



# Construction of CBP- Owned Land Ports of Entry

Program Specific Recovery Act Plan

May 17, 2010



Homeland  
Security

*U.S. Customs and Border Protection*

## Message from the CBP Senior Accountability Official

May 17, 2010

I am pleased to present the following updated report, “U.S. Customs and Border Protection Construction of CBP-Owned Land Ports of Entry Recovery Act Plan.” This is an update of the original plan issued on May 15, 2009.

This document has been completed in response to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) *Updated Implementing Guidance for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, M-09-15*, which provides guidance for carrying out programs and activities enacted in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (“Recovery Act”) of 2009. Agencies are required to submit separate Recovery Program Plans for each program funded by the Recovery Act. This plan summarizes the Recovery Act projects and activities planned for Construction of CPB-Owned Land Ports of Entry.



CBP would be pleased to respond to any questions you may have. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (202) 344-2300.

Sincerely,

Eugene H. Schied  
Chief Financial Officer

# Executive Summary

Pursuant to requirements of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (“ARRA,” P.L. 111-5), the following pages provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s (CBP) Recovery Act Plan for the Construction of Land Ports of Entry (LPOEs) program. The ARRA authorized \$420 million dollars for the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) that will remain available through the year ending September 30, 2010. This mandated speed for the expenditure of federal funds into the economy of the United States is the essence and the essential spirit of the ARRA.

This funding must be expended specifically on the LPOEs owned by CBP. Modernization of these critical port facilities will benefit not only CBP operations, but also create jobs and provide an economic stimulus into the nation’s economy. The legislation recognizes the important role that modern and efficient Ports of Entry play in both the security of our country as well as stimulus of cross border commerce. This legislation requires an intense effort to greatly accelerate the pace of CBP’s modernization program and immediate implementation action as it is intended primarily as a wide ranging program to stimulate the regional economies of all communities that are proximate to the CBP Ports.

The purpose of this report is to outline the CBP Port Modernization program’s major activities and objectives, the expenditure plan, delivery schedule, and risks associated with this Modernization Initiative. The expenditure plan outlines the allocation of the \$420 million provided until the end of FY 2010 for the planning, management, design, alteration and construction of CBP-owned LPOEs. The delivery schedule gives a high level view of the major milestones from planning to execution along with an award and project completion schedule.



# Construction of CBP-Owned Land Ports of Entry Recovery Act Plan

## Table of Contents

I.	Legislative Requirement	1
II.	Funding Table	2
III.	Objectives	2
IV.	Activities	3
V.	Characteristics	5
VI.	Delivery Schedule	5
VII.	Environmental Review Compliance and Federal Infrastructure Investments	6
VIII.	Measures	10
IX.	Monitoring/Evaluation	10
X.	Transparency	10
XI.	Accountability	11
XII.	Barriers to Effective Implementation	11

# I. Legislative Requirement

This document responds to the requirements of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (“ARRA,” P.L. 111-5), which includes the following provision:

## *CONSTRUCTION*

*For an additional amount for ‘Construction’, \$420,000,000 solely for planning, management, design, alteration, and construction of U.S. Customs and Border Protection owned land border ports of entry: Provided, That no later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a plan for expenditure of these funds.*

This document also responds to the requirements set forth in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum M-09-15, *Updated Implementing Guidance for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009*.

## II. Funding

The following is LPOE ARRA funding listed by program and project categories. This table provides estimates of monthly obligations and gross outlays for ARRA-funded activities.

### PLANNED OBLIGATIONS IN \$ MILLIONS

	Q2 FY 2010	April 2010	May 2010	June 2010	July 2010	Aug 2010	Sept 2010
<b>Obligations</b>	\$229.3	\$301.7	\$328.0	\$365.2	\$381.2	\$410.0	\$411.0
<b>Obligations %</b>	54.6%	71.8%	78.1%	87.0%	90.8%	97.6%	97.9%
<b>Actual</b>	\$229.9	\$301.3					

### PLANNED OUTLAYS IN \$ MILLIONS

	Q2 FY 2010	April 2010	May 2010	June 2010	July 2010	Aug 2010	Sept 2010	Oct 2010	Nov 2010	Dec 2010
<b>Outlays</b>	\$16	\$25	\$30	\$35	\$40	\$45	\$50	\$55	\$60	\$65
<b>Outlays %</b>	3.8%	6.0%	7.1%	8.3%	9.5%	10.7%	11.9%	13.1%	14.3%	15.5%
<b>Actual</b>	\$15.2	\$23.7								

## III. Objectives

The ARRA funding provides \$420 million for the planning, management, design, alteration, and construction of CBP-owned border LPOEs. The allotted \$420 million for CBP-owned LPOEs will increase the program by approximately 20 positions (20 FTEs). Up to 5 percent (\$21 million) of the funds may be used to enhance management and oversight of construction.

Of the \$420 million, \$388 million will be used for reconstruction of up to 33 existing CBP-owned LPOEs as well as repairs and alterations (R&A) at an additional 8 locations. Project costs include:

- Site Acquisition [where necessary];
- Design;
- Construction;
- Environmental planning and compliance;
- Historic and cultural preservation planning and compliance;
- Site acquisition support services through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers;
- Government and Contract personnel; and
- Project and construction management support services.

Additionally, \$21 million will be used for development of the Program Management and Reporting System (PMRS), an integrated suite of software solutions and systems configured to support:

- Comprehensive real property planning and needs analysis;
- Environmental, historic, and cultural preservation requirements; and
- Project management and reporting and facility sustainment.

Congress legislated that ARRA funds be used for CBP-owned land port of entry facilities – which are primarily located along the northern border of the U.S. — and were mostly constructed to fulfill pre-DHS missions, with layouts and designs to meet the needs of the 1960’s and 1970’s.

On average, current facilities slated for modernization were constructed more than 40 years ago and were built decades before 9/11 during an entirely different era of land port of entry inspection. Various inspection technologies that exist today were not imagined when many of the existing land ports of entry were built. Modernization projects were determined according to an assessment of conditions at the facilities based on their capacity to meet CBP’s operational priorities and mission. CBP will target ARRA funding toward LPOEs struggling with the most urgent operational deficiencies.

ARRA projects implemented by CBP will operate in the spirit of full and open competition. While there are no specific requirements to use local contractors, CBP Recovery Act projects function under “Buy American” provisions that require agencies to buy specified ‘American-produced goods such as iron, steel and other manufactured goods for construction projects of public buildings or public works.’

## IV. Activities

Beginning in 2003, CBP, in partnership with the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA), undertook a thorough assessment of all 163 existing LPOEs along the northern and southern borders. Based on this information, CBP has outlined a multiyear strategy to modernize every land port facility to address outmoded configurations and years of physical deterioration.

The CBP Port Modernization Program Management Office (PMO) plans to modernize existing land ports of entry along both the northern and southern borders. Under the ARRA, the funding provided directly to DHS for ports of entry may only be applied to the forty-three facilities owned by CBP. The agency will target the available funding toward the ports in greatest need, based on operational priorities, facility assessments and project risk analysis. CBP will (1) expand the ports to address increasing demands for through-put capacity by adding lanes, thereby reducing wait times at many locations; (2) incorporate mission enhancements required to bring these facilities designed for a different era of inspections to current operational requirements; (3) address deteriorating physical conditions caused by inadequate funding streams due to previously competing national budget priorities. Unfortunately, CBP cannot address every need within this critical inventory, but thanks to the resources provided, we have made great strides towards making progress in the LPOE modernization program. The prioritized list of CBP-owned LPOEs that are targeted to receive ARRA funding are below.



**Estimated Cost Breakout:**

<b>Budget Plan</b>	<b>Amount (\$ Millions)</b>
<b>ARRA LPOE Construction (Design/Build)</b>	<b>\$258,143,260</b>
<b>ARRA LPOE Contingency, Program Support, and Project Build-out</b>	<b>\$121,706,620</b>
<b>ARRA LPOE R&amp;A (contract services)</b>	<b>\$10,150,120</b>
<b>PMRS (contracts and equipment)</b>	<b>\$21,000,000</b>
<b>Available Funding</b>	<b>\$9,000,000</b>
<b>Total LPOE Initiative</b>	<b>\$420,000,000</b>

**Project Cost Estimate:**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Design/Build Award/IGE</b>	<b>Contract Award</b>	<b>Project Completion</b>
Antelope Wells, NM	\$9,654,947	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Frontier, WA	\$10,460,755	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Scobey, MT	\$6,595,988	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Boundary, WA‡	\$11,038,806	FY 2010 Q3	FY 2012 Q2
Los Ebanos, TX*	\$9,974,632	FY 2010 Q3	FY 2012 Q2
Walhalla, ND	\$6,598,167	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Neche, ND	\$7,030,269	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Morses Line, VT	\$4,919,000	FY 2010 Q3	FY 2012 Q2
Hamlin, ME‡	\$9,457,000	FY 2010 Q3	FY 2012 Q2
Noonan, ND	\$7,957,940	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Antler, ND	\$6,643,442	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Wild Horse, MT	\$7,973,883	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Del Bonita, MT	\$5,807,586	FY 2010 Q3	FY 2012 Q2
Cannon Corners, NY	\$7,499,050	FY 2010 Q3	FY 2012 Q2
Churubusco, NY	\$6,881,786	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Hansboro, ND	\$6,929,000	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Pinnacle Road, VT	\$7,236,000	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Pittsburg, NH	\$7,419,000	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Carbury, ND	\$7,004,000	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Westhope, ND	\$6,936,000	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Morgan, MT	\$7,544,151	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Whitetail, MT	\$8,485,000	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Sherwood, ND	\$6,770,000	FY 2009 Q4	FY 2011 Q4
Maida, ND†	\$6,974,301	FY 2010 Q2	FY 2012 Q2

Amistad Dam, TX*†	\$8,933,464	FY 2010 Q4	FY 2012 Q4
Sarles, ND*†	\$7,279,618	FY 2010 Q3	FY 2012 Q3
Easton, ME*†	\$8,378,461	FY 2010 Q4	FY 2012 Q4
Bridgewater, ME*†	\$10,087,024	FY 2010 Q4	FY 2012 Q4
Pinecreek, MN*†	\$8,254,590	FY 2010 Q3	FY 2012 Q3
Hannah, ND*†	\$7,855,252	FY 2010 Q3	FY 2012 Q3
Whitlash, MT*†	\$7,674,628	FY 2010 Q3	FY 2012 Q3
Nighthawk, WA*†	\$7,889,520	FY 2010 Q3	FY 2012 Q3
Forest City, ME*†	\$8,000,000	FY 2010 Q4	FY 2012 Q4
<b>Total Design Build</b>	<b>\$258,143,260</b>		
<b>Total Contingency, Program Support and Project Build out **</b>	<b>\$110,516,135</b>		
<b>Available Funding</b>	<b>\$20,190,485</b>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$388,849,880</b>		

\*Costs for these projects are based on current estimates pending finalization and contract award.

\*\* Project build out costs include, environmental remediation, moving services, voice and data, and land acquisition costs.

†Maida, ND; Amistad Dam, TX; Sarles, ND; Easton, ME; Bridgewater, ME; Pinecreek, MN; Hannah, ND; Whitlash, MT; Nighthawk, WA; Forest City, ME are additional projects added to the Expenditure Plan due to available funds from projects awarded under budget.

‡ Small business projects that require environmental remediation.

		<b>Contract Award</b>	<b>Completion</b>
<b>R&amp;A*</b>	\$7,210,120	FY 2010 Quarter 2	FY 2011 Quarter 3
	\$2,940,000	FY 2010 Quarter 3	FY 2012 Quarter 1
<b>PMRS</b>	\$1,000,000	FY 2009 Quarter 3	FY 2010 Quarter 1
	\$900,000	FY 2010 Quarter 1	FY 2010 Quarter 2
	\$900,000	FY 2010 Quarter 2	FY 2010 Quarter 4
	\$400,000	FY 2010 Quarter 2	FY 2011 Quarter 4
	\$4,500,000	FY 2010 Quarter 2	FY 2010 Quarter 3
	\$12,500,000	FY 2010 Quarter 3	FY 2011 Quarter 3
	\$800,000	FY 2010 Quarter 4	FY 2011 Quarter 3

\* Maida, ND; Amistad Dam, TX; Sarles, ND; Easton, ME; Bridgewater, ME; and Pinecreek, MN; Hannah, ND; Whitlash, MT; Nighthawk, WA; Forest City, ME were originally on the R&A spend plan and have been added to the capital construction project list, resulting in a \$14,849,880 reduction to the original plan. This reduction has been allocated towards the costs for the additional modernization projects.

## V. Characteristics

There are no plans for the CBP FOF PMO to award any type of funding listed in Section 4 of Appendix 3 to M-09-15.

## VI. Delivery Schedule

In the spirit of economic recovery, CBP awarded 17 initial capital construction projects before Q1 FY2010. Due to significant cost savings from these initial awards, CBP was able to add ten additional capital projects to its spend plan, allowing CBP to complete replacement projects at all CBP-owned land ports of entry requiring reconstruction.

Below is the schedule and milestones for the capital construction projects, the award of 17 capital construction awards within 180 days, approximately 50% of the total funding.

### Completed Milestones

- March 13, 2009:** CBP, in partnership with USACE and GSA, confirms the initial requirements packages to the capital construction projects.
- April 2009:** CBP received approval on its ARRA Expenditure Plan in order to conduct 23 capital construction projects at CBP-owned land ports of entry
- May 11, 2009:** Issued Interagency Agreement to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for the execution of capital construction projects on behalf of CBP.
- June 2, 2009:** CBP, in partnership with USACE and GSA, finalizes requirements packages for the capital construction project
- July 2009:** CBP begins to issuing draft environmental assessments for a 30 day public comment period
- July 22, 2009:** Issued Interagency Agreement to the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) for the execution of capital construction projects
- July 30, 2009:** GSA post Requests for Proposals (RFP) on [www.Fedbizopps.gov](http://www.Fedbizopps.gov) for design/build contractors to conduct capital construction projects at Frontier, WA; Scobey, MT; Noonan, ND; Antler, ND; Wild Horse, MT; Churubusco, NY; and, Morgan, MT
- July 30, 2009:** USACE post Requests for Proposals (RFP) on [www.Fedbizopps.gov](http://www.Fedbizopps.gov) for design/build contractors to conduct capital construction projects at Antelope Wells, NM; Walhalla, ND; Neche, ND; Hansboro, ND; Pinnacle Road, VT; Pittsburg, NH; Carubury, ND; Westhope, ND; Whitetail, MT; and, Sherwood, ND

- August 17, 2009:** GSA awards seven design/build contracts to conduct capital construction projects at Frontier, WA; Scobey, MT; Noonan, ND; Antler, ND; Wild Horse, MT; Churubusco, NY; and, Morgan, MT
- August 18, 2009:** CBP issues Phase I RFPs on [www.Fedbizopps.gov](http://www.Fedbizopps.gov) for small business design/build contractors to conduct capital construction projects at Cannon Corners, NY; Hamlin, ME; Del Bonita, MT; Los Ebanos, TX; Boundary, WA; and Morses Line, VT
- August 19, 2009:** Due to cost savings from seven design/build contracts, CBP adds Maida, ND to its list of capital construction projects to be executed by GSA
- September 3, 2009:** USACE awards ten design/build contracts to conduct capital construction projects at Antelope Wells, NM; Walhalla, ND; Neche, ND; Hansboro, ND; Pinnacle Road, VT; Pittsburg, NH; Carubury, ND; Westhope, ND; Whitetail, MT; and, Sherwood, ND
- October 2009:** CBP begins issuing Final Environmental Assessments and Finding of No Significant Impact for land ports of entry that will receive capital construction projects
- December 7, 2009:** CBP issues Phase II RFPs from the Phase I down select from small business design/build contractors to conduct capital construction projects at Cannon Corners, NY; Hamlin, ME; Del Bonita, MT; Los Ebanos, TX; Boundary, WA; and Morses Line, VT
- January 2010:** GSA awards a design/build contracts to conduct a capital construction project at Maida, ND
- April 2, 2010:** Due to cost savings from the award of 18 design/build contracts, CBP adds nine additional land ports of entry to its capital construction list and received approval on its updates ARRA Expenditure Plan
- April 14, 2010:** CBP issues Phase I RFPs on [www.Fedbizopps.gov](http://www.Fedbizopps.gov) for small business design/build contractors to conduct capital construction projects at Easton, ME and Bridgewater, ME
- April 22, 2010:** CBP awards five design/build contracts directly to small businesses to conduct capital construction projects at Cannon Corners, NY; Hamlin, ME; Del Bonita, MT; Los Ebanos, TX; Boundary, WA; and Morses Line, VT

### **Upcoming Milestones**

- Spring 2010:** Initiate construction at the 17 initial sites awarded design/build contracts in Aug/Sept 2009

CBP, in partnership with USACE and GSA, finalizes requirements packages for the additional capital construction projects

- May 2010:** CBP awards a design/build contract directly to a small business to conduct capital construction project at Los Ebanos, TX
- GSA posts an RFP on [www.Fedbixopps.gov](http://www.Fedbixopps.gov) for a design/build contract at Nighthawk, WA
- USACE posts RFPs on [www.Fedbixopps.gov](http://www.Fedbixopps.gov) for design/build contracts at Amistad Dam, TX; Sarles, ND; Forest City, ME; Pinecreek, MN; Hannah, ND; and, Whitlash, MT
- June 2010:** CBP issues Phase II RFPs from the Phase I down select from small business design/build contractors to conduct capital construction projects at Easton, ME and Bridgewater, ME
- July 2010:** GSA awards a design/build contract at for a capital construction project at Nighthawk, WA
- August 2010:** USACE awards design/build contracts for a capital construction project at Amistad Dam, TX; Sarles, ND; Forest City, ME; Pinecreek, MN; Hannah, ND; and, Whitlash, MT
- September 2010:** CBP will award design/build contracts directly to small business contractors to conduct capital construction projects at Easton, ME and Bridgewater, ME
- Fall 2010:** Initiate construction at the six initial sites awarded directly by CBP to small businesses and at Maida, ND
- Spring 2011:** Initiate construction at the additional capital construction sites added to the ARRA Expenditure Plan in April 2010
- Summer 2012:** Construction complete at all sites that received capital construction projects

## VII. Environmental Review Compliance and Federal Infrastructure Investments

### Environmental Review Compliance:

CBP's Land Port of Entry (LPOE) Modernization projects will comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Endangered Species Act (ESA), and related statutes.

NEPA and the Council on Environmental Quality regulations, implementing NEPA, direct CBP to fully understand and consider the environmental consequences of proposed federal actions (projects) during decision making. CBP policies related to environmental planning and historic preservation require compliance with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations, Executive Orders and DHS directives for the protection of the human and natural environments. In accordance with these requirements, CBP will comply with all environmental planning and historic preservation requirements for all LPOE Modernization projects.

All projects within the LPOE Modernization initiative are being evaluated to determine the appropriate level of NEPA analysis required. While it is anticipated that Categorical Exclusions (CatEx) may be exercised for repair and alternations activities, CBP is currently in the process of preparing Environmental Assessments (EAs) to analyze the potential impacts to the human and natural environments for each new construction project under the LPOE Modernization initiative. In compliance with NEPA and NHPA, CBP will conduct architectural and archeological surveys to identify cultural and historical resources of significance. CBP will consult with State Historic Preservation Offices, coordinate potentially impacted federally recognized tribal nations, and engage local stakeholder groups to determine impacts to sites that are listed on, or potentially eligible for listing on, the National Register of Historic Places. Similarly, each site will be surveyed for the presence of threatened or endangered species and will consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in accordance with the Endangered Species Act. Potential impacts to these sensitive resources will also be analyzed in the EA.

If during the course of construction or alternation activities CBP discovers that sensitive historical, archeological, or biological resources could be impacted, project operations will be suspended and the appropriate authorities consulted.

### Federal Infrastructure Investments:

Using an integrated project planning team, CBP has incorporated the new construction and major R&A energy efficiency and sustainable building requirements cited in the Energy Policy Act (EPACT), Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA), and Executive Order (E.O.) 13423 into the initial planning process and design-build (DB) contractor requests for proposals (RFPs) and contracting process. CBP performed energy life cycle cost analysis (LCCA) while developing the facility prototype designs to identify cost effective, energy efficient design

elements and the potential for onsite renewable energy generation sources. Using LCCA at the prototype design phase, various options were considered for meeting the EPACT requirement to design new federal buildings to achieve 30% below ASHRAE Standard 90.1, if LCC effective, and the EISA requirement to meet at least 30% of new federal building hot water needs using solar hot water heaters, if life cycle cost effective. The prototype designs and specifications will be incorporated into the site specific DB RFPs and contracts to complete the site specific designs and construct the facilities. The DB contractors will be required to perform LCCA on the final designs to determine the anticipated energy performances of the new facilities. The DB RFPs will contain design requirements, including building utility metering, based on energy laws, the Federal Leadership in High Performance and Sustainable Buildings Guiding Principles, as cited in E.O. 13423, and associated Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) criteria. The RFPs will also contain additional sustainable building options for which the DB contractors will propose cost estimates, including additional LEED criteria, onsite renewable energy generation sources, and other energy-saving systems that the DB contractors propose. Once CBP selects the most appropriate and cost effective mix of proposed sustainable building options, the DB contractors will be contracted to design the final site specific facilities to meet all the initial RFP requirements and the selected options. Staged design reviews, onsite inspections during construction, and DB contractor reporting requirements will ensure the facilities are designed and built according to specifications. Testing and measurement during commissioning of the delivered facilities will confirm their actual energy performance.

CBP will provide data on (1) the amounts of ARRA-purchased electronics that meet energy performance standards and products that meet green purchasing standards, and (2) the disposition of ARRA-funded construction projects in meeting various sustainable building regulatory requirements and LEED rating system criteria. This data will be provided upon completion of each ARRA-funded construction project.

## VIII. Measures

The CBP FOF PMO will have more than 50% of the total \$420 million of ARRA funding obligated by the third quarter in FY 2010. The measures associated with the CBP LPOE modernization projects include:

Measure	Target/Actual			
	2009	2010	2011	2012
[+]Percent of capital projects awarded	17/17	16/6	0/0	0/0

When a funds transfer is made between CBP and another federal agency, the recipient of that funding will report the total amount of recovery funds received, a detailed list of all projects for which the recovery funds were expended or obligated and the amount that is associated with that project or activity. Along with this report, the recipient will also provide an estimate of the number of jobs created and the number of jobs retained by the project that received the funding.

CBP will also ensure that all environmental, energy and sustainability requirements are met. These requirements include employing integrated design principles, optimizing energy performance, protecting and conserving water, enhancing indoor environmental quality and reducing environmental impact of materials. CBP's ability to meet these requirements is outlined in Section VII.

## IX. Monitoring/Evaluation

The CBP FOF PMO has established an Integrated Program Management Team (IPMT), consisting of representatives across CBP as well as external stakeholders including the Army Corp of Engineers and the U.S. General Services Administration. The IPMT ensures real-time coordination to execute projects approved under the ARRA in an expedited and responsible manner. The IPMT established a Program Management Plan (PMP) to provide the structure and guidance required to execute the port modernization projects, including Risk Management, Change Management, Communications, Program Controls, and Quality Management plans.

The IPMT has also employed a master schedule enabling transparency in the monitoring of all elements of project planning and execution thereby allowing stakeholders, through daily meetings, to provide oversight for the execution of team objectives and record issues and accomplishments of tasks/milestones on all execution items. The IPMT is also responsible for effectively monitoring funding expenditures and reporting on program completion requirements. The PMO senior management holds a bi-weekly meeting to evaluate and update the status of the master schedule and the major deliverables which are developed by the IPMT.

## X. Transparency

CBP, through DHS, has a link at the [www.recovery.gov](http://www.recovery.gov) web site that requires financial data related to ARRA funding to be submitted on a regular basis. CBP's enterprise wide financial system, utilizing SAP software, integrates budget, accounting, procurement and property data. As a result we are in a strong position to quickly and accurately provide financial and performance data. This program does not involve the utilization of grant processing.

## XI. Accountability

CBP's financial system and processes will provide a strong capability to measure performance against Recovery Act goals, in particular measures of obligated, expended and undelivered. Consequently we will be able to monitor our financial performance in an accurate and timely manner and identify any issues quickly. In addition, our system gives us the same ability to measure actual performance regarding competitive procurement activity.



## XII. Barriers to Effective Implementation

Capital construction projects have inherent risks associated with them which are exacerbated by the expedited timeline required under the ARRA. A few of the barriers to effective implementation are environmental compliance issues, the aggressive acquisition timeline, finalizing all technical requirements, real estate/land acquisition, state highway rights of way, and stakeholder coordination and communication.