

Activity: Ecological Services
Subactivity: Endangered Species

		2008 Actual	2009 Enacted	2010			Change from 2009 (+/-)
				Fixed Costs & Related Changes* (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	
Candidate Conservation	(\$000)	9,731	10,670	+172	-250	10,592	-78
	FTE	59	60	+3	0	63	+3
Listing	(\$000)	17,978	19,266	+837	0	20,103	+837
	FTE	114	115	+7	0	122	+7
Consultation/HCP	(\$000)	51,758	53,462	+1,201	+2,200	56,863	+3,401
	FTE	432	432	0	+14	446	+14
Recovery	(\$000)	71,041	74,575	+1,174	+850	76,599	+2,024
	FTE	419	419	0	0	419	0
Total, Endangered Species	(\$000)	150,508	157,973	+3,384	+2,800	164,157	+6,184
	FTE	1,024	1,026	+10	+14	1,050	+24

*The FTE increases listed in the FY2010 "Fixed Cost & Related Changes" column represent FTE positions that were funded in FY2009, but due to the late enactment of the 2009 Appropriations Act, will not be filled until FY10. The savings realized in FY09 by not having to pay salaries will be used to fund one-time expenses, such as human capital recruitment costs, supplies, and equipment.

Summary of 2010 Program Changes for Endangered Species

Request Component	(\$000)	FTE
• Candidate Conservation	-250	0
• Consultation/HCP	+2,200	+14
• Recovery	+850	0
Total, Program Changes	2,800	+14
Internal Transfer – NCTC Literature Search Service (Fixed Costs and Related Changes)	-105	0
Internal Transfer – International Listing (Fixed Costs and Related Changes)	+500	4

Justification of 2010 Program Changes

The 2010 budget request for Endangered Species is \$164,157,000 and 1,050 FTE, a net program change of +\$2,800,000 and +14 FTE from the 2009 Enacted. Additionally, the function of listing international species under the ESA has been transferred from the International Affairs program to the Endangered Species program (+\$500,000 and 4 FTE).

Candidate Conservation (-\$250,000/+0 FTE) – The Service is not requesting Candidate Conservation funding for the Idaho Sage Grouse earmark in FY 2010 because other potential funding sources are available for this work, including funding for States through the State Wildlife Grants program. Funding that is narrowly-focused does not provide the Service the flexibility to deliver sagebrush/sage-grouse conservation actions in the most effective manner. The Service’s efforts to prevent the need to list candidate species (CSF 8.3) will not be affected by this reduction.

Consultation/HCP (+\$2,200,000/+14 FTE) – Funding increases are requested for consultations related to renewable energy projects and America’s Arctic, including interagency consultations on the effects of oil and gas projects on the Polar Bear. It is anticipated that consultations associated with energy projects (CSF 14.1) will result in improved timeliness in completing consultations.

Recovery (+\$850,000/+0 FTE) – The FY 2010 request includes funding for developing a conservation strategy for the recently listed polar bear and implementing recovery actions for species near extinction or near delisting/downlisting. Funding is not requested for endangered species grants through the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and the Lahontan cutthroat trout due to more pressing needs elsewhere in the Service’s request. Critical Success Factor 7.30, implementation of recovery actions for listed spotlight species, will increase as a result if these increases are funded.

Internal Transfer- International Listing (+\$500,000/+4 FTE) – The FY 2010 request includes an internal transfer from International Affairs to consolidate all listing actions, both domestic and foreign species, in the Endangered Species program. The \$500,000 and 4 FTEs will be transferred from the International program. With the transfer, the Service expects to be able to complete an additional 3 final listing determinations for 15 foreign species, 1 proposed listing determination for 6 foreign species and 1 petition finding for 1 foreign species.

Program Overview

The Fish and Wildlife Service’s Endangered Species program implements the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), in coordination with numerous partners. The program provides expertise to accomplish key purposes of the Act, which are to provide a means for conserving the ecosystems upon which endangered and threatened (listed) species depend and to provide a program for the conservation of such species.

“For more than three decades, the Endangered Species Act has successfully protected our nation's most threatened wildlife, and we should be looking for ways to improve it -- not weaken it. Throughout our history, there's been a tension between those who've sought to conserve our natural resources for the benefit of future generations, and those who have sought to profit from these resources. But I'm here to tell you this is a false choice. With smart, sustainable policies, we can grow our economy today and preserve the environment for ourselves, our children, and our grandchildren.”

*-- President Barack Obama,
Remarks By The President
To Commemorate The 160th Anniversary
of The Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C.
March 3, 2009*

Implementation of the ESA and the achievement of conservation for the more than 1,300 domestic listed species, almost 250 candidates for listing, and an additional 600 foreign listed species and 25 foreign candidates for listing, requires a strategic focus. Implementing a strategic approach that incorporates the best available scientific information to identify and address the species’ conservation needs will ensure that all of the activities carried out under the ESA by the Service and its partners will be used efficiently and effectively.

The program’s strategic framework is based on two over-arching goals to achieve the ESA’s purposes: 1) recovery of endangered or threatened (federally-listed) species, and 2) conservation of species-at-risk so that listing them may be unnecessary. The program achieves these goals through the minimization or abatement of threats that are the basis for listing a species. Threats are categorized under the Endangered Species Act as the following five factors:

- The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of a listed species' habitat or range;
- Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes;
- Disease or predation;
- The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; and
- Other natural or manmade factors affecting a species' continued existence.

Factors resulting in listing can range from threats due to hunting or collection, to spread of a new disease, or to habitat alteration. The key factor identified for many species is related to habitat alteration. The scope and severity of habitat-based threats and the number of species involved is likely to increase as a result of a complex series of events, including climate change. Through the minimization or removal of threats, a species can be conserved and sustain itself in the future, and thus would not need the protection of the ESA.

The Service focuses on threat reduction and thus conservation through the four program elements of the Endangered Species program: Candidate Conservation, Recovery, Consultation/Habitat Conservation Planning and Listing. Furthermore, the program's activities are complemented by the projects funded through the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund.

Conservation of listed, candidate or other at-risk species is a challenging task. For many species, more than one kind of threat is involved, such as habitat degradation (through land, water, and other resource development and extraction) and invasive species proliferation. Determining how best to reduce or eliminate those synergistic threats can be a complex task. Because listing a species as endangered or threatened under the ESA does not immediately halt or alter the threats that may have been impacting it for decades, species often continue to decline following listing. However, as knowledge of species and their requirements increase through the development and implementation of recovery plan actions, the status of species will often stabilize and begin to show improvement over time.

The key role of the **Candidate Conservation** program is to provide technical assistance and work with numerous partners on proactive conservation for removing or reducing threats so that listing species may be unnecessary. This begins with a rigorous assessment to determine whether a species faces threats such that it is a candidate for listing under the ESA. For U.S. species, this entails close cooperation with States and other appropriate parties. For foreign species, it includes working with other countries to ensure our assessments and associated decisions are based on the best scientific information available. In addition to identifying new candidates for listing, the Candidate Conservation program also annually reviews all existing candidate species to update information regarding threats and conservation efforts. This information is used to facilitate conservation that is targeted at threats and thus may make listing unnecessary.

For U.S. species that are candidates for listing or are likely to become candidates, the program uses a proactive, strategic, and collaborative approach for conservation planning that is strategically designed to reduce or remove identified threats. Designing, implementing, and monitoring conservation agreements and strategies, as well as updating them to incorporate new information on threats and conservation, and apply adaptive management, requires continuing coordination with partners by Candidate Conservation biologists. Even if threats cannot be reduced or removed so that listing is unnecessary, this approach provides the foundation for a recovery plan and expedites the recovery process for listed species.

The **Recovery** program oversees development and implementation of strategic recovery plans that identify, prioritize, and guide suites of actions designed to reverse the threats that were responsible for the species' listing. This allows the species to improve, recover and ultimately, be removed from the ESA's protection (i.e., delisted). Similar to the Candidate Conservation program, the Recovery program plays a crucial conservation role by working with various Service programs, other DOI bureaus, Federal agencies, States (e.g. through coordination involving State Wildlife Action Plans), Tribes, and other partners and stakeholders to develop and implement conservation actions.

Some examples of recovery implementation are: conducting nest box surveys or section 7 consultations; restoring habitat; providing technical guidance to partners on biological aspects of recovery project; researching or monitoring threats to a species, especially in light of new information about climate change; participating in landscape planning; and assisting with grant writing to fund land acquisition or research activities. The Service's Directorate has identified recovery implementation as a priority for all Service programs. The Endangered Species program provides leadership in the conservation of listed and candidate species, but the contribution of others is necessary to recovery. Other Service programs and our partners are key players in species conservation.

One of the first steps in recovering listed species is planning a strategy for the implementation of recovery actions. Listed species that were the subject of proactive, partnership-based candidate conservation agreements or strategies will have a head-start on recovery planning and the associated actions to address threats. Many listed species, however, do not have such documents to use as a basis for recovery planning. In both situations, Recovery program staff depend on the involvement of a large group of partners and stakeholders to develop innovative recovery approaches to address threats, make use of existing flexible conservation tools, broaden support for current and future on-the-ground actions and monitoring, and implement necessary recovery actions. Without our partners and stakeholders, all of the actions necessary to conserve the more than 1,300 currently listed domestic species to the point where they no longer need ESA protections could not be implemented. This large and diverse 'army' can greatly improve a species' recovery potential, but requires the continued coordination and oversight of Service Recovery program staff to ensure effectiveness.

The ESA contains a suite of tools that provides the flexibility needed to guide land development and use to aid species' recovery. The **Consultation** program leads a collaborative process between the Service and other federal agencies to identify opportunities to conserve listed species. Other federal agencies consult with the Service to balance adverse impacts of their development actions with conservation actions that will contribute towards species recovery. Interagency (or often called Section 7) consultations constitute a significant workload for the Service. The Service is continuously looking for efficiencies to improve the consultation process. An internet-based "Information, Planning, and Consultation" tool was piloted (IPaC) in the Southwest, and may soon expand geographically and in functional capability. With IPaC, project proponents will use interactive, on-line tools to develop and submit information needed to complete a section 7 consultation and fulfill monitoring and reporting requirements. By automating some functions, the system will make the consultation process more efficient and effective.

Because the conservation of the Nation's biological heritage cannot be achieved by any single agency or organization, one of the foundations of all aspects of the Endangered Species program is to work in partnership with the States, other Federal agencies, Tribes, non-governmental organizations, industry, academia, private landowners and other Service programs or partners to achieve conservation. Under section 10 of the ESA, the program is directed to work with private landowners to minimize impacts to the species from habitat development or use. For example, Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) provide conservation benefits in the form of proactive landscape planning which combines

private land development planning with species ecosystem conservation planning. Research conducted by recovery partners who utilize scientific permits issued under section 10 is also vital to species' recovery. This research often provides current information about the threats and the associated impacts on a listed species.

The California Habitat Conservation Planning Coalition recently estimated that regional HCPs in California will conserve almost 1.5 million acres of land, while permitting projects with a cumulative value of \$1.6 trillion; this illustrates the point that resource development and species conservation need not be an "either-or" choice.

The **Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund** (CESCF) provides grant funding to States and territories for species and habitat conservation actions on non-federal lands. Habitat loss is one of the most significant threats for many listed and candidate species. Because most listed species depend on habitat found on State and private lands, the grant assistance available under the CESCF for land acquisition related to HCPs or recovery needs is crucial to listed species conservation and recovery. States and territories have been extremely effective in garnering participation of private landowners. Section 6 grants assist states and territories in building these partnerships that achieve meaningful on-the-ground conservation to address or minimize threats.

In addition, the Traditional or Conservation Grants available under the CESCF provide funding to the States to assist with monitoring or basic research on listed and candidate species. Monitoring species populations and evaluating the results of conservation actions are essential to recovery success. Periodic review of all available information concerning a species' status ensures that: species are properly classified; recovery funds are appropriately prioritized; and, recovery plan recommendations remain up to date. Delisting and reclassification are the long term results of recovery success.

The **Listing** program is the mechanism through which foreign and domestic plant and animal species are afforded the protections available under the ESA when, on the basis of the best available scientific information concerning threats, a species is determined to be threatened or endangered. This determination includes information crucial for recovery planning and implementation, which helps to identify and address the conservation needs of the species, including the designation of critical habitat. Without the legal protections afforded under section 9 of the ESA that become effective upon listing, many species would continue to decline and become extinct.

Endangered Species Program Mission: We will lead in recovering and conserving our Nation's imperiled species by fostering partnerships, employing scientific excellence, and developing a workforce of conservation leaders.

Approach from a Performance Management Perspective

Through a strategic management approach, the Endangered Species program identified that the best approach to achieving our objectives is by emphasizing – in harmony with the Service's conservation principles – reliance on partnerships, science excellence, and service to the American people.

While the program continues to lead recovery for all listed and candidate species, the Service will be tracking a subset of those species for performance accountability. To make the most effective use of the limited resources available to the Service and its partners, the program has identified particular species to track for performance. The list of Spotlight Species includes approximately 140 listed species. The list of Spotlight Species-at-risk includes approximately 40 candidate species and some

species-at-risk. These lists serve to demonstrate accomplishments and effort by the Service on behalf of all listed and candidate species. For each of the selected species, a 5-year action plan is being developed during FY 2009. For listed Spotlight Species, this action plan is based on the most recent recovery plan, 5-year review, section 7 consultation, and other documents, as well as discussion with States, partners and stakeholders. For Spotlight Species-at-risk, the candidate assessment process significantly informs the 5-year action plan and its recommended conservation actions, along with input from States and other partners. The objectives of each spotlight species action plan is to identify the most immediate actions that should be continued or undertaken between FY 2010 and FY 2015 to improve the conservation status of the spotlight species. It is likely that these actions also will help conserve many other species, listed or not, that have ranges which overlap with spotlight species.

Spotlight Species

To demonstrate results towards the Endangered Species Program's conservation goals, the Service has established two lists of Spotlight Species, one for listed species and another for candidate species and species-at-risk. The Spotlight Species represent approximately 10% of all listed and candidate species. The goal of these lists is to show what actions the Service undertakes to benefit species and the challenges it faces in implementing these tasks.

The following criteria were considered in the selection of the Spotlight Species lists:

- Partnership potential to help conserve the species;
- Ability/potential to reduce threats to a species' survival;
- A keystone species or representative of a priority landscape;
- Current level of public interest and program expenditure;
- A priority in a State's Wildlife Action Plan;
- The Program's ability to resolve conflicts to improve species status.

Science and the Endangered Species Act

Through the 5-year Spotlight Species action plans and other activities which implement the ESA, the program will continue to rely on the best scientific information available. Though basic biological information about some of these species is unknown, the program will continue to press for better understanding of the life history, range, behaviors, and other key information regarding the species. The Service cannot do this alone- the collection of this information is dependent on active research and monitoring partnerships with local communities, scientists, Federal and State agencies, and all interested organizations and individuals. For example, Climate change is just one example of the many threats facing many listed and candidate species. By working together through the Service's climate change action plan, with partners like the U.S. Geological Survey, and in other forums to improve our scientific knowledge, we will gain a better understanding of the threats to the species and immediacy of impacts, and share the best approaches for conservation in the face of complex, interacting threats and uncertainty.

Endangered Species – Use of Cost and Performance Information

In FY 2009, the Service is developing 5-year Action Plans for all Spotlight Species and Spotlight Species-at-risk. These action plans will guide activities to be undertaken over the next 5 years to improve the conservation status of each spotlight species. Progress on completing actions necessary to achieve the 5-year goal will be measured and reported annually.

Program Performance Overview

Performance Goal	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2008 Actual	2009 Plan	2010 President's Budget	Change from 2009 Plan to 2010	Long-term Target 2013
Sustaining Biological Communities									
CSF 7.11 Percent of prioritized listed species showing improvement in their status indicators	unk	unk	unk	4% (7 of 172)	3% (6 of 172)	4% (6 of 143)	---	---	---
CSF Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$99,258	\$153,867	---	---	---
CSF Program Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$77,413	\$133,058	---	---	---
Actual/Projected Cost Per Species (whole dollars)	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$16,543,076	\$25,644,429	---	---	---
Comments:	This performance measure (CSF 7.11) will be replaced by CSF 7.19 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our objectives and species covered.								
Performance Goal	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2008 Actual	2009 Plan	2010 President's Budget	Change from 2009 Plan to 2010	Long-term Target 2013
CSF 7.19 % of listed Spotlight Species that achieve their five-year conservation target	unk	unk	unk	unk	unk	unk	(0 of 142)	---	(0 of 142)
7.19.2 % of threatened or endangered species that are stabilized or improved (GPRA)	35% (442 of 1,256)	41% (522 of 1,269)	45% (573 of 1,269)	42% (527 of 1,267)	43% (549 of 1,267)	42% (534 of 1,270)	42% (534 of 1,270)	0.0%	42% (534 of 1,270)
7.19.3 Decrease in average completion time for 5-year reviews of all listed species	unk	unk	unk	5	21	23	23	0 (0.0%)	23
7.19.3.1 Total number of months spent on completed 5-year reviews of all listed species	unk	unk	unk	302	3,848	5,446	5,912	466 (7.9%)	5,912
7.19.3.2 Total number of 5-year reviews of all listed species completed	unk	unk	unk	60	187	233	253	20 (7.9%)	253
Comments:	This performance measure replaces CSF 7.11 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our objectives and species covered.								
CSF 7.13 Percent of prioritized species that are delisted due to recovery	unk	unk	unk	1% (2 of 172)	1% (2 of 172)	---	---	---	---
CSF Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$2,363	---	---	---	---

ENDANGERED SPECIES

FY 2010 BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

CSF Program Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$1,899	---	---	---	---
Actual/Projected Cost Per Species (whole dollars)	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$1,181,743	---	---	---	---
Comments:	This performance measure is being replaced by CSF 7.20 to more accurately reflect our objectives and species covered								
CSF 7.20 % of delisted species due to recovery (cumulative)	unk	28% (9 of 32)	31% (11 of 35)	34% (12 of 35)	34% (12 of 35)	38% (14 of 37)	51% (25 of 49)	13.2% (34.8%)	51% (25 of 49)
Comments:	This performance measure replaces CSF. 7.13 to more accurately reflect our program objectives and species covered.								
CSF 7.14 Percent of prioritized listed species with current recovery plan	unk	unk	unk	63% (109 of 172)	81% (140 of 172)	78% (111 of 143)	---	---	---
CSF Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$4,920	\$3,821	---	---	---
CSF Program Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$4,087	\$2,981	---	---	---

Performance Goal	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2008 Actual	2009 Plan	2010 President's Budget	Change from 2009 Plan to 2010	Long-term Target 2013
Actual/Projected Cost Per Species (whole dollars)	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$35,144	\$34,422	---	---	---
Comments:	This performance measure will be replaced by CSF 7.30. 40 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our objectives and species covered.								
7.30.4 # of species with approved recovery plans (cumulative)	unk	1,084	1,085	1,089	1,089	1,090	1,090	0	1,090
Comments:	This performance measures replaces CSF 7.14 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our objective and species covered.								
CSF 7.15 Percent of recovery actions for prioritized species implemented	unk	unk	unk	44% (2,497 of 5,630)	66% (3,733 of 5,630)	51% (2,807 of 5,523)	---	---	---
CSF Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$83,121	\$92,470	---	---	---
CSF Program Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$45,893	\$58,001	---	---	---
Actual/Projected Cost Per Actions (whole dollars)	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$22,267	\$32,943	---	---	---
Comments:	This performance measure (CSF 7.15) will be replaced by CSF 7.30 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our objectives and species covered.								
CSF 7.30 % of recovery actions for listed Spotlight species implemented	unk	unk	unk	unk	unk	unk	52% (2,892 of 5,523)	---	52% (2,892 of 5,523)
Comments:	This performance measures replaces CSF 7.14 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our objective and species covered.								
7.30.2 # of listed species benefiting from Endangered Species Grant Programs (Traditional and Nontraditional Section 6)	unk	unk	unk	607	676	663	925	262 (28.3%)	876
Comments:	The increase in performance from 2009 to 2010 is due to an increase in funding. This measure replaces 7.15.2 in 2010 to more accurately reflect our objectives and species covered.								
7.30.3 # of Spotlight listed species benefitting, Traditional & Nontraditional Sec 6 Project Awards	unk	unk	unk	47	91	72	124	52 (41.9%)	118
Comments:	The increase in performance from 2009 to 2010 is due to an increase in funding. This measure replaces 7.15.3 in 2010 to more accurately reflect our objectives and species covered.								

Performance Goal	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2008 Actual	2009 Plan	2010 President's Budget	Change from 2009 Plan to 2010	Long-term Target 2013
CSF 7.16 % of formal/informal "other non-energy" consultations addressed in a timely manner	unk	unk	84% (15,902 of 18,822)	76% (13,777 of 18,040)	86% (11,746 of 13,711)	84% (10,418 of 12,337)	---	---	---
CSF Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	unk	\$29,010	unk	\$30,713	\$37,647	---	---	---
CSF Program Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	unk	\$22,128	unk	\$22,923	\$29,663	\$30,345	\$682	\$32,487
Actual/Projected Cost Per Consultations (whole dollars)	unk	unk	\$1,824	unk	\$2,615	\$3,614	\$3,697	\$83	\$3,958
Comments:	This measure is being replaced by CSF 7.31 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our program objectives and species covered.								
CSF 7.31 % of formal/informal "other non-energy" consultations addressed in a timely manner	unk	unk	84% (15,902 of 18,822)	76% (13,777 of 18,040)	86% (11,746 of 13,711)	84% (10,418 of 12,337)	85% (10,628 of 12,547)	0.3% (0.3%)	85% (10,628 of 12,547)
Comments:	This measure replaces CSF 7.16 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our program objectives and species covered.								
CSF 7.17 Percent of final listing determinations promulgated in a timely manner	unk	unk	unk	unk	unk	33% (2 of 6)	---	---	---
CSF Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$15,315	---	---	---
CSF Program Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$13,268	---	---	---
Actual/Projected Cost Per Unit (whole dollars)	unk	unk	unk	unk	unk	\$7,657,480	---	---	---
Comments:	This performance measure (CSF 7.17) will be replaced by CSF 7.32 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our objectives and species covered.								
CSF 7.32 Percent of final listing determinations promulgated in a timely manner	unk	unk	unk	unk	unk	33% (2 of 6)	81% (38 of 47)	47.5% (142.6%)	---
Comments:	This performance measure replaces CSF 7.17 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our objectives and species covered. The % of final listing determinations promulgated in a timely manner will increase from 33% (2/6) in FY 2009 to 81% (38/47) in FY 2010, a 48% increase. This effort will allow the program to complete final listing determinations for an additional 15 species.								
7.32.2 % of petition findings made within one fiscal year of petition receipt	unk	unk	unk	46% (101 of 218)	0% (0 of 226)	0% (0 of 226)	12% (75 of 608)	---	---
7.32.3 % of critical habitat rules promulgated in a timely manner	unk	unk	unk	(0 of 14)	80% (8 of 10)	80% (8 of 10)	100% (7 of 7)	20.0% (20.0%)	---

Performance Goal	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2008 Actual	2009 Plan	2010 President's Budget	Change from 2009 Plan to 2010	Long-term Target 2013
CSF 8.3 % Spotlight species-at-risk, spec does not meet T&E def, conservation agreements/act	unk	unk	unk	unk	unk	unk	(0 of 43)	---	---
Comments:	This performance measure (CSF 8.3) replaces CSF 8.11 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our objectives and species covered.								
CSF 8.11 Percent of prioritized species-at-risk for which there is an Agency determination that the species does not meet the definition of threatened or endangered due to conservation agreements or actions	unk	unk	unk	2% (2 of 86)	0% (0 of 86)	---	---	---	---
Comments:	This performance measure (CSF 8.11) will be replaced by CSF 8.3 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our objectives and species covered.								
8.11.4 % of candidate species where listing is unnecessary as a result of conservation actions, including actions taken through agreements (GPRA)	1% (3 of 256)	2% (5 of 283)	1% (3 of 283)	0% (1 of 244)	0% (0 of 244)	0% (0 of 210)	0% (1 of 251)	0%	0% (1 of 251)
Comments:									
8.11.8 Number of candidate species benefiting from Traditional and Nontraditional Section 6 Project Awards	unk	unk	unk	46	89	62	122	60 (49.2%)	115
Comments:	The performance increase is due to an increase in funding.								
8.11.10 # Spotlight species-at-risk benefiting from Traditional & Nontraditional Sec 6 Proj Awards	unk	unk	unk	14	9	10	12	2 (16.7%)	12
Comments:	The performance increase is due to an increase in funding.								
Improve Resource Management to Assure Responsible Use and Sustain a Dynamic Economy									
CSF 14.2 Hydropower Energy: Percent of advanced planning coordination responses and formal/informal biological consultations provided in a timely manner	unk	110% (796 of 726)	46% (543 of 1,174)	63% (645 of 1,023)	54% (721 of 1,343)	56% (358 of 635)	54% (371 of 682)	-2.0% (-3.5%)	54% (371 of 682)
CSF Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	\$6,146	\$3,404	unk	\$4,663	\$5,223	\$5,537	\$314	\$5,927

Performance Goal	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2008 Actual	2009 Plan	2010 President's Budget	Change from 2009 Plan to 2010	Long-term Target 2013
CSF Program Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	\$994	\$704	unk	\$781	\$1,033	\$1,057	\$24	\$1,132
Actual/Projected Cost Per Consultations (whole dollars)	unk	\$7,721	\$6,268	unk	\$6,468	\$14,588	\$14,924	\$336	\$15,977
14.2.2 % of formal/informal hydropower consultations addressed in a timely manner	unk	89% (266 of 300)	52% (139 of 269)	77% (233 of 301)	89% (58 of 65)	87% (71 of 82)	87% (71 of 82)	0.0%	87% (71 of 82)
CSF 14.3 Water: Percent of advanced planning coordination responses and formal/informal biological consultations provided in a timely manner	unk	87% (2,365 of 2,733)	73% (1,892 of 2,587)	66% (1,749 of 2,632)	57% (1,283 of 2,265)	64% (1,053 of 1,658)	64% (1,078 of 1,696)	0.1% (0.1%)	64% (1,078 of 1,696)
CSF Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	\$3,783	\$3,307	unk	\$3,649	\$4,263	\$4,464	\$202	\$4,779
CSF Program Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	\$2,355	\$1,897	unk	\$1,998	\$2,415	\$2,470	\$56	\$2,644
Actual/Projected Cost Per Consultations (whole dollars)	unk	\$1,599	\$1,748	unk	\$2,844	\$4,048	\$4,141	\$93	\$4,434
14.3.2 % of formal/informal water consultations addressed in a timely manner	unk	92% (1,576 of 1,719)	90% (1,278 of 1,426)	79% (1,231 of 1,559)	88% (817 of 933)	85% (678 of 796)	85% (678 of 796)	0.0%	85% (678 of 796)
CSF 14.4 % formal/informal forage consultations addressed in a timely manner	unk	92% (137 of 149)	89% (167 of 188)	84% (147 of 174)	96% (121 of 126)	89% (92 of 103)	89% (92 of 103)	0.0%	89% (92 of 103)
CSF Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	\$1,136	\$573	unk	\$474	\$556	\$568	\$13	\$608
CSF Program Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	\$532	\$429	unk	\$393	\$518	\$530	\$12	\$567
Actual/Projected Cost Per Consultations (whole dollars)	unk	\$8,292	\$3,431	unk	\$3,921	\$6,039	\$6,177	\$139	\$6,613
CSF 14.5 % formal/informal forest consultations addressed in a timely manner	unk	94% (1,160 of 1,238)	90% (570 of 631)	87% (569 of 656)	90% (433 of 481)	87% (374 of 432)	87% (374 of 432)	0.0%	87% (374 of 432)
CSF Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	\$4,923	\$4,621	unk	\$4,511	\$5,559	\$5,687	\$128	\$6,088
CSF Program Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	\$4,137	\$4,010	unk	\$3,994	\$5,147	\$5,265	\$118	\$5,637

Performance Goal	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2008 Actual	2009 Plan	2010 President's Budget	Change from 2009 Plan to 2010	Long-term Target 2013
Actual/Projected Cost Per Consultations (whole dollars)	unk	\$4,244	\$8,108	unk	\$10,418	\$14,864	\$15,206	\$342	\$16,279
CSF 14.6 % formal/informal non-energy minerals consultations addressed in a timely manner	unk	90% (153 of 170)	89% (167 of 187)	83% (149 of 179)	85% (70 of 82)	79% (58 of 73)	79% (50 of 63)	-0.1% (-0.1%)	79% (50 of 63)
CSF Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	\$830	\$498	unk	\$352	\$452	\$399	(\$53)	\$427
CSF Program Total Actual/Projected Expenditures(\$000)	unk	\$629	\$358	unk	\$281	\$412	\$422	\$9	\$451
Actual/Projected Cost Per Consultations (whole dollars)	unk	\$5,425	\$2,982	unk	\$5,033	\$7,795	\$7,974	\$179	\$8,537

**Subactivity: Endangered Species
Program Element: Candidate Conservation**

		2008 Actual	2009 Enacted	2010		Change from 2009 (+/-)	
				Fixed Costs & Related Changes* (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)		Budget Request
Candidate Conservation	(\$000)	9,731	10,670	+172	-250	10,592	-78
	FTE	59	60	+3	0	63	+3

*The FTE increases listed in the FY2010 "Fixed Cost & Related Changes" column represent FTE positions that were funded in FY2009, but due to the late enactment of the 2009 Appropriations Act, will not be filled until FY10. The savings realized in FY09 by not having to pay salaries will be used to fund one-time expenses, such as human capital recruitment costs, supplies, and equipment.

Summary of 2010 Program Changes for Endangered Species

Request Component	(\$000)	FTE
• Idaho Sage-Grouse	- 250	0
Total, Program Changes	-250	0

Justification of 2010 Program Changes

The 2010 budget request for Candidate Conservation is \$10,592,000 and 63 FTE, a program change of -\$250,000 and +0 FTE from the 2009 Enacted.

Idaho Sage-Grouse (-\$250,000/+0 FTE) – Over the past several years, this earmark has resulted in modifications to an existing cooperative agreement with the Idaho Office of Species Conservation to transfer funds for greater sage-grouse conservation in Idaho for implementation of the Idaho Sage-Grouse management Plan. The Service is not requesting additional or continued Candidate Conservation funding for this earmark in FY 2010. Earmarked funding for this project deprives the Service of flexibility to deliver conservation actions in the most effective manner possible. Sage-grouse occur in 11 states, and the Service would prefer to direct funds for its conservation in a strategic manner that is most likely to effectively reduce or remove specific threats to the species. Idaho is eligible to apply for grant funding for sage-grouse conservation actions or plan implementation through the Service’s State Wildlife Grants program.

Program Performance Change

Performance Goal	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Plan	2010 Base Budget (2009 Plan + Fixed Costs)	2010 President's Budget	Program Change Accruing in 2010	Program Change Accruing in Out-years
Sustaining Biological Communities								
8.11.4 % of candidate species where listing is unnecessary as a result of conservation actions, including actions taken through agreements (GPRA)	2% (5 of 283)	1% (3 of 283)	0% (1 of 244)	(0 of 210)	(0 of 210)	0% (1 of 251)		
Comments:	The FY 2010 performance increase is due to prior (multi) year management planning and is not attributable solely to annual funding. Based on the success of ongoing conservation efforts with the U.S. Forest Service, we anticipate we will be able to address the threats to the Ramshaw Meadows sand-verbena so that it does not need to be listed.							

Program Overview

The Candidate Conservation program plays a crucial role in identifying species that warrant listing through a scientifically rigorous assessment process, and guiding, facilitating, supporting, and monitoring the implementation of partnership-based conservation agreements and activities by the Service, other DOI bureaus and Federal agencies, States (e.g. through coordination involving State Wildlife Action Plans), Tribes, and other partners and stakeholders.

For U.S. species that are candidates for listing or are likely to become candidates, the program uses a proactive, strategic, and collaborative approach for conservation planning that is designed to reduce or remove identified threats. This often results in a conservation agreement or strategy covering the entire range of one or more candidate species, or a landscape scale plan targeting threats in a particular area that supports multiple species-at-risk. One recent example is the adoption of two coordinated conservation agreements, one involving non-Federal landowners and the other involving Bureau of Land Management lands with habitat in New Mexico for two candidate species, the lesser prairie chicken and the sand dune lizard. Another on-going example is the collaborative work by the Service with a coalition of partners including federal, state, and non-governmental organizations to develop a conservation agreement to guide conservation activities for the gopher tortoise and its habitat at a landscape scale, spanning four southeastern states.

2010 Program Performance

Currently, 252 species are candidates for listing, and due to pending petitions to list several hundred additional species, this number may increase substantially by FY 2011. Despite this increase potential, we anticipate that the number of candidates in FY 2010 will decrease to approximately 220. This decrease is anticipated due to work in the Listing program that will be completed in FY 2009, which will result in proposed rules to list species or determinations that listing is not warranted.

In FY 2010, the Candidate Conservation program will continue providing technical assistance for developing Candidate Conservation Agreements (CCA), Candidate Conservation

Agreement with Assurances (CCAA), and facilitating voluntary conservation efforts by private landowners, States, tribes, territories, federal agencies (in particular Natural Resource Conservation Service), and partners for priority candidate and other species-at-risk for which potential listing is a concern. The Service will focus conservation efforts on reducing or eliminating threats to priority species identified using the criteria in the program's Strategic Plan. The majority of future conservation efforts will be focused on these prioritized species, such as the Taylor's checkerspot butterfly in Oregon and Washington, New England cottontail, elfin woods warbler in Puerto Rico, grotto sculpin in Missouri, and Guadalupe fescue from Texas.

The Service's cross-program approach to candidate conservation will also continue. This includes sharing information resources and expertise, and coordinating conservation work for priority species and geographic focal areas in order to increase efficiency and maximize benefits to target species.

Proposed accomplishments in FY 2010 are as follows:

- Through continued collaboration with the States and other partners, the program will conduct activities to meet the goal of reducing the number of species-at-risk for listing through conservation actions or agreements. The program will strive to meet this goal by continuing to work with partnerships to design and prepare collaborative conservation activities, begin implementation, and determine effectiveness on a scale that is meaningful to the species.
- The Service will complete rigorous assessments under the candidate assessment process for approximately 225 species. This includes the 220 species projected as candidates at the end of FY 2009, plus 5 additional species that will be assessed for possible elevation to candidate status. Based on past history, we expect some species will be removed from candidate status and others may be elevated to candidate status.

Species assessments include information on threats that help to guide the design of conservation agreements and actions so that listing might become unnecessary for some candidate species. The exact number of candidate species in 2010 will depend on the outcome of the assessments of existing candidates, as well as the outcome of findings on existing petitions to list several hundred additional species. Funding for the petition findings is provided through the Listing program. If the Service finds that listing is warranted but precluded by other higher priority listing actions, the Service considers the petitioned species to be a candidate for listing and we address its conservation through the Candidate Conservation pending development of a proposed listing rule or removal from candidate status due to conservation efforts or other reasons.

- The Service will continue to provide technical assistance to our partners to implement specific activities identified in CCAs and CCAAs, particularly for our prioritized candidate and species-at-risk.
 - For example, landowners are beginning to enroll in the programmatic CCA/CCAA for the lesser prairie chicken and sand dune lizard, and implement actions to enhance and protect the habitat for these two species. This agreement is unique in that it combines efforts on federal land with those on private land in southeastern New Mexico. One of our main partners in this effort is the Bureau of Land Management.

- The Service also will provide information and training to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of candidate conservation efforts.
 - This includes continuing to work in close partnership with the States to design and implement new conservation agreements, strategies, and management actions for candidate and potential candidate species identified in the State Wildlife Action Plans.
 - It also includes continuing strong coordination with the Service's Partners for Fish and Wildlife program to help private landowners implement habitat restoration projects that are likely to be effective in addressing threats and thus helping make listing unnecessary for certain candidate and other species-at-risk.

**Subactivity: Endangered Species
Program Element: Listing and Critical Habitat**

		2008 Actual	2009 Enacted	2010			Change from 2009 (+/-)
				Fixed Costs & Related Changes* (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	
Critical Habitat	(\$000)	9,771	10,458	+174	0	10,632	+174
	FTE	57	58	+3	0	61	+3
Listing	(\$000)	8,207	8,808	+663	0	9,471	+663
	FTE	57	57	+4	0	61	+4
Total Listing	(\$000)	17,978	19,266	+837	0	20,103	+837
	FTE	114	115	+7	0	122	+7

*The FTE increases listed in the FY2010 "Fixed Cost & Related Changes" column represent FTE positions that were funded in FY2009, but due to the late enactment of the 2009 Appropriations Act, will not be filled until FY10. The savings realized in FY09 by not having to pay salaries will be used to fund one-time expenses, such as human capital recruitment costs, supplies, and equipment.

Summary of 2010 Program Changes for Listing and Critical Habitat

Request Component	(\$000)	FTE
Internal Transfer – International Listing (Fixed Costs and Related Changes)	+500	+4

Justification of 2010 Program Changes

The 2010 budget request for Listing and Critical Habitat is \$20,103,000 and 122 FTE, a program change of +\$0 and +0 FTE from the 2009 Enacted.

Internal Transfer-International Listing (+\$500,000/+4 FTE) - The Service is transferring the functions under Section 4 of the ESA for international species from the International Affairs program to the Endangered Species program. By placing all listing actions under one management team, the Service will achieve more efficient operation, better consistency between domestic and international listing rules, and stronger rules. It is important that the Service address this issue, as the number of listing actions for foreign species is expected to increase as there are 30 species for which listing has been determined to be warranted under the ESA and an additional 20 species for which listing has been determined to be warranted but precluded. In response to recent litigation, the Service has developed a schedule to review listings of foreign species with a listing priority status number of 2 or 3 and make expeditious progress on addressing the remaining international species.

In FY 2009, significant progress was made on developing proposed and final rules for several of these foreign species. The increase of \$500,000 in the listing program in FY 2010 will allow the Service to make continued progress addressing these listing actions. Along with the \$500,000, 4 FTEs will be transferred to the listing program to address these foreign species listing actions.

As a result of increased funding for FY 2010 the % of final listing determinations promulgated in a timely manner will increase from 33% (2/6) in FY 2009 to 81% (38/47) in FY 2010, a 48% increase. This effort will allow the program to complete final listing determinations for an additional 15 foreign species.

Program Performance Change

Performance Goal	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Plan	2010 Base Budget (2009 Plan + Fixed Costs)	2010 President's Budget	Program Change Accruing in 2010	Program Change Accruing in Out-years
Sustaining Biological Communities								
CSF 7.32 Percent of final listing determinations promulgated in a timely manner	unk	unk	unk	33% (2 of 6)	33% (2 of 6)	81% (38 of 47)	47.5% (142.6%)	---
Comments:	This measure is replacing CSF 7.17 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our program objectives and species covered. The % of final listing determinations promulgated in a timely manner will increase from 33% (2/6) in FY 2009 to 81% (38/47) in FY 2010, a 48% increase. This effort will allow the program to complete final listing determinations for an additional 15 species.							
7.32.2 % of petition findings made within one fiscal year of petition receipt	unk	unk	0% (0 of 218)	0% (0 of 226)	0% (0 of 226)	12% (75 of 608)	---	---
Comments:	This measure is replacing 7.17.2 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our program objectives and species covered. The program is proposing a new measure in FY 2010: % of petition findings made within one fiscal year of petition receipt. The FY 2010 target is 12% (75/608).							
7.32.3 % of critical habitat rules promulgated in a timely manner	unk	unk	0% (0 of 14)	80% (8 of 10)	80% (8 of 10)	100% (7 of 7)	20.0% (20.0%)	---
Comments:	This measure is replacing 7.17.3 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our program objectives and species covered. The % of critical habitat rules, promulgated in a timely manner will be 100% (7/7) in FY 2010, a 20% increase above the FY 2009 target of 80% (8/10)							

Program Overview

The Listing program funds the process of adding species to the list of threatened and endangered species, and evaluating petitions to list species. It also funds critical habitat petitions and designation of critical habitat. Listing a species and designating critical habitat provides species with the protections of the *Endangered Species Act (ESA)*, and focuses resources and the efforts of the Service and its partners on the recovery of the species. Under the ESA, these determinations must be made on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available.

ESA DEFINITIONS	
<p><i>Endangered</i> - a species is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.</p>	<p><i>Threatened</i> - a species is likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future.</p>

The Service undertakes the listing process for species it identifies as needing the protections of the ESA, candidate species, or species for which we determine listing is warranted upon our review of a petition. The Service also receives petitions for amendments to critical habitat and other actions.

Listing determinations, critical habitat designations and their associated processes support the program's goal to recover species. This support stems in large part from the information conveyed within the rules. Using the best scientific and commercial data available, the listing rule provides information on the species (taxonomy, historic and current range, population information, habitat requirements, etc.), an analysis of the threats faced by the species, designation of critical habitat if appropriate, examples of available conservation measures, and a preview of actions that would be prohibited if the species were to be listed. Additionally, recovery efforts for species are initially identified based on information to address threats identified within the listing rules. In this way, listing packages are a crucial step on the road to recovery.

2010 Program Performance

The Service anticipates the following accomplishments and activities:

Critical Habitat for Already Listed Species

The Service anticipates publishing 7 final critical habitat rules (for 7 species) and 10 proposed critical habitat rules (for 10 species) in FY 2010.

Listing Determinations

During the 2010 Fiscal Year, we project completion of:

- Final listings/critical habitat determinations for 29 species
- Final listings determinations for 18 species
- Proposed listings/critical habitat determinations for 31 candidate species
- Proposed listings determinations for 13 candidate species
- Emergency listings as necessary

Petition Findings

The Service intends to address 90-day and 12-month findings on citizen petitions in FY 2010.

- 22 petition findings, 90-day and 12-month, for 608 species

**Subactivity: Endangered Species
Program Element: Consultations and HCPs**

		2008 Actual	2009 Enacted	2010			Change from 2009 (+/-)
				Fixed Costs & Related Changes (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	
Consultation /HCP	(\$000)	51,758	53,462	+1,201	+2,200	56,863	+3,401
	FTE	432	432	0	+14	446	+14

Summary of 2010 Program Changes for Consultations and HCPs

Request Component	(\$000)	FTE
• Creating a New Energy Frontier	+1,500	+10
• America's Arctic/Polar Bear	+700	+4
Total, Program Changes	+2,200	+14
Internal Transfer – NCTC Literature Search Service (Fixed Costs and Related Changes)	-53	0

Justification of 2010 Program Changes

The 2010 budget request for Consultation and Habitat Conservation Planning is \$56,863,000 and 446 FTE, a net program change of +\$2,200,000 and +14 FTE from the 2009 Enacted.

Creating a New Energy Frontier (+\$1,500,000 /+10 FTE) - The Nation’s drive to find renewable domestic energy sources in the midst of climate change has led to increased demand to site and develop renewable energy projects such as solar and wind power. The Service recognizes the national priority to develop carbon-free energy sources, and plans to use funds from this request to streamline environmental reviews and thereby facilitate development of renewable energy projects.

Currently, the Service is not always able to respond (in a timely fashion) to all requests received for environmental reviews of alternative energy projects while also providing assistance to other federal agencies involved in renewable energy production. With the significant new emphasis on planning and developing sources of energy, there is a critical need for additional Service capacity to facilitate “smart development” and ensure appropriate consideration of these activities under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) so that goals are met for both resource development and conservation. It is particularly important that the Service be able to provide expertise in a timely manner to Federal, State, and local governments, Tribes, and the energy industry, about where, when, and how to develop alternative energy projects. Increased funding will bolster timeliness of reviews and in particular will accelerate the development and more widespread implementation of the Service’s Information, Planning, and Consultation (IPaC) System.

The prototype for IPaC was recently developed by the Service to provide a decision-making tool that agencies can use to assist in designing and implementing both small- and large-scale projects along the southwestern US/Mexico border. This internet-based system is designed to provide resource information to regional planning efforts and streamline environmental review and approval processes. Among other things, the system provides rapid identification of potential projects that will not affect specific categories of natural resources, expedites completion of requirements involving ESA section 7 consultation and other environmental review processes, and better integrates the various reviews. Application of the IPaC program involves completing much of the needed environmental review

work in advance, which facilitates project planning efforts and allows proposed activities to move quickly through the final stages of environmental review and approval. The additional funding would allow the Service to expand IPaC to include the information needed to address planning and developing alternative energy resources in a manner consistent with the purposes and requirements of the ESA and provide expertise and timely assistance for renewable energy production.

Climate Change Key Performance Measure	2009 Plan*	2010-2009 (Variance)	2010 Climate Metric
14.1.2 % of formal/informal energy (non-hydropower) consultation addressed in a timely manner	84% (1,377 of 1,641)	0.0% (138 of 164)	84% (1,515 of 1,805)
Comments:	This increase in performance is the result of additional funds to support consultations on renewable domestic energy sources in the midst of climate change.		

* Note the FY 2009 Plan numbers will be completed using program dollars, not dollars specifically tied to climate change impacts.

Consultations on Actions in America’s Arctic/Polar Bear (+\$700,000 /+4 FTE) - The Endangered Species program will increase its ability to address a large consultation workload in America’s Arctic. The Service's Section 7 consultation workload in Alaska has grown significantly with the listing of the polar bear and increases in economic activity. Rising gas prices over the last few years led to increased oil and gas activity, which often occurs in close proximity to polar bear habitat and within the Steller’s eider’s range. Additionally, the consultation caseloads have increased due to other factors such as economic development, population growth in villages, and the impacts of climate change.

Since the listing of the polar bear, the Service has been approached by federal agencies operating in and near polar bear habitat to reinitiate consultations to ensure that projects that may impact polar bears and other species have been sufficiently addressed. In particular, the consultation workload for ongoing and proposed offshore and onshore oil and gas exploration and development has increased. The Service expects even more demand for consultation relative to oil and gas exploration and development as the Nation seeks to reduce its reliance on foreign oil. This increase in demand for consultations is especially challenging as the polar bear workload has high visibility and the Service’s decisions are often litigated. The Service is concerned that the workload will exceed existing staff’s ability to provide products in a timely manner.

The increase in funding will allow Service biologists to play a critical role in this process by providing expert technical assistance and working with federal action agencies and their applicants to design and/or modify projects to minimize impacts to polar bears and other listed species.

Program Overview

The Consultation program is the primary customer service component of the Endangered Species program and makes an important contribution to addressing threats and moving species towards recovery. The Consultation program includes two primary components, the Section 10 Habitat Conservation Planning program and the Section 7 Consultation program.

Section 7 - Interagency Consultation

Section 7 of the ESA requires federal agencies to use their authorities to conserve endangered and threatened species, including an obligation to ensure that activities they authorize, fund, or carry out are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat. For example, U.S. Forest Service (USFS) or Bureau of Land Management (BLM) approval of livestock grazing on federal lands, or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers approval of discharge of fill material into waters of the U.S., requires Section 7 consultation when these activities may affect listed species. Through section 7 consultations, the Service attempts to confront and remove many threats to endangered and threatened species. Coordination between the Service, other federal agencies, and their applicants during consultation is critical to ensure that the actions are designed in ways that reduce threats to species, minimize effects that can not be avoided, and incorporate conservation measures to offset unavoidable impacts in a way that promotes species recovery.

Non-federal applicants play a large role in the consultation process. Many of the federal actions subject to Section 7 consultation, such as grazing allotments or timber sales on federal lands and permits issued under the Clean Water Act, involve non-federal applicants. Section 7 of the ESA and its implementing regulations provide non-federal applicants a role in all phases of the interagency consultation process.

Interagency consultations between federal project proponents and the Service, required by Section 7 of the ESA, take time. Better efficiency can be achieved by encouraging federal partners to initiate and better prepare for consultations, lessening the time needed for Service review. Efficiencies can also be attained through automation of data entry and retrieval, Web-based access to consultation planning, and customer education. Service staff has already begun to educate and provide techniques to federal partners so that the federal project proponents and non-federal applicants can become more self-sufficient in fulfilling Section 7 requirements.

Section 10(a)(1)(B) - Habitat Conservation Planning

The Service works with private landowners and local and State governments through the Habitat Conservation Planning program to develop Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) and their associated Incidental Take Permits. Private land development is one of the most common threats to listed species. By working with States, cities, and private individuals to develop and implement HCPs, the Service is able to facilitate private lands development in a way that addresses threats and fulfills recovery needs of endangered and threatened species and species at-risk.

2010 Program Performance

The Service anticipates the following accomplishments and activities.

- Continue to work with all our federal customers to design projects that avoid and minimize adverse impacts and conserve listed species. In FY 2010 the Service will complete more than 15,000 consultations, with an increase in response to consultations associated with energy related projects.
- Continue to develop and expand the internet-based Information, Planning, and Consultation (IPaC) system that can be used to obtain information regarding all Service trust resources, screen out projects that will not affect ESA listed species or designated critical habitat, complete or expedite the requirements of section 7 consultation, better integrate section 7 consultation with action agencies' other environmental review processes, including NEPA, and better coordinate the Service's various programs toward unified objects in accordance

with the goals of the Strategic Habitat Conservation initiative. In addition, implementation of the IPaC system will help decrease the time project proponents spend obtaining resource information and project design recommendations from the Service and allow the Service to assist many who currently are not receiving this service presently. The Service is currently developing this system with the assistance of Customs and Border Protection; however, additional agencies have expressed interest in participating in system development.

- Continue coordination efforts in areas with high concentrations of conventional energy development to facilitate energy and other projects in a manner that is compatible with threatened and endangered species conservation.
- Complete an evaluation of the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) program. In the HCP program, the Service provides technical assistance to applicants in developing a Conservation Plan which will contribute to the recovery of listed species as well as provide for conservation of unlisted species. In FY 2010, approximately 52,000,000 acres will have been covered by HCPs, benefiting more than 600 listed and non-listed species.

**Subactivity: Endangered Species
Program Element: Recovery of Listed Species**

		2008 Actual	2009 Enacted	2010			Change from 2009 (+/-)
				Fixed Costs & Related Changes (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	
Recovery	(\$000)	71,041	74,575	+1,174	+850	76,599	+2,024
	FTE	419	419	0	0	419	0

Summary of 2010 Program Changes for Endangered Species

Request Component	(\$000)	FTE
• Polar Bear Recovery	+800	0
• Endangered Species Recovery	+1,800	0
• NFWF Endangered Species Grants	-1,500	0
• Lahontan Cutthroat Trout	-250	0
Total, Program Changes	+850	0
Internal Transfer – NCTC Literature Search Service (Fixed Costs and Related Changes)	-52	0

Justification of 2010 Program Changes

The 2010 budget request for Recovery is \$76,599,000 and 419 FTE, a net program change of +\$850,000 and +0 FTE from the 2009 Enacted.

Polar Bear Recovery (+\$800,000/+0 FTE) - Polar bear recovery efforts will require significant and wide-ranging coordination with numerous international partners, including the Polar Bear Specialist Group and range states. The Service will prepare a range-wide Polar Bear Conservation Plan to guide U.S. and international work to improve the status of the species. Harvest monitoring is an important component of the Conservation Plan. Information on the existing harvest is crucial to determine appropriate quotas, and to support determination of population goals. Similarly, range-wide monitoring in consultation with the Polar Bear Specialist Group and U.S. Geological Survey will fulfill a critical information need as we determine the best approach to conserving the species.

Endangered Species Recovery (+\$1,800,000/+0 FTE) – This initiative will provide funding for the Endangered Species Recovery program’s Showing Success/Preventing Extinction Initiative. The purpose of this initiative is to fund the implementation of final recovery actions for species near delisting or reclassification from endangered to threatened (i.e., showing success) and urgently needed actions for critically endangered species (i.e. preventing extinction). This initiative allocates funding through a competitive process among the Regions. Species and projects to be funded are selected using a pre-defined set of criteria for each category.

- The Showing Success/Preventing Extinction Initiative focuses on implementing 1) final recovery actions for species near delisting or reclassification from endangered to threatened (i.e., showing success) and 2) urgently needed actions for critically endangered species (i.e. preventing extinction).
- Showing Success funds are allocated among species with an “overall species status” and “population trend” of improving or stable and the potential for initiating a reclassification or delisting rule within 1-2 years.
- Funding awarded in the Preventing Extinction category is based on: 1) the risk of extinction if unfunded, 2) the likelihood of success with a single year of funding, and 3) cross-program component/multiple partners. Service proposals that have potential to benefit multiple species receive higher priority.

The Service has been successful in Showing Success and Preventing Extinction of many species through previous fiscal year projects. For example, the Tinian monarch and West Virginia northern flying squirrel have been delisted due to recovery; the Hawaiian hawk and Maguire daisy have been proposed for delisting due to recovery; and proposed rules to downlist two other species from endangered to threatened are being drafted because the Service was able to implement actions from projects funded through this Initiative. In addition, projects for over 150 species have been implemented to help prevent their extinction.

Some of the species that could benefit from Showing Success/Preventing Extinction project funds are also Spotlight Species identified by Service regions as part of the Endangered Species program’s strategic planning process described above in the general overview section. Where there is overlap, the initiative funding would help implement actions identified in the Spotlight Species Action Plans. However, all species that meet the competitive criteria would be eligible for receiving project funding.

NFWF Endangered Species Grants (-\$1,500,000/+0 FTE) - The 2009 Appropriations Act provided \$1,500,000 for Pacific Salmon grants through the Service’s Recovery program. This funding is a pass-through grant to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) for salmon habitat recovery projects in the State of Washington. The Service proposes to discontinue funding this project in FY 2010 to direct funding to higher priority endangered species conservation activities. Although the Service plays a role in salmon management, the National Marine Fisheries Service is the federal agency with lead responsibility for recovery of the Pacific salmon. An array of federal grant programs are available for species and habitat conservation, particularly programs focused on salmon and anadromous fish recovery such as the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (NOAA).

Lahontan Cutthroat Trout (-\$250,000/+0 FTE) - The 2009 Appropriations Act provided a \$250,000 earmark to the Service for recovery of the Lahontan cutthroat trout in Nevada. Continued funding is not requested because these on-the-ground actions have been implemented and a Management Oversight Group has been established. Additionally, any recommendations for future actions—and the appropriate management entities to implement them—are expected to come out of the revised Recovery Plan.

Program Performance Change

Performance Goal	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Plan	2010 Base Budget (2009 Plan + Fixed Costs)	2010 President's Budget	Program Change Accruing in 2010	Program Change Accruing in Out-years
Sustaining Biological Communities								
CSF 7.20 % of delisted species due to recovery (cumulative)	28% (9 of 32)	31% (11 of 35)	unk	38% (14 of 37)	38% (14 of 37)	51% (25 of 49)	13.2% (34.8%)	---
Comments:	This performance measure will replace CSF 7.13 in FY 2010 to more accurately reflect our objectives for the program. The performance increase is due to an increase in funding							

Program Overview

Coordinating, developing, implementing, and managing all of the recovery tools and partner activities in a cohesive and effective manner for species’ recovery requires significant commitment and resources. The Recovery program plays a vital role in leading or guiding the recovery planning process and facilitating, supporting, and monitoring the implementation of recovery actions by the Service, other DOI bureaus, federal agencies, States, and other partners and stakeholders.

Two examples of successful multi-party partnerships include:

- The Upper Colorado River Recovery program, where federal, State, local agencies, and water users 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, including the endangered whooping crane, piping plover, and least tern.

The Recovery program utilizes flexibility in the implementation of the ESA whenever feasible and practical. Special rules developed for threatened species under section 4(d) of the ESA allow the Service to tailor protections to the needs of the species while enabling human activities to continue, 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 Apache trout habitat. In addition, experimental populations established 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.

Other successful and flexible conservation tools include Safe Harbor agreements and recovery management agreements. Safe Harbor Agreements build positive relationships with landowners to preserve needed habitat; while recovery management agreements work to implement actions that manage remaining threats so that a species may be delisted and transferred to the management authority of another appropriate agency, such as a State partner.

The goal of the Recovery program is to minimize or remove the threats that led to the listing of a species so that the species can be delisted or reclassified from Endangered to Threatened status. This

requires constant monitoring, adaptive management, and holistic planning over decades, along with close coordination and technical leadership to our partners to assist their recovery efforts.

2010 Program Performance

The Service anticipates the following accomplishments and activities:

- In FY 2010, based upon funding and other new information, delist 7 species due to recovery; possible examples include Johnston's frankenia, brown pelican, and Tennessee purple coneflower.
- Initiate 5-year reviews for 253 species in FY 2010, and complete more than 190 5-year reviews initiated in prior years.
- Implement newly completed 5-year action plans for 142 Spotlight species, based on current recovery plans.
- Build partnerships to help the Service implement recovery actions (including habitat restoration, captive propagation, and reintroduction) for all listed species.
- Implement more than 2,800 recovery actions for Spotlight species.