Recovery

	2006 Actual	2007 CR	2008 Fixed Costs & Related Changes (+/-)	2008 Program Changes (+/-)	2008 Budget Request	Change from 2007 (+/-)
Recovery Program ($000)	73,562	65,879	+1,844	+344	68,067	+ 2,188
Transfer from USFS Jarbridge ($000)	590					
FTE	*450*	*456*		*0*	*456*	*0*

Summary of 2008 Program Changes for Recovery

Request Component	Amount	FTE
• Yellowstone Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy	+1,098	0
• Wolf Monitoring (ID Office of Species Cons.)	+715	0
• Wolf Monitoring – Montana	+400	0
• Eradicate Invasives (Tamarisk)	-985	0
• Alaska Sea Life Center	-488	0
• Ivory Billed Woodpecker	-396	0
Total, Program Changes	**+ 344**	**0**

Justification of 2008 Program Changes

The 2008 budget request for the Recovery Program is $68,067,000 and 456 FTEs, a net program change of +$344,000 and 0 FTE from the 2007 President's budget.

Yellowstone Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy (+$1,098,000)
This funding would be used for the implementation of the Yellowstone Conservation Strategy (YCS), a long-term regulatory mechanism for recovery of grizzly bears and their monitoring in anticipation of the potential delisting. This funding supports the Service's efforts to propose delisting of the grizzly bears in the Yellowstone population and the implementation of the YCS. Funding would be dispersed to various Federal and State agencies (signatories to the YCS) that participate in the delisting of the Yellowstone population.

Wolf Monitoring (+$1,115,000) [ID Office of Species Conservation +$715,000; Montana +$400,000] The gray wolf population in the western U.S. has reached its numerical and distributional recovery goals. The Service has finalized a 10(j) experimental population rule that transfers wolf management authority to the States of Montana and Idaho, including responsibility for wolf monitoring. Both states have Service-accepted state wolf management plans. The Service currently has a cooperative agreement with the State of Montana and a Memorandum of Agreement with Idaho. The State of Idaho has subcontracted with the Nez Perce Tribe to monitor wolves. The Service intends to continue to work with the states, local governments and landowners on depredation and ungulate issues as general program funding allows.

Eradicate Invasives (Tamarisk) (-$985,000)
Tamarisk or saltcedar is an exotic (non-native) woody shrub or small tree that grows along rivers and streams in the West. This exotic plant is considered a threat for many endangered and threatened species that reside in aquatic and riparian habitats in the southwest. The Service proposes to discontinue funding these efforts in FY 2008 in order to projects that will have a greater impact on the recovery and successful delisting of species. Additionally, this program is eligible for Service grant programs such as the State and Tribal and section 6 Conservation and Recovery Land Acquisition grant programs.

Alaska Sea Life Center (-$488,000)
In FY 2007, the Service requested $488,000 for a recovery research program for the threatened spectacled eider, Steller's eider and sea otter recovery. Most of this funding will be provided to the Alaska Sea Life Center to identify and implement a recovery research agenda for these species. The remaining funds will be used by the Service to coordinate the eider and sea otter recovery teams and applied studies on sea otter and eider biology, physiology, and ecology. The Service proposes to discontinue funding these efforts in FY 2008 in order to fund higher priority conservation activities elsewhere in the budget request. The Alaska Sea Life Center is eligible for the Service's section 6 Conservation grant program.

Ivory-Billed Woodpecker (-$396,000)
The Service is proposing a total of $1,182,000 for recovery activities and to coordinate effective and efficient recovery planning for the species. This is a decrease of $396,000 to fund higher priority conservation activities elsewhere in the budget request. In addition to establishing a recovery team and writing a draft and final recovery plan, implementation efforts in 2008 may include: improving and expanding the survey effort in Arkansas and other formerly occupied locations; describing the habitat of the species sufficiently so that the most likely locations for other extant populations may be identified and searched; delineating habitat and determining the proper management actions which might be needed once additional information on the species is obtained; proactively keeping the local public informed on developments in management and recovery; and, conducting a more intensive, careful management and assemblage of larger block sizes of habitat through acquisition in fee or conservation easement.

Program Performance Change

	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 CR[1]	2008 Base Budget (2007 PB + Fixed Costs)	2008 Plan	Program Change Accruing in 2008	Program Change Accruing in Outyears
					A	B=A+C	C	D
Number of species proposed to be delisted due to recovery (13.10.1) (BUR) (1) *	2	0	2	6	6	2	-4	1
Number of final delisting determinations made due to recovery (13.10.2) (BUR) (1) *	n/a	1	0	5	5	5	0	1

* Cost not available for this measure.

1 The performance and cost data in the 2007 CR column is presented at the 2007plan level, which is based upon a projection of 2007 likely enacted made during the first quarter of 2007. The 2008 plan builds on the 2007 plan. To the extent Congress enacts a 2007 appropriation that is different from the 2007 projection, the 2008 plan may require revision.

Column A: The level of performance and costs expected in 2008 at the 2007 President's budget level plus funded fixed costs. Reflects the impact of prior year funding changes, management efficiencies, absorption of prior year fixed costs, and trend impacts, but does not reflect the proposed program change.

Column D: Outyear performance beyond 2008 addresses lagging performance — those changes occurring as a result of the program change (not total budget) requested in 2008. It does not include the impact of receiving the program change again in a subsequent outyear.

Program Overview

The Recovery Program carries out the primary purpose of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) conserving endangered and threatened species and the ecosystems upon which they depend. The Recovery program prepares recovery plans that guide, prioritize, and identify necessary recovery actions. The Service works with other federal, state, tribal, and non-government partners in a cross-programmatic manner to implement these recovery actions.

Recovery of endangered and threatened species is an ever-challenging task. The factors that lead to species imperilment, including habitat degradation through land, water, and other resource development and extraction and invasive species proliferation, are increasingly complex. Adding the notion that decades if not centuries of impacts resulted in a species' imperilment, addressing these factors requires coordinated action between the Service and its partners over a long period of time. Because listing species as endangered or threatened under the ESA does not immediately halt or alter these threats, species often continue to decline following listing. However, as knowledge of species and their requirements increase through the development of recovery plans and implementation of recovery actions, the status of species will often stabilize and begin to show improvement.

The Recovery Program contributes directly to the Department's strategic goal to sustain biological communities on Department managed and influenced lands, in the Resource Protection mission component, and the Service's proposed mission goal of "Conservation Leadership for Fish, Wildlife, and Their Habitats."

Recovery Planning

Recovery planning guides and focuses species recovery efforts and includes the development of recovery outlines as soon as a species is listed, preparation of draft and final recovery plans, and, as new information becomes available, revision of plans. The recovery outline, the first step in recovery planning, guides the immediate implementation of urgent recovery actions, and describes the process to be used to develop a recovery plan. The recovery plan identifies the recovery objectives, measurable recovery criteria, a strategy for achieving recovery, specific recovery actions, and methods for monitoring recovery progress. Recovery teams, consisting of species experts, federal and state agencies, non-government organizations and stakeholders, are often established to develop recovery plans. The Service has been working to increase the involvement of stakeholders in recovery planning. Stakeholder involvement early in and throughout the planning process ensures recovery actions are feasible and establishes support for implementation of recovery actions following completion of the plan. Scientific peer review and public review ensure plans are based on the best available science and information.

Approximately 87 percent of the species requiring recovery plans had them by the end of FY 2006. The development of high quality recovery plans for currently listed species without plans as well as for newly listed species, and the revision of older plans, continues to be a priority for the program. Recovery plans are essential to the effective and efficient implementation of recovery actions not only by the Recovery Program, but by other Service programs and DOI bureaus, and other partners. Recovery planning, therefore, is critical to the accomplishment of the DOI's end outcome measures for endangered species conservation under the Resource Protection goal to sustain biological communities.

Recovery Implementation

Recovery implementation includes organizing, coordinating, funding, and overseeing the on-the-ground actions identified in recovery plans. The Service works with federal and state agencies, non-government organizations and the private sector and private landowners to implement recovery actions. Within its available resources, the program must balance the need to implement urgent recovery actions for species on the brink of extinction with the need to continue support for ongoing recovery programs, and the need to initiate recovery programs for newly listed species. The Service engages and encourages multiple stakeholder input throughout the recovery implementation process to develop innovative approaches, broaden support for implementation of on-the-ground actions, and implement recovery actions. Involvement of as many partners as possible, especially the states, increases our ability to implement more recovery actions for more species.

The Service employs several tools that provide flexibility in meeting both species recovery objectives and human needs. The development of special rules under section 4(d) of the ESA for threatened species allows the Service to tailor protections to the needs of the species while enabling human activities to proceed consistent with the conservation of the species. Special rules have been developed for several fish species, such as the Apache trout, that allow the accidental catch of the species by anglers provided the species is returned to the water. The revenues generated from fishing in waters inhabited by the Apache trout helps to promote conservation of habitat. The establishment of experimental populations under section 10(j) of the ESA provides for flexibility in management by considering the population as threatened, regardless of its status elsewhere in its range, and allowing for the development of a special rule to provide flexibility in management of the species. The 10(j) rule developed for the gray wolf population reintroduced into the northern Rocky Mountains allows livestock producers to harass wolves that threaten livestock, and in some cases for these wolves to be killed by appropriate authorities and permitted landowners if they prey upon livestock. Controlling problem wolves helps to maintain support for wolf recovery by reducing real and potential impacts to ranchers.

To prevent species extinction the Service will work with partners and stakeholders to:

- *develop recovery plans*
- *implement on-the-ground actions*
- *restore habitat*
- *find new and efficient methods for advancing species recovery*
- *enter into Safe Harbor Agreements*

Safe Harbor Agreements allow for flexible management by providing assurances to private landowners who implement conservation measures for listed species that their actions will not lead to additional ESA restrictions. Safe Harbor Agreements have contributed significantly to the conservation of the red-cockaded woodpecker in the southeast as well as other species inhabiting private lands. Developing and implementing special rules and Safe Harbor Agreements can require considerable resources as they are often complex, cover extensive areas, and require close coordination with states, communities, and other stakeholders.

Monitoring species populations and evaluating the results of recovery actions are essential to the success of recovery programs. Periodic review of all available information concerning a species' status ensures that species are properly classified, that recovery funding is appropriately prioritized, and that recovery plan recommendations remain valid. The ESA requires the Service to review the status of all listed species at least once every five years to determine whether a change in status (delisting or reclassification) is necessary. The Service is increasing the priority it places on conducting 5-year reviews with the intent of balancing the need to ensure that decisions are based on the best available information and the need to implement on-the-ground actions that directly further the recovery of listed species.

Translocation marks the first significant step in the recovery process. A radio transmitter is being attached to a Laysan duck before its release after translocation from Laysan to Midway Atoll

Delisting and reclassification are the results of recovery success. Delistings also represent the removal of regulatory restrictions that are no longer necessary to sustain the species. Removing a species from the Endangered Species List or reclassifying it from endangered to threatened requires a formal rulemaking with the associated scientific peer review and public review. When a species has been recovered and delisted, the ESA requires the Service, in cooperation with the states, to monitor the species for a

minimum of five years to assess each species' ability to sustain itself without the ESA's protective measures.

The Recovery Program plays a vital role in guiding, facilitating, supporting, and monitoring the implementation of recovery actions by other Service programs, other DOI bureaus, Federal agencies, States, and other partners and stakeholders. The work of the Recovery Program, therefore, is critically important to the accomplishment of the DOI's end outcome measure for endangered species conservation under the Resource Protection goal to sustain biological communities. Involvement of as many partners as possible, especially the States, increases the Service's ability to effectively implement more recovery actions for more species. Two examples of these types of partnerships include the Upper Colorado River Recovery Program, which is a partnership of Federal, State, local agencies and water users that implement and assist in recovery activities for the humpback chub, Colorado pikeminnow, razorback sucker, and bonytail chub; and the Platte River Recovery Program which focuses on protecting and restoring the Platte River ecosystem. The Service continues to fund these two important initiatives with general program activities funding.

Use of Cost and Performance Information

The Endangered Species Program is using cost and performance information to improve its completion of 5-year reviews of endangered and threatened species, as well as to direct resources, in partnership with others, to aid the recovery of listed species.

- In FY 2005, the Service initiated 182 5-year reviews of endangered and threatened species, significantly exceeding the target of 10% (118 species). In FY 2006, the Service adopted a policy of initiating 5-year reviews for 20% of the species listed 5 years or more.
- In FY2006, the Service initiated 252 5-year reviews, exceeding the goal of 20% by 9 reviews.
- In 2007, the Service plans to initiate 236 5-year reviews (slightly less than 20%).
- In FY 2008, the Service proposes to initiate 248 5-year reviews. Policy guidance, a template, and training have been provided to field and regional staff to ensure consistent approaches to these reviews across all regions.

In addition, the Service should become more efficient in conducting 5-year reviews as it gets more experienced. The Service is collecting information to better identify cost estimates, timeliness, and streamlining mechanisms for 5-year reviews. Field office and regional office staff are tracking the staff time and costs associated with completing each review, as well as using the appropriate ABC code for time spent working on 5-year reviews, so that additional opportunities for efficiency can be identified.

2008 Program Performance

In recognition of the success of gray wolf recovery efforts under the Endangered Species Act, in FY 2007 the Service is removing the western Great Lakes population of gray wolves, and proposing to remove the northern Rocky Mountain population of gray wolves from the federal list of threatened and endangered species.

In addition, the Service anticipates the following accomplishments and activities:

- In FY 2008 based on requested funding and other new information, delist or downlist six species due to recovery; possible examples include the West Virginia northern flying squirrel, brown pelican, and Ute's ladies-tresses. In FY 2007, the Service anticipates delisting or downlisting five

species due to recovery; possible examples include the bald eagle, Johnston's frankenia, and the Yellowstone population of the grizzly bear.

- Prepare recovery outlines for species added to the U.S. List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants in FY 2007 and complete final recovery plans for 10 species, resulting in 88 percent of species listed 2.5 years or more with approved recovery plans in FY 2008, building on the 2007 estimate of completing final recovery plans for 11 species. In FY 2006, the Service completed final recovery plans for 40 species, including Atlantic salmon and 20 California vernal pool species; drafted revised final recovery plans for 19 species; and, published draft plans for an additional 9 species. While the Service anticipated completing more plans in FY 2006, recovery planning has become increasingly complex and the increase in workload on 5-year reviews precluded completion of more plans in FY 2006.

- Initiate 5-year reviews for 248 species in FY 2008. In FY 2007, the Service plans to initiate 5-year reviews for 236 species, such as Hine's emerald dragonfly and Colorado pikeminnow. In FY 2006, the Service completed 26 5-year reviews, including reviews for West Virginia northern flying squirrel, San Francisco garter snake, and California least tern; and initiated 252 5-year reviews.

- Build partnerships to help the Service implement recovery actions (including habitat restoration, captive propagation, and reintroduction) for all priority listed species.

- Continue to use the Recovery On-line Reporting Database (ROAR) to track implementation of recovery actions from both draft and final recovery plans; complete integration of ROAR with other Service databases; ensure public access to implementation schedule information in ROAR; and, explore the possibility of using ROAR as the mechanism to notify the public of updates and revisions to recovery plans. Completion of the programming of Phase II of ROAR and initiation of a pilot project is planned for FY 2007.

- Where appropriate, develop special 4(d) rules for threatened species, 10(j) rules for experimental populations, and 10(a)(1)(A) enhancement of survival permits for Safe Harbor Agreements. In FY 2006, the Service finalized the northern sea otter 4(d) rule and finalized a 10(j) experimental population rule for 15 freshwater mussels, 1 freshwater snail, and 5 fishes in the Lower French Broad River and in the Lower Holston River, Tennessee; and also finalized 8 Safe Harbor Agreements covering 7 species. Of these, 4 are programmatic agreements that will streamline the process of enrolling additional landowners in the future through certificates of inclusion.

The tan riffleshell is a freshwater mussel species that is being artificially propagated successfully and being reintroduced back into their native habitat.