

State and Tribal Wildlife Grants

Appropriation Language

For wildlife conservation grants to States and to the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and federally recognized Indian tribes under the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, for the development and implementation of programs for the benefit of wildlife and their habitat, including species that are not hunted or fished, \$69,492,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the amount provided herein, \$5,282,000 is for a competitive grant program for Indian tribes, not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: Provided further, That \$5,000,000 is for a competitive grant program for States, territories, and other jurisdictions with approved plans, not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: Provided further, That the Secretary shall, after deducting said \$10,282,000^{1/} and administrative expenses, apportion the amount provided herein in the following manner: (1) to the District of Columbia and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, each a sum equal to not more than one-half of 1 percent thereof; and (2) to Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, each a sum equal to not more than one-fourth of 1 percent thereof: Provided further, That the Secretary shall apportion the remaining amount in the following manner: (1) one-third of which is based on the ratio to which the land area of such State bears to the total land area of all such States; and (2) two-thirds of which is based on the ratio to which the population of such State bears to the total population of all such States: Provided further, That the amounts apportioned under this paragraph shall be adjusted equitably so that no State shall be apportioned a sum which is less than 1 percent of the amount available for apportionment under this paragraph for any fiscal year or more than 5 percent of such amount: Provided further, That the Federal share of planning grants shall not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of such projects and the Federal share of implementation grants shall not exceed 50 percent of the total costs of such projects: Provided further, That the non-Federal share of such projects may not be derived from Federal grant programs: Provided further, That no State, territory, or other jurisdiction shall receive a grant if its comprehensive wildlife conservation plan is disapproved and such funds that would have been distributed to such State, territory, or other jurisdiction shall be distributed equitably to States, territories, and other jurisdictions with approved plans: Provided further, That any amount apportioned in 2008 to any State, territory, or other jurisdiction that remains unobligated as of September 30, 2009, shall be reapportioned, together with funds appropriated in 2010, in the manner provided herein.

^{1/} This is a technical correction which changes the \$5,282,000 in the appropriations language in the President's budget for this account to \$10,282,000.

Authorizing Statutes

Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531-1544). Prohibits the import, export, or taking of fish and wildlife and plants that are listed as threatened or endangered species; provides for adding species to and removing them from the list of threatened and endangered species, and for preparing and implementing plans for their recovery; provides for interagency cooperation to avoid take of listed species and for issuing permits for otherwise prohibited activities; provides for cooperation with States, including authorization of financial assistance; and implements the provisions of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES). Authorization of Appropriations: Expired September 30, 1992.

Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended (16 U.S.C. 742(a)-754). Establishes a comprehensive national fish and wildlife policy and authorizes the Secretary to take steps required for the development, management, advancement, conservation, and protection of fisheries resources and wildlife resources through research, acquisition of refuge lands, development of existing facilities, and other means.

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 661). The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to provide assistance to, and cooperate with, Federal, State, and public or private agencies and organizations in the development, protection, rearing, and stocking of all species of wildlife, resources thereof, and their habitat, in controlling losses of the same from disease or other causes, in minimizing damages from overabundant species, in providing public shooting and fishing areas, including easements across public lands for access thereto.

		2006 Actual	2007 CR	2008			Change From 2007 (+/-)
				Fixed Costs & Related Changes (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	
State Formula Grants (\$000)	61,580	63,726	0	-4,516	59,210	-4,516	
State Competitive Grants (\$000)	0	5,000	0	0	5,000	0	
Tribal Grants (\$000)	5,912	5,940	0	-658	5,282	-658	
Estimated User-Pay Cost Share (\$000)	[170]	[211]		[212]			
Impact of the CR (\$000)		-24,666		+24,666		+24,666	
Total, State and Tribal Wildlife Grants (\$000)	67,492	50,000	0	+19,492	69,492	+19,492	
<i>FTE</i>	16	16	0	0	16	0	

Summary of 2008 Program Changes for State and Tribal Wildlife Grants

Request Component	Amount	FTE
Program Changes		
• State Grants Program	-4,516	0
• Tribal Grants Program	-658	0
• Impact of the CR	+24,666	0
Total, Program Changes	+19,492	0

Justification of 2008 Program Changes

The 2008 budget request for State and Tribal Wildlife Grants is \$69,492,000 and 16 FTE, a net program change of -\$19,492,000 and 0 FTE from the 2007 CR level.

Formula based State Wildlife Grants (-\$4,516,000)

This level of funding will allow the FWS to provide a significant level of support for State and Tribal wildlife programs, yet focus resources on ecologically sensitive regions such as Wyoming’s Green River Basin, where other FWS programs such as Partners for Fish and Wildlife and the National Fish Habitat Action Plan will support State actions to avert conflicts between development and wildlife. The State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program provides funds to states, tribes and eligible territories through an apportionment formula established in law. Tribes participate in this program through a separate competitive program using a portion of the total program appropriation. This year’s funding level will help the Service address many resource management challenges through the ongoing activities of many of its bureaus. However, three challenges stand out as requiring significantly increased levels of effort in 2008 and beyond. These include challenges associated with growing energy activities in the West and the potential conflicts that result at the wildlife interface; those associated with coastal wetland losses that adversely affect wildlife and community safety; and those associated with managing at-risk species to prevent listing and better assure recovery for those listed as threatened or endangered. For example, the Service is working with Wyoming to address wildlife issues, and SWG funding will support landscape-level conservation that that will benefit the sage grouse. Improvements for wildlife will be accomplished by protecting and restoring landscapes to protect native wildlife. This budget amount will provide opportunities for States to protect and stabilize wildlife populations and to increase depleted populations to self-sustaining levels.

State Competitive Grants (+5,000,000)

The FY 2008 budget continues the competitive component of the State and Tribal Wildlife Grant program as first proposed in FY 2007. The competitive portion of the program will fund the highest ranking cooperative conservation projects that are in the State Wildlife Conservation Plans. Priority will be given to exemplary cooperative conservation projects with an emphasis on performance and results. It is intended that this competitive component will be an incentive to integrate the principles of cooperation and performance into conservation projects.

Tribal Grants (-\$658,000)

The proposed reduction in competitive Tribal Grants is a proportional reduction from the 2007 funding level to address other Service and Department priorities..

Impact of the CR [-24,666,000]

The 2008 budget includes a \$24.7 million program reduction to align the priorities of the 2007 President's budget with the 2007 continuing resolution level, eliminating unrequested congressional earmarks, implementing the program enhancement and other program reduction proposals included in the 2007 President's budget, including fixed costs for 2007.

Performance Measurement: The Service is currently developing performance measures for the State and Tribal wildlife grants program. The Service is engaged in a cooperative initiative with our partners to identify suitable measures and, subsequently, to sharpen our reporting procedures to fully report performance and provide accurate and up-to-date performance information.

Cost Information: Cost data is not yet available for this program. Once performance measures are in place and activity-based costing goals and procedures can be refined for this program, cost information will be reported and used for evaluation of program performance.

Use of Cost and Performance Information

Activity Based Costing (ABC) data will be used to monitor the overall production costs of achieving the State and Tribal Wildlife Grant program's primary performance measures, acres and stream miles developed, improved, or maintained. However, cost data is not yet available for the program performance measures.

Program Overview

The State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program provides grants to State and other eligible jurisdictions through a formula-based distribution, and to Tribes through a National competitive award processes. Congress initiated this grant program in FY 2002 and funded it from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Since the program's inception, Congress has provided over \$355 million for conservation work on State, private, and Tribal lands.

Goals of the Program: The long-term goal of the State and Tribal Wildlife Grant program is to stabilize, restore, enhance, and protect species and their habitat that are of conservation concern. By doing so, the Nation avoids the costly and time-consuming process that occurs when habitat is degraded or destroyed and species' populations plummet, therefore needing additional managed protection through the Endangered Species Act or other regulatory protection. The program accomplishes its protection goals by 1) focusing projects on species and their habitats that are in most need of conservation, and 2) by leveraging Federal funding through cost-sharing provisions with State and territorial fish and wildlife agencies.

State Wildlife Action Plans: The goal of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in FY 2006 and 2007 was to ensure all 56 States and territories (States) have approved State Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (or Wildlife Action Plan). The States all met this goal as of January 2007. As a result, States have this tool to improve their strategic conservation planning, enabling them to focus their Federal and State financial resources on habitats and species in ways that will provide the most effective and efficient conservation. With the States on track to engage in well-planned and managed conservation, Federal, State, private, and other resources will more quickly and efficiently work for the benefit of species of the greatest conservation need and their habitat. The Service and the Department are eager to explore how to use the state wildlife plans in order to prioritize landscape-scale conservation activities.

Indian Tribes are exempt from the requirement to develop wildlife plans, but Tribal lands are vast and Tribes are eager to continue their conservation work using resources from this program.

Funding Planning and Implementation Grants:

The Service developed new program guidance (2006) for SWG that narrowed the scope of work that may be conducted under planning grants. This more limited scope restricts the content of State planning grants to conducting internal evaluation of the Wildlife Action Plans and to obtaining input from partners and the public on how to improve the Plans. Through this restriction of what work may be carried out under planning grants, the Service expects States will shift most of their SWG financial resources from spending on planning activities to conducting “implementation” work on the ground.

The State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program leverages Federal funds through cost-sharing provisions. States and eligible territories provide a 25 percent match of total project costs for planning grants and 50 percent for implementation grants. Tribes are not required to provide a share of project costs, but many do, and some quite substantially.

Examples of projects funded through the State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program include:

“Mussel Building” in Southwest Virginia: Restoring Virginia’s Rich Freshwater Mussel Community in the Upper Tennessee River System:



Photo: The VDGIF and its partners have released hundreds of Thousands of tagged juvenile mussels into the Upper Tennessee River system.

Freshwater mussels are one of the most imperiltaxonomic groups in North America, with over two-thirds of species identified as threatened, endangered, extinct, or of special concern. The Tennessee River system contains the highest mussel diversity, with more than 100 species occurring in seven states. Drastic declines have been observed in this fauna due to habitat degradation by changes in land use and from various chemical/toxic spills. The Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (VDGIF), along with partners such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, The Nature Conservancy, Virginia Tech, the Upper Tennessee River Roundtable, private landowners, and others, has been successful in leveraging State Wildlife Grants funds to realize considerable accomplishments towards mussel restoration. Using its Aquatic

Wildlife Conservation Center (Center), the VDGIF is propagating and recovering at-risk aquatic species in this watershed resulting in twenty-five species of freshwater mussels spawning at the Center, including federally listed species. Over 520,000 individuals of 15 species were propagated at the Center during the 2006 production year alone, and many were released into targeted areas. Annual monitoring of sites is being conducted to gauge success of restoration efforts.



Photo: State Wildlife Grant funds are used for songbird research in Alaska at Creamer's Field Bird Banding. Continued operation of this banding station will provide long-term trend information on migratory bird populations, an important natural resource for the U.S. and other Western Hemisphere nations.

Minnesota: Lake Christina Reclamation

Lake Christina, a shallow lake in west-central Minnesota, is nationally recognized as a critical habitat and breeding area for many birds, including a large population of western grebes. Unfortunately, the water quality of the lake has worsened in recent years, making it difficult for wildlife to live there. In 2003, a chemical was put into the lake to help improve water quality and habitat conditions. State Wildlife Grants have provided money to see how the lake, as well as the fish and other wildlife that live there, responded to the treatment. Data for the 2 years after treatment indicate that Lake Christina is returning to a clear-water state. In the year immediately after treatment western grebes returned to the lake but quickly abandoned traditional nesting sites probably because of the lack of minnows to feed on. When the grebes returned in 2005 however, the minnow population had greatly increased and over 315 nests were documented with 63 percent of the nests hatching at least one young.

Through these and other projects, the program is protecting wildlife and restoring its habitat.

2008 Program Performance

As mentioned earlier, the State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program currently does not have performance measures. To correct this deficiency, the Service is engaged in discussions with its partners to identify proper measures that will reflect the overall conservation goals of the program.

State Wildlife Grants Apportionment FY 2006

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 15.634

<u>State</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Alabama	\$937,391
Alaska	\$3,016,768
American Samoa	\$150,838
Arizona	\$1,428,966
<u>Arkansas</u>	<u>\$704,803</u>
California	\$3,016,768
Colorado	\$1,252,463
Connecticut	\$603,354
Delaware	\$603,354
<u>District of Columbia</u>	<u>\$301,676</u>
Florida	\$2,555,594
Georgia	\$1,493,834
Guam	\$150,838
Hawaii	\$603,354
<u>Idaho</u>	<u>\$710,875</u>
Illinois	\$2,054,929
Indiana	\$1,061,073
Iowa	\$759,091
Kansas	\$892,896
<u>Kentucky</u>	<u>\$809,891</u>
Louisiana	\$914,904
Maine	\$603,354
Maryland	\$789,592
Massachusetts	\$919,222
<u>Michigan</u>	<u>\$1,729,667</u>
Minnesota	\$1,210,867
Mississippi	\$693,098
Missouri	\$1,209,169
Montana	\$1,063,223
<u>N. Mariana Islands</u>	<u>\$150,838</u>
Nebraska	\$728,073
Nevada	\$979,544
New Hampshire	\$603,354
New Jersey	\$1,198,168
<u>New Mexico</u>	<u>\$1,025,603</u>
New York	\$2,903,489
North Carolina	\$1,435,154
North Dakota	\$603,354
Ohio	\$1,813,457
<u>Oklahoma</u>	<u>\$917,765</u>
Oregon	\$1,087,343
Pennsylvania	\$1,965,526
Puerto Rico	\$301,676
Rhode Island	\$603,354
<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>\$746,422</u>
South Dakota	\$603,354
Tennessee	\$1,045,796
Texas	\$3,016,768
Utah	\$847,530
<u>Vermont</u>	<u>\$603,354</u>
Virgin Islands	\$150,838
Virginia	\$1,225,504
Washington	\$1,239,684
West Virginia	\$603,354
Wisconsin	\$1,090,853
<u>Wyoming</u>	<u>\$603,354</u>
Total	\$60,335,361

Note: FY 2006 Apportionment includes \$779,652 in reverted at the end of FY 2005, and \$59,555,709 in FY 2006 State Wildlife Grant Competitive Program funds. Of the reverted amount, \$776,101 is from the FY 2001 competitive SWG program, and \$3,551 is from the apportioned grant SWG program. Apportionments for the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands are not calculated on land area and population, but rather on percentages of the total amount apportioned.

Standard Form 300

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
STATE and TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS FUND**

Program and Financing (in millions of dollars)			
Identification code 14-1694-0	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate
Obligations by program activity:			
00.01 State Wildlife Grants	62	65	64
00.02 State Competetive Grants	1		1
00.03 Administration	2	2	2
00.04 Tribal Wildlife Grants	7	7	7
10.00 Total obligations	72	74	74
Budgetary resources available for obligation:			
21.40 Unobligated balance available, start of year	56	53	29
Recoveries	2		
22.00 New Budget authority (gross)	67	50	69
23.90 Total budgetary resources available for obligation	125	103	98
23.95 New obligations (-)	-72	-74	-74
24.40 Unobligated balance available, end of year	53	29	24
New budget authority (gross), detail:			
Discretionary			
40.20 Appropriation (Special Fund) LWCF	68	50	69
40.76 Reduction pursuant to P.L. 107-206	-1	0	
43.00 Appropriation (total discretionary)	67	50	69
Change in unpaid obligations:			
Unpaid obligations, start of year:			
72.40 Obligated balance, start of year	138	134	141
73.10 New obligations	72	74	74
73.20 Total outlays, gross (-)	-74	-67	-82
73.45 Recoveries of Prior Year Obligations	-2		
Unpaid obligations, end of year:			
74.40 Obligated balance, end of year	134	141	133
Outlays, (gross) detail:			
86.97 Outlays from new discretionary authority	25	16	21
86.98 Outlays from discretionary balances	49	51	61
87.00 Total outlays (gross)	74	67	82
Net budget authority and outlays:			
89.00 Budget authority	67	50	69
90.00 Outlays	74	67	82
Object classification (millions of dollars)			
Direct obligations:			
11.9 Total personnel compensation	2	2	2
41.0 Grants, subsidies and contributions	70	72	72
99.9 Total obligations	72	74	74
Personnel Summary			
Direct:			
Total compensable work years:			
1001 Full-time equivalent employment	16	16	16