



Department of Defense

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

Energy Conservation Investment Program Plan

June 2010

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN

A. Funding Table

Appropriation	Amount (\$000s)
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	\$120,000
Total	\$120,000

Additional details on funding, allocated by project and activity for the Energy Conservation Investment Program, are found in Attachment A.

B. Objectives

Program Purpose

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) provides \$120 million in funding for the Department of Defense Energy Conservation Investment Program (ECIP), in addition to annual appropriations by Congress. The ECIP is a small, but key component of the Department's energy management strategy. This program is specifically designated for Recovery Act projects that reduce energy and water usage, and consequently, costs. This program includes construction of new, high-efficiency energy systems and the improvement of existing systems. Additional energy conservation and alternative energy projects funded through the Military Construction program are covered in a separate Recovery Act program plan.

Public Benefits

The ECIP includes projects that meet the long-term Department of Defense goal to reduce energy consumption. The program complies with facility requirements that ensure high operational performance and productivity, while emphasizing sustainability, energy efficiency, and safety at the lowest overall life-cycle cost. Project activities funded by the Recovery Act achieve long-term public benefits by investing in technologies that increase economic efficiency and health benefits, build new sources of renewable energy, enhance job creation/retention, improve military facilities, and improve the quality of life for our troops and their families.

This program supports the goals of fostering energy independence and security while improving infrastructure that will provide long-term economic benefits. The Military Services and Components (including Defense Commissary Agency, Defense Logistics Agency, and National Security Agency) are working to maintain mission readiness while incorporating energy conservation projects into existing Department facilities. Savings-to-Investment Ratios (SIR), estimated through life-cycle cost analyses, and specific payback

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN

periods (the length of time needed to pay back the initial capital investment), are key components in the selection of ECIP projects. Historically ECIP obtains more than two dollars in life-cycle savings for every dollar invested. Department ECIP guidance targets projects with SIR greater than 1.25 and Simple Payback of less than ten years. This program delivers costs savings, freeing funds for other war fighter needs. For example, by implementing ECIP projects, annual savings for the Army are estimated to be \$5.0 million in operating costs.

The Department's use of ECIP combines the desire to leverage innovative technologies in concert with our historic leadership role in environmental stewardship across the enterprise. This includes using renewable energy, highly efficient heating, ventilating and air conditioning (HVAC) systems and controls, and water conservation measures. Reducing energy usage at installations frees up resources for operational and mission requirements.

Recovery Act funding for ECIP was provided to the Military Services based on the combined requirements of the Recovery Act and goals of ECIP. ECIP is generally designated for projects that reduce energy and water consumption, but, ECIP also provides a critical funding source for investments in small-scale renewable energy technologies that fall within the savings-to-investment ratio and payback goals of the program. These projects also focus on improving energy efficiency in existing Department of Defense facilities and creating new energy generation sources on military installations in a cost-effective manner.

The economic conditions in the construction market have had a profound impact on the bidding environment for DoD projects. Many ECIP projects had contract awards less than the government estimate. These bid savings will be reinvested into additional ECIP requirements. The savings also allowed DoD to reconsider its project selection process. In support of Recovery Act goals, the Department revised its policy in order to allocate bid savings to the maximum extent possible, to states and localities where the unemployment rate is above the national average. This change ensures that those areas most affected by economic hardship are assisted directly using Recovery Act resources.

C. Activities:

In May 2009, the ECIP Recovery Act program identified 45 construction and three associated planning and design funding lines that would be executed in 17 different States. Project titles, locations, and estimated costs were provided in the Reports to Congress submitted on March 20, 2009, and April 28, 2009. Subsequent changes were made in a March 4, 2010, Report to Congress; two ECIP projects were cancelled due to execution delays and were replaced with two new projects.

Project activities are focused on facility energy improvements, including:

- Installing renewable energy sources, including wind turbines and solar photovoltaic and solar thermal systems

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN

- Completing energy conservation upgrades
- Installing direct digital controls
- Upgrading and installing high efficiency lighting and associated controls
- Drilling geothermal test wells
- Installing solar “air / ventilation” pre-heating systems
- Replacing heat pumps to improve energy efficiency and cost-effectiveness

From February 2009 to March 31, 2010 the military services have awarded 32 of the 45 ECIP projects or over \$61 million of the \$120 million appropriated by Congress. Of the 32 awarded projects, 15 have started construction, and two projects have completed construction.

The Department is on schedule to award all projects before the end of the fiscal year.

D. Characteristics:

The following characteristics demonstrate how ECIP projects will be contractually implemented.

Type of Award

Fixed Price is the preferred contract type for Federal procurements. The planned obligations align with the goals of the Recovery Act, the guidance from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to maximize use of Fixed Price, and President Obama’s March 4, 2009 Government Contracting memorandum regarding the use of Fixed Price contract type.

Based upon a fixed price emphasis, the Department forecasts 90 - 95%, or \$108M - \$114M, of Recovery Act Energy Conservation Investment Program funds will be obligated as Fixed Price. DoD expects to award the remaining 5 - 10%, or \$6M - \$12M, as Cost contracts. This projection is based on acquisition strategies developed by the Military Departments.

Targeted Recipients

The targeted ECIP program recipient includes Federal agencies, small businesses, and profit organizations. The Department of Defense is committed to maximizing small business opportunities within DoD acquisition opportunities. Also, the Department recognizes that small businesses play a critical role in stimulating economic growth and creating jobs, which is one of the primary goals of the Recovery Act. The Department adheres to the Federal Acquisition Regulations Part 19, Small Business Programs, which allows agencies to make awards both competitively and noncompetitively to various types of small businesses. The use of these programs enables contracting activities to maximize small business participation in Federal contracting. The Department will make every effort

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN

to provide maximum practical opportunities for small businesses to compete for agency contracts and to participate as subcontractors in contracts that are awarded using Recovery Act funds. DoD contracting activities will work with their small business offices and the Department's Office of Small Business Programs to maximize small business opportunities that use Recovery Act funds.

Similarly, the targeted beneficiaries include local governments (city/county), minority groups, small businesses, engineer/architects, builder/contractor/developers, and for-profit organizations (other than small businesses).

The ECIP program does not include any Federal in-house projects, as all project contracts are competitive or non-competitive. Therefore, all projects will be awarded to non-federal recipients.

Methodology for Award Selection

Competition is the preferred methodology for award selection. The Department of Defense continues to promote full and open competition after exclusion of sources (such as excluding large businesses from a small business competition) in its acquisition processes. This facilitates awarding the best value to benefit the war fighters and taxpayers. Given the importance of the Recovery Act dollars in stimulating the economy, the Department has taken extra steps, including frequent communications with Senior Procurement Executives (SPEs), regarding the expectations for contract implementation. SPEs in the Department are communicating more frequently with their respective acquisition workforce, by using flash notices and reminders of Recovery Act regulations, to emphasize the importance of competition.

Consistent with law and OMB guidance, exclusions to full and open competition are allowable. However, competition will be used to the maximum extent practical for Recovery Act funds. When other than full and open competition is utilized, the appropriate documentation and reporting will occur to meet the requirements of the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Recovery Act.

At this time, DoD expects to award at least 80%, or \$96 million, of ECIP contract dollars on a competitive basis. This projection is based on acquisition plans that the Military Departments developed.

E. Delivery Schedule:

While each project in the Energy Conservation Investment Program is unique in its schedule and size, all of the schedules can be broadly divided into four delivery phases. Completion of individual phases will represent project milestones from a portfolio delivery perspective.

Planning and Design Phase: The planning and design (P&D) phase for the portfolio commenced when requirements were identified at the military base level. This effort

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN

focused on planned projects that were included in the Department's Expenditure Plan on March 20, 2009. Based on current planning estimates and the recent addition of two new projects, this phase will be completed by June 2010.

Procurement Phase: The procurement phase is ongoing as Military Services work to obligate Recovery Act funds in a deliberate manner. In this phase, the Department performs the required pre-award activities, including market research, determination of contract type, publication, contractor selection, and contract award. Based on current planning estimates and the addition of two new projects, this phase will continue obligations up through August 2010.

Project Execution Phase: Once the procurement phase is complete, the awarded contractor will mobilize and start work on the project. The execution phase will vary on a project-by-project basis due to the scope and complexity of each individual project. Local conditions may impact the ability to execute projects within the prescribed timeline, and discretion is provided to the local contracting officer, installation engineer and financial officers to adjust timelines to ensure DoD obtains the best value for the funds expended. Based on current planning estimates, the Department anticipates all projects will have begun by November 2010.

Project Review and Approval Phase: DoD officials will review and approve each project upon completion of the engineering aspects. Based on current estimates, all ECIP projects will be completed with construction by December 2011.

A table listing the specific ECIP projects that will be funded by the Recovery Act and the delivery schedule of the milestones for the major phases of ECIP activities is in Attachment A.

F. Environmental Review

The Recovery Act funds 45 ECIP projects and three associated planning and design funding lines valued at \$120 million. In each case, the Department follows the rigorous requirements outlined in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), and all other statutes that involve protecting the environment and vital land resources under DoD stewardship.

The Department of Defense has a long and successful program to comply with NEPA. DoD's policy is in DoD Instruction 4715.9, Environmental Planning and Analysis, which can be found on the internet at <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/471509p.pdf>. Each of the Military Departments and Defense Agencies was required to demonstrate how they would comply with NEPA prior to selection of each ECIP project using Recovery Act funds.

In addition, the Department is tracking compliance with NEPA for every project and reporting its status, as required, to the Council on Environmental Quality. The Department is using the full range of actions available under NEPA:

- An Environmental Impact Statement when projects are known to have a significant effect on the environment.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN

- An Environmental Assessment (EA) for actions in which the significance of the environmental impact is not clearly established. Should environmental analysis and interagency review during the EA process find a project to have no significant impacts on the quality of the environment, a Finding of No Significant Impact is issued.
- Categorical Exclusions for actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the environment.

The Department has an outstanding Cultural Resources Management program; DoD's policy is in DoD Instruction 4715.16, Cultural Resources Management, which can be found on the internet at <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/471516p.pdf>. The Military Departments and Defense Agencies already have extensive inventories of historic properties, both buildings and archeology sites, so they can easily identify if any Recovery Act project may have the potential to affect a historic property. Most military installations have programmatic agreements or memorandums of understandings with State Historic Preservation Offices establishing standard processes to exchange information and streamline NHPA Section 106 reviews. In addition, the Department has an extensive list of Program Comments issued by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation that meet the requirement to comply with Section 106 of NHPA. The Military Department and Defense Agencies are using this full range of tools to meet the requirements of Section 106 of NHPA.

The Military Departments and Defense Agencies selected projects for Recovery Act funding to comply with NEPA, NHPA, and other environmental statutes, such as the Clean Water Act and Clean Air Act, within the required timeframes. The Department recognizes that if some projects have a higher risk of being affected by these critical environmental laws, they may take longer to execute and thus not provide the rapid economic stimulus envisioned by the Recovery Act.

G. Performance Measures

In meeting the requirements of the Recovery Act, the Department established performance measures for the ECIP that were consistent with the intent and goals of the Recovery Act and past program assessments. These performance measures are supported by quantifiable outputs and engineering estimates and have designated measurement frequencies at the end of each fiscal year. Performance measures that will no longer be reported are noted below:

The metric pertaining to the jobs created or retained was eliminated from this plan as this data is collected through <http://www.federalreporting.gov>. DoD totals for jobs created/retained can be viewed at:

<http://www.recovery.gov/Pages/TextView.aspx?data=jobSummaryAgency&topnumber=200&qtr=2010Q1>.

The metric pertaining to payback period was eliminated from this plan as measuring a future payback from year to year is not statistically correct or relevant and could be misleading. Projections for the ECIP payback are not expected to materialize for almost 10 years. As such,

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN

it is more relevant to measure the savings to investment and estimated energy savings as a means to validate the future payback.

- Estimated Annual Energy Savings for Recovery Act Projects

Metric	Goal	Status
<p>This output measurement is the million British thermal unit (MMBtu) estimated savings for Recovery Act projects that will be determined using the optimal efficiency of the equipment and systems installed, hours of operation, local weather conditions, and costs for electricity in that local area. Each calculation will depend upon local conditions and usage. The targets in the goals are based on one year of realized savings after project construction completes. Frequency of measurement: Annual</p>	<p>FY 2010: Not Applicable FY 2011: 35 ,000 MMBtu per year FY 2012: 340,000 MM Btu per year FY 2013: 435,000 MMBtu per year FY goals are cumulative. Goals are established by “binning” projects into fiscal years based upon having one year of realized savings after project construction completion.</p>	<p>Metrics are not expected on this goal until the second quarter of FY 2011 after a year of savings on completed projects.</p>

- Savings-to-Investment Ratio for Recovery Act Projects

Metric	Goal	Status
<p>This output is the discounted energy and/or water savings estimate, plus savings estimates in other operation-related costs for Recovery Act projects divided by the initial investment costs plus increased replacement costs. The targets in the goals are based on one year of realized savings after project construction completes. Frequency of measurement: Annual</p>	<p>FY 2010: Not Applicable FY 2011: 1.4 FY 2012: 1.8 FY 2013: 1.8 FY goals are cumulative. Goals are established by “binning” projects into fiscal years based upon having one year of realized savings after project construction completion.</p>	<p>Metrics are not expected on this goal until the second quarter of FY 2011 after a year of savings on completed projects.</p>

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN

- Percent of Total Dollar Value of Recovery Act Projects Awarded

Metric	Goal	Status
This output measurement is the total dollar value of Recovery Act projects awarded divided by total dollar value of Recovery Act projects. This output measurement will be sampled monthly and tracks the status of total funding for awards made with the Recovery Act. Frequency of measurement: Monthly.	Oct 2009: 30%	As of March 31, 2010, the percent of projects awarded for FY 2010 are: Oct 2009: 30% Nov 2009: 34% Dec 2009: 34% Jan 2010: 35% Feb 2010: 36% Mar 2010: 53%
	Nov 2009: 33%	
	Dec 2009: 34%	
	Jan 2010: 51%	
	Feb 2010: 51%	
	Mar 2010: 53%	
	Apr 2010: 53%	
	May 2010: 53%	
	Jun 2010: 59%	
	Jul 2010: 59%	
	Aug 2010: 62%	
	Sep 2010: 100%	

H. Monitoring and Evaluation

Review of the progress and performance of major programs, including risk-mitigation and corrective actions, is guided by the Risk Management Plan developed by the Department in accordance with the OMB Circular A-123, Management’s Responsibility for Internal Control. The Department’s current Management’s Responsibility for Internal Control process has a Senior Assessment Team that is lead by Principal Deputy Under Secretary (Comptroller), who is also the Responsible Officer for the Department’s Recovery Act funding. As part of the Risk Management Plan, each program has been evaluated on a quarterly basis, with a Risk Profile being submitted to the Comptroller (who also serves as the Department’s Chief Financial Officer). The Plan identifies areas of high risk and high and low performance through a Risk Assessment and Gap Analysis. The Plan evaluates the potential for financial, reporting and procurement risks; and is used to analyze Information Technology (IT) systems; and review results from any audits and investigations.

An initial evaluation provided an overview of management capabilities for senior leadership in assessing their people, processes and technology. The risk assessment reviewed

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN

internal controls on human capital, performance, and measurement tools. Upon completion of the risk assessments, gap analyses were conducted.

The completion of Risk Profiles, the second step in the Plan, allows for the periodic review of each program's progress in monitoring and evaluating risk management. These iterative evaluations were conducted on a quarterly basis and submitted to the Comptroller. This process also identified significant uncorrected weaknesses or newly identified gaps for each program and when applicable, required more detailed information related to the questions identified in the Risk Assessment and Gap Analysis. Managers for any program area that required mitigation were required to submit a Risk Management Strategy that included a description of the issue, the pace of corrective action, the methodology to ensure the effectiveness of the corrective action(s), performance measures that were met, and major upcoming milestones. The next submission is due at the end of June, 2010.

The current status as a result of the quarterly risk management process is that three remaining gaps continue to adversely affect Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol (TAFS) within the ECIP Plan, as reported in the Risk Management Strategies.

Gap #G-OSDC-02 was reported by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, Comptroller and Chief Financial Officer in the 2nd Quarter, FY 2010. It was identified that transactions being submitted contain coding that does not match the current master project listing for all the TAFS in the ECIP Plan. Project listings are run each day. Codes that are unassigned are researched to see if they are new, erroneous or miss assigned. The system queries to research unassigned transactions and to correct problems, if feasible. When the data is not valid enough to process, the appropriation holder is notified to enter corrective transactions in the field level system, which feeds the reporting system. The targeted correction date is 4th Quarter, FY 2010.

In the first quarterly review completed May 31, 2009, the Tricare Management Activity (TMA) reported gap #F-TMA-01 in both the Military Construction for Hospitals, which they manage, and the ECIP, which is managed by the Military Services and other DoD Components. The problem is that both of these programs are funded through a single TAFS and the Treasury does not provide disbursement (outlay) data at a level below the TAFS level to the program level. This practice hinders the reconciliation with Treasury Balance for these programs. With support received from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, Comptroller and Chief Financial Officer, the TMA initiated a workgroup in the 1st Quarter, FY 2010, to perform a required quarterly reconciliation, which helped make possible the prompt resolution of an issue identified during the same period. The targeted correction date is 3rd Quarter, FY 2010.

Gap #S-OSDC-01, reported by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, Comptroller, and Chief Financial Office in the 2nd Quarter, FY 2010, was found to occur in the Department of the Navy's ECIP Plan. Transactions reported by the Department of Navy's United States Marine Corps' Standard Accounting, Budget and Reporting System (SABRS) are not being passed from the Defense Corporate Database to the Business Enterprise Information Services for inclusion on all data reports, including the weekly Financial

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN

Accounting Reports. Reports are being updated manually using a weekly report from SABRS for all their executable appropriations. The resolution is projected for the 3rd Quarter, FY 2010.

I. Transparency:

The Recovery.gov website was established to provide the public with unprecedented visibility. The Department of Defense provides financial and contractual information to the Recovery.gov site using existing information systems.

Due to the magnitude of normal budgeting for national defense, the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) has established a centralized Business Enterprise Integration System (BEIS) for financial review and internal control. The Department uses BEIS to handle financial tracking, particularly obligation and execution data, at a project-level. This ensures compliance with general financial management policies pertaining to the Recovery Act.

The Department captures contract award information using the Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS), identifying Recovery Act procurement actions in accordance with the guidance provided by the Office of Management and Budget.

J. Accountability:

Accountability for the execution of Recovery Act programs is enforced in all DoD Components receiving Recovery Act funds. DoD will use the existing civilian and military service performance regulations and policies (such as Career and Non-Career Senior Executive Service (SES), General Schedule (GS)) to assess, review, reward and penalize results in carrying out the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Recovery Act activities are considered a part of a manager, employee, and Service member's duties; and performance will be reviewed within existing assessment cycles.

Performance success and failures will also be rewarded and enforced respectively for the execution of Recovery Act funds through the Department's Risk Management Plan. This management plan includes setting priorities and performance measures and encourages the workforce to improve the overall performance of the Department for the Recovery Act and beyond. As part of the Risk Management Plan, each program is directed to identify the roles and responsibilities of management and upper level management and the processes that management follows to ensure that program and projects are reviewed on a frequent basis.

K. Barriers to Effective Implementation:

The Department's mission to provide installation assets and services necessary to support our military forces in a cost effective, safe, sustainable, and environmentally sound manner is what we attempt to accomplish on a daily basis. It is a complex and costly mission. The

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN

worldwide installation assets and resources under the management of the Department of Defense are immense.

A major implementation barrier that has impacted DoD in previous years, which could pose the most issues, is competition for labor and material in the construction industry. While the bidding environment has resulted in bid savings, how long this will continue is uncertain.

Additionally, in previous years, unplanned demand on the construction industry due to regional-level natural disasters, such as mid-west flooding or west-coast wildfires, may also impact the commodity pricing, potentially jeopardizing current project cost estimates.

The Department of Defense will continuously review execution of its projects to be better prepared to respond should resource competition affect implementation of projects funded through the Recovery Act. DoD will use established procedures to work through any barriers that may occur during the implementation of the Recovery Act and does not anticipate any major setbacks in achieving the goals and requirements outlined in the Recovery Act.

L. Federal Infrastructure Investments:

The Department of Defense has issued policy guidance for implementing energy and water efficiency and other sustainability requirements included in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, Executive Order 13423, and Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. DoD Components have developed subordinate policies for implementing the legislative and Executive Order requirements as well. For example, each of the three Military Departments has a policy that includes using the ability to attain Leadership in Environmental and Energy Design (LEED) Silver Certification as a basis for new construction sustainability; a metering implementation plan; an energy professional training program; and awareness and award programs. The Department has developed and implemented Unified Facilities Criteria to ensure new construction and major renovation projects comply with applicable requirements and goals. The DoD Energy Program also includes initiatives for audit programs and procurement of energy-efficient products. Other contributing factors include integrated energy planning, enhanced use of renewable energy, and demonstration of innovative technologies.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN AS OF MARCH 31, 2010 – ATTACHMENT A**Funding Table and Delivery Schedule with Major Milestones - Projects listed are those in the program effective March 31, 2010**

Installation/Location	State	Project Number	Project Title	Cost Estimate (\$000)	Construction			
					Contract Award Date	Construction Start Date	Construction Completion Date	
ARMY								
1	Fort Wainwright	AK	69413	Facility Energy Improvements	1,950	<i>Nov-09</i>	<i>Feb-10</i>	Feb-11
3	Iowa AAP	IA	72869	Ground Source Heat Pumps & Photovoltaic for Bldg 100-101	590	<i>Mar-10</i>	Jun-10	Feb-11
4	Fort Campbell	KY	69776	Replace Heating System with Solar, Efficient Boilers	1,015	<i>Apr-10</i>	Jul-10	Feb-11
5	Fort Knox	KY	67264	Barracks Ground Source Heat Pumps, Phase 5	4,626	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Nov-09</i>	Feb-11
6	Fort Knox	KY	67265	Barracks Ground Source Heat Pumps, Phase 6	3,400	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Nov-09</i>	Feb-11
7	Fort Bragg	NC	69770	Install Energy Management and Control System	1,042	<i>Sep-09</i>	Jun-10	May-11
9	White Sands MR	NM	64880	Install Direct Digital Controls	990	<i>Nov-09</i>	Jul-10	Jan-11
10	Hawthorne AD	NV	72693	Geothermal Test Wells, Phase 2	3,000	May-10	Nov-10	May-11
11	Fort Drum	NY	62388	Install Solar Walls, Energy Improvements	1,600	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Dec-09</i>	Feb-11
12	Fort Sill	OK	72679	Solar Water Preheater	310	<i>Apr-10</i>	Jul-10	Jan-11
13	Fort Hood	TX	69693	Install 8,000 Motion Sensors	1,450	<i>Dec-09</i>	Jun-10	May-11
14	Tooele AD	UT	72922	Solar Walls on 14 Buildings	800	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Jan-10</i>	Feb-11
15	Fort Lee	VA	69637	High Efficiency Lighting (Phase III)	2,750	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Feb-10</i>	Oct-10
16	Fort Lee	VA	67411	High Efficiency Lighting (Phase III)	1,416	<i>Aug-09</i>	<i>Nov-09</i>	Oct-10
17	Various Locations			Planning & Design - Army ECIP	2,194			
49	Fort Dix	NJ		Photovoltaic Power System 321 KW	3,100	May-10	Dec-10	May-11
50	Lawrenceville Readiness Center	NJ		Electric Power Photovoltaic 170 KW	1,850	May-10	Dec-10	May-11
NAVY								
18	Naval Air Warfare Center China Lake	CA	P0878	Photovoltaic System	2,473	<i>Sep-09</i>	May-10	Oct-10

(1) Gap in project numbers results from project cancellations

(2) Estimated construction dates are in plain text, actual construction dates are in italics

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN AS OF MARCH 31, 2010 – ATTACHMENT A

	Installation/Location	State	Project Number	Project Title	Cost Estimate (\$000)	Construction		
						Contract Award Date	Construction Start Date	Construction Completion Date
19	Naval Air Warfare Center China Lake	CA	P0879	Photovoltaic System	2,616	<i>Sep-09</i>	Jun-10	Oct-10
20	Naval Air Warfare Center China Lake	CA	P0861	Photovoltaic System	1,646	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Mar-10</i>	Oct-10
21	Naval Base Coronado	CA	P0872	Photovoltaic System	1,903	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Apr-10</i>	Oct-10
22	Naval Base San Diego	CA	P0874	Photovoltaic System	1,903	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Feb-10</i>	Jul-10
23	Naval Base Ventura County	CA	P0885	Wind Turbine Generation	4,242	Aug-10	Oct-10	Oct-11
24	Naval Weapon Station Seal Beach	CA	P0868	Photovoltaic System	2,421	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Mar-10</i>	Oct-10
25	SPAWAR San Diego	CA	P0875	Photovoltaic System	4,405	Jun-10	Jul-10	Dec-11
26	SPAWAR San Diego	CA	P0876	Photovoltaic System	4,405	Jun-10	Jul-10	Dec-11
27	Naval Air Station Oceana	VA	P0859	Solar Ventilation Preheat	825	<i>Jun-09</i>	Jun-10	Jul-11
28	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	P0764	Solar & Lighting	1,022	<i>Jun-09</i>	Jun-10	Jul-11
29	Naval Shipyard Norfolk	VA	P0728	Solar & Lighting	1,257	<i>Jun-09</i>	Jun-10	Jul-11
30	Various Locations			Planning & Design - Navy ECIP	400			

MARINE CORPS								
31	MCAGCC Twenty-nine Palms	CA	P180M	Photovoltaic System	4,834	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Mar-10</i>	Jun-10
32	MCAS Camp Pendleton	CA	P010M	Photovoltaic System	1,166	<i>Aug-09</i>	<i>Jan-10</i>	<i>Feb-10</i>
33	MCAS Miramar	CA	P982M	Facility Energy Improvements	7,230	Jun-10	Sep-10	Apr-11
34	MCAS Miramar	CA	P196M	Photovoltaic System	2,295	<i>Aug-09</i>	<i>Dec-09</i>	<i>Apr-10</i>
35	MCB Camp Pendleton	CA	P885M	Photovoltaic System	3,278	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Mar-10</i>	Jun-10
36	MCLB Barstow	CA	P970M	Facility Energy Improvements	10,759	<i>Apr-10</i>	Jul-10	Dec-11
37	MCRD San Diego	CA	P905M	Photovoltaic System	5,506	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Feb-10</i>	Oct-10
38	MCAS Cherry Point	NC	P931M	Solar Training Pool	727	<i>Jul-09</i>	<i>Oct-09</i>	<i>Feb-10</i>

- (1) Gap in project numbers results from project cancellations
(2) Estimated construction dates are in plain text, actual construction dates are in italics

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM PLAN AS OF MARCH 31, 2010 – ATTACHMENT A

	Installation/Location	State	Project Number	Project Title	Cost Estimate (\$000)	Construction		
						Contract Award Date	Construction Start Date	Construction Completion Date
39	MCAS Cherry Point	NC	P931M	Facility Energy Improvements	408	Jun-10	Sep-10	Apr-11
40	Various Locations			Planning & Design - USMC ECIP	1,475			

AIR FORCE								
41	Cape Lisburne Long Range Radar Site	AK	DBQT080001	Construct Wind Generators	4,700	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Apr-10</i>	Sep-11
42	Cape Newenham Long Range Radar Site	AK	DBST080001	Construct Wind Generators	4,700	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Apr-10</i>	Sep-11
43	Cape Romanzof Long Range Radar Site	AK	DBWT030002	Construct Wind Generators	4,700	<i>Sep-09</i>	<i>Apr-10</i>	Sep-11
44	Minot AFB	ND	QJVF066016A	Repair Missile Alert Facility HVAC System (Heat Pumps)	3,074	May-10	Jul-10	Jul-11

DEFENSE-WIDE								
45	USAF Academy Commissary (DECA)	CO	WP10ME01	Energy Conservation Upgrades	110	Jun-10	Sep-10	Nov-10
46	DDJC Tracy (DLA)	CA	JCT-08040	Upgrade to Lighting in Warehouses 30, 56 and 57	820	<i>Sep-09</i>	Sep-09	Sep-10
47	DSCC Columbus (DLA)	OH	CSC-09762	Upgrades to Warehouse Lighting and Steam Distribution System	1,000	<i>Sep-09</i>	Oct-09	Aug-10
48	Fort George G. Meade (NSA)	MD	21136	Burgin Building Energy Savings Project	1,289	<i>Sep-09</i>	May-10	Oct-10

- (1) Gap in project numbers results from project cancellations
- (2) Estimated construction dates are in plain text, actual construction dates are in italics