mechanisms. Researchers also coordinate and collaborate with their counterparts at other federal agencies and research institutions. Researchers have both formal and informal relationships and communications with researchers in related fields. Reclamation coordinates desalination efforts within the Federal community, professional research organizations, the military and various water authorities through the Interagency Consortium.

Evidence: River modellers coordinate via the Interagency Hydrologic Modeling Committee; USGS, Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), and COE collaborate on Riverware development; BOR coordinates with the Department of Agriculture (USDA), COE, and several universities on invasive species R&D, and with the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) on power efficiency and related issues. 3.5-1: WRRCC ensures no duplication of water resources research. 3.5-2: Steering team helps collaboration and avoids duplication, with collaboration via the Desal Consortium and the Recycling/ Reuse Task Force. Ex: 2.3-3, Leveraged funding by three of the five members of the Reuse Task Force. 3.5-3 By partnering with the Navy, identified research opportunities 3.5-4, Awwa Research Foundation (AWWARF)/BOR Workshop led to joint funding of 2 projects. 3.5-5, Work with the Middle East Desalination Research Center via State Dept support. 3.5-6: List of partner entities for FY2003 S&T projects. 3.5-7: Use Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs) to collaborate with other organizations.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Type(s): Research and Development | Competitive Grant | Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

---

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Budget Analyst uses the Federal Finance Accounting system to track expenditures against each project on a monthly basis, and more frequently when necessary. Tracking includes auditing categories of expenditures to ensure consistency with project intent and working with research contractor to correct inappropriate charges. Recent General Accounting Office (GAO) audit to evaluate cost accounting and cost recovery practices for Reclamation's Bureauwide programs found no anomalies with the S&T Program and that activities funded were consistent with Reclamation's authorities for research. Every extramural research agreement has a financial plan and schedule supervised by the COTR and the Contracting Officer. The COTR certifies that the information is accurate and timely. The Acquisitions and Assistance Management Services Department assures that the financial systems meet statutory requirements. Cooperative agreements are periodically audited including a recent one by the Inspector General's office. The TSC has a budget group that monitors spending and overspending.

Evidence: Strong program financial management practices are fully documented in Section 3.3. 3.6-1: GAO audit report number GAO-02-973 found no anomalies with the S&T Program and that activities funded were consistent with Reclamation's authorities for research. 3.6-2 Forms showing staff hours, lab rates, and equipment costs by task are required in all research cooperative agreements. Cooperative agreements are periodically audited, including a recent one by the Inspector General's office. The Technical Services Center has a budget group that monitors spending. The Science and Technology Office has a Budget Analyst who monitors expenditures through the Federal Financial System.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Because of feedback and suggestions from steering team, BOR's leadership team & others, and because the NRC's 2001 report also identified water resource R&D coordination among federal agencies as a concern, program expanded the steering team membership to include stakeholders, USGS, ERS, & ARS and established the Federal Water Resources Research Coordinating Committee to better coordinate and catalyze federal water resources research collaboration across the federal government. We have developed plans and actions to enhance collaboration and coordination with USGS & NIWR, integrated coordination and collaboration incentives and guidance within the proposal process. BOR leadership also identified better outreach to end-users as an improvement need, resulting in monthly activity reports, the newly-established S&T bulletin concept, and research exchange workshops. To respond to Presidential Management Initiatives, developed program goals and performance measures & implemented web-enabled efficiencies to better manage program workflow.

Evidence: Program coordination improvements are fully documented in Section 1.3, 1.5, and 3.5. Program goals and performance measures are fully documented in Sections 2.1 to 2.4. S&T Program steering team evaluations & responses to other program management concerns are contained in section 2.6 explanation and evidence. Web-enabled IT efficiencies are fully documented in section 3.4-1.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

3.CA1 **Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Not applicable as facility construction is not yet fully authorized. However, construction of the Tularosa Basin National Research Facility will be managed by clearly defined deliverables, performance characteristics and carefully planned cost and schedule goals identified in the Draft Report to Congress: Tularosa Basin National Desalination Research Facility Study (Draft Report) of September 2002. See Tab 2.CA1.1

Evidence: 2.CA1-1: The Draft Report documents that the mission of the facility is to conduct R & D activities in desalination of brackish ground water, concentrate disposal issues, and renewable energy/ desalination hybrids. The facility is also to function as an information center for the public. The draft report to congress contains a mission statement (pg. 1), operational guidelines (pg. 30), conceptual design (pp. 11-14), facility layout (pp. 15-28), organizational structure (pp. 30-32), cost breakdown (pp. 29, 33), and streamlined performance-based design-build process (pg. 34). 2.CA1-2, Minutes of Meetings, provides an elaboration of these elements. The program was further refined through organizational meetings to plan the scope of work, cost and schedule for a performance-based design-build contract to be issued July 15, 2003. The defined deliverables are specified through floor plans, architectural views and site layouts. BOR established a 24-month schedule for completing the project, which will reduce costs and project duration. 3.CA1-1: shows a draft statement of objectives.

3.CO1 **Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Not directly applicable as this program uses Cooperative Agreements instead of grants. The agreement cycle begins with a widely distributed announcement and request for preproposals. All preproposals are assessed based on merit of concept and appropriateness to our published program goals. The proposals are evaluated by at least three individuals, including some individuals outside Reclamation.

Evidence: Examples of publicity for the competition are shown in 3.CO1-1 to -3 and 2.RD1-2. The procurement is widely advertised on Reclamation's Water Treatment website, through Government procurement sites, and by our newsletter that receives wide circulation in the water community. About 40% of preproposers are requested to submit a full proposal. 2.5-8: The proposal rating sheet, which uses ten factors shows the importance of factors in rating. About 40% of proposals are funded. Recipients of awards between FY98 and FY02 are listed in Tab 3CO1-4. In FY99, 8 of the 12 recipients were new, excluding two 2-year pilot projects. No awards made in FY00. In FY01, 5 of the 8 recipients were new. In FY02, 9 of the 10 recipients were new. The pilot scale projects under Task H are for two years. These are listed separately so there appear to be more repeat awards than there actually are. There is a unique case where a recipient was funded three cycles in a row. This was a technically difficult membrane development.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

3.CO2 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Not directly applicable because extramural research is handled through cooperative agreements in lieu of grants to ensure that BOR has sufficient oversight and influence over program data quality. The proposed work is required to be broken down into tasks and costs for labor, materials and supplies are provided for each task in the proposed budget and monitored closely. Each program is monitored by a GCAOTR (Grants and Cooperative Agreements Officer's Technical Representative) who is required to understand the content and track the progress of the program.

Evidence: One or two GCAOTRs, people familiar with the technology under study, are assigned to oversee each award. As an aid to oversight, each GCAOTR is provided with the Technical and Financial Proposals, and with a sheet, shown in 3.1-1, showing contacts and a schedule for contacts. Early in the award period, the GCAOTR visits the study site. The Principal Investigator (PI) is required to submit quarterly progress reports. Telephone contact is maintained at least once a quarter. The GCAOTR is typically able to make meaningful contributions to the research program. Each invoice is reviewed for approval by the GCAOTR with program costs being checked against the detailed budget in the Financial Proposal. On completion of the program, the PI submits a final report and makes an oral presentation to researchers in Denver. The draft final report is reviewed and comments are submitted for incorporation in the published version. 3.CO2-1 shows an example of the comments provided by the GCAOTR. Three times a year, the GCAOTRs and the Group Manager meet to discuss program progress. See minutes of meeting, 3.2-3.

3.CO3 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner? Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: Not strictly applicable as extramural research is handled by cooperative agreements. New awards are summarized in the Water from Water newsletter, 3CO3-1, and the Bureau of Reclamation website.

Evidence: The results from each research project are published in a formal final report. These reports are available in hard copy from Reclamation and are delivered to those who request them. The reports can also be downloaded from Reclamation's Water Treatment website. These reports are also contained in a set of CDs that are being issued as part of the history of desalination and water treatment research. Note that the pilot plant projects produce a final report only at the end of the 2-year period, the first year generally being devoted to construction of the pilot plant rather than generation of data. The publication library from this program now contains almost one hundred technical reports. The list of reports is shown as Tab 4.1-6. A sample report, one of the shorter ones, appears as 3CO3-2. In addition BOR encourages presentation at technical conferences and in refereed journals.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Type(s): Research and Development | Competitive Grant | Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

---

3.RD1 **For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 9%

Explanation: The program uses an annual, BOR-wide, competitive call for proposals implemented in 2002 for all intramural R&D. Each proposal is evaluated for mission relevancy & technical merit. Relevancy review is conducted by BOR cadre of subject matter resource managers across BOR (external to program). Technical review is conducted by at least 3 technical experts. One from BOR's TSC & two external to TSC and ideally external to BOR (sometimes there is not expertise outside of BOR). Funded proposals are selected from those having both high technical and relevancy scores and which are aligned with steering team/Administration priorities. Proposal and selection process meets Circular A-11 definition for merit reviewed research with competitive selection using external (peer) evaluations. Approx 10% of awarded funds are sub-contracted to external entities for specific tasks through subsequent contracts and cooperative agreements. The proposal & selection process for extramural desalination R&D meets Circular A-11 definition for merit-reviewed research w/competitive selection & external (peer)evaluation(see 2.5-8).

Evidence: 3.RD1-1: Web page outlines the S&T Program competitive, merit-based process(also documented in Section 1.4). Peer review occurs on all intra&extramural research. Historically nearly all desal funds written in by Congress in highly variable amounts; however, in FY04 the Admin. requested $4.7M for desal R&D spread across several line items. In addition Congress earmarks in 02 & 03 about $2M/year for funding extramural weather modification research under BOR's drought authorities. Research Office manages weather mod research activities under drought authorities for BOR's Office of Policy & Program Services. On average, 86% of FY02 & 03 intramural research was competed (remaining funds were used for tech transfer, outreach, special studies, e-gov IT improvement, & program management). In FY02, 57% of all desal funds received were subject to competition. Remaining funds went to tech transfer & program admin; and at Congress direction: partnerships, clearinghouse develop/management, desal roadmap, Tularosa Basin studies. External NRC,NWRI desal assessments documented elsewhere.

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight20%

Explanation: Relevant, long-term outcome and output goals and measures are clearly established (see Questions 2.1 and 2.2). Functional schedule for establishing meaningful baseline and performance measure tracking are in-place and scheduled to be completed by the end of FY2004. The long-term goal performance reporting period is FY2005 'FY2010. As such, complete and accurate performance tracking consistent with the program goal objectives and framework are not available at this time. However, performance evidence to date suggests the program is on track, achieving stakeholder value and expectations, and making progress toward successful long-term goal accomplishments. A long-term performance goal in the authorizing legislation for desal required a report to Congress recommending demonstration plants. This report was provided in May 2001. Although these goals are new, the program also made significant progress toward achieving its prior long-term goals, which were revised and collapsed into the new goals.

Evidence: A variety of documents show the progress made toward both old and new program goals. These include: 4.1-1, Case history analysis in Section III.D of the S&T Program Goal Document; 4.1-2, Summary of various success stories indicating program achievements; 4.1-3, Letters from stakeholders recognizing value of the program; 4.1-4: Summary of collaborating/partner entities for FY2003 projects as evidence of achievements; 4.1-5, Summary of current Agreements as evidence that achievements are being made toward goals. High ratings and statements of support in Question 2.6 show satisfaction with achievements. The desal program has funded 84 cost-shared projects with 50% of the funding going to at least 27 universities. 4.1-6 is a list of reports distributed by the program. During this period, desalination costs are reported to have dropped 50%, part of which can be attributed to work in this program. 4.1-7, slide 12, shows the decreased costs of desal. A measure of the program's success is the growing interest in membrane bioreactors, recommended in the report to Congress, 4.1-8.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Annual outcome & output goals and measures are clearly established (see Questions 2.3 and 2.4). A schedule for establishing meaningful baseline by the end of FY2004 is in place. The first formal goal reporting year is FY2005, so complete performance tracking is not available now. However, evidence suggests the program is now on track, achieving stakeholder value, and making progress toward successfully accomplishing annual performance measures. The annual performance goals for the desal program are to fund projects within the priorities for that year and hold the contractors and partners accountable on individual projects. The desal roadmap and the management plan will set measurable annual performance goals. Initial program output goals for each S&T program R&D output area were established, linked to our S&T Roadmap, and posted on our website in FY2002. FY03 program R&D awards were targeted at the goals and program priotities.

Evidence: Annual goals and performance measures are strategically linked to the long-term goals to provide meaningful and relevant data about progress toward the long-term goals. Consequently, the evidence in Question 4.1 is also the evidence for Question 4.2. See evidence in section 1.2-7 for the output goals developed and posted on our website in FY2002 for each of the R&D output areas on our S&T Program roadmap. Stuctured goal measure tracking not implemented in past but is scheduled for FY2004 (see 2.2-3). However, program accomplishments consistent with goal objectives are documented in section 4.1 and are also posted on our website.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Measures of output goals are normalized with respect to S&T investment to create a ratio of production to costs (see Sections 2.1-4, 2.1-5, and 2.3-2). Outcome goal measures are based on achieving a high return on the S&T investment. These measures will provide consistent, meaningful indicators of efficiency and cost effectiveness from FY2005 to 2010. Although formal progress against these measures is not scheduled to be reported yet, the program has shown improvement since 2001. The change in the desal program, recommended in the 1998 peer review, to develop a research roadmap is producing significant efficiencies. The roadmap facilitates setting priorities based upon expert advice and helping to realize efficiencies by combining similar testing for differing needs. The roadmap is also outlining areas of collaboration to provide the greatest payoff. Where others have pursued research separately, the roadmap provides a guide for collaboration. Our goal is to have the best and brightest engaged in the highest priority research.

Evidence: 4.3-1 is a Denver News article: 2003 Award for Exceptional Productivity or Process Improvement given to program. 4.3-2 is a DOI People, Land & Water news article on program tech transfer effectiveness. 4.3-3 is a letter from the WESCAS showing recognition of high level of progress with relatively small budget. Evaluations shown in Questions 2.6-3 & 2.6-4 recognize recent program improvements. Other program improvements addressing coordination & collaboration to increase efficiency and effectiveness of R&D investments are documented in section 1.3. Recent program business practice improvements to improve intramural R&D effectiveness & efficiency are documented in Question 1.4. Recent program IT improvements to increase efficiency appear in 3.4-1. Progress toward A-76 competitive sourcing implementation is included in Question 3.4. Progress toward program efficiency is documented in Questions 4.1 and 4.2. 4.3-4 contains an analysis of how a currently funded research project could reduce the cost of desalination through reduced operating expenses & increased investor confidence.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Type(s): Research and Development | Competitive Grant | Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

---

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: No other R&D programs are focused & dedicated to developing solutions for BOR water managers and water users and their unique western water needs. There are similar or complimentary R&D activities performed by USGS, COE, &USDA. Although there are some similarities with these organizations, BOR's mission and R&D needs are different. For example, COE is a flood control/navigation agency and BOR is a water supply agency. Also USGS primarily concentrates on basic research and problem definition while BOR concentrates on applied R&D and solutions to problems. BOR compared their program practices with NIWR which focuses on applied R&D by academia for state water managers, and found their practices to be compatible with NIWR practices. BOR also compared their program practices with COE and with organizations that concentrate on basic water resources research and found their own program practices are strong in comparison. Stakeholder feedback also indicates the program compares very favorably with other programs that conduct water resources R&D that compliments BOR efforts and focus.

Evidence: Program comparisons and results are further explained and documented in Question 2.RD1. BOR actions to better understand, coordinate and integrate with other complimentary water resources research programs are explained and documented in Question 1.3. The size of BOR's R&D is significantly smaller than the other federal R&D programs with activities related to water and agriculture (COE,USGS, USDA),has comparable to stronger processes, and has productivity. Power marketing agencies fund no R&D on power efficiency and reliability.

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Comments from the program steering team (consisting of external stakeholders, academia, USGS Regional Directors, USDA, NIWR, and BOR customers (region and area offices)) indicate strong support for program management, practices, and results. External evaluations indicate the program has been moderately effective in the past, and in recent years has drastically improved; new performance measures should better track effectiveness. The program is also being reviewed as part of a National Research Council (NRC) review of federal water resources research to address Congressional response to the 2001 NRC report 'Envisioning a Water Resources Research Agenda for the 21st Century'. The NRC is currently reviewing the desalination research roadmap as the basis for future investments in the program and will determine if it is an effective way to address the nation's water needs. The program has never requested an evaluation that focused only on its effectiveness, although as a part of a nomination for a prestigious water prize, the program was used as a justification of the nomination.

Evidence: The independence and diversity of the steering team is documented in the steering team roster (see 1.3-2). Program evaluations and results are documented in Question 2.6. Other documentation of program impact and value is contained in evidence 4.1-1 and 4.1-2, and Question 4.3. The initial comments, due in late June, from the National Research Council's review of the desalination research roadmap, will indicate the effectiveness of this approach. Tab 4.5-1 is a letter of nomination that cites the accomplishments of the desalination program.

4.CA1 **Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Not applicable. No construction is occurring as the program's only capital project, the Tularosa Basin Deslination Research Facility, is not authorized.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

---

Measure: Quantity of water liberated (expressed in acre-feet). The net present value of the water liberated will be 10 times greater than the initial R&D investment.

Additional Information: Tracks if R&D outputs get used and produce a 10:1 return on the annual R&D investment.Targets set based on estimated R&D investment with water liberation as the primary outcome. Targets will be adjusted based on actual annual program appropriations.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	baseline		
2005	41,500		
2006	41,500		
2007	41,500		
2008	41,500		

Measure: Increase technology transfer to end-users by increasing the cumulative production rate of S&T Bulletins per program dollar by 34% over a 6-year period.

Additional Information: Tracks production of relevant R&D findings & their dissemination to end-users as an efficieny ratio of electronic S&T Bulletins produced per program dollar. The measure pursues a cumulative overall program efficiency increase over a 6-year period.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term (Efficiency Measure)
2010	34% over FY04		

Measure: Cumulative quantity of water liberated (expressed in acre-feet). The net present value of the water liberated will be 10 times greater than the initial R&D investment, over a 6-year period.

Additional Information: Tracks if R&D outputs get used & produce a 10:1 cumulative return (accumulation of annual stream of benefits) on the R&D investment based on six years of record. Targets set based on estimated R&D investment with water liberation as the primary outcome.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2010	871,500		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Type(s): Research and Development | Competitive Grant | Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

---

Measure: Produce a 10:1 return on Reclamation's R&D investment in terms of the economic present value of operational costs avoided as a result of deploying program R&D outputs.

Additional Information: Tracks if R&D outputs get used & produce a 10:1 return on the annual R&D investment. Targets set based on estimated R&D investment with cost saving as the primary R&D outcome. Targets will be adjusted based on actual annual program appropriations.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	baseline	
2005	406,000	
2006	406,000	
2007	406,000	
2008	406,000	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Produce a 10:1 cumulative rate of return on Reclamation's R&D investment over a 6-year period in terms of the economic present value of operational costs avoided as a result of deploying program R&D outputs.

Additional Information: Tracks if R&D outputs get used & produce a 10:1 cumulative return (accumulation of annual stream of benefits) on the R&D investment based on six years of record. Targets set based on estimated R&D investment with cost savings as the primary R&D outcome.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	$8.5 million	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Produce a 10:1 return on Reclamation's R&D investment in terms of the economic present value of increased power generation efficiency or reliability as a result of deploying program R&D outputs.

Additional Information: Tracks if R&D outputs get used & produce a 10:1 return on the annual R&D investment. Targets set based on estimated R&D investment with power generation as the primary R&D outcome. Targets will be adjusted based on actual annual program appropriations.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	Baseline	
2005	12.5 million KWH	
2006	12.5 million KWH	

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation
Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

2007	12.5 million KWH	
2008	12.5 million KWH	

Measure: Produce a 10:1 cumulative rate of return on Reclamation's R&D investment over a 6-year period in terms of the economic present value of increased power generation efficiency or reliability as a result of deploying program R&D outputs.

Additional Information: Tracks if R&D outputs get used & produce a 10:1 cumulative return (accumulation of annual stream of benefits) of the R&D investment based on six years of record. Targets will be adjusted based on actual program appropriations.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2010	262.5 million KWH		

Measure: Increase R&D collaboration by increasing the amount of resource leveraging per program dollar by 5% each year.

Additional Information: The goal is intended to catalyze the production of R&D outputs. This measure tracks resource leveraging as an efficiency ratio of resources leveraging achieved per program dollar. The measure pursues a 5% efficiency increase over each prior year.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	baseline		
2005	5% over FY04		
2006	5% over FY05		
2007	5% over FY06		
2008	5% over FY07		

Measure: Increase R&D collaboration by increasing the cumulative resource leveraging per program dollar by 34% over a 6-year period.

Additional Information: This measure tracks resources leveraging as an efficiency ratio of resource leveraging achieved per program dollar. The measure pursues a cumulative overall program efficiency increase over a 6-year period.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2010	34% over FY04		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Science & Technology Program (S&T)
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Reclamation

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	100%	73%	

Type(s): Research and Development Competitive Grant Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Measure: Increase technology transfer to end-users by increasing the production rate of S&T Bulletins per program dollar by 5% each year.

Additional Information: The goal is intended to catalyze putting R&D outputs in the hands of end-users. This measure tracks production of relevant R&D findings & their dissemination to end-users as an efficieny ratio of electronic S&T Bulletins produced per program dollar.

Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)

Year	Target	Actual
2004	baseline	
2005	5% over FY04	
2006	5% over FY05	
2007	5% over FY06	
2008	5% over FY07	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	13%	71%	20%	Demonstrate

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program purpose is to provide for the orderly disposal of certain Federal lands in Clark County, Nevada, and to provide for the acquisition of environmentally sensitive lands in the State of Nevada as well as to provide for community recreation and infrastructure needs in Clark County. The Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act, as amended, provides that land sale receipts are to be used for: 1) BLM's costs in implementing the Act and in completing land disposal actions; 2) acquiring environmentally sensitive land in Nevada; 3) completing capital improvements on BLM, NPS, USFS and NPS lands; 4) developing a multi-species habitat plan in Clark County; 5) funding the development of parks, trails and natural areas in Clark County; 6) conservation initiatives on federal land administered by DOI and USDA in Clark County; 7) Lake Tahoe restoration projects; and 8) payments to the State of Nevada General Education Fund and to the Southern Nevada Water Authority.

Evidence: PL 105-263, PL 107-282, HR-2000, the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act Implementation Agreement and Strategic Plan.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program was designed to address specific needs related to development in the Las Vegas Valley and replace a land exchange program which had been the subject of critical audit reviews. Additionally, the proceeds from land sales are used to fund purchases of environmentally sensitive lands and for recreation and related projects in Clark County.

Evidence: The enabling laws and the Congressional Record detail the intent of the law and describe the specific need for the program.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The land sale program as conducted under the laws referenced in Question 1.1 is unique to the Department and the Bureau. Sale proceeds are used for land acquisitions and projects in Nevada, as approved by the Secretary of Interior. Projects funded through program revenues are coordinated with other projects in each affected bureau (i.e., BLM, NPS, FWS, and USFS) as each bureau submits project requests for SNPLMA program funding. Similar coordination occurs for project requests by state, local and private entities.

Evidence: The Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act of 2000 (PL 106-248) and the Lincoln County Land Act of 2000 (PL 106-298) do not apply within the SNPLMA boundary.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program is not free of design flaws because it is generating significantly more revenues than had been anticipated. The Administration would like to work with the Congress to identify alternatives for allocating these revenues.

Evidence: The Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA) and legislative history; Clark County Conservation Act of 2002; SNPLMA Implementation Agreement; recent land sale receipts and fund balances.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	13%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Despite the legislation's underlying design problems, intended beneficiaries and program purposes are identified specifically in the SNPLMA legislation (PL 105-263) and subsequent laws (PL 107-282), and the program's public participation process ensures that resources are targeted to these beneficiaries. There is little evidence to suggest at this point that activities that would have occurred without the program are being subsidized beyond a level that may be warranted. But based on the recent unanticipated high levels of receipts, this remains a distinct possibility as the program moves forward.

Evidence: The Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA); Clark County Conservation Act of 2002; SNPLMA Implementation Agreement; authorized SNPLMA projects for Rounds 1-5.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight 13%

Explanation: While the program has a clear set of objectives and a process for prioritizing activities, the agency lacks quality performance measures for most aspects of the program. Therefore, it is difficult to say whether the program is effectively and efficiently meeting its long-term outcome goals.The agency has developed a few performance measures for the disposal side of the program and is in the process of developing targets for these measures. DOI is working with OMB to develop specific long-term measures for the spending side of the program.

Evidence: See attached list of measures.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight 13%

Explanation: Quantifiable targets are being developed for the disposal-related measures referenced in question 2.1.

Evidence: N/A.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight 13%

Explanation: Annual performance measures will be developed to correspond to the long-term measures that are under development.

Evidence: See attached list of measures.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight 13%

Explanation: Specific annual targets and baseline data will be established for the measures that are under development.

Evidence: N/A.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	13%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Because the program lacks good performance measures, these partners are not held accountable for their contribution to the program's broader performance goals. However, work is completed through and with contractors and partners in performing program tasks.

Evidence: The SNPLMA Implementation Agreement and Task Orders describe contractor and partner commitments to meeting specific program tasks. Implementation Agreement ' Special Account Obligation and Reimbursement Process (pgs. 13-21) and Appendix H (pgs. 47-52).

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Internal and external audits and reviews have been conducted on the disposal side of the program, primarily relating to financial management. However, there is no schedule established for regular, independent reviews, and the spending side of the program has not yet been evaluated.

Evidence: DOI, OIG Report No. 2003-I-0065, audits performed under the CFO Act resulting in Audited Financial Statements and a planned program assessment for FY04 are among the current evaluation tools.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: Budget documents cannot be directly linked to performance because of the lack of adequate performance measures.

Evidence: N/A.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: A program strategic plan has been prepared, and is being updated. A plan update began in February 2004 is scheduled for completion in FY 2004. An overall program evaluation is scheduled to begin this year.New performance measures have been developed for the disposal portion of the program, and the agency is working on developing measures on the spending side.

Evidence: Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act Strategic Plan and Strategic Plan Updates.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	13%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Although there is not a clear link to agency performance measures, BLM collects cost, schedule, and performance information on each project funded with SNPLMA receipts from each bureau as well as from external partners. This information is used to manage the program and provides the basis for BLM reimbursement of project costs.

Evidence: Quarterly reports, reimbursement requests, payment requests, site inspections and status reports document performance and provide evidence of areas where performance can be improved.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Costs, schedules, and performance are regularly measured and Federal managers, partners and contractors are held accountable for completing specific tasks. However, managers' appraisals are not linked to broader program goals.

Evidence: Project Task Orders specifically identify costs, schedules and expected outcomes. Reimbursements requests are reconciled with projects approved by the Secretary of the Interior and with approved Task Orders.

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: The timing and purpose of obligations are clearly defined by task orders and approved budgets. Business rules have been established to determine intended purpose of expenditures.

Evidence: Task Orders, reimbursement requests, BLM spending reports and SNPLMA budget documents provide evidence of timely, appropriate expenditures. The SNPLMA Implementation Agreement details the program business rules and establishes timelines for expenditures.

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NO Question Weight:14%

Explanation: On the disposal side, BLM indicates that it has taken steps to improve efficiency and effectiveness, such as the automation of a land sales database to allow pre-registration of potential bidders, developments and refinement of a website to provide accurate up-to-date information to the public (resulting in fewer phone calls or other information requests), and establishment of a bidder deposit to qualify potential bidders and curtail defaults on parcels offered at auction. However, little evidence is available to suggest that the program has processes in place to measure efficiencies and cost effectiveness on the spending side of the program.

Evidence: Office of Inspector General (OIG) Report No. 2003-I-0065, Audited Financial Statements in compliance with the CFO Act.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	13%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Collaboration with other Federal, State, local and private programs and stakeholders is an essential element of this program, and builds in checks and balances for internal controls. The National Business Center and the BLM Washington Office play key roles in this collaboration process.

Evidence: Office of Inspector General (OIG) Report No. 2003-I-0065. Program goals, performance measures and planning documents are developed and implemented on a collaborative basis. Regularly scheduled Federal Manager and Local Partner meetings formalize the coordination efforts. Congressional briefings and public meetings provide a forum for other input and collaboration.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Financial management systems are in place to ensure that the program is free of material internal control weaknesses. Regulatory and program reports are reconciled for increased accountability.

Evidence: The OIG Report No. 2003-I-0065 states that "SNPLMA's Project Office and BLM's national business center have worked together to develop and maintain good controls in accounting for and disbursing the receipts derived from federal land sales". An independent audit firm annually provides Chief Financial Officer Act Audited Financial Statements, and BLM has strong internal management systems and controls. The SNPLMA Financial Matrix provides a ready resource for tracking of receipts and obligations. Business Management Roles & Responsibilities, IM BC 2003-046, IM NC 2003-105, IM NC 2003-106.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:14%

Explanation: Program management activities are regularly reviewed to identify and correct management deficiencies. Addressing the program's strategic planning deficiencies will help identify areas for management improvement. The referenced OIG report and CFO audits also identify areas for improvement. Continuous improvement practices such as annual Implementation Agreement revisions and stakeholder and partner working group meetings help ensure that deficiencies are addressed. The SNPLMA website offers opportunity for public involvement and comment.

Evidence: An independent program assessment has been ordered for FY04. Post-sale critiques are held to identify deficiencies and prescribe corrective action. In one example, a critique revealed a problem with bidder defaults and resulted in a requirement for bid deposits to qualify potential bidders (published as Notice of Realty Action 4-08807). The annual Implementation Agreement revision was completed in June 2004.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Program received a 'No' in reference to Question 2.1. Although specific annual and long-term performance targets are only now being set, the program is on track to meet the broader long term performance goal associated with disposal of federal lands, as set out in the enabling legislation.

Evidence: DOI has sold 8,142 acres out of a total 49,000 acres identified within the disposal boundary established in the enabling legislation (PL 105-263, PL 107-282).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	13%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Program received a 'No' in reference to Question 2.2. Specific annual performance targets have not yet been established.

Evidence: N/A.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BLM has not been able to provide sufficient evidence that the program has made any substantial improvements in its efficiency and/or effectiveness, particularly on the spending side of the program.

Evidence: N/A.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: On the land disposal side, this program compares favorably to the Arizona State Land Department program of competitive land sales. (No other government or private programs with similar purposes has been identified.) Comparisons are less obvious for land acquisition and recreation projects. However, both the project ranking process and the performance measurement challenges for these projects are similar to that of programs in other agencies. So one would expect performance of the SNPLMA program to be relatively comparable in these areas.

Evidence: DOI-OIG Report No. 2003-I-0065 calls this program "A Model for Success" in Partnerships, Public Land Auctions, and a Businesslike Approach to Financial Controls.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: A recent IG evaluation found that the program is very effective on the land disposal side and in terms of financial controls. However, many questions remain regarding the effectiveness of the spending side of the program (e.g., land acquisition and recreation projects). A program assessment is currently being conducted on the entire program and will hopefully provide some useful information in terms of program effectiveness.

Evidence: OIG Report No. 2003-I-0065 has been completed, and the program receives annual Audited Financial Statements in conformance with CFO Act Audits. Quarterly status reports are prepared and reviewed. An independent program assessment has been ordered for FY04.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Land Management
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
80%	13%	71%	20%	Demonstrated

Measure: Percent of total federal land within SNPLMA boundary offered for sale

Additional Information: The SNPLMA legislation (as amended) identifies a specific amount of land that BLM is required to offer for sale upon request by a local government. This measure assesses how BLM is progressing toward this ultimate goal.

Year	Target	Actual

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Percent of parcels offered for sale within 12 months of nomination

Additional Information: Measures BLM responsiveness to local government demand for lands identified for sale under SNPLMA. Local governments nominate Federal land parcels for sale based on community needs. BLM offers the parcels through competitive land sales.

Year	Target	Actual

Measure Term: Annual

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Competitive Grant Programs

Name of Program: Title XVI Water Reuse and Recycling

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	Purpose is to identify and investigate opportunities for reclaiming and reusing wastewater and naturally impaired ground and surface water, and to provide financial and technical assistance to local water agencies for planning and development of water recycling projects. This program helps Reclamation meet its mission to manage and develop water and related resources in an economically and environmentally sound manner.	Title XVI of P.L. 102-575, as amended. "Guidelines for Preparing, Reviewing, and Processing Water Reclamation and Reuse Project Proposals Under Title XVI of Public Law 102-575, as Amended".	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Municipalities in the west are facing increases in fresh water demand due to changing population trends, decreasing water supplies and drought. This program helps local agencies reduce demand for new sources of non-recycled potable water, improve water supply reliability, and protect against future droughts by reclaiming and reusing treated wastewater for nonpotable purposes and naturally impaired ground and surface water.	Southern California must reduce its use of water from the Colorado River from about 5.2 to 4.4 million acre-feet per year, its legal entitlement. When completed, ongoing Title XVI projects will provide as much as a half million acre-feet per year of reclaimed water for non-potable uses, thereby reducing demand on imported supplies. Other Title XVI examples of reductions in demand for potable water include Albuquerque, NM; San Jose, CA; El Paso, TX; and Las Vegas, NV.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	This program is designed to provide the incentive to local agencies to implement water recycling projects by providing seed money that helps to defray the cost of these expensive alternative water supply projects. Many water recycling projects would not be feasible without Federal financial assistance and would not be implemented at the local level. This program leverages Federal dollars with funds from state agencies and the sponsoring local agencies.	Federal funding can account for as much as 25% of total project costs subject to legislated ceilings. Funding for appraisal and feasibility studies can be as much as 100% and 50%, respectively. Research can be funded at 50%. Since Congress first appropriated funding in FY1994, Reclamation has expended more than $260 million for Title XVI activities. This funding leverages significant local dollars. Federal participation also helps local partners improve their bond rating status, improving their financial performance.	20%	0.2
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	No other Federal program provides assistance to local agencies to develop water recycling projects. Congress designed this program to provide the incentive to local agencies to implement water recycling projects by providing seed money that helps to defray the cost of these expensive alternative water supply projects. The program also assists local agencies, particularly in small communities lacking sufficient staff and expertise, with technical support for planning, design and construction of the water reuse and recycling projects.	EPA and state agencies provide funds through State Revolving Fund programs. These agencies, however, do not provide direct technical support or project management assistance. Other Federal agencies do not have formal programs. EPA and others have received Congressional write-ins for various reuse projects, but have a very limited or no role in project development or technical support.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	This program funds as many projects as possible by limiting the funding provided to any one project in any given year, thereby providing incentives to the greatest number of local agencies to move forward with project implementation. Federal funds are leveraged in such a way as to have the greatest net benefit to the most local project sponsors. Although taken by itself the program is well-designed, it works at cross-purposes with other Reclamation projects. Traditional water development projects produce cheap, subsidized water with a price that does not reflect its true cost, thereby discouraging the expansion of more expensive water reuse and recycling.	This program is designed to provide funds as an incentive for local agencies to plan, design and construct projects. Ownership to the title of facilities remains with the local sponsor who is also responsible for operation and maintenence costs (O&M). Although Title XVI allows for cost-sharing on O&M for research and demonstration projects, it is Reclamation policy to not provide funds for this purpose. Thus, the Federal exposure to long-term funding is avoided. The Federal cost-share limitations ensure that the project sponsor, who typically designs and constructs the project, does so in an efficient and cost effective manner, as it is the sponsor who pays the great majority of the total project cost. The Federal participation ends when the cost-share ceiling has been reached. Refer to P.L. 102-575 and the "Guidelines for Preparing, Reviewing, and Processing Water Reclamation and Reuse Project Proposals Under Title XVI of Public Law 102-575, as Amended".	20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**100%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	Although the Title XVI program has long-term goals, they do not meet all the criteria necessary to receive a 'Yes'. In particular, they do not have clear timeframes, which compromises the usefulness of data indicating progress toward meeting the long-term goal of attaining 500,000 acre-feet per year of recycled and reused water. The principal long-term desired outcome is to increase the total water supply availability in critical water short regions (e.g. southern California) without causing undue harm to the environment by constructing new dams and reservoirs, or to the agricultural community by requiring a change of use from irrigation to Municipal and Industrial (M&I) use in order to meet the growing demand for fresh water in urban areas of the western US. The current long-term goals for water reuse and recycling projects are to increase the reclamation and reuse of reclaimed water by 500,000 acre-feet per year, and reduce the cost of treating wastewater by 10%.	Draft FY 2004 End Outcome Goal in Reclamation's Strategic Plan: Deliver Water in an Environmentally Responsible and Cost-efficient Manner. The long-term goal for southern California is to reduce the use of Colorado River water to the state's legal entitlement of 4.4 million acre feet by 2015. Implementing ongoing and future water recycling projects can help to make up most of the water supply shortfall, without the need to import additional supplies from northern California or build new storage facilities.	14%	0.0
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	Yes	The principal annual goal is to make all funding provided by Congress available to project sponsors in the year funds were appropriated, and in as timely a manner as possible during the course of the year. This is achieved by expeditiously completing or approving feasibility studies and environmental compliance activities, and entering into cost-share agreements so that water recycling project sponsors can meet work schedules and projects can be implemented as soon as possible. While this goal is useful in indicating progress in meeting the long-term goals, it would be more useful if the long-term goals had timeframes, which in turn could be shown to drive the setting of short-term goals.	Project data. Program accomplishment data is available from previous fiscal years.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	Yes	All project sponsors have consistently met or exceeded their cost-share requirements in a timely manner such that projects remain on schedule to the degree possible.	Project sponsors are required to enter into cost-share agreements (Cooperative Agreements) before funds can be made available. These agreements define the funding arrangements and each entities' responsibility. Funds are only provided to the sponsor after actual costs have been incurred and the cost-share requirement has been met. All submittals for reimbursement are scrutinized to ensure that only eligible project costs are being reimbursed.	14%	0.1
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	Increasing total water supply availability at the Federal level through water recycling is optimized when planning and project implementation is coordinated with local and state efforts and when done in a regional context, which is generally beyond the jurisdiction of individual water agencies. Also, maximum efficiencies are achieved when regional recycling activities are combined with water conservation programs, conjunctive use programs and other innovative alternative water supply strategies, including integrated resources planning.	Reclamation has established partnerships and entered into cooperative agreements with non-Federal project sponsors for each project and program Congress has funded. These partnerships ensure that project specific goals are achieved, the National Environmental Policy Act is adhered to, and benefits are maximized to the extent possible. Reclamation emphasizes a regional approach to project planning and formulation when such opportunities arise by cooperating and coordinating with similar reuse activities in neighboring districts.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	Yes	Most of the activities required to implement a recycled water project are being conducted by local project sponsors and their contractor. These water districts are ultimately responsible for program accomplishment and undergo periodic audits conducted by independent auditors, because they are local governmental agencies that are subject to state regulations. In addition, Reclamation requires yearly single audits of projects in order to ascertain project progress and the appropriateness of expenditures incurred during the year.	Reclamation staff are intimately involved with the project sponsors on all aspects of project development. However, staff are not involved in independent audits conducted by water agency contractors. Reclamation is involved with single audits conducted at the end of each year and upon completion of the project when the cooperative agreement is closed and a single audit is conducted by Reclamation finance staff.	14%	0.1
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	Yes	Funding is prioritized each year to support on-going authorized projects which have had strong local participation and are showing progress towards project completion. Reductions in the Bureau's budget proposal result in participation in fewer projects, and can delay completion of ongoing projects. Although Reclamation generally provides its cost-share after the local sponsors have expended funds for a particular phase of project implementation, future phases may not be completed as scheduled if subsequent year Federal funding is inadequate to justify the outlay of 100% financing by the non-Federal project sponsor for the next phase of development. This can lead to delays in realizing full project benefits.	Schedules which indicate funding requirements by project, expectations of Federal contributions by fiscal year, and anticipated acre-feet of water recycled/produced by project operation.	14%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	Solid criteria are in place to evaluate potential projects prior to funding, and also to monitor and evaluate projects under construction. The strong degree of local participation (including local funding) ensures cost-efficient designing, value engineering, and monitoring of costs and quality control during the planning and construction phases.	Guidelines for Preparing, Reviewing, and Processing Water Reclamation and Reuse Project Proposals Under Title XVI of Public Law 102-575, as Amended.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**86%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	Yes	Reclamation staff are in frequent contact with the project sponsors on all aspects of project development. Local Reclamation staff maintain on-going communication with local project sponsors and monitor the progress of each project. Federal funds are requested and dispersed only for qualified projects exhibiting the required local participation and adherence to planning/construction schedules. Each cooperative agreement includes a requirement for regular progress reports, at least quarterly.	Project experts in several Reclamation offices; field reports from site visits; planning and construction reports; and progress reports from local sponsoring agencies. Progress reports are used to compare available funding with actual needs, and can result in moving funds from one component to another in order to maximize efficient use of Federal funds.	10%	0.1
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	Yes	See above. Since the Title XVI projects are construction projects, interim goals are well-defined and easy to monitor.	All program managers have performance measures tied to program accomplishments. All grantees are required to document accomplishments and justify funding needs prior to modification of cooperative agreements. No reimbursements are made to grantees until actual work has been accomplished and documented.	10%	0.1
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	The Title XVI construction projects have obtained an obligation rate of over 95% almost every fiscal year. The funds have been spent for the intended purpose, which is to support authorized water recycling projects. In large part, projects have proceeded on schedule once funds are made available. The high degree of local participation and funding ensures the local sponsor uses all funds in a timely and responsible fashion.	Project data. Program accomplishment data is available from previous fiscal years.	10%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	No	No formal mechanisms are in place. However, as stated previously, the strong degree of local participation and funding ensures cost-efficient planning and design, and the timely and responsible use of all funds. Congress specifically authorizes each Title XVI construction project, and the effectiveness of the program is measured by program accomplishment, or how much of the appropriated funds are actually obligated each fiscal year. Since the Title XVI construction projects obligate over 95% of their funds for authorized projects almost every fiscal year, there is a high confidence level that funds are being used for their intended purpose.	Program accomplishment data is available from previous fiscal years.	10%	0.0
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Present cost accounting systems of the Department of the Interior comply with Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board #4 - Managerial Cost Accounting. Full costs are reported at the segment level from the Department of the Interior perspective and also from the bureau perspective. This includes full cost reporting by Department strategic goals in the Department's Annual Accountability Report and by bureau mission goals in bureau-level annual financial statements. Cost accounting at lower levels, as requested by individual PART reviews, does not currently accumulate full costs as defined in the PART instructions and OMB Circular A-11; for example, "the full employer share of the annual accruing cost of retiree pension and health benefits is not included".		10%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	Financial management practices are in place, and auditors have noted no deficiencies. While there have been payment errors, they have always been promptly discovered and corrected.	Financial records are kept and tracked in the Denver Finance Office, the Regional Office, and the Area Office so that two offices always check the third whenever an action is processed.	10%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	Program management is primarily the responsibility of the Area Offices, with Reclamation-wide coordination and oversight provided by Reclamation's Office of Policy in Washington and Denver.	In June 1997, the Department of the Interior Office of the Inspector General (OIG) issued a Survey Report on the Title XVI program, and two minor deficiencies were noted. They are: 1. Implement the 1994 "Procedures for Reviewing Cost-Share Agreements," and 2. Follow up on the Single Audit Act process by: --Obtaining copies of single audit reports from project grantees and following up on any identified reportable conditions or material weaknesses; --Requesting copies of management letters and information on deficiencies communicated orally to the grantees; --Obtaining information on corrective actions planned or taken. Reclamation agreed with the two recommendations, and has implemented corrective actions.	10%	0.1
8 (Co 1.)	*Are grant applications independently reviewed based on clear criteria (rather than earmarked) and are awards made based on results of the peer review process?*	No	Funding for the construction portion of Title XVI projects is not subjected to a grant application process, but is determined by the annual appropriations process. However, the research aspect of Title XVI involves an independent review of grant applications. Sec. 1605 of Title XVI of P.L. 102-575 authorizes research. Congress has directed Reclamation to support the WateReuse Foundation's research agenda. The Foundation assists Reclamation by providing competed, merit reviewed research projects to address national needs. The Foundation also provides management of the research projects and continued peer review through completion and dissemination of the final report.	Reclamation uses a ranking and priority process to decide on which new-starts to fund when budget targets allow for such new-starts. The criteria Reclamation uses to set priorities are based, in part, on the authorizing legislation and are described in the "Guidelines for Preparing, Reviewing, and Processing Water Reclamation and Reuse Project Proposals Under Title XVI of Public Law 102-575, as Amended".	10%	0.0

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (Co 2.) *Does the grant competition encourage the participation of new/first-time grantees through a fair and open application process?*	N/A	Major funding comes in the form of Congressional add-ons for new projects, and not through a traditional grant process. This question does not apply because nearly the entire budget each year is dedicated to ongoing obligations associated with previously initiated projects. Because of many years of limited funding in comparison to the large number of authorized projects, Reclamation's focus has been to complete and adequately fund existing projects already under construction, and thus fulfill its commitment to the local sponsors. Thus, new applicants have been at a disadvantage. Funding to support the Research component of the program is competed annually through a well-defined process, however, the budget for reseach is only about 3% of Reclamation's annual request for Title XVI activities. Generalized needs and specific projects are determined at an annual WateReuse Foundation Research Conference jointly sponsored by Reclamation, EPA, and three other nonprofit research foundations.	Reclamation uses a ranking and priority process to decide which new starts to fund when budget targets allow for such new-starts. The criteria Reclamation uses to set priorities are based, in part, on the authorizing legislation and are described in the "Guidelines for Preparing, Reviewing, and Processing Water Reclamation and Reuse Project Proposals Under Title XVI of Public Law 102-575, as Amended". Because the research program started two years ago, all the contractors are first-time grantees.	0%	
10 (Co 3.) *Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	Reclamation staff are in close communication with the project sponsors on all aspects of project development. See response to #1 above. The research program has been developed to include a Reclamation employee on the Research Committee, and all Project Advisory Committees.	Progress reports are used to compare available funding with actual needs, and can result in moving funds from one component to another in order to maximize efficient use of Federal funds. See response to #1 above. Each research project has a Project Advisory Committee responsible for evaluating proposals, monitoring accomplishment, and checking budget expenditures.	10%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
11 (Co 4.)	*Does the program collect performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	No	Due to the nature and variability of the projects, no formal procedure is in place to collect performance data. Information is collected on a case by case basis as the grantee submits requests for reimbursement or a modification to a cost-share agreement is negotiated. This information is not made readily available to the public.	The research program sponsors an annual research conference held by the WateReuse Foundation. Proceedings from the conference are publicly available and include information on the program and projects.	10%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**60%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	The program has been successful at making progress toward meeting its long-term goals, but because of the lack of any timetable associated with meeting those goals, it is not possible to ascertain whether the progress is sufficient.		20%	0.0

Long-Term Goal I:	Increase the total water supply availability by reclaiming and reusing wastewater and impaired ground and surface water.
Target:	500,000 acre-feet of reclaimed water reused by participating local water agencies per year.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	98,000 acre-feet per year now being reused as a result of progress on currently funded authorized projects.
Long-Term Goal II:	Increase the affordability and public acceptance of water reuse projects by improving and enhancing treatment technologies through research
Target:	10% reduction in wastewater treatment cost.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	No progress to date, as the Title XVI research component is only in its second year of existence.
Long-Term Goal III:	
Target:	
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	

2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	Yes	The program has largely met its annual performance goals.		20%	0.2

Key Goal I:	Execution of all necessary cooperative agreements and obligation of appropriated funds.
Performance Target:	100% obligation in each Fiscal Year
Actual Performance:	FY 2000 - 97.3% obligation; FY2001 - 97.7% obligation; FY2002 - 98% obligation (est.)
Key Goal II:	Identify and investigate new opportunities for future water recycling projects.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Performance Target: Complete at least one new appraisal and one feasibility study each year. Actual Performance: Two appraisal studies and one feasibility study completed in FY2002.					
	Key Goal III: Performance Target: Actual Performance:					
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	No	From a budget perspective, the program is being administered at a 97% success rate and has little margin for demonstrating improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness. From a project perspective, in almost all cases to date Reclamation has little actual responsibility or control over project implementation and schedule.	See Section IV, Question 2 above.	20%	0.0
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	Yes	Reclamation's program performance is based on actual work accomplished, as evidenced by obligation or expenditure of Federal funds for project implementation and research.	Within budgetary limitations, Reclamation has consistently met its cost-share requirements and obligations to the non-Federal project sponsor in a timely manner, and therefore, performance equals or exceeds that of the non-Federal programs of similar nature, such as the various State Revolving Fund programs. Funds that were not obligated in the past 2 years were carried over due to schedule slippage on the part of the non-Federal program. (See performance goals in question IV.2)	20%	0.2
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	Yes	Most of the activities required to implement a recycled water project are being conducted by local project sponsors and their contractor. These water districts are ultimately responsible for program accomplishment and undergo annual single audits to account for the expenditure of Federal funds during the year.	Yearly single audits of the funded projects conducted for Reclamation have yet to disclose any issues or misappropriation of Federal funds for project purposes, which is evidence that the program is being effective in meeting the goal of providing financial assistance to local agencies for water reuse project implementation.	20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**60%**

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Tribal Courts
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
40%	25%	0%	0%	Demonstrate

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BIA's Tribal Courts program has no specific, statute-based goals or purposes. GPRA performance objectives are limited to tribal codes/training to implement specific IIM trust regulations.

Evidence: Indian Tribal Justice Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-176) [25 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.] directs BIA to survey tribal court systems to determine conditions, caseloads, capabilities, and needs for a Report to Congress by July 1994. A survey report was published in 2000 (see section 1.2).

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Indian reservations have violent crime rates (657 per 100,000 residents) higher than national average (506 per 100,000 residents), higher aggravated assault rates (600 vs. 324), and lower property crime rates (1,083 vs. 3,618). Based on a 1998-99 survey, about 42% of tribal court cases were criminal with potential jail time. Other caseloads included: traffic (26%), juvenile (15%), family (7%), housing/land use (3%), and commercial (3%).

Evidence: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Fact Sheet (January 2003). Survey of Tribal Justice Systems & Courts of Indian Offenses, American Indian Law Center, Inc. (May 2000). The final survey report was not approved by DOI and OMB prior to release by the Center.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Jurisdiction: BIA has no current inventory of tribal courts, but estimates about 275 general, special (i.e. traffic, juvenile, family) and appellate courts serve about 40 tribes. Tribal courts have primary jurisdiction on civil and criminal crimes committed on Indian lands by a tribal member against other members. Some tribal courts adjudicate matters between members of different tribes within jurisdiction. Federal and state courts serve about 522 tribes that have not established tribal courts. Most tribes have adopted modern and customary codes; modern codes are usually based on federal and state statutes. Federal Assistance: U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) provides discretionary grant assistance to develop and improve tribal justice systems. DOJ grants are intended to supplement BIA's support for tribal court operations and improvements.

Evidence: Jurisdiction: Felix S. Cohen's Handbook of Federal Indian Law, 1982 Edition (pp. 250-265) for general discussion and legal citations. Financial Assistance: Indian Tribal Justice and Technical Assistance Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 3651 et seq.) authorizes DOJ to award grants to (1) Indian tribes for development/operation of judicial systems, (2) national/regional organizations to provide training/tecnical assistance to tribes, and (2) non-profit entities to provide criminal/civil legal assistance to tribes and tribal members. DOJ grants are available for tribal courts assistance ($8 million); adult, juvenile, family drug courts; alcohol/substance abuse demonstration project; and technology/information sharing outreach.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BIA operates 22 Courts of Indian Offenses. Tribes operate others under contract/compact agreements, with performance monitoring subject to negotiation with each tribe. BIA's statute precludes imposing federal standards on tribal court administration and conduct. DOJ's grant program authorities cannot encroach upon, diminish, impair the rights of each tribal government to determine its judicial system.

Evidence: Indian Tribal Justice Act of 1993 [25 U.S.C. 3611(d) and (e)(1)(E)]. Indian Tribal Justice and Technical Assistance Act [25 USC 3665]

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Tribal Courts
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
40%	25%	0%	0%	Demonstrated

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Within BIA's Tribal Priority Allocation (TPA) program, tribal governments determine annual allocations among over 35 programs, including tribal court operations. In FY 2003, TPA funds total $772 million, of which $26 million is available for tribal courts. BIA plans to target $5.5 million on Probate and Supervised IIM Account (25 CFR 15/115) codes and cases.

Evidence: Federal Register, Vol. 68, No. 22, pp. 37857-8 (June 25, 2003). BIA to provide information on TPA reprogrammings to/from tribal court subprogram since FY 1999 (due by 7/11/03) for further analysis.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight 12%

Explanation: BIA is reevaluating program capabilities, goals and targets for the new DOI Strategic Plan. The BIA will work with OMB and the Tribal Courts program manager to clarify program goals and measures.

Evidence:

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight 12%

Explanation: BIA is reevaluating program capabilities, goals and targets for new DOI Strategic Plan.

Evidence: BIA's FY 2004 Budget Justifications (p. 36). OMB may consider new information submitted prior to/with the FY 2005 budget estimates.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight 12%

Explanation: Annual number of tribal codes/court procedures and training sessions for enforcing recent changes in Indian Probate (25 CFR 15) and Supervised IIM Accounts (25 CFR 115) regulations.

Evidence: FY 2003 targets are number of tribal codes/court procedures (3) established and training sessions (10) conducted on 25 CFR 15/115 regulations.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight 12%

Explanation: FY 2002 annual targets were estimated without baseline data for reliable projections.

Evidence: BIA's FY 2004 Budget Justifications (p. 36). OMB may consider new information submitted prior to/with the FY 2005 budget estimates.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Tribal Courts
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
40%	25%	0%	0%	Demonstrated

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: Program lacks long-term goals and annual performance measures.

Evidence: Tribal courts not required to report on staffing, caseloads, time for adjudication, appeals to non-tribal courts, case dispositions, or other performance indicators.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: No credible independent evaluations have been conducted or are planned.

Evidence: Survey of Tribal Justice Systems & Courts of Indian Offenses, American Indian Law Center, Inc. (May 2000) published without proper review/approval by DOI and OMB. Recently, the BIA/Tribal Budget Advisory Council established a Judicial Subgroup to conduct a survey of tribal court funding needs for FY 2005 budget planning. In May 2003, the National Tribal Justice Resource Center published the survey results on its website without proper review/clearance by DOI and OMB.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: YES Question Weight:12%

Explanation: In 2003, about 20% of tribal court funds are targeted for Supervised IIM accounts (25 CFR 115) or for other priority or backlog cases. No status/progress report is available.

Evidence: In FY 2002, BIA targeted $1.5 million for tribal court enforcement of 25 CFR 15/115. Thirteen tribal courts applied for and received awards. In FY 2003, $5.5 million is targeted for these caseloads.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: NO Question Weight:12%

Explanation: DOI/BIA are reevaluating program capabilities, goals and targets for new DOI Strategic Plan.

Evidence: OMB may consider new information submitted prior to/with the FY 2005 budget estimates.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: NO Question Weight:15%

Explanation: See section 2.5

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Tribal Courts
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
40%	25%	0%	0%	Demonstrated

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight:15%

Explanation: See sections 1.5 and 2.5.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: NO Question Weight:15%

Explanation: See sections 1.5 and 2.5.

Evidence:

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Tribal courts are an inherently governmental function, not subject to competitive sourcing. BIA's statute precludes imposing federal standards on tribal court administration and conduct.

Evidence: Indian Tribal Justice Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-176) [25 U.S.C. 3601, 3611(d) and 3631.]

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: NO Question Weight:25%

Explanation: BIA and DOJ do not coordinate on technical/financial assistance programs, including oversight to assure that DOJ grant awards supplement BIA funding.

Evidence: BIA to provide information on TPA reprogrammings to/from tribal court subprogram since FY 1999 (due by 7/11/03) for further analysis.

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: NO Question Weight:15%

Explanation: See sections 1.5, 2.5 and 3.5.

Evidence:

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: NO Question Weight:15%

Explanation: DOI/BIA are reevaluating program capabilities, goals and targets for new DOI Strategic Plan.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Tribal Courts
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
40%	25%	0%	0%	Demonstrated

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BIA is reevaluating program capabilities, goals and targets for new DOI Strategic Plan.

Evidence:

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: BIA is reevaluating program capabilities, goals and targets for new DOI Strategic Plan.

Evidence:

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: See sections 1.5, 2.5, 3.1 - 3.3.

Evidence:

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: See sections 1.5, 2.5, 3.1 - 3.3. No performance data on tribal courst available to compare with U.S. court or state court systems. No study located that compares Indian reservations served by tribal courts to those served by federal/state courts on operational efficiency, cost effectiveness, or quality of services.

Evidence: The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts issues periodic performance reports on district and appellate courts. Trend indicators include: civil and criminal cases filed, pending, terminated; civil cases by nature of suit; civil cases over 3 years old; criminal cases by major offenses; judgeships filled and vacant; court support staffing and workloads.

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: NO Question Weight 20%

Explanation: No GAO, IG or other credible independent evaluations have been conducted or are planned.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Tribal Courts
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Type(s): Direct Federal

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not
40%	25%	0%	0%	Demonstrated

Measure: Measure Under Development
Additional Information:

Year | Target | Actual | **Measure Term:** Long-term

Measure: Measure Under Development
Additional Information:

Year | Target | Actual | **Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Measure Under Development
Additional Information:

Year | Target | Actual | **Measure Term:** Annual (Efficiency Measure)

Measure: Number of tribal codes/court procedures to enforce 25 CFR 15/115.
Additional Information:

Year | Target | Actual | **Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Number of training sessions on 25 CFR 15/115.
Additional Information:

Year | Target | Actual | **Measure Term:** Annual

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Capital Assets & Service Acquisition Programs

Name of Program: TRIBAL LAND CONSOLIDATION

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	Statutory purposes of pilot program are to: (1) acquire small ownership interests in Indian trust lands; (2) prevent further fractionation; (3) consolidate for tribal development.	Indian Land Consolidation Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-462), Title I, Sec. 213, authorizes federal acquisition of fractional ownership interests. Priority for small (2% or less) interests.	25%	0.3
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Federal Government's Indian trust responsibilities include maintaining legal records (title, probate, survey, lease) on land ownership and lease transactions. Ownership shares fractionate over each generation, compounding workload demands on trust administration.	Over 10 million acres of Indian trust lands owned by individuals, with about 4 million interests distributed among 400,000 individuals. Over 1.4 million interests are 2% or less.	25%	0.3
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Acquisitions eliminate/reduce the Government's current and future costs in managing land title records, probates, leases, and individual trust fund accounts.	Through FY 2002, the Midwest pilot projects have inactivated 664 IIM accounts, closed 125 IIM accounts, and avoided 1,688 future probate cases.	25%	0.3
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	No	ILCA requires federal acquisitions be coordinated with tribal land acquisition and development programs. Pilot projects are adjusting to these recent statutory requirements, but have a high volume of pending applications from voluntary sellers to process.	Pilot projects, initiated in 1999, acquire interests from voluntary (willing seller) applicants without priority consideration of tribal development plans or income generation.	25%	0.0
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	NA	Active pilot projects on five Indian reservations: Bad River, Lac Courte Oreilles, Lac du Flambeau, and Red Cliff (WI) and Keewanee Bay (MI). Recent expansion to Rosebud (SD) is excluded from this review.	Significant program planning and additional resources will be needed to expand to other Indian reservations with high concentrations of fractional ownership interests.	0%	
Total Section Score					**100%**	**75%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	Statutory long-term goal is to consolidate fractional ownerships for tribes to develop lands for economic and social benefits, with repayment of the Government's purchase costs from future revenues.	No references in DOI and BIA Strategic Plans despite relevance to Indian trust fund management reforms. DOI to address in Strategic Plan for FY 2003-2008.	13%	0.0
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	Yes	BIA pilot projects focus on acquiring ownership interests from voluntary willing sellers rather than annual plans based on goal-directed priorities.	BIA to address in FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan.	13%	0.1
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	Yes	BIA pilot projects supported by tribal partners with tribal resolutions of endorsement and cooperative agreements for outreach efforts to notify landowners of acquisition program.	BIA pilot projects have limited coordination with tribal land acquisition priorities, consolidation, and development plans. These recent statutory requirements should become program prerequisites at new locations.	13%	0.1
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	NA	No other federal Indian land consolidation program.		0%	
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	Yes	BIA issued first program evaluation: Indian Land Consolidation Pilot Project Report (April 2002), conducted by Booz-Allen-Hamilton. Recommends program management improvements needed prior to expansion to other locations.	Report includes various program performance indicators, and 24 recommendations to improve program management and accountability. Midwest Region to establish a team to address or implement recommendations.	13%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	Budget/accounting structure separates Land Acquisition, Youpee Escheatment, and Administration. Acquisition Fund established to deposit revenues received from acquisitions. No linkage between budgetary resources and program workloads and performance measures.	ILCA assumes repayment for each interest purchased. Recommend amendments to consolidate revenues to avoid maintaining or establishing accounts for each ownership. Criteria needed for repayment (partial or full) waiver provisions.	13%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	No	BIA should develop a strategic plan for expanding the land acquistion and consolidation program to other regions and reservations. (Also see B-A-H Report. p. IV-13.) BIA should establish national program manager to plan/coordinate future program expansions.	DOI-BIA has initiated strategic planning activities, including federal-tribal workgroup, to assess policy and program initiatives.	13%	0.0
8 (Cap 1.)	*Are acquisition program plans adjusted in response to performance data and changing conditions?*	Yes	High unobligated balances during 1999-2002 despite volume of willing sellers. BIA's Midwest Region required full-time staff to handle program demands.	FY 2002 budget provided for increased administrative expenses to hire dedicated staff. Staff has expanded from 10 to 17 full-time personnel in Midwest region.	13%	0.1
9 (Cap 2.)	*Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule and performance goals?*	No	Alternative strategies should be assessed, such as concentrating acquisitions on: (1) owners with active IIM accounts, and/or (2) land parcels with tribal development plans. Such priorities could produce more immediate federal cost-savings and repayment schedules.	Cost-savings analyses needed to estimate current and future federal benefits associated with eliminating IIM accounts, land title records, probates, and other trust-related administration activities.	13%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**50%**
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	Yes	Midwest region provides monthly status and activity reports on key performance indicators: interests acquired, acres, average costs, IIM accounts made inactive or closed, probates avoided, and pending applications and interests.		10%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	Yes	Midwest projects are closely monitored by BIA agency superintendent, BIA regional director, and OMB.		10%	0.1
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	No	Low annual obligation rates: 41% in FY 1999; 50% in FY 2000; 37% in FY 2001, and 41% in FY 2002.	Over $8 million carried over into FY 2002; and $11.7 million carried over into FY 2003. Reduced FY 2003 Budget to spend down carryover balances.	10%	0.0
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	Yes	B-A-H Report recommends actions to improve business processes, activity based costing, and standard performance and management processes before expanding to other regions or reservations.	Midwest Region is forming team to review/assess B-A-H Report recommendations for implementation.	10%	0.1
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	B-A-H Report recommends full cost analysis, including outreach, appraisal, title search, purchase price, labor, benefits, and other administrative expenses. See Item # 9 below.	Recommend further quantification of federal program costs and benefits. Ownership transfers accrue current and future benefits (cost savings) in federal trust administration that offset original purchase price.	10%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	B-A-H Report finds pilot program records are auditable, and recommends actions to improve business processes and management controls.	Funds are not disbursed to seller prior to receipt of deed transfer. However, no audits conducted on financial management practices.	10%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	Midwest Region has hired dedicated program staff to address most immediate management concern.	Temporary personnel hired for training and performance assessment prior to conversion to full-time status.	10%	0.1
8 (Cap 1.)	*Does the program define the required quality, capability, and performance objectives of deliverables?*	No	Midwest pilot project acquisitions not targeted towards performance (outcome) goals.	Outcome goals are: (1) reduce land management and accounting costs and (2) economic development to repay purchase costs.	10%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (Cap 2.)	*Has the program established appropriate, credible, cost and schedule goals?*	Yes	B-A-H Report outlines administrative processes, with unit time and costs for each stage. Labor costs exclude benefits and overhead.	Estimate of administrative costs: $295 per case, or $15 per interest acquired.	10%	0.1
10 (Cap 3.)	*Has the program conducted a recent, credible, cost-benefit analysis that shows a net benefit?*	Yes	B-A-H Report demonstrates customer responsiveness, customer satisfaction, and future cost benefits for Government.	Example cost-benefit - Average purchase cost: $328 per interest. Average future probate savings: $450 per interest.	10%	0.1
11 (Cap 4.)	*Does the program have a comprehensive strategy for risk management that appropriately shares risk between the government and contractor?*	NA	ILCA Act precludes tribal governments from operating federal acquisition program under contract/compact agreements.		0%	
Total Section Score					**100%**	**70%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	Yes	Through FY 2002, 47,188 ownership interests acquired in 25,044 acres. About 91% of interests purchased were small (2% or less) ownerships.	About 32% of all individual ownership interests purchased on pilot reservations.	25%	0.3

Long-Term Goal I:	Prevent further fractionation of ownership interests in Indian trust land allotments.
Target:	None established.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Rate of fractionation reduced, but total number of fractionated interests remained about the same. Acquisitions could not keep pace with applications and ownership transfers (inheritance) from deceased owners.
Long-Term Goal II:	Consolidate fractional ownership interests into usable land parcels for tribal economic and community development.
Target:	None established; pilot projects not fully coordinated with tribal land consolidation and development plans.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	
Long-Term Goal III:	Repayment of Government's purchase price of interests acquired from income generated.
Target:	None established; pilot projects respond to owners willing to sell small interest holdings regardless of productive value of land.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	As of August 2002, $945 deposited into Acquisition Fund from revenues derived from acquired ownership interests.

2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	NA	No annual performance goals since pilot projects respond to applications from voluntary sellers.	Annual goals could be set if acquisitions targeted on land parcels, IIM accountholders with low activity, and other priorities.	0%	

Key Goal I:	Acquisition of small ownership interests in Indian trust land allotments
Performance Target:	FY99: NA FY00: NA FY01: NA FY02: NA

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Actual Performance: FY 99: 8,178 FY00: 17,523 FY01: 10,788 FY02: 10,699 Total: 47,188					
	Key Goal II: Number of IIM accounts inactivated/closed.					
	Performance Target: FY 99: NA FY00: NA FY01: NA FY02: NA					
	Actual Performance: FY 99: NA FY00: NA FY01: 310 FY02: 479 Total: 789					
	Key Goal III: Number of probates avoided.					
	Performance Target: FY 99: NA FY00: NA FY01: NA FY02: NA					
	Actual Performance: FY 99: NA FY00: NA FY01: 654 FY02: 1,034 Total: 1,688					
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	No	See Sec. III, Q-4.		25%	0.0
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	NA	No other federal Indian land acquisition program.		0%	
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	Yes	B-A-H Report (April 2002). OMB has monitored the pilot program for 2.5 years, including field visits/reviews, since a Report to Congress is due to identify/assess impacts of reductions in fractional interests on BIA accounting and recordkeeping.	ILCA Act, Sec. 213 requires Report to Congress on pilot program due three years after certification (expected in 2003) to address possible extension and modifications.	25%	0.3
6 (Cap 1.)	*Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?*	Yes	During FY 1999-2001, pilot program had substantial balances due to lack of full-time staff available for processing pending applications from the unanticipated number of willing sellers.	Pilot program increased cumulative obligations to 63% through 2002 as Midwest agency staff was expanded.	25%	0.3
Total Section Score					**100%**	**75%**

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The U.S. Geological Survey has the principal responsibility within the Federal Government to provide the hydrologic information and understanding needed by others to achieve the best use and management of the Nation's water resources. To accomplish this mission, the Water Resources Division, in cooperation with State, local, and other Federal agencies, systematically collects and analyzes data to evaluate the quantity, quality, and use of the Nation's water resources and provides results of these investigations to the public. Coordinates the activities of Federal agencies in the acquisition of water resources data for streams, lakes, reservoirs, estuaries, and ground water.

Evidence: Legislative mandates (1.1A): The Organic Act of March 3, 1879, Additional legislation includes eight authorizations pertaining to data collection and dissemination, from 31U.S.C.1535, through P.L.106-457 (reference: FY2005 Budget Justifications, p. 73-85). The Water Resources Discipline (WRD) IC&D mission is consistent with the mission and goals of the DOI Strategic Plan (2003-2008), which states: 'The DOI protects and manages the Nation's natural resources and cultural heritage; provides scientific and other information about those resources" (1.1B); also, DOI's four Mission Areas and Outcome Goals (p. 6): "Serving Communities" Advance Knowledge Through Scientific Leadership and Inform Decisions Through the Applications of Science. USGS Water Resources information and data are used to improve and enhance national stewardship of water resources. The USGS Strategic Plan (1.1C) The Strategic Directions for the Water Resources Division, 1998-2008 (1.1D) under "Long-Term Data Collection (page 10).

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The U.S. faces the combined challenges of an expanding need for water because of growing population, particularly in the western and southwestern water-poor regions of the Nation, a growing dependence on water that is transferred across large distances, and--because of increasing concerns about the ecological health of wetland, riparian, lacustrine, and estuarine environments--demands that water resource extraction and use be environmentally sound. Additionally, more communities are at risk for flood hazards because of the increase in the Nation's population and its expansion into more hazardous areas. A sound, scientific knowledge base is needed to assess available water resources, the impact of using those resources, and the degree of flood risk. This information is essential for decision makers to understand and weigh the costs and benefits of water usage and to evaluate flood hazard.

Evidence: A New Evaluation of the USGS Streamgaging Network - A Report to Congress (1998, 20 p.) and Streamflow Information for the Next Century A Plan for the National Streamflow Information Program of the USGS: USGS Open-File Report 99-456 (http://water.usgs.gov/nsip/pubs/99-456.pdf).Cooperative Water Program: 'Most work in the Coop Program is directed toward potential and emerging long-term problems, such as water supply, waste disposal, ground-water quality, effects of agricultural chemicals, floods, droughts, and environmental protection.' (http://water.usgs.gov/coop/description.html).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Rivers and aquifers cross political boundaries, hence, only a Federal agency can have a long-term, national-scale interest in monitoring the availability and quality of surface- and ground-water resources. Two factors assure that WRD data collection efforts are not redundant with other agencies: 1) the USGS Mission, dating to 1879, and enhanced by statute in 1894 for gaging the streams and determining the water supply of the United States, ensures that WRD hydrologic data collection programs at National scale and over the long term are unique in the Federal, State and local government as well as private and academic sectors; 2) the WRD business model is designed and executed to include regular communication and coordination of hydrologic data collection among Federal and State agencies. At the National level, USGS liaisons coordinate with their counterparts in Federal and State agencies.. (see ACWI evidence below and performance measures for additional details). At the local level, WRD District Chiefs direct USGS programs in 48 District offices that include the 50 US states and territories. Additional factors that make the USGS unique with respect to hydrologic data collection and distribution: the USGS does not implement nor decide policy, and has no regulatory duties, therefore, has no vested interest in the particular outcome of an assessment or study, and as such WRD information and results are viewed as unbiased.

Evidence: This mission was assigned to the USGS through the Organic Act of 1879. Furthermore, provision was made in 1894 for gaging the streams and determining the water supply of the United States (28 Stat. 398). No other Federal, State, local governmental or non-governmental entity has this mission, capability, or responsibility (DOI Manual, Chapter 1, http://elips.doi.gov/elips/release/3304.htm).OMB Memo M-92-01, 'Coordination of Water Resources Information' designates the DOI-USGS as the lead agency for the Water Information Coordination Program (WICP) and states: 'All other Federal organizations funding, collecting, or using water resources information should assist the USGS in ensuring the implementation of an effective WICP.' The USGS streamgaging program has over 1,200 Federal, State, and local partners that help fund USGS streamgages because of the high quality and consistent streamflow information the USGS provides. (National Streamflow Information Program: Implementation plan and Progress Report FS-048-01).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: USGS WRD funding is appropriated through seven line items, the collection and dissemination of hydrologic data from a large distributed network of streamflow, ground-water, and water quality monitoring sites is executed through a combination of centralized planning and coordination with WRD District offices where state and regional hydrologic issues and needs are identified. Funding for each of the three major hydrologic data types (streamflow, ground-water, and water quality) is derived from multiple line items but is coordinated through five national WRD Programs: National Streamflow Information, Cooperative Water, Hydrologic Networks & Analysis, NAWQA, and Ground Water Resources. Sampling strategies are planned with National perspective and scope and multiple national-level data collection networks are in place. While there is coordination the program could not easily demonstrate how activities across the program elements contribute to national capabilities, an example of this is the lack of measurable long term goals for all data collection and dissemination activities. New measure were developed during the PART process.Additionally, WRD products are digital in nature, having moved away from the limitations and expense of paper. The widespread use of GIS technology also indicates increased efficiency, as GIS products allow users to build upon existing databases and maps and can be used for purposes beyond the original intent.

Evidence: WRD 5 year plans (see http://water.usgs.gov/usgs/prgmplans/) are implemented through the Strategic Directions for the Water Resources Division 1998-2008 Plan, and USGS Strategic Plan. WRD IC&D functions are citizen centered: distributed nationally into 48 Districts and additional Sub-district and field offices, fostering local and regional data collection efforts, knowledge, and expertise on water-related issues, as well as contact with partner governmental agencies and local academic institutions.To gauge WRD IC&D effectiveness, stakeholder and partner feedback is actively sought by many venues, including: (1) regular meetings between WRD District, (including WRD regional officials) with local government water- and land-management agencies; (2) WRD District Strategic Reviews (3) interactions with customers at scientific and technical meetings, (4) WRD membership on interagency steering committees, ie. SWAQ, ACWI http://water.usgs.gov/wicp/acwi/. WRD members belong to standardization committees such as the ASTM. WRD seeks outside validation of its methodologies and assessments to ensure that no major flaws are present. Example: WRD requested the NAS to evaluate its Water use information program. (Committee on USGS Water Resources Research, 2002, Estimating Water Use in the United States: A New Paradigm for the National Water-Use Information Program: National Research Council, 190 p.).The effectiveness and efficiency of WRD IC&D programs have been reviewed by the ACWI Streamgaging Taskforce and a National Academy of Science Committee.ACWI Charter: http://water.usgs.gov/wicp/acwi/a_charter.html ACWI advises the Federal Government, through the USGS on the Federal Water Information Coordination Program (WICP).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The WRD IC&D mission concentrates on providing original, hydrologically based, non-biased water information to stakeholders: policy makers, land and resource managers, the general public other federal agencies, nongovernmental groups, industry, academia, and other scientists. Programs are coordinated principally through three IC&D Programs to achieve program goals, namely monitoring, assessing, and providing water resources data of the Nation. WRD develops goals and assesses effectiveness in meeting goals through annual Water District Strategic Program Reviews (DSPR) in which HQ, Regional and District leadership meet with representatives of state and local government agency heads to evaluate past and current work as well as discuss/determine future needs for hydrologic information. Results of these DRPR's are synthesized into scientific needs and challenges for the Nation and communicated to all WRD Program Coordinators, Regional and District leadership through a guidance document: the annual CWP Priorities memo (see also 2.RD2). WRD resource information is the WRD IC&D product that reaches intended beneficiaries. As previous sentences show, WRD works very closely with target beneficiaries, however information is not systematically collected that can be aggregated to report on how information collection and dissemination activities affect beneficiaries at the national level.

Evidence: The operation and maintenance of streamgages, wells, and water-quality station (data-collection) networks is coordinated among WRD IC&D programs, the four WRD regions, and through each of 48 District offices across the Nation in order to meet the highest priority National goals as well as local needs to ensure that the information needs are being met as effectively as available resources allow. WRD IC&D programs coordinate work to support data collection networks with multi-purpose stations, for example, a single streamgaging station may serve multiple stakeholder needs: water supply, flood warning, and water quality monitoring. (see for example, the 2002 Virginia District Annual Data Report: http://water.usgs.gov/pubs/wdr/WDR-VA-02-1/)

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: WRD worked with DOI and OMB during the PART process to develop a set of specific performance measures. These measures are based on program goals described in each of the WRD Program 5-year plans and are described in the PART 'Performance Measures' section.

Evidence: The FY2005 Budget Justifications, page 364The Strategic Directions for the Water Resources Division, 1998-2008 [please refer to 1.4] provides overview of scientific rational for performance measures and priority issues under the 'Strategic directions in WRD scientific activities' section (p. 6). http://water.usgs.gov/admin/memo/WRD/strategic_report.pdf

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Long-term measures, noted in 2.1 above, have targets and timeframes and described in the PART 'Performance Measures' section. These have been developed with input from OMB and DOI during the PART process. WRD targets and timeframes currently in use are described in the 5-year plans and in the WRD Strategic Directions publication.

Evidence: WRD IC&D 5 year plans (http://water.usgs.gov/usgs/prgmplans/) describe the science priorities that guide targets and timeframes; see example: NSIP 5-year plan.Strategic Directions for the Water Resources Division, 1998-2008 [please refer to 1.4] lists priority issues under the 'Strategic directions in WRD scientific activities' section (p. 6).http://water.usgs.gov/admin/memo/WRD/strategic_report.pdf

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: WRD has established new IC&D annual performance measures to quantify progress towards long-term goals. These measures are updated and refined from long-standing goals outlined in WRD program plans. The annual measures pertain to the improvement and enhancement of the basic data produced by the WRD IC&D programs, including the maintenance of (and increase in the number when funding permits) long-term data collection and large data infrastructures--which include the maximization of the percentage of long-term stream gages (30+ years of record) retained (and reported in NWIS-Web) from one year to the next. In addition to streamflow data, the two other basic data collection types reported in NWIS-Web are ground-water and water-quality (see evidence in PART 1.4). WRD IC&D Performance Measures include the collection and dissemination of real-time and non-real-time data. In addition to the performance measure-30+ years of streamflow record, additional annual measures include: 2) Percent of ground-water stations that have real-time reporting capability in the ground-water climate-response network (GWCRN) http://groundwaterwatch.usgs.gov/; 3) Percentage of daily streamflow and monthly ground-water level measurement sites with data that are converted from provisional to final status within 3 months of day of data collection.

Evidence: A New Evaluation of the USGS Streamgaging Network - A Report to Congress (1998, 20 p.)http://water.usgs.gov/streamgaging/index.html [please refer to 1.2]Streamflow Information for the Next Century A Plan for the National Streamflow Information Program of the USGS: USGS Open-File Report 99-456, 13 p.http://water.usgs.gov/pubs/of/ofr99456/ [please refer to 1.2]USGS Information Sheet: Measuring the Pulse of our Nation's Rivers, 2001, 2 p.http://water.usgs.gov/nsip/pubs/nsip-2page.pdfUSGS Fact Sheet 048-01: NSIP Implementation Plan and Progress Report, 2001, 6 p.http://water.usgs.gov/nsip/pubs/FS048-01.pdf [please refer to 1.3]Hydrologic data'NWIS (National Water Information System): Hydrologic data derived from streamflow, ground-water, and water quality monitoring stations are published on the web (http://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis)

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: WRD IC&D programs commit the USGS and partnering government agencies to annual and long-term hydrologic data collection program goals through MOU's, Interagency Agreements. and joint funding agreements (JFA's). The USGS builds relationships with partners having complementary goals (e.g., state water-management agencies-for water supply and water-quality data; National Weather Service-for streamflow data needed for flood warning systems; USEPA for water-quality data and information) to leverage resources/expertise. Joint-Funding Agreements (JFA) with more than 1,400 state and local government agencies across the Nation detail the exact work to be accomplished and entail close coordination through regular reviews and annual reports. The JFA's and MOU's specify goals to be reached and outline specific timeframes. The JFA's are renewed on an annual basis, normally at the level of the individual WRD District office. IAG's and MOU's may be renewed annual or on a longer time step, depending on the types of commitments they contain. These types of documents specify the locations where data will be collected and the type of data to be collected.

Evidence: GPRA reports: FY 2003 Performance and Accountability Report-http://www.doi.gov/pfm/par2003/GPRA-USGS Strategic Plan: http://www.usgs.gov/stratplan/stratplan_rev/index.htmlStrategic Directions for the Water Resources Division, 1998-2008http://water.usgs.gov/admin/memo/WRD/strategic_report.pdf5-year plansProject proposals and annual work plans include additional annual targets for project-specific work. [please refer to 1.4]

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: WRD IC&D programs commit the USGS and partnering government agencies to annual and long-term hydrologic data collection program goals through MOU's, Interagency Agreements. and joint funding agreements (JFA's). The USGS builds relationships with partners having complementary goals (e.g., state water-management agencies-for water supply and water-quality data; National Weather Service-for streamflow data needed for flood warning systems; USEPA for water-quality data and information) to leverage resources/expertise. Joint-Funding Agreements (JFA) with more than 1,400 state and local government agencies across the Nation detail the exact work to be accomplished and entail close coordination through regular reviews and annual reports. The JFA's and MOU's specify goals to be reached and outline specific timeframes. The JFA's are renewed on an annual basis, normally at the level of the individual WRD District office. IAG's and MOU's may be renewed annual or on a longer time step, depending on the types of commitments they contain. These types of documents specify the locations where data will be collected and the type of data to be collected.

Evidence: WRD Five-Year Plans are used to set and publicize program priorities with partners.[please refer to 1.4]WRD District Strategic Reviews (representative samples from several WRD Districts) [please refer to 1.4]Annual WRD District Program Reviews (conducted by WRD Regional offices to determine operational/financial status of District office, including the names of each Federal and state cooperative agency, cost and nature of annual program with each, status of reports and products planned for delivery to partners)MOUs and IAG's with other agencies/entities such as Department of Defense, USEPA (see examples). These documents outline the tasks and goals to be accomplished. Joint-Funding Agreements (JFA): WRD has approximately 1,400 JFA's signed with state, local, and tribal government agencies covering work in the Cooperative Water Program. These JFA's list the locations where data will be collected, the type of data to be collected, and the support to be provided from each partner agency. In most cases, the partner agency provides funding but no services. See examples

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Numerous independent reviews of WRD have been requested of the National Academy of Science to seek advice on improvement of WRD IC&D programs. These reviews have been conducted regularly during the past 10 years and are ongoing. The reviews are requested by USGS on an ad hoc basis when feedback is needed and the scope is defined for each review.However, there has not been a holistic review of all information collection and dissemination activities.

Evidence: The reviews list recommendations for ways that the USGS can improve the collection and distribution of data. For example, the National Water Use Information Program (NWUIP) review (2002) recommended that the NWUIP: 1) be elevated to a water use science program; 2) build on existing data collection efforts by systematically integrating USGS and other agency datasets; 3) compare and improve water use statistical methods; 4) integrate water use, water flow, and water quality data to enhance policy-relevant information.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The budget justifications provide links to annual goals but it is difficult to determine the effects on long term goals. GPRA tables are not well linked to the text of justifications for long term goals.

Evidence: FY2005 Budget Justifications: identifies the linkage between the accomplishments and the performance measures/outputs in the DOI strategic plan that are tracked as part of GPRA. NSIP p. 411,

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The subactivities of WRD IC&D progams have taken steps to correct strategic planning deficiencies identified by external reviews. The Cooperative Water Program, which represents about a third of the entire WRD program and includes IC&D plus research components, was reviewed and a list of 32 findings was provided to the USGS. Examples of some of the findings and USGS actions taken are listed in 2.6 above. Each finding was addressed and is available on line at: http://water.usgs.gov/wicp/acwi/coop/Hirsch.html. Additionally, WRD Program Coordinators are currently revising their 5-year plans to better reflect the performance measures that are described within this PART.

Evidence: Cooperative Water Program Task Force Review findings: http://water.usgs.gov/pubs/circ/circ1192/html/finding.html USGS Response to Coop. Program Task Force Review findings: http://water.usgs.gov/wicp/acwi/coop/Hirsch.html Response letters from DOI Secretary Norton and WRD Associate Director Hirsch, plus the list of recommendations and USGS actions taken is included.

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The overall goal of monitoring the quality of water in the U.S. is common to many of these programs, but there are important differences in geographic and scientific focus, methods, and questions to be answered by the monitoring. For example, the EPA directs states and water agencies to perform water monitoring, but does little large-scale monitoring itself. EPA does conduct a national scale EMAP water quality monitoring program, which can be viewed as a complement to USGS monitoring in that EMAP takes a statistical, random approach to selection of monitoring sites, and emphasizes a single, widespread snapshot in time rather than long-term trend analysis at stations selected for their hydrologic significance'which is what the USGS does. EPA and USGS meet regularly to coordinate their programs and avoid duplication.States monitor effluents for compliance applicable clean-water and safe-drinking-water laws, and most states also conduct ambient water-quality monitoring as required by EPA, and published in the 305B report. There is some variation among the states in sampling and analytical methods, site-selection, water- quality standards, and data analysis. States, EPA, and USGS coordinate their programs through the National Water Quality Monitoring Council, a subgroup under the FACA Advisory Committee on Water Information.

Evidence: USGS/EPA Memorandum of Agreement on the Management of Water Quality Data, February 25, 2003, Establishes that USGS and EPA will deliver data from USGS/NWIS and EPS/STORET in a common format. Organic Act of 1879. Establishes unique role of USGS and directed USGS to classify public lands and examine the geological structure, mineral resources, and products within and outside the national domain. Additional legislation: eight authorizations pertaining to data collection and dissemination, from 31U.S.C.1535, through P.L.106-457 (reference: FY2005 Budget Justifications, pages 73-85). 28 Stat. 398: provision was made in 1894 for gaging the streams and determining the water supply of the United States by the USGS.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

2.RD2 **Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The USGS has a drafted a Bureau-level science planning handbook, which demonstrates the relationships between the annual Regional Executive Program Coordinator meeting, Regional meetings with DOI Bureaus and other stakeholders as elements that contribute to the WRD budget and science prioritization process. Due to a lack of long term measures it has been difficult to clearly assess actual decisions to prioritize investments based on national needs. New measures have been developed in the PART process which help to clearly demonstrate decisions based on priorities.

Evidence: Bureau Science Planning HandbookRegional Executive Program Coordinator meeting, example agendaNSIP, Cooperative Water, HN&A Five Year PlansDirector's Annual GuidanceCooperative Water Program memorandum

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: DOI, USGS, and USGS WRD IC&D programs regularly collect performance information through customer and partner reviews and surveys. Feedback is incorporated into program plans and specific actions are taken in response. The DOI and Bureau Strategic Plans include partner and customer reviewed long term goals, annual performance measures, and GPRA measures. Progress on GPRA are verified quarterly and reported and updated annually. The USGS Director convenes annual listening sessions, recording needs of partners and informing them of response. The NAS/NRC reviews long term goals and program performance, utilizing blue ribbon panels of scientists and stakeholders. All projects are required to record detailed workplans, progress and products, and budgets by object class in the Bureau wide system BASIS+. The majority of agreements (JFA's) made with State and local government agencies through the Cooperative Water Program are funding agreements whereby the non-USGS party agrees to reimburse the USGS for work outlined in the JFA. The USGS monitors the financial (and technical) contributions made by the cooperating agencies. If financial contributions are late, collection procedures are used, up to and including referral to the US Department of Treasury and, if needed, the US Department of Justice. If other promised contributions are not delivered, cooperative partnerships are occasionally terminated. Standard national criteria are used for the timing of funding reimbursements to the USGS. These are outlined in USGS internal websites and in USGS internal Instructional Memorandums.

Evidence: USGS Strategic Plan showing long term goals, measures, and annual GPRA targets (pp 9-15). GPRA update memo GPRA Reports and example of quarterly verification. Directors 03 Listening Session Report showing recommendations and actions taken. Attachment includes examples of how information has been used from evaluations and listening sessions to make changes in WRD programs.Bureau Science Planning Handbook shows performance requirements in program five-year plans and collecting performance information in BASIS+ system .

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: There is currently not a direct likage betweensater district manager's performance goals to for the entire water discipline to ensure that priorities are met and to understand the tradeoffs of decisions made at the local level. USGS does use some mechanisms to hold senior management and program partners accountable for performance through performance evaluation, management process controls, and performance guidance provided in agreements, contracts, and grants. Measures for GPRA, financial management, and the Presidents Management Agenda are in all USGS SES performance agreements. Regional Executives and Program Coordinators are accountable for achieving performance as part of the USGS Planning Model and as part of their performance agreements. While SES level managers have GPRA annual goals incorporated into their annual plans, starting in 2004 Water district managers began including performance standards in their performance plans which link their individual performance with the achievement of program goals. At the end of FY04 and beyond it will be possible to assess whether this information is used to ensure accountability. While partners and cost sharing agreements include performance information they are not clearly linked to achievement of water discipline performance goals.

Evidence: SES Performance Plan Guidance and Trujillo Memo USGS Planning Model responsibilities list (p.4-7). USGS Policy Manual Contract and agency agreement requirements http://www.usgs.gov/usgs-manual/toc.html. Chapters 300.000 - 369.999 deal with financial management (including billing, budget, contractual agreements, and general policies), and chapters 400.000 - 407.999 deal with contracts specifically.

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?

Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The USGS has an established budget, allocation, and spending process that includes annual planning, quarterly and monthly reviews, and review of any funds allocation change over 25K. Upon approval from the Bureau, funds are authorized into BASIS+ for all approved projects, and monthly tracking of the status of funds is done by project chiefs and management officials. Cost center managers obtain and review monthly financial reports showing the obligation/spend rate. Unliquidated obligations are reviewed and certified quarterly. Certifying officers ensure the availability of funds for all obligations. Examples: All requisitions and all travel authorizations are signed by a certifying official. A list of findings and USGS responses is available on line in the USGS FY 2003 Annual Financial Report. See page 27. http://pubs.usgs.gov/03financial/

Evidence: USGS Budgeting and Finance diagramAllocation Process Memo showing appropriation actions and requirements. Program and admin office allocation tables to cost centers, projects, and accounts.Spending progress by object class for all USGS for 2nd and 3rd quarters.Summary of Program quarterly obligations for FY03

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: A new efficiency measure was established during the PART process. The Nation Water Information System (NWIS) is undertaking process improvements to improve productivity. Improvements to NWISWeb are continuous and include Web based tutorials on accessing the data through NWISWeb. In addition, USGS has partnered with EPA to provide digital access to NWIS data through their on-line web-based map interface, Window to my Environment. However, the WRD never evaluated whether a national contract could be issued for management of the stream flow measurement system to make it more cost effective, as identified in the strategic directions document.

Evidence: DOI Capitol Asset Guidance Guidance For Exhibit 300 And 300-1 - Capital Asset Plan And Business Case And Project Profile. DOI's guidance is located on the web at: http://www.doi.gov/ocio/cp/300guidance.DOCExample IT improvement--digital data initiatives and portals: NWISWeb provides Web accessible water information from NWIS to the nation http://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis and is described in USGS Fact-Sheet 129-02 November 2002.

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The USGS and EPA have established, under the FACA, the Advisory Committee on Water Information (ACWI) to help provide coordination among federal agencies and from state, local, and private organizations in the area of water data collection and dissemination. Significant developments in the water monitoring programs of various federal agencies are discussed at ACWI semiannual meetings. The ACWI includes a number of subgroups that are charged with coordinating programs and improving consistency, including the National Water Quality Monitoring Council, and the Methods and Data Comparability Board, and subcommittees on hydrology, sedimentation, and spatial water data. In addition to ACWI, the USGS participates in the CENR Subcommittee on Water Availability and Quality, which also promotes discussions and coordination among federal agencies involved in water monitoring.

Evidence: Effective collaboration between WRD IC&D programs and others is demonstrated by working agreements that WRD has with others. An example of this type of partnership is the sharing of long-term WRD precipitation data sets, which are often unpublished, with the NOAA-NWS for development of the NOAA Technical Report 42 series (Precipitation accumulation and return frequency). In these types of relationships, WRD plays a distinct and complimentary role. WRD cooperative working relationships benefit both parties, and WRD scientists gain access to data, knowledge, and expertise as well as funding. Examples of USGS participation in State drought plans:New York: ny.water.usgs.gov/projects/drought99/ how_declared1.htmlIllinois: www.nal.usda.gov/wqic/statedrought.htmlArizona: www.awwa.org/waterwiser/watch/index.cfm?ArticleID=26 Examples of EPA citing USGS water monitoring programs on the EPA web pages: - Joint reservoir monitoring for pesticides: http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/cumulative/pra-op/iii_e_3-f.pdf- Organophosphorus pesticide monitoring: http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/cumulative/pra-op/iii_e_1-f.pdf- National Coastal Research and Monitoring Strategy: http://www.epa.gov/ged/crc/epa620r-00-005u.pdf

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: USGS has: taken corrective actions for IT security (target date 6/30/04); taken necessary steps to ensure that all staff performing accounting functions comply with Circ. A-123; performed appropriate reviews of the financial statements; developed procedures to ensure that accounting adjustments are handled properly; established policies and procedures for proper accounting for all property; established inventory controls to ensure compliance with SFFAS No. 3; and has established a procedure for maintaining Working Capital Fund investments. USGS exceeded DOI's goal for electronic funds transfer compliance, consistent with the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996, and promptly paid its invoices, again exceeding DOI's goal of 97% (consistent with the Prompt Payment Act). For the revenue cycle control issue, USGS has implemented a corrective action plan and is having monthly reviews conducted by cost center managers.

Evidence: FY 2003 Independent Auditors' Report (Dec 9, 2003)USGS Status of FY 2002 Findings (Sept 30, 2003)Bureau annual planning process documentation

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The USGS has taken significant steps to resolve management deficiencies. Through the USGS Geographic Information Office (GIO), Chief Technology Office, the USGS has taken steps to improve IT systems controls (resulting in better security and management of critical infrastructures). The USGS has strengthened its financial management organization and leadership by establishing a Deputy CFO with full authority and responsibility for overseeing all financial management activities and filled key positions for skilled supervisory and operating accountants. USGS has established a training program for its professional and administrative staff on proper accounting procedures. To receive Certification and Accreditation (C&A), WRD addressed the Performance Objectives and Milestones identified by the Bureau Security Manager. NWIS met the identified requirements to receive C&A this year.

Evidence: USGS FY 2003 Annual Financial Report http://pubs.usgs.gov/03financial/FY 2003 Independent Auditors' Report (Dec 9, 2003)USGS Status of FY 2002 Findings (Sept 30, 2003)Bureau annual planning process documentation

3.RD1 For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: WRD IC&D programs have several mechanisms to maintain program quality. These include: 1) regular reviews of project-level financial transactions by District Administrative Officer; 2) reviews of District financial transactions by Regional Management Officers; reviews of Regional financial transactions by Headquarters financial officers.In the Cooperative Water program, IC&D project proposals are developed by WRD District managers and submitted for approval through a multi-level process The IC&D proposals are first prepared by Data Chiefs in the Districts, then reviewed and approved by the District Technical Specialist (for Ground Water, Water Quality, or Surface Water), then the District Chief. Projects involving both data collection and research are approved at the Regional level. Criteria for approval include satisfaction of partnership goals, maintenance of long-term records, maintenance of adequate geographic coverage, meeting needs for support of water-resources management decisions, and consistency with WRD IC&D science and information goals. Project proposals are reviewed for technical merit, acceptable time-line planning, appropriate budgeting and staffing, and final products. Project proposals that do not satisfy all criteria are returned to Data Chiefs for corrections and revisions and are not approved unless all criteria are satisfied. What are your criteria? (at least provide a link to where these are written)

Evidence: Director's Annual GuidanceAnnual Cooperative Water Program memoProgram 5-year plans

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Past measures, though inadequate, indicate that progress was made. New long term measures were developed during the PART process.

Evidence: 5-year plans, GPRA plans and Congressional Budget Justifications,

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Earlier performance measures were very input orientied and it was difficult to determine how they contribute to long term goals, however WRD regularly achieved its annual performance goals.

Evidence: 5-year plans [please refer to 1.4], GPRA plans and Congressional Budget Justifications,

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: A new efficiency measure was developed in the PART process against which improved effectiveness and efficiences can be measured in the future. Anecodtal information show efficiencies were achieved., through collaborative effort with EPA on a water information web portal.

Evidence: 5-year plans [please refer to 1.4], GPRA plans and Congressional Budget Justifications,

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program did not receive an outright "yes" for this question because there are no known surveys or analyses that directly compare the performance of the Water Resources Program with other water research programs operated by other governmental or educational entities. Because the program is a recognized leader in water information, however, it warrants a score of "large extent." Water information activities in the private sector (site specific) and in other agencies (National Weather Service (NWS, Corps of Engineers, EPA) looks to the WRD for direction and standards through cooperation. The NWS operates a small precipitation monitoring network (with only limited real-time data collection/transmittal capability) for forecasting and reporting on weather conditions. Additionally, like the NWS, the WRD reports streamflow on a 24x7 basis, and reports must be accurate and timely. Unlike the NWS, the USGS provides calibrated estimates of mean daily streamflow when measured data are unavailable for any reason.

Evidence: NWIS web: one the largest hydrologic data bases on Earth, NWIS currently contains surface-water, ground-water, and water-quality data from more than 1.5 million sites in the 50 states, several Territories, and the District of Columbia. http://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwisNRC, 1999, 'Hydrologic Hazards Science at the U.S. Geological Survey', National Academy Press, page 65. 'The USGS stream gaging network is a unique and irreplaceable source of primary data supporting planning, research, and management for hydrologic hazards. It is of critical national importance that this source of consistent and reliable hydrologic data be maintained, both as the foundation for other hydrologic activity conducted by USGS and as a basis for planning and operations carried out by countless other public and private entities.' (page 65)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT

Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Independent review of WRD IC&D programs (NAS, ACWI-Cooperative Water Program Review) document that the programs are effective and achieving results. Additional indication of the effectiveness of WRD IC&D programs is the feedback received in the form of e-mail and letters acknowledging the value, breadth and scope of use of WRD IC&D program products. The NSIP Program has been reviewed nationally by the ACWI Streamgaging Taskforce and the National Academy of Sciences. However, there are not regular holistic reviews of the all information collection and activities.

Evidence: NAS review'In the United States, a massive effort is in progress to remediate sites at which hazardous materials threaten the environment. The science and technology programs of the WRD [Water Resources Division of the U.S. Geological Survey], with a heritage of over 100 years, contribute significantly to the national remediation effort by continually imparting new and credible understanding about soil and water contamination.' (page 1) 'The long-term streamflow and ground water-level monitoring programs of the USGS provide the base information for determining the probability of occurrence of extreme hydrologic events.' (page 18)NRC, 1999, 'Hydrologic Hazards Science at the U.S. Geological Survey', National Academy Press.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

Measure: % of river basins that have streamflow stations

Additional Information: Indicates that each major river basin has basic streamflow information available.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	Baseline	77%
2005	79%	
2006	81%	
2007	83%	
2008	85%	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: % of streamflow stations with real-time measurement /reporting of water quality

Additional Information: Indicates what percent of streamflow stations have monitoring capability that is important to measuring TMDLs,

Year	Target	Actual
2004	Baseline	6%
2005	7%	
2006	8%	
2007	9%	
2008	11%	

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

Measure: % of the Nation's 65 principal aquifers with monitoring wells that are used to measure responses of water levels to drought and climatic variations.

Additional Information: The monitoring of water levels in aquifers is necessary for tracking ground-water supply response to droughts and natural climatic trends.

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2004	Baseline	60%
2005	61%	
2006	62%	
2007	63%	
2008	65%	

Measure: % of proposed streamflow sites currently in operation that meet one or more federal needs

Additional Information: Measures indicates the % of sties that support one or more federal decision making needs are active.

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2004		64%
2005	63%	
2006	60%	
2007	57%	
2008	55%	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

Measure: % of WRD streamflow stations with 30 or more years of record

Additional Information: A record of long-term data contributes to the accuracy of flood and drought statistics needed to make decisions.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004		60%	
2005	61%		
2006	62%		
2007	73%		
2008	75%		

Measure: % of ground-water stations that have real-time reporting capability in the ground water climate response network

Additional Information: Measure indicates the accessiblity of information that is needed to monitor drought and climate variability on groundwater.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	Baseline	57%	
2005	62%		
2006	67%		
2007	72%		
2008	77%		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

Measure: % of daily streamflow measurement sites with data that are converted from provisional to final status within 4 months of day of collection

Additional Information: Timely conversion of water data is a critical need for water management agencies, the private sector and academic researchers.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Efficiency
2004	Baseline	0%	
2005	10%		
2006	20%		
2007	30%		
2008	40%		
2009	50%		

Measure: # of long term data collections maintained

Additional Information: Indicates # of priority databases which are kept timely and accurate.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	5	5	
2005	5		
2006	5		

Measure: # of real-time streamgages reporting in NWIS-Web

Additional Information: Indicates the number of streamgages which provide real-time information on the internet.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	5553	5978	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Information Collection and Dissemination
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

2005	5187
2006	4990

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The U.S. Geological Survey has the principal responsibility within the Federal Government to provide the water resource information and understanding needed by others to achieve the best use and management of the Nation's water resources. To accomplish this mission, the Water Resources Discipline, in cooperation with state, local, and other Federal agencies:' Conducts water-resources appraisals describing the occurrence, availability, and physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of surface and ground water. ' Conducts basic and problem-oriented hydrologic and related research that aids in alleviating water resources problems and provides an understanding of hydrologic systems sufficient to predict their response to natural or human-caused stress. ' Provides scientific and technical assistance in hydrologic fields to other Federal, State, and local agencies, to licensees of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and to international agencies on behalf of the Department of State.

Evidence: Legislative mandates (1.1A): The Organic Act of March 3, 1879, established the USGS. This section provides that the USGS is directed to classify public lands and examine the geological structure, mineral resources, and products within and outside the national domain. Additional legislation includes 9 authorizations pertaining to research and investigations, from 15U.S.C.2901,2908, through P.L.106-498 (reference: FY2005 Budget Justifications, p.73-85).

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Cost effective decisions about water resources management must be based on sound understanding of hydrologic processes so that outcomes of those decisions can be effectively predicted. The fundamental decisions concern water supplies, flood hazard reduction, water quality protection or water quality cleanup'but also include decisions about capital investments, operations, or regulation. Poor understanding of the hydrologic system and poor predictions of the outcomes of decisions can lead to the over-development or under-design of facilities as well as the creation of regulatory policies that are not effective or have undesired consequences. Decision support is needed by Federal, state or local agencies, the private sector, and the public. Issues include:' Flooding is the number one natural hazard for the Nation with respect to property damage and loss of life. Floods pose significant risk to millions Americans in every state & territory and cause annual direct losses of $5 billion per year (ref. US Army Corps of Engineers).' Efficient remediation of contaminated ground water is a national priority. Expenditures for clean up may exceed $ 750 billion per year. (NRC 1994, "Alternatives for Ground Water Cleanup", "The potential costs of these remedial activities may be as large as $750 billion in 1993 dollars to be spent over the next 20-30 years.", page vii).' Salt-water intrusion threatens the availability of drinking water to many coastal communities. WRD research has developed 3-dimensional numerical models of density-dependent flow and transport that are helping communities manage coastal ground-water systems to minimize effects of salt-water intrusion.

Evidence: The National Academy of Sciences (NAS), National Research Council (NRC) conducts periodic reviews of WRD research priorities and approaches. Several recent reviews of USGS activities provide evidence to support the role of USGS in addressing National water problems and guidance for improvement. ' NRC 2002, 'Opportunities to Improve the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Assessment Program'.' NRC 2001, 'Future Roles and Opportunities for the U.S. Geological Survey'. ' NRC 2000, 'Investigating Groundwater Systems on Regional and National Scales'. ' NRC 1999, 'Hydrologic Hazards Science at the U.S. Geological Survey'.' NRC 1997, ' Watershed Research in the U.S. Geological Survey'.' NRC 1996, "Hazardous Materials in the Hydrologic Environment: The Role of the USGS'.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The WRD research role is clearly defined and unique from other Federal, state, local, or private entities. Several inter-agency coordinating committees guarantee that duplication of effort is minimized. The USGS Director, WRD Associate Director, and WRD Chief Scientist regularly meet with their counterparts and water managers in other Federal agencies and associations to assure complementary roles among agencies. WRD research fills a unique niche within the water-research community through two essential aspects of its infrastructure: (1) Long-term stability: the ability to implement long-term field-based approaches, including maintenance of long-term field research laboratories, coordination of large interdisciplinary research teams, and provision of long-term support for methods and models that are developed for and provided to stakeholders across the Nation; and (2) National consistency: development and use of reliable and consistent research methods and water data collection on extensive regional and national networks.

Evidence: WRD coordinates closely with other Federal agencies to avoid duplication of effort. Examples of this include a USGS-EPA MOU, regular meetings with the NWS, cooperative agreements and a new MOU with the USACoE. The WRD Associate Director is the Co-Chair of the Subcommittee on Water Availability and Quality (SWAQ) and WRD is the convener of Advisory Committee on Water Information (ACWI) http://water.usgs.gov/wicp/acwi/. USGS co-chairs the National Water Quality Monitoring Council (NWQMC).' SWAQ Charter: March 2003, defines Subcommittee on Water Availability and Quality, composed of 14 Federal science agencies, plus Office of Science and Technology Policy, Office of Management and Budget, and Council on Environmental Quality.' ACWI Charter: http://water.usgs.gov/wicp/acwi/a_charter.html' USGS Press Release, October 18, 2002--USGS Introduces A Web-Searchable Database of Environmental Methods:

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight 20%

Explanation: WRD research programs continually strive to improve research through comments input from major users of WRD science products as well as independent reviews of WRD by the National Academy of Science to seek advice on further improvement. WRD employs an expert federal workforce with extensive experience in the hydrologic sciences. A world-class water-quality laboratory is operated at the regional USGS center, Denver, where costs are shared with all WRD programs, and the program has three research centers with staff located in Reston, VA, Denver, CO, and Menlo Park, CA, where interaction with other USGS programs and other federal agencies is facilitated. While there are no major program flaws in WRD research, the goals of the 6 water research budget line items could be better integrated at the Discipline level. The USGS water reserach programs have been added in a piecemeal fashion as needs arose rather than in a strategic framework to address water information for the nation. Previous to the PART review, the lack of long term measureable goals and performance measures indicate this lack of coordination. As a result it was difficult to measure and clearly explain the impact of the all water resources research at USGS.

Evidence: Program 5-yr plans define goals mission and long term goals, partners and customers of each WRD research program (all 5-year plans on web at: http://water.usgs.gov/usgs/prgmplans/). Quarterly WRD Senior Staff meeting discuss program directions (see example agenda). The annual Research Committee Meeting and the smaller Watershed Research Meeting also help set science directions and review current research activities (see example agendas).The National Academy of Sciences (NAS), National Research Council, reviews have been used to increase WRD research efficiency through recommendations for enhancement and change of scientific management and direction. For example, Envisioning the Agenda for Water Resources Research in the Twenty-First Century (2001). Examines the future of the nation's water resources and the appropriate research needed to achieve long-term sustainability. Watershed Research in the U.S. Geological Survey, (1997).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: WRD research program 5-year plans describe science goals and the intended beneficiaries. Regardless of the nature of the various WRD Programs, the beneficiaries are ultimately the same and include: 1) general public'citizens who request information about local water-related issues such as hazards, water quality, ground-water levels, etc.; 2) private consultants and engineers'who request information such as ground-water levels, surface-water flows, peak-flow data, ground-water levels, etc.; 3) State water-management agencies'who enter into cooperative funding agreements to study water-resources problems and trends; 4) Federal environmental and other agencies'who request water-resources information of all types and enter into reimbursable agreements to study particular large-scale water-resources problems. Each of the Water Research Program elements address a subset of the water science research issues that have specific scientific characteristics and specific beneficiaries. This breakdown enables USGS to target resources to the intended purpose and beneficiary. While the program can demonstrate that specific beneficiary groups are well targeted, it is not always clear what the benefits are from a national/federal perspective.

Evidence: Two examples of stakeholder participation are provided for the NAWQA and TOXICS Programs: ' NAWQA Program: The program has a National Liaison committee made up of representatives from USGS, other Federal agency, and state organizations, and each of the Programs 42 Study Units (local study areas) have Study Unit liaison committees (with similar membership composition) Each meet at least annually to coordinate with beneficiary priorities and needs.' Toxics Program: Other reviews utilized to increase effectiveness and value to beneficiaries include:' Assessment of Water Resources Research. ' Studies on Hydrologic Science. ' Cooperative Water Program Task Force Review, 1999: http://water.usgs.gov/coop/review.html

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: WRD worked with DOI and OMB to develop a set of specific performance measures. These measures are based on the USGS Strategic Plan, WRD strategic planning, and WRD program goals described in each of the WRD Program 5-year plans. The measures are described in the PART 'Performance Measures' section. Unlike previous measures which focused on outputs such as the number o investigations, the new measures focus on acheivement of information products by theme: such as high-priority location- and topic-based synthesis activities.

Evidence: The FY2005 Budget Justifications, page 364The Strategic Directions for the Water Resources Division, 1998-2008 lists performance measures and priority issues under the 'Strategic directions in WRD scientific activities' section (p. 6).

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Long-term measures, noted in 2.1 above, have targets and timeframes and described in the PART 'Performance Measures' section. These have been developed with input from OMB and DOI during the PART process.

Evidence: The FY2005 Budget Justifications, page 364The Strategic Directions for the Water Resources Division, 1998-2008 lists performance measures and priority issues under the 'Strategic directions in WRD scientific activities' section (p. 6).

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: WRD has established new annual performance measures to quantify progress towards long-term goals. These measures are updated and refined from long-standing goals outlined in WRD program plans. The annual measures pertain to the improvement and enhancement of the research produced by WRD programs, including the quantification of scientific products such as peer-reviewed literature, hydrologic models, laboratory and field analytical methods, technical transfer activities, and topical regional/national synthesis products.

Evidence: The FY2005 Budget Justifications, page 364The Strategic Directions for the Water Resources Division, 1998-2008 lists performance measures and priority issues under the 'Strategic directions in WRD scientific activities' section (p. 6).

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: As described under the performance measures tab, baselines are established for some annual measures and will be established in FY2004 for those measures that have been defined in consultation with DOI and OMB during the PART process. Some baselines and targets are described and updated in GPRA plans, program 5-year plans, and in the Strategic Directions for the Water Resources Division, 1998-2008. Additionally, GPRA baselines and targets are shown in the FY2005 Budget justification. Many WRD projects are funded by multiple sources, so that baselines and targets are set for the WRD as a whole, not for individual programs.

Evidence: The FY2005 Budget Justifications, page 364The Strategic Directions for the Water Resources Division, 1998-2008 lists performance measures and priority issues under the 'Strategic directions in WRD scientific activities' section (p. 6).

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: WRD research programs commit the USGS and partnering government agencies to combination of annual and multi-year contractual agreements to maintain collaborative and other hydrologic research goals. Program 5-year plans list goals, and individual project proposals specify purpose and objective of each project. USGS builds relationships with partners having complementary goals (e.g., state water-management agencies for investigation and interpretation of water resources-related problems, USEPA and state equivalents for water-quality models and interpretation) to leverage resources/expertise. Cooperative agreements with more than 1,400 cooperators total, (cooperators not differentiated between data collection and research). state and local government agencies across the Nation entail close coordination through regular reviews and annual reports.

Evidence: WRD Five-Year Plans [please refer to WRD/ICD 1.4]WRD District Strategic Reviews (see representative example) [please refer to WRD/ICD 1.4]Annual WRD District Program Reviews (conducted by WRD Regional offices to determine operational/financial status of District office, including the names of each Federal and state cooperative agency, cost and nature of annual program with each, status of reports and products planned for delivery to partners)MOUs, CRADA's, and IAG's: see USGS-NWS [please refer to WRD/Research 1.3]Examples of Criteria, procedures, and guidance for WRD Project Proposal development [please refer to WRD/ICD 2.RD1]WRD Western Region:http://wwwrcamnl.wr.usgs.gov/uo/proposals/Programs/Western_Region_Programs.htmlWRD Western Region URL with specific instructions for preparing proposals:http://wwwrcamnl.wr.usgs.gov/uo/adm/Policies/Prog_Plans-Pol_on_Prep_Submssn_Proj_Proposal.htmlWRD Central Region: http://wwwrcolka.cr.usgs.gov/uo/proposals/CRproposalweb.htmlWRD Eastern Region: http://water.usgs.gov/usgs/orh/nrwww/prog-dev/proposals.html

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: Numerous independent reviews of WRD have been conducted by the National Academy of Science to seek advice on improvement of WRD research programs. Although not on a fixed schedule, these reviews have been conducted regularly during the past 10 years and are ongoing. The reviews are requested by USGS on an ad hoc basis when feedback is needed and the scope is defined for each review in accordance with emerging and ongoing science priorities. However, It has been over 10 years since there was a holistic review of all the elements in the Water resources research program. USGS scientists and managers meet with NAS committees to provide information and status of WRD programs. NAS committees travel to WRD District offices, field sites, laboratories, regional centers, and the USGS National Center to evaluate all aspects of WRD research programs. For example, five times since 1985, the NAWQA Program has participated in independent reviews of their Program plans and accomplishments. Each review was conducted by committees of experts assembled by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences. The most recent review was published in 2002, and covered accomplishments of NAWQA over the years 1993 to 2000. The review also evaluated plans for Program research expected to cover the period 2001 to 2011. However, It has been over 10 years since there was a holistic review of all the elements in the Water resources research program.

Evidence: Advisory Committee on Water Information (ACWI) [please refer to WRD/ICD 1.4] or http://water.usgs.gov/wicp/acwi/ Review of Cooperative Water Program (CWP) [please refer to WRD/Research 1.5] or (http://water.usgs.gov/coop/review.html). NRC, 2002, 'Opportunities to Improve the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Assessment Program' , National Academy Press, page 3. NRC, 1996, 'Hazardous Materials in the Hydrologic Environment: The Role of the U.S. Geological Survey', National Academy Press, page 2.Other NRC reviews: ' Watershed Research in the U.S. Geological Survey (1997) ' Investigating Groundwater Systems on Regional and National Scales (2000)

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The budget justifications provide links to annual goals but it is difficult to determine the effects on long term goals. GPRA tables are not well linked to the text of justifications for long term goals.

Evidence: FY2005 Budget Justifications: identifies the linkage between the accomplishments and the performance measures/outputs in the DOI strategic plan that are tracked as part of GPRA. NSIP p. 411, Coop Water Program p. 433, HNA p. 421.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: The subactivities of water reserach progams have taken steps to correct strategic planning deficiencies identified by external reviews. Regarding other strategic planning issues, WRD has been more effective. The Cooperative Water Program, which represents about a third of the entire WRD program was reviewed and a list of 32 findings was provided to the USGS and each finding was addressed. A 1991 review of the Water research program indicated that more direction needed to be set at the Associate director level to ensure that high priority needs are addressed and for development of budgets. USGS has made steps in this direction but more progress could be made.

Evidence:
- FY2005 Budget Justifications: includes table with accomplishments and the performance measures/outputs in the DOI strategic plan that are tracked as part of GPRA (Coop Water Program p. 433, HNA p. 421), but are not clearly linked to the budget.Cooperative Water Program Task Force Review findings [please refer to WRD/Research 1.5] or http://water.usgs.gov/pubs/circ/circ1192/html/finding.html

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: WRD research programs have a long-term, national-scale interest in development and maintenance of water resources investigations, research, and hydrologic models for the well being of the public and the Nation. No other Federal agency or Federally-funded program has been given this mission, which was assigned to the USGS through the Organic Act of 1879. No private entities satisfy the public interest component of WRD research in which all products such as hydrologic models and laboratory methods enter the public domain and are available to any and all users.Most research funded through universities is supported by the NSF, whose RFP's are typically highly topical and focused. Although some NSF RFP's call for hydrologic research at the national and/or long-term scale, NSF-supported researchers must turn to Federal agencies such as the USGS for the long-term data sets. Non-federal agencies do not have the standards and practices in place to consistently collect and archive data and study results for mult-decadal to century time scales. This is the Federal role. The NSF-funded LTER is focused on a narrow set of mainly ecological disciplines by definition. Furthermore, the LTER is a set of 24 study sites and cannot be used to study or understand the hydrological issues that face the Nation.As stated in the DOI Manual, the mission of the USGS is to 'serve the Nation by providing reliable scientific information to describe and understand the Earth; minimize loss of life and property from natural disasters; manage water, biological, energy and mineral resources; and enhance and protect our quality of life.

Evidence: WRD/ICD 1.1]. Establishes unique role of USGS and directed USGS to classify public lands and examine the geological structure, mineral resources, and products within and outside the national domain. (DOI Manual, Chapter 1 [please refer to WRD/ICD 1.3] or http://elips.doi.gov/elips/release/3304.htm)LTER home page: defines the program--http://lternet.edu/

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

2.RD2 **Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?** Answer: YES Question Weight:10%

Explanation: If there is a change in funding, WRD bases research program enhancement or reduction decisions on national plans and guidance such as 1) the Report to Congress, Concepts for National Assessment of Water Availability and Use USGS Circular 1223; 2) The National Water-Quality Assessment Program-Entering a new decade of investigations. Additionally, the USGS has a drafted a Bureau-level science planning handbook, which demonstrates the relationships between the annual Regional Executive Program Coordinator meeting, Regional meetings with DOI Bureaus and other stakeholders as elements that contribute to the WRD budget and science prioritization process. The elements of water research program trade off priorities within their elements but it is not as apparent how priorities are weighed and decisions made at the discipline level.

Evidence: DOI Strategic PlanUSGS Strategic PlanStrategic Directions for the Water Resources Division, 1998-2008WRD Five Year PlansDirector's Annual GuidanceDirector's Annual Program Direction MemoCooperative Water Program memorandum

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: USGS WRD research programs regularly collect performance information through customer and partner reviews and surveys. Feedback is incorporated into program plans and specific actions are taken in response. The performance information seems largely to improvements in process and can not be directly linked to outcomes. In developing the annual priorities for the Cooperative Water Program, the USGS refers to its directions from Congress and the Administration, needs expressed by cooperators at the state, regional, and national levels, and our own assessment of the nation's needs for water-resources information.

Evidence: USGS Strategic Plan showing long term goals, measures, and annual GPRA targets (pp 9-15). GPRA update memo for FY02.GPRA Reports for FY03 and example of quarterly verification. Directors 03 Listening Session Report showing recommendations and actions taken. USGS Planning Model process showing performance requirements in program five-year plans and collecting performance information in BASIS+ system . Strategic Directions for the Water Resources Division, 1998-2008 The DOI and Bureau Strategic Plans include partner and customer reviewed long term goals, annual performance measures, and GPRA measures. Progress on GPRA are verified quarterly and reported and updated annually. The USGS Director convenes annual listening sessions, recording needs of partners and informing them of response. The NAS/NRC reviews 5 year plans, utilizing review teams composed of scientists and stakeholders. All projects are required to record detailed workplans, progress and products, and budgets by object class in the Bureau wide system BASIS+.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight:13%

Explanation: There is currently not a direct likage betweensater district manager's performance goals to for the entire water discipline to ensure that priorities are met and to understand the tradeoffs of decisions made at the local level. USGS does use some mechanisms to hold senior management and program partners accountable for performance through performance evaluation, management process controls, and performance guidance provided in agreements, contracts, and grants. Measures for GPRA, financial management, and the Presidents Management Agenda are in all USGS SES performance agreements. Regional Executives and Program Coordinators are accountable for achieving performance as part of the USGS Planning Model and as part of their performance agreements. While SES level managers have GPRA annual goals incorporated into their annual plans, starting in 2004 Water district managers began including performance standards in their performance plans which link their individual performance with the achievement of program goals. At the end of FY04 and beyond it will be possible to assess whether this information is used to ensure accountability. While partners and cost sharing agreements include performance information they are not clearly linked to achievement of water discipline performance goals.

Evidence: SES Performance Plan Guidance and Trujillo MemoSES performance agreement, genericUSGS Planning Model responsibilities list (p.4-7). USGS Policy Manual: Contract and agency agreement requirements http://www.usgs.gov/usgs-manual/toc.html

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The USGS has an established budget, allocation, and spending process that includes annual planning, quarterly and monthly reviews, and review of any funds allocation change over 25K. It has implemented management controls and measures to ensure dollars are allocated and obligated in a timely manner and spent for intended purposes. Budget planning to object class is done in the BASIS+ system, which ties budget to intended use. Allocation tables are constructed from BASIS+ and FFS is used to provide monthly and quarterly spending information by object class, to review obligation and debt, and take corrective action. Projects and their budgets are reviewed monthly by line managers and annually by Programs. Changes of over 25K are reviewed by both regional line managers and Programs as they occur. The Bureau conducts quarterly review of status of funds against performance measures. A certified Contracting Officer's Representative annually reviews and verifies contract funds are obligated and spent for intended purposes. A list of findings and USGS responses is available on line in the USGS FY 2003 Annual Financial Report. See page 27. http://pubs.usgs.gov/03financial/

Evidence: USGS Budgeting and Finance diagram. Allocation Process Memo showing appropriation actions and requirements. Program and admin office allocation tables to cost centers, projects, and accounts.Spending progress by object class for all USGS for 2nd and 3rd quarters.Summary of Program quarterly obligations for FY03Final spending report for all FY03 Programs. Instructional Memos APS-2003-11-13 USGS FY 2003 Annual Financial Report http://pubs.usgs.gov/03financial/

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: WRD research has developed an efficiency measures during the PART process which is in the measures section, a baseline and targets must still be developed for this measure.

Evidence: See PART measures section.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: WRD research programs work collaboratively with federal, state, and local governments, industry, and academia towards the achievement of complimentary goals. Major partners are identified in program Five-Year Plans and include, but are not limited to, NWS, DOD, NSF, DOE, EPA, BLM, and DOI, state and local resource agencies, and major consortia of academic, governmental, and industry groups. In general, USGS provides the broad scientific framework that provides context and support for partners to conduct work on a more specific or local basis. USGS establishes roles and responsibilities with partners through cooperative agreements, Memoranda of Understanding, and Interagency Agreements.For example, the NAWQA Program has as part of its strategic plan, to deliver data and information useful to policy and decision makers. As a result, each study unit and at the national level there are NAWQA Liaison Committees. These Committees have included more than 1000 organizations and agencies at all levels of government across the US, with interest and responsibility for water resource and water quality management.

Evidence: Effective collaboration between WRD research programs and others is evidenced by working agreements such as MOU's Interagency Agreements, and JFA's, that that WRD has with others. An example of this type of partnership is WRD scientific collaboration with NSF-funded programs such as the LTER whereby scientists share data and data collection efforts such as meteorological stations and field experiments (see NRP WEBB program: http://water.usgs.gov/webb/). Another example is the sharing of long-term WRD precipitation data sets, which are often unpublished, with the NOAA-NWS for development of the NOAA Technical Report 42 series (Precipitation accumulation and return frequency). In these types of relationships, WRD plays a distinct and complimentary role. WRD cooperative working relationships benefit both parties, and WRD scientists gain access to data, knowledge, and expertise as well as funding.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: USGS has: taken corrective actions for IT security (target date 6/30/04); taken necessary steps to ensure that all staff performing accounting functions comply with Circ. A-123; performed appropriate reviews of the financial statements; developed procedures to ensure that accounting adjustments are handled properly; established policies and procedures for proper accounting for all property; established inventory controls to ensure compliance with SFFAS No. 3; and has in place a model for maintaining WCF investments. USGS exceeded DOI's goal for electronic funds transfer compliance, consistent with the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996, and promptly paid its invoices, again exceeding DOI's goal of 97% (consistent with the Prompt Payment Act). For the revenue cycle control issue, USGS has implemented a corrective action plan and is having monthly reviews conducted by cost center managers.The USGS project management system, BASIS+ is set up to reflect financial transactions in system on a 24 hour update cycle. BASIS+ has new report types that permit regular budget execution reports and review of transactions at all levels of financial management, from the individual WRD District office, to USGS Headquarters. Regular review of transactions is carried out by financial management officers.

Evidence: FY 2003 Independent Auditors' Report (Dec 9, 2003)USGS Status of FY 2002 Findings (Sept 30, 2003)Bureau annual planning process documentation

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: The USGS has taken significant steps to resolve management deficiencies. Through the USGS Geographic Information Office (GIO), Chief Technology Office, the USGS has taken steps to improve IT systems controls (resulting in better security and management of critical infrastructures). The USGS has strengthened its financial management organization and leadership by establishing a Deputy CFO with full authority and responsibility for overseeing all financial management activities and filled key positions for skilled supervisory and operating accountants. USGS has established a training program for its professional and administrative staff on proper accounting procedures. USGS has established stronger policies and procedures for improved controls over financial reporting. Through use of BASIS+ WRD coordinates annual planning and budget/program execution as part of the Bureau's program planning model To receive Certification and Accreditation (C&A), WRD addressed the Performance Objectives and Milestones identified by the Bureau Security Manager. NWIS met the identified requirements to receive C&A this year. Financial management problems have been identified by an independent auditing company. USGS responses and corrective actions are described and addressed in the FY2003 Annual Financial Report.

Evidence: USGS FY 2003 Annual Financial Report http://pubs.usgs.gov/03financial/FY 2003 Independent Auditors' Report (Dec 9, 2003)USGS Status of FY 2002 Findings (Sept 30, 2003)Bureau annual planning process documentation

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

3.RD1 **For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?** Answer: YES Question Weight:13%

Explanation: WRD research programs have several mechanisms to maintain program quality. In the NRP, all scientists are required to regularly submit RSR's/RGEG packages for scientific peer review. The system is used to examine strengths and weaknesses in scientific achievement (publication record and scientific contribution to the Bureau), scientific methodology, progress on goals, use of funds. Reviews are conducted by scientific peers and WRD management. In the Cooperative Water program, project proposals are developed by WRD District scientists and submitted for approval through a multi-level process that includes scientific discipline specialists, managers, and program officers at the District and WRD Regional office level. Only those proposals that satisfy program goals, and meet high standards for scientific merit, planning, budgeting, and product, are funded.The Toxics program process for allocating funding telescopes down from funding targets for the Program goals and objectives in the Program 5-Year Plan (which defines budget targets) to the annual allocations which incorporate evaluation of accomplishments and progress as well as competition for supplemental funding. The quality of Program products are maintained by a review structure that evaluates the relevance and effectiveness of project plans and is supported by specific performance measures that address peer review. The NAWQA program requires annual work plans be developed for all activities of the Program. Work plans are reviewed at the local, regional and national levels. Plans are adjusted based on past performance to account for influences of capability and environmental conditions encountered. Annual work plan guidance is based on the Programs 5-year plans and long-term NAWQA plan. WRD research programs have several additional mechanisms to maintain program quality. These include: 1) regular reviews of project-level financial transactions by District Administrative Officer; 2) reviews of District financial transactions by Regional Management Officers; reviews of Regional financial transactions by Headquarters financial officers.In research funded by the Cooperative Water program, research project proposals are developed by WRD District scientists and submitted for approval through a multi-level process The proposals are first prepared by project or hydrologic investigation section chiefs in the Districts, then reviewed and approved by the District Technical Specialist (for Ground Water, Water Quality, or Surface Water), then the District Chief. Projects involving both data collection and research are approved at the Regional level. Criteria for approval include satisfaction of partnership goals, maintenance of long-term records, maintenance of adequate geographic coverage, meeting needs for support of water-resources management decisions, and consistency with WRD science goals. Project proposals are reviewed for technical merit, acceptable time-line planning, appropriate budgeting and staffing, and final products. Project proposals that do not satisfy all criteria are returned to the author for corrections and revisions and are not approved unless all criteria are satisfied.

Evidence: RGE guidance memoAnnual Cooperative Water Program memoProgram 5-year plans

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight:20%

Explanation: Past measures, though inadequate, indicate that progress was made. New long term measures were developed during the PART process. USGS lacks an adequate measure to indicate the status of water quality monitoring.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Earlier performance measures were very input orientied and it was difficult to determine how they contribute to long term goals, however WRD regularly achieved its annual performance goals.

Evidence:

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: A new efficiency measure was developed in the PART process against which improved effectiveness and efficiences can be measured in the future. Anecodtal information show efficiencies were achieved., through collaborative effort with EPA on a water information web portal.

Evidence:

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: The program did not receive an outright "yes" for this question because there are no known surveys or analyses that directly compare the performance of the Water Resources Program with other water research programs operated by other governmental or educational entities. Because the program is a recognized leader in water information, however, it warrants a score of "large extent." Water information activities in the private sector (site specific) and in other agencies (National Weather Service (NWS, Corps of Engineers, EPA) looks to the WRD for direction and standards through cooperation. The NWS operates a small precipitation monitoring network (with only limited real-time data collection/transmittal capability) for forecasting and reporting on weather conditions. Additionally, like the NWS, the WRD reports streamflow on a 24x7 basis, and reports must be accurate and timely. Unlike the NWS, the USGS provides calibrated estimates of mean daily streamflow when measured data are unavailable for any reason.

Evidence: NAS review: Investigating Groundwater Systems on Regional and National Scales (2000)NAS review: Opportunities to Improve the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Assessment Program (2001)These NAS reviews outline future directions for WRD research and highlight unique aspects of USGS WRD research: national scope, long-term data sets, and goals with federal (public) interest.

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight 20%

Explanation: Independent review of WRD research programs by the NAS document that the programs are effective and achieving results. Additional indication of the effectiveness of WRD research programs is the feedback received in the form of e-mail and letters acknowledging the value, breadth and scope of use of WRD research program products. A large extent is awarded because few reviews have looked at the effectiveness of WRD programs holistically. Those that have looked at WRD holistically note that Water resource programs would be more effective if clear policy direction was set at the top.

Evidence: NRC, 2002, 'Opportunities to Improve the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Assessment Program', National Academy Press, page 3.NRC, 1996, 'Hazardous Materials in the Hydrologic Environment: The Role of the U.S. Geological Survey', National Academy Press, page 1. See NRC commentary in response to question 2.6 and the external Coop Program review, and the EPA award mentioned above.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

Measure: % of US with ground water quality status and trends information to support resource management decisions

Additional Information: The measure indicates what % of aquifers have essential indicators of ground water quality across the nation.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	Baseline	0%
2005	12%	
2006	18%	
2007	24%	
2008	30%	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: % of States with web based Streamflow statistics tool to support water management decisions.

Additional Information: The measure indicates where ungaged areas have information necessary to make management decisions about ecosystem management, industrial effluent or flood hazards

Year	Target	Actual
2004	Baseline	4%
2005	11%	
2006	18%	
2007	29%	
2008	40%	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

Measure: % of US with ground water availability status and trends information to support resource management decisions

Additional Information: Indicates how much of the country has key water availability indicators needed by managers.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	Baseline	5%
2005	7%	
2006	8%	
2007	9%	
2008	10%	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: % of targeted contaminants for which methods are developed to assess potential environmental and human health significance

Additional Information: Measure indicates whether information is availabe to managers to understand risk of emerging toxic contaminants

Year	Target	Actual
2004	Baseline	10%
2005	20%	
2006	30%	
2007	40%	
2008	50%	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately
100%	90%	88%	53%	Effective

Measure: % improvement in accuracy of watershed model (SPARROW) prediction for total nitrogen and total phosphorus (measured as percentage reduction in error of model)

Additional Information: Improvement in accuracy of the model imrpoves the ability of water management agencies to characterize the conditions of river reaches and evaluate the success of pollution control efforts.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	Baseline	40%
2005	36	
2006	32	
2007	29	
2008	25	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Average cost per analytical result, adjusted for inflation.

Additional Information: The measures indicates how well USGS is controlling costs at water quality lab which provides lab work for 20% of all water research activities.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	Baseline	$8.64
2005	$8.64	
2006	$8.64	
2007	$8.64	
2008	$8.64	

Measure Term: Efficiency

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Water Resources Research
Agency: Department of the Interior
Bureau: USGS
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Rating
1	2	3	4	Moderately Effective
100%	90%	88%	53%	

Measure: #of systematic analysese and investigations delivered to customers

Additional Information: Measure indicates the # of priority analyses were completed (usually 2 year efforts)

Year	Target	Actual
2004	425	415
2005	425	
2006	425	

Measure Term: Annual